Faculty Senate Agenda 3/28/2025 Noon-1 p.m. Mill 201

I. Welcome and minutes: https://mtech.edu/facultystaff/facultysenate/minutes/docs/2025/minutes-3-5-25.pdf

Action Items

- II. CRC Recommendations (<u>crc</u> link expires 3/29)
 - a. LCME Computer Science
 - b. LCME Petroleum Engineering
 - c. ROTC
- III. Research Advisory Committee Safety Concerns noted by campus constituents
- IV. MGMG Merit Request
- V. Faculty and Staff Climate Survey AY 24/25
- VI. Propose summer teaching salary change to 2/9ths pay for teaching 8 credit/contact hours with a new minimum average enrollment of 4 students per course instead of the current 10 student average, and then resuming offering many summer classes beginning summer 2025
- VII. Proposed change to course evaluations

Information Items

- VIII. Adjunct Pay
 - a. Adjunct pay increased from \$1000 to \$1100 in AY 24/25
 - b. Budgeted to increase adjunct pay from \$1100 to \$1200 starting July 1
- IX. Policy proposals feedback due by April 15th
 - a. Honorary Degree
 - b. Posthumous Degree
- X. Senator/Officer terms end April 11th
- XI. Save the Date, April 17th 2pm Let's talk about AI Do's and Don'ts

Discussion Items

XII. For the Good of the Order

CRC Meeting Agenda - Friday, March 3, 2025 3:00pm

Meeting via zoom:

https://us06web.zoom.us/j/84157510938

Proposals

	College	Department	Program	Proposal	Vote
01	CLSPS	Business	BS & Others	Adds new CCN courses, remove courses no longer taught, rename two courses, change BS Mgmt of Info Option & BAS – Helena College	Tabled to April
02	LCME	Computer Science	BS Software Engineering	Curriculum Changes	Approved
03	LCME	Petroleum Engineering	Minor, BS & MS	Curriculum Changes, change petroleum minor, catalog cleanup	Approved
04	LCME	Electrical Engineering	BS & MS	Course updates, Catalog Cleanup	Deferred to April 4 Meeting
05	CLSPS	ROTC	ROTC	Create ROTC Courses	Approved

Discussion Items:

- CRC Form Update Subcommittee: Chris Roos, Mary MacLaughlin, Nathan Huft, did I miss someone?
 - o Etrieve?
- Course sequence changes only last year this body opted to see ALL sequence changes
- Discussion/as a reminder for any course changes, syllabi need to be included, even for "small" changes like prerequisite changes, course description, or credit adjustment
 - o Please include all requested documentation on the request form

206.5 MBMG Merit Awards

206.5.1 General Considerations for Merit Awards

The following points shall be observed:

- 1. To receive a Merit Award, the Bureau member must apply for it. It is the applicant's responsibility to describe and explain the reasons they should receive a Merit Award. The application must explicitly address the criteria that the Merit Award Committee will use to evaluate applications.
- 2. Up to three (3) Merit Awards can be granted each year. However, there is no expectation that any or all awards will be granted in a given year.
- 3. The applicant must be a full-time employee of the Montana Bureau of Mines and Geology.
- 4. A Merit Award shall be granted for exceptional achievement in one key area (research/publication, service, or leadership) or excellence in two or three key areas (research/publication, service, or leadership).
- 5. The activities or accomplishments under consideration for a Merit Award shall have taken place in the immediate three years prior to the application.
- 6. Applications shall be evaluated by a Merit Award Committee consisting of five (5) Bureau Professional Practice Faculty members:
 - a. three (3) program leaders (Geology, GWAP, GWIP) or alternates selected by the Director each year,
 - b. two (2) at large members with demonstrated long-term leadership, selected by the MBMG Director each year.
- 7. No members of the Merit Award Committee will be active

- applicants; membership will be determined after applications have been received by the Director. The Director is never eligible for the Merit Award.
- 8. The Merit Award Committee shall elect a new non-consecutive chair each year.
- 9. The Merit Award Committee will submit recommendations to the Research Division Chief, but is encouraged to consult with the Division Chief during their review.
- 10. The Research Division Chief will present recommendations to the Director who will present recommendations to the Chancellor.
- 11. A Bureau member shall not be eligible to apply for a Merit Award for two years following receipt of a Merit Award.
- 12. Funding for Merit Awards shall not be taken from the general salary pool.
- 13. Merit Awards shall be in the amount of \$2,000.00 \$2,500, all of which shall go into the Awardee's base salary beginning July 1 following the award.



Student

a.	Was this course required for your major or was it an elective?	Re	quir	ed	Ele	ective
b.	What grade do you expect in this course?	F	D	С	В	Α
C.	How much time did you spend on this course outside of class?			hrs/	wk	
d.	How much outside time involved the instructor (office hours/appointment)?			hrs/	wk	

Course Evaluations are routinely used so courses and labs can be adjusted based on your input. Both positive comments and constructive criticism are welcome. It is important to note that your input is used by the instructors to improve all courses and labs and thereby help future students taking them. This evaluation will not be seen by the instructor until after the course is completed and grades are submitted.

Instructor

	1 = Strongly disagree	2 = Disagree	3 = Neither agree nor disagree	4 = Agree	5 = Strongly agree
was prepared for lecture and maintained effective teaching.	0	0	0	0	0
provided and reviewed a syllabus that included course objectives and outcomes (see below).	0	0	0	0	0
used various assignments, quizzes and/or exams effectively for evaluation and synthesis.	0	0	0	0	0
4. used fair evaluation and synthesis methods.	0	0	0	0	0
gave timely feedback that helped students prepare for future assignments, quizzes and/or exams.	0	0	0	0	0
was responsive and available during office hours or by appointment.	0	0	0	0	0
7. used lecture time efficiently.	0	0	0	0	0
encouraged students to challenge themselves and produce quality work.	0	0	0	0	0

Comments

What course aspects contributed to your learning (and meeting course objectives and outcomes)?

What course aspects did not contribute to your learning (and meeting course objectives and outcomes)?

What do you suggest for improving the course?

Feedback for other students: What advice would you give to another student who is considering taking this course (or section)?



Course Evaluations are routinely used so courses and labs can be adjusted based on your input. Both positive comments and constructive criticism are welcome. It is important to note that your input is used by the instructors to improve all courses and labs and thereby help future students taking them. This evaluation will not be seen by the instructor until after the course is completed and grades are submitted.

Course Objectives – Please indicate if the following objectives were met or not met and comment							
The student will:							
Course Objective #1:		_ <type here="" in="" objective="" the=""></type>					
Met	Not Met						
Comments							
Course Objective #2:		_ <type here="" in="" objective="" the=""></type>					
Met	Not Met						
Comments	 						
Add more Course Obje Course Outcomes – Please		ving outcomes were met or not met and comment					
The student will:							
Course Outcome #1:		_ <type here="" in="" outcome="" the=""></type>					
Met	Not Met						
Comments							
Course Outcome #2:		_ <type here="" in="" outcome="" the=""></type>					
Met	Not Met						
•							



Evaluation for Distance Courses (fully-online)

<CRN, Dept, Course Number, Course Name, Semester, Year, Instructor>

Student

a.	Was this course required for your major or was it an elective?	Re	quir	ed	Ele	ectiv	e
b.	What grade do you expect in this course?	F	Ď	С	В	Α	
C.	How much time did you spend on this course (including in-class and independently)?			hrs	/wk		
d.	Did you take advantage of the instructor's online office hours?	Ye	s	No)		
e.	Did you find the flexibility of a fully-online schedule useful?	Ye	s	No)		

Course Evaluations are routinely used so courses and labs can be adjusted based on your input. Both positive comments and constructive criticism are welcome. It is important to note that your input is used by the instructors to improve all courses and labs and thereby help future students taking them. This evaluation will not be seen by the instructor until after the course is completed and grades are submitted.

Instructor

		1 = Strongly disagree	2 = Disagree	3 = Neither agree nor disagree	4 = Agree	5 = Strongly agree
1.	provided clear directions for course exercises.	0	0	0	0	0
2.	provided clearly stated course objectives and outcomes in a syllabus or other location (see below).	0	0	0	0	0
3.	provided access to resources needed to complete the course work.	0	0	0	0	0
4.	articulated clearly the expected standards of performance.	0	0	0	0	0
5.	gave timely feedback that helped students prepare and improve.	0	0	0	0	0
6.	was responsive and available during office hours or by appointment.	0	0	0	0	0
7.	provided opportunities for interaction with the content, other learners, and/or the instructor.	0	0	0	0	0
8.	was present for online discussions and interactions.	0	0	0	0	0



Evaluation for Distance Courses (fully-online)

<CRN, Dept, Course Number, Course Name, Semester, Year, Instructor>

Design

1.	was effectively and logically organized.	0	0	0	0	0
2.	provided a fully-online schedule resulting in a seamless experience.	0	0	0	0	0
3.	had assignments and lectures that were useful and complemented each other.	0	0	0	0	0
4.	offered clear instructions for accessing course materials (including manuals, handouts, Apps and tools, audio or video recordings, etc.).	0	0	0	0	0
5.	provided opportunities for low-stakes assessment such as self-evaluation to measure learning (formative assessment) throughout the course.	0	0	0	0	0

Comments

What course aspects contributed to your learning (and meeting course objectives and outcomes)?

What course aspects did not contribute to your learning (and meeting course objectives and outcomes)?

What do you suggest for improving the course?

Feedback for other students: What advice would you give to another student who is considering taking this course (or section)?



Evaluation for Distance Courses (fully-online)

<CRN, Dept, Course Number, Course Name, Semester, Year, Instructor>

Course Evaluations are routinely used so courses and labs can be adjusted based on your input. Both positive comments and constructive criticism are welcome. It is important to note that your input is used by the instructors to improve all courses and labs and thereby help future students taking them. This evaluation will not be seen by the instructor until after the course is completed and grades are submitted.

Course Objectives – Please in	ndicate if the follo	wing objectives were met or not met and comment
The student will:		
Course Objective #1:		<type here="" in="" objective="" the=""></type>
Met	Not Met	
Comments		
Course Objective #2:		<type here="" in="" objective="" the=""></type>
Met	Not Met	
Comments	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Add more Course Object Course Outcomes – Please in		wing outcomes were met or not met and comment
The student will:		
Course Outcome #1:		<type here="" in="" outcome="" the=""></type>
Met	Not Met	
Comments		
Course Outcome #2:		<type here="" in="" outcome="" the=""></type>
Met	Not Met	
Comments		



Student

a.	Was this course required for your major or was it an elective?	Re	equir	ed	Ele	ectiv	ϵ
b.	What grade do you expect in this course?	F	Ď	С	В	Α	
C.	How much time did you spend on this course (including in-class, online, and independently)?			hrs	/wk		
d.	Did you take advantage of the instructor's office hours?	Ye	s	No)		
_	Did you find the flexibility of a Hyflex schedule useful?	٧e		No			

Course Evaluations are routinely used so courses and labs can be adjusted based on your input. Both positive comments and constructive criticism are welcome. It is important to note that your input is used by the instructors to improve all courses and labs and thereby help future students taking them. This evaluation will not be seen by the instructor until after the course is completed and grades are submitted.

Instructor

		1 = Strongly disagree	2 = Disagree	3 = Neither agree nor disagree	4 = Agree	5 = Strongly agree
1.	provided clear information regarding the online and face-to-face schedules and requirements as well as flexibility between the two designs.	0	0	0	0	0
2.	provided clearly stated course objectives and outcomes in a syllabus or other location (see below).	0	0	0	0	0
3.	provided clear directions for course exercises.	0	0	0	0	0
4.	provided access to resources needed to complete the course work.	0	0	0	0	0
5.	articulated clearly the expected standards of performance.	0	0	0	0	0
6.	gave timely feedback that helped students prepare and improve.	0	0	0	0	0
7.	was responsive and available during office hours or by appointment.	0	0	0	0	0
8.	provided opportunities for interaction with the content, other learners, and/or the instructor.	0	0	0	0	0
9.	was present for online discussions and interactions.	0	0	0	0	0



I)	00		\sim	•
u		П	a	
_			3	

1.	was effectively and logically organized.	0	0	0	0	0
2.	provided a Hyflex schedule resulting in a seamless experience.	0	0	0	0	0
3.	had assignments and lectures that were useful and complemented each other.	0	0	0	0	0
4.	offered clear instructions for accessing course materials (including manuals, handouts, apps and tools, audio or video recordings, etc.).	0	0	0	0	0
5.	provided opportunities for low-stakes assessment such as self-evaluation to measure learning (formative assessment) throughout the course.	0	0	0	0	0

Comments

What course aspects contributed to your learning (and meeting course objectives and outcomes)?

What course aspects did not contribute to your learning (and meeting course objectives and outcomes)?

What do you suggest for improving the course?

Feedback for other students: What advice would you give to another student who is considering taking this course (or section)?



Evaluation for Distance Courses (Hyflex)

<CRN, Dept, Course Number, Course Name, Semester, Year, Instructor>

Course Evaluations are routinely used so courses and labs can be adjusted based on your input. Both positive comments and constructive criticism are welcome. It is important to note that your input is used by the instructors to improve all courses and labs and thereby help future students taking them. This evaluation will not be seen by the instructor until after the course is completed and grades are submitted.

Course Objectives – Please in	ndicate if the follo	wing objectives were met or not met and comment
The student will:		
Course Objective #1:		<type here="" in="" objective="" the=""></type>
Met	Not Met	
Comments		
Course Objective #2:		<type here="" in="" objective="" the=""></type>
Met	Not Met	
Comments		
Add more Course Object Course Outcomes – Please in		wing outcomes were met or not met and comment
The student will:		
Course Outcome #1:		<type here="" in="" outcome="" the=""></type>
Met	Not Met	
Comments		
Course Outcome #2:		<type here="" in="" outcome="" the=""></type>
Met	Not Met	
Comments		



Student

a.	Was this course required for your major or was it an elective?	Re	quir	ed	Εle	ective
b.	What grade do you expect in this course?	F	D	С	В	Α
C.	How much time did you spend on this course outside of class?			hrs/	wk	
d.	How much outside time involved the instructor (office hours/appointment)?			hrs/	wk	

Course Evaluations are routinely used so courses and labs can be adjusted based on your input. Both positive comments and constructive criticism are welcome. It is important to note that your input is used by the instructors to improve all courses and labs and thereby help future students taking them. This evaluation will not be seen by the instructor until after the course is completed and grades are submitted.

Instructor

	1 = Strongly disagree	2 = Disagree	3 = Neither agree nor disagree	4 = Agree	5 = Strongly agree
was prepared for lab and included explanations for safety and health issues as applicable.	0	0	0	0	0
provided and reviewed a syllabus that included course objectives and outcomes (see below).	0	0	0	0	0
offered hands-on labs unless equipment was delicate, expensive and/or solely available.	0	0	0	0	0
4. used fair evaluation and synthesis methods.	0	0	0	0	0
gave timely feedback that helped students prepare and improve future reports.	0	0	0	0	0
was responsive and available during office hours or by appointment.	0	0	0	0	0
7. offered labs that complemented the lectures.	0	0	0	0	0
encouraged students to challenge themselves and produce quality work.	0	0	0	0	0

Comments

What course aspects contributed to your learning (and meeting course objectives and outcomes)?

What course aspects did not contribute to your learning (and meeting course objectives and outcomes)?

What do you suggest for improving the course?

Feedback for other students: What advice would you give to another student who is considering taking this course (or section)?

Course Evaluations are routinely used so courses and labs can be adjusted based on your input. Both positive comments and constructive criticism are welcome. It is important to note that your input is used by the instructors to improve all courses and labs and thereby help future students taking them. This evaluation will not be seen by the instructor until after the course is completed and grades are submitted.

Course Objectives - Please indicate if the following objectives were met or not met and comment The student will: Course Objective #1: _____<type in the objective here> _____ Met Not Met Comments _____ Course Objective #2: _____<type in the objective here> _____ Met Not Met Comments _____ Add more Course Objectives as needed **Course Outcomes** – Please indicate if the following outcomes were met or not met and comment The student will: Course Outcome #1: <type in the outcome here> Not Met Met Comments _____ Met Not Met Comments



Evaluation for Distance Courses (blended)

<CRN, Dept, Course Number, Course Name, Semester, Year, Instructor>

Student

a.	Was this course required for your major or was it an elective?	Re	quir	ed	Ele	ective
b.	What grade do you expect in this course?	F	D	С	В	Α
C.	How much time did you spend on this course (including in-class, online, and independently)?			hrs/	wk	
d.	Did you take advantage of the instructor's office hours?	Ye	s	No		
e.	Did you find the flexibility of a blended schedule useful?	Ye	s	No		

Course Evaluations are routinely used so courses and labs can be adjusted based on your input. Both positive comments and constructive criticism are welcome. It is important to note that your input is used by the instructors to improve all courses and labs and thereby help future students taking them. This evaluation will not be seen by the instructor until after the course is completed and grades are submitted.

Instructor

		1 = Strongly disagree	2 = Disagree	3 = Neither agree nor disagree	4 = Agree	5 = Strongly agree
1.	provided clear information regarding the online and face-to-face schedule and requirements.	0	0	0	0	0
2.	provided clearly stated course objectives and outcomes in a syllabus or other location (see below).	0	0	0	0	0
3.	provided clear directions for course exercises.	0	0	0	0	0
4.	provided access to resources needed to complete the course work.	0	0	0	0	0
5.	articulated clearly the expected standards of performance.	0	0	0	0	0
6.	gave timely feedback that helped students prepare and improve.	0	0	0	0	0
7.	was responsive and available during office hours or by appointment.	0	0	0	0	0
8.	provided opportunities for interaction with the content, other learners, and/or the instructor.	0	0	0	0	0
9.	was present for online discussions and interactions.	0	0	0	0	0



Evaluation for Distance Courses (blended)

<CRN, Dept, Course Number, Course Name, Semester, Year, Instructor>

Design

1.	was effectively and logically organized.	0	0	0	0	0
2.	provided a blended schedule resulting in a seamless experience.	0	0	0	0	0
3.	had assignments and lectures that were useful and complemented each other.	0	0	0	0	0
4.	offered clear instructions for accessing course materials (including manuals, handouts, apps and tools, audio or video recordings, etc.).	0	0	0	0	0
5.	provided opportunities for low-stakes assessment such as self-evaluation to measure learning (formative assessment) throughout the course.	0	0	0	0	0

Comments

What course aspects contributed to your learning (and meeting course objectives and outcomes)?

What course aspects did not contribute to your learning (and meeting course objectives and outcomes)?

What do you suggest for improving the course?

Feedback for other students: What advice would you give to another student who is considering taking this course (or section)?



Evaluation for Distance Courses (blended)

<CRN, Dept, Course Number, Course Name, Semester, Year, Instructor>

Course Evaluations are routinely used so courses and labs can be adjusted based on your input. Both positive comments and constructive criticism are welcome. It is important to note that your input is used by the instructors to improve all courses and labs and thereby help future students taking them. This evaluation will not be seen by the instructor until after the course is completed and grades are submitted.

Course Objectives – Please i	ndicate if the follo	wing objectives were met or not met and comment.
The student will:		
Course Objective #1:		<type here="" in="" objective="" the=""></type>
Met	Not Met	
Comments		
Course Objective #2:		_ <type here="" in="" objective="" the=""></type>
Met	Not Met	
Comments		
Add more Course Object Course Outcomes – Please in		wing objectives were met or not met and comment.
The student will:		
Course Outcome #1:		<type here="" in="" outcome="" the=""></type>
Met	Not Met	
Comments		
Course Outcome #2:		<type here="" in="" outcome="" the=""></type>
Met	Not Met	
Comments		

DRAFT

Honorary Degree Policy

Subject:

Academic Affairs

Policy Number:

322.1

Revised:

Effective date:

May 1, 2025

Review date:

May 1, 2028

Responsible Party:

Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs

Historical Versions:

N/A - link to BOR policy here.

Introduction and Purpose:

The purpose of this policy is to establish the criteria for the award of honorary degrees to individuals as allowed by the Montana Board of Regents in **BOR Policy 322.1.**

Policy:

Montana Technological University may award an honorary degree to individuals who:

- Have an association with Montana Technological University and/or the State of Montana by virtue of birth, of residence, of education, of service, or of direct contribution to the well-being of the state's citizens.
- Have achieved a level of distinction which would merit comparable recognition in his or her profession or area of excellence.
- Will reflect favorably on Montana Technological University, Montana University System, and the State of Montana.

To protect the privacy of nominees, all involved must maintain complete confidentiality at every step of the nomination and approval process.

Long tenure in a position, personal durability and above average service, while praiseworthy do not equate with merit as conceived in these criteria. Honorary degrees

are rightfully conferred in acknowledgment of a full and distinguished career or extraordinary impact in their field, and may also be conferred upon distinguished young achievers.

The Office of the Provost oversees the process and procedures related to the nomination, review, and approval of proposed honorary degrees.

Interna	I control	considerations	, if ap	plicab	le
----------------	-----------	----------------	---------	--------	----

Adopted by: (Chancellor)		Date

Procedures:

The honorary doctorate is the highest honor Montana Technological University can confer upon an individual. Faculty and any other interested persons may nominate qualified individuals for an honorary degree by submitting a letter of nomination and supporting materials to the Honorary Degree Committee.

Supporting materials may include letters of support from nationally or internationally known leaders in the area of endeavor of the nominee, from faculty/staff/students, past and present, and from others who have been impacted by the nominee. Additionally, documentation such as press articles, professional organization honors, and other materials demonstrating the candidate's notoriety usually accompany nominations.

Nominees lacking a direct connection to Montana Technological University or Montana but whose extraordinary accomplishments have either benefited Montanans directly, or whose stature will serve as an outstanding role model to young people, may be considered and require special justification.

Current employees of the Montana University System are not eligible.

Nominations for an honorary doctorate to be awarded at Spring commencement must be received by November 10th, preceding the commencement date in May. Nominations for an honorary doctorate to be awarded at Fall commencement must be received by April 10th, preceding the commencement date in December.

The Honorary Doctorate Committee reviews the nominations and provides a list of potential nominees to the Chancellor. If approved by the Chancellor, the nominees are voted on by faculty senate leadership in a closed session during, or immediately prior to, the final week of academic instruction of the semester. The names of honorary degree candidates, and supporting material, will be sent to the President of the University of Montana immediately following recommendation by Faculty Senate Leadership.

Upon recommendation by the UM President, the final recommendation is forwarded to the Montana Commissioner of Higher Education and the Montana Board of Regents for ultimate approval.

To protect the privacy of nominees, all persons involved in the process must maintain complete confidentiality at every step of the nomination and approval process.

The Chancellor will contact the successful nominees after the Board of Regents has approved their selection.

The Honorary Doctorate Committee shall include the provost and four additional members who will be appointed by the Provost. These shall include 1 faculty member from the College of Letters, Science, and Professional Studies, 1 faculty member from the Lance College of Mines and Engineering, 1 professional employee, and 1 at-large member.

DRAFT

Consideration of Posthumous Degree Candidates Policy

Subject:

Academic Affairs

Policy Number:

325

Revised:

Effective date:

May 1, 2025

Review date:

May 1, 2028

Responsible Party:

Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs

Historical Versions:

N/A

Introduction and Purpose:

In exceptional circumstances, the university can recommend to the Board of Regents that a degree from Montana Technological University be awarded posthumously.

An appropriate degree may be awarded on the recommendation of the student's major department chair, with support from the appropriate college dean, approval by the Provost and the Chancellor and approval of the Board of Regents.

Policy:

To be considered for a posthumous degree, the student must meet the following requirements:

- A. the student was in good academic standing, and
- B. the student had completed two thirds (2/3) of the credits requirements for the degree to be awarded.

In the case of graduate students, the major professor, department head and college dean shall recommend to the Graduate Dean and the Graduate Dean's Counsel potential recipients of posthumous degrees.

Procedures:

Requests for posthumous degrees will be forwarded to the registrar along with:

- 1) Student's full name and degree program
- 2) Confirmation that student is deceased (obituary, etc.)

Registrar will confirm whether policy requirements have been met. If the requirements are met, the registrar will submit the request to the Faculty Senate, as an independent item, at the same meeting where standard degree candidates are presented for approval.

Notification of faculty approval will be forwarded to the Chancellor immediately following the meeting. The Chancellor will notify the requester.

The Registrar will be notified and the degree will be awarded at a subsequent commencement ceremony or presented to the student's family in an appropriate setting.

Diplomas for posthumous degrees will be identical to other degrees awarded as all certified Montana Technological University degrees. Posthumous degrees will appear in the commencement program. Posthumous degrees will not appear on transcripts.

internal control considerations, if applicable:						
Adopted by: (Chancellor)	Date					