

MONTANA TECH FACULTY SENATE

Friday, February 2, 2007

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

Members present: Mark Sholes, Miriam Young, Lance Edwards, Betsy Garlish,
John Brower, Karen Porter, John Nugent, Rod James, Paul Conrad

Members absent: None

Also present, ex officio: Chancellor Gilmore, Vice Chancellor Abbott

Discussion

1. Continued discussion of the “up-or-out” concept. The motion was made by Rod James and seconded by Lance Edwards that Montana Tech should adopt an “up-or-out” policy. The vote passed unanimously.
2. Continued discussion of need for each department to develop its own set of criteria for advancement within that department. A motion was made by Rod James and seconded by Lance Edwards that each department should develop these criteria. The vote passed unanimously. Subsequent discussion about enforcement of the concept concluded that the Vice Chancellor would have to provide the leadership and place the expectation upon departments.
3. New discussion of development of guidelines was begun. It was decided, without vote, that Faculty Senate should develop a general guidelines document to help departments prepare their own specific document.

A subcommittee of three (Lance Edwards, Miriam Young, Rod James) will examine advancement standards from other institutions, including the U of M and the Internet, and will report back to Faculty Senate within a month. Vice Chancellor Abbott indicated he planned to have a General Faculty meeting near the end of February and the announcement could be made then that the Senate is working on this task. It was recognized that up to a year might be required for individual departments to develop their own advancement rubrick, after the general guidelines are provided.

4. A Board of Regents meeting is scheduled for February 28th. Senate President Mark Sholes asked if there were subjects senate members wished to take before the Board. None were specifically mentioned.
5. A new, in-effect BOR policy was presented by President Sholes. Starting with the Class of 2009, a grade of D will not be accepted as applying to a student’s degree-required courses. During discussion, several senate members indicated that this concept was effectively already in place within their departments.
6. House Bill 525 – the bill that calls for “diversity” of thought and materials presented in the classrooms within university system – was discussed. Issues include (1) the subtext of what “diversity” means in this bill; (2) the cost, in time and dollars, of the reporting part of the bill.

NEXT MEETING: Friday, February 16, 2007

2:00 PM, Mountain Con Room

Respectfully submitted,
Karen Porter, Secretary