Montana Tech Full Faculty Meeting April 30th, 2025 • Copper Lounge Minutes

The meeting of the full faculty commenced at 1:10 p.m. Sixteen faculty members and two members of the administrative staff were present, and a quorum was established.

- I. Welcome Scott Risser, Chair of the Faculty Senate, called the meeting to order and introduced the 2025-26 Faculty Senate Officers. Scott Risser will continue as Chair, Scott Juskiewicz will serve as Vice-Chair and Janet Cornish will serve as Secretary.
- II. Approval of Spring and Summer 2025 Graduates A motion was made and seconded to approve the slate of graduates. The motion was approved.
- III. MBMG Merit Increase Proposal A motion was made and seconded to increase the Merit Award amount from \$2,000.00 to \$2,500.00 for the Montana Bureau of Mines and Geology, to be in line with other Merit Awards at Montana Tech. The motion was approved.
- IV. Academic Year Emerit Nominations The agenda for the meeting included the list of the six persons nominated for Emeritus status. The nominations will be referred to the Montana Board of Regents. No action was necessary in this process.
- V. Reserved for the Provost and Montana Tech Administration Provost Elgren reported that as of this date, 27 percent of the current student body had not yet registered for the Fall 2025 semester and that our retention rate at Montana Tech was 76 percent. This retention rate results in an overall annual loss of \$3.5 million, despite the fact that Montana Tech is credited when students transfer from Tech to complete their education at another MUS campus. The Provost noted the importance of student advising (both professional and department based) and mentoring in assisting students in developing an academic plan, which is more than simply a plan to meet the requirements associated with a particular major. The Provost also encouraged faculty members to attend the graduation to greet and celebrate the graduates.
- VI. Faculty Climate Survey Results Scott Risser presented the Faculty Climate Survey results, noting that 64 members, or 29% of all faculty, had responded to the survey as of April 28th, 2025. Approximate half of those responding were from College of Letters, Sciences, & Professional Studies (CLSPS) and half were from the Lance College of Mines and Engineering (LCME). Scott R. observed that a 29% return rate was a fairly good response. However, several faculty members noted that the response numbers might improve if the survey were to be conducted earlier in the semester, either in January or February. This

recommendation will be referred to the Faculty Senate. There was some further discussion regarding if and to what extent the results of the survey had any effect on the faculty climate overall.

VII. Course Evaluation Revision Proposals – Three possible options were presented to improve the course evaluation process at Montana Tech. The first is to keep/revise/shorten the existing evaluation form. The second is to engage a national firm with expertise and experience in developing, conducting and evaluating course evaluation processes. The third is a proposal developed by a Senate Faculty sub-committee. The sub-committee recommended a survey that would be considerably shorter and tied to particular modalities (in-person classes, labs, hybrid classes and on-line courses). The sub-committee included representatives from the Employee Relations Committee and the Associated Students of Montana Tech and developed a proposed eight-question form that would be tied to specific course outcomes.

Faculty members discussed the three options, noting that the use of an outside national firm would be advantageous, in that the data could be nationally normed and would be analyzed by those with questionnaire expertise. For any of the options, contract and union issues, as well as department performance standards would have to be taken into account. In any case, a new evaluation system would likely not be piloted (or put into place) earlier than the Fall 2026 semester.

A motion was made and seconded to seek more information on outside firms, including possible vendors, system costs and the ability to pilot the program, prior to making a final decision. The motion was approved.

VIII. For the Good of the Order – A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting at 2:14 p.m. The motion was approved.