

Faculty Senate Meeting
1/21/14

- Call to Order—Michelle Anderson, Tyler Seacrest, Kurt Steadman, Megan Chilson, Michael Francisconi, Dana Cotton, Bethany Blankenship
- Approval of Minutes—Vikki moved to approve, Dana seconded. Minutes passed.
- Unfinished Business
 - Speech component of curriculum—tabled
 - International committee status—tabled
 - Strategic plan—Karl and Anneliese attended. The Strategic Plan can be commented upon until February 21st. No changes in the document are anticipated. The tactical plan will be open for more student/faculty/staff input. (see Appendix A)
 - Assessment Committee update—Sean Eudaily has resigned his Faculty Senate-appointed position on the committee. We will review the UMW Western Assessment Committee charge (see Appendix B)
- New Business
 - NWCCU report—tabled
 - Faculty Senate administrative review—see Appendix C for Missoula’s plan and sample surveys. Dana moved to proceed with this evaluation. Vikki seconded. Motion carried. Megan moved we review Richard Storey (Chancellor), Karl Ulrich (Provost), and the Assistant Provost, when a permanent staff member has been chosen for that position. Kurt seconded. Motion carried.
 - Curriculum proposals 3 – 15, first reading—first reading in person and continued via email to prepare for a vote.
 - IT—governance plan for back-end website (Scott, Corey, Elise, Kent will govern the website), there will be department managers (responsible for day-to-day management of the website of their department/program) as well as content providers who provide information to the department managers. Corey, Scott, Jessica, and Susan will be invited to the next meeting.
 - Faculty senate priorities for spring—see tabled above
- The Good and Welfare/Question and Answer—nope

Kurt moved to end the meeting. Dana seconded. Motion carried.

Appendix A

Response to comments from Strategic Planning Meeting, December 17, 2013
Strategic Planning Taskforce

The Strategic Planning Taskforce met on January 14, 2014, to discuss faculty comments resulting from December, 17, 2013 campus meeting. The following bullets are provided in response to written comments that were presented to the campus leadership.

- There is obvious redundancy in some goals and priorities. Much has been done to eliminate redundancy, but members of the taskforce felt that elimination of all redundancy was not necessary and in some cases it silenced important constituent voices in the plan.
- “Who are comparator institutions?” Montana Western has many comparator institutions, many of which we do not define for ourselves. Examples of comparator institutions include CUPA comparators, IPEDS comparators, in-state universities, U.S. News comparators, etc. Goal 2E is stated to keep the Montana Western focused on institutional data as related to multiple comparators.
- “What is a best-fit student?” A best-fit student is one that succeeds at Montana Western. If our primary objective is to graduate students from academic programs, the definition is focused on who graduates. What can we learn from who graduates? Can we develop a marketing and recruitment strategy that identifies these students?
- “Where does baseline data come from?” All baseline data comes directly from institutional data—Registrar reports, MUS Dashboard Indicators, syllabi and assessment reports submitted to the Provost, etc.
- “Small class sizes are impossible without caps or new faculty.” For the past ten years Montana Western maintained an average class size between 15 and 16 students. The strategic plan states a commitment to optimizing experiential education by managing class enrollments to achieve optimal efficiency. Class enrollments are the result of multiple management and scheduling strategies—the available tools for managing class size extend beyond adding faculty and setting course caps. Before the institution can commit to additional faculty, it is obligated to first manage the number of low enrollment courses.
- The taskforce had a lengthy discussion regarding the suggestion to further revise the strategic plan by reducing the six guiding principles and creating one goal—student success. The strategic planning process started more than two years ago. Numerous meetings have been held to seek input to the plan. Given that the campus has operated without a new plan since 2012 and that the campus has an immediate obligation to respond to the NWCCU’s concerns and recommendations, the taskforce does not recommend further revisions.

The Strategic Planning Taskforce recommends that campus leadership adopt the current plan without further revision.

Appendix B

UM Western Assessment Committee

Charge:

The Assessment Committee is tasked with overseeing a systematic campus plan for gathering information about student learning. It analyzes that information and shares its findings with various campus decision makers. The committee also showcases high quality pedagogical practices that have developed and flourished as part of Western's unique *Experience One* approach.

The Assessment Committee reports to the Provost and is specifically assigned to:

- support assessment efforts at all levels and offer assessment workshops or other educational opportunities ;
- review the annual General Education Committee report and pass that report, along with Assessment Committee comments, to the Provost;
- aggregate and interpret assessment information and organize an annual report for decision makers;
- monitor the effectiveness of Western's assessment system, focusing especially on continuity of formats and clarity of communications, and recommend changes for improvement;
- call attention to exceptional student learning practices as well as recommend ways that student learning at Western could be improved;
- maintain fully transparent records of the information utilized and the reports issued and post data and reports on the assessment page of the UM Western website.

Membership:

- 3 faculty members nominated by Faculty Senate---Judy Ulrich, Delena Norris-Tull, Sean Eudaily
- 2 department heads---Eric Wright, Laura Straus
- Interim Assistant Provost---Anneliese Ripley
- Director of Institutional Research---Charity Walters
- Director of Student Success---Ilene Cohen
- 1 student nominated by Student Senate---Seamus Manley

Consultant: Sylvia Moore on an as needed basis

Focus for the first three years:

- Year One (2013-14)
 - o Work with departments to strengthen the plans submitted in 2013;
 - o Offer local "mini-workshops" on writing good learning outcomes
 - o Require learning outcomes to be included in writing on all general education course syllabi by the beginning of block 4 and on all course syllabi by the beginning of block 5; monitor compliance
 - o Review minutes from the annual department assessment meetings (May 2014)
- Year Two (2014-15)
 - o Continue to monitor annual department assessment reports; work to standardize reporting formats (including visual impact), especially as they are posted on the web for external audiences

- Continue to monitor inclusion of learning outcomes on syllabi; consider developing a rotational or sampling plan to lessen committee work load;
 - Consider holding a “Scholarship of Teaching & Learning” meeting to encourage cross-discipline sharing of best pedagogical practices;
 - Continue to evaluate the quality and continuity of information submitted to the assessment committee; consider the value and feasibility of additional direct and indirect sources and make recommendations to the Provost
- Year Three (2015-16)
- Develop a reward system to help sustain and energize assessment activities
 - Expand the use of rubrics for measuring learning
 - Review all templates and report forms to make certain that necessary information is easily shared and unnecessary reporting requirements are eliminated

Appendix C



Procedure Number	102.40
Procedure:	Faculty Evaluation of the Administration
Date Adopted:	1/17/80
Last Revision:	8/15/11
References:	Faculty Senate Articles and Bylaws (XIII- 3/18/82), CBA
Approved By:	Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate

1. Introduction

The faculty evaluation of the administration occurs biennially on odd years (e.g., 2011/2012 academic year). The purpose of the evaluation is to give faculty the opportunity to review job performance as it bears on matters of academic and administrative leadership. It is not intended to be a comprehensive review of all official responsibilities. The evaluation is conducted as an electronic survey through a secure website (Select Survey – with modifications by the Information Technology Office for security). Faculty are asked to use a five-point scale to evaluate a number of performance dimensions of the President, Provost, Associate Provosts, all Vice Presidents, all Academic Deans, the Dean of Students, the Chief Information Officer, and the Registrar. In addition to completing the rating scales, faculty are given the option to provide written comments specific to the performance of each administrator. Reasonable efforts will be made to ensure as high a response rate as possible. The President's and Provost's Offices may provide incentives to encourage faculty involvement in the evaluation process.

The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate (ECOS) writes a summary report for each administrator based on the compiled electronic survey results and the written comments, with comparisons to prior year's results when available. The evaluation results for each administrator are submitted to that administrator and his or her immediate supervisor and the President. Each administrator is invited to meet with ECOS to discuss his or her results.

The general results of the faculty evaluation process may be discussed at the Faculty Senate meeting following the completion of the electronic survey (no later than the April Faculty Senate meeting) and will include the number of faculty eligible to evaluate each administrator (e.g., only faculty within a certain College will evaluate that Dean), the number of faculty responding and the resulting response rate. Faculty Senate can approve the report without discussing the specifics. Or the Senate can then elect to enter Executive Session (to maintain the privacy of the Evaluation Report contents) to view and discuss the full Evaluation Report (Bylaws sec. E. Executive Session).

After approval by the Faculty Senate, the Chair formally submits the Evaluation Report to the President and the Provost. The Faculty Senate Chair then submits the Evaluations for the President, Provost, and Vice-Presidents to the Board of Regents and Commissioner of Higher Education at the May Board of Regents meeting.

Method

A. Identification of Eligible Faculty

The Faculty Senate Office obtains a report of current faculty (as defined by Articles of the Faculty Senate [Article 1, Sec 1.] and the current CBA) from the Office of Planning, Budgeting and Analysis. The list is reviewed by the Faculty Senate administrative associate and ECOS. Retired faculty and faculty with FTE below .5 are removed from the list. The final list of eligible faculty is organized by academic unit (College and/or School) to enable the calculation of the appropriate response rate for each Academic Dean.

A formal mechanism is in place to guarantee the confidentiality of faculty input. Each faculty member is assigned a unique identifying number to facilitate survey administration. Once a completed survey is collected from an eligible faculty member, the responses are separated from the unique identifying number to maintain faculty anonymity.

B. Survey Questions

The Administration provides a position description that includes specific goals and assessment criteria for each administrator to be evaluated. ECOS drafts a set of questions for each administrator based on prior years' surveys and any changes identified with the position description or assessment criteria for each administrator. Administrators are given a copy of the evaluation questions, their position description, and the draft communication to faculty and are encouraged to notify the Faculty Senate Office of any revisions to their position description or survey questions as appropriate.

Early in the fall semester, the Senate leadership will meet with the two Administration committees (Academic Officers and Cabinet) to discuss the evaluation process, the types of questions that will be used and to receive any feedback from the Administration.

The effectiveness of the President, Provost, Vice Presidents, Associate Provosts, and the Registrar are evaluated on several common dimensions (communication, ethics, and overall effectiveness in their respective positions). In addition, each of the administrators is evaluated on other dimensions specific to their respective positions, such as academic leadership, administrative leadership, finance, curriculum, diversity, and supervised services. There is a specific question or questions under each dimension. Faculty members also evaluate their own dean for the dean's academic leadership, administrative leadership, communication, ethics, and overall effectiveness.

C. Survey Administration

To ensure the highest possible response rate, the President and the Provost may provide incentives to the faculty for completing the survey. For example, faculty completing the survey may be entered into a drawing.

The President, the Provost, and the Faculty Senate Chair send a joint message to eligible faculty stressing the importance participation in the electronic survey. A separate email communication is sent with instructions to complete the evaluation by the deadline. The instructions include a link to the secure site and provide an ID number and password. The electronic survey includes links to the administrators' current position descriptions and specific goals and assessment criteria if available. Two weeks after the initial communication is sent, an urgent follow-up message is sent to faculty who have not yet participated. A third reminder message is sent one week later.

3. Data Compilation and Reporting

A. Reporting

Survey results are summarized for each administrator evaluated and include the written comments and comparative data from previous years when available. The summary provides a snapshot of the evaluation data. For each item, there are several lines describing the summarized data. The first line lists the frequency of responses for each of the five points on the scale, followed by the total number of responses and the mean. The second line lists these frequencies in terms of percentages. The third line lists the percentages and the mean rating obtained in the prior survey (if available).

ECOS prepares an evaluation summary for each administrator based on the summarized data and the written comments. Comparisons with previous evaluations will provide guidance as to trends in the faculty's perception of administrator's performance. The evaluation is intended to be a review of job performance as it bears on matters of academic and administrative leadership based on faculty perception. It is not intended to be a comprehensive review of all official responsibilities.

B. Evaluation Feedback

ECOS first discusses the evaluations directly with those being evaluated. The written review provided to the academic administrator shall address the evaluations received from faculty, and issues raised shall be addressed with the specific administrator under review.

4. Approval by Faculty Senate

At the completion of the Evaluation Report and after meeting with the administration (President, Provost, and any administrator requesting a meeting with ECOS) the Faculty Senate will be given the option to discuss the results of the Faculty Evaluation of the Administration. To ensure the privacy of those being evaluated, the Faculty Senate votes to move into Executive Session (see Bylaws sec. E. Executive Session) and the results of the report will be discussed. The Faculty Senate then approves the Evaluation Report.

5. Disseminating the Faculty Evaluation of the Administration

After approval by the Faculty Senate, the Chair formally submits the Evaluation Report to the President and the Provost. The Chair then submits the Evaluations for the President, Provost, and Vice-Presidents to the Board of Regents and Commissioner of Higher Education at the May Board of Regents meeting with a cover letter stating the purpose and method of the faculty's evaluation and the limitations of those methods.

6. Feedback on the Review Process with the President and Provost

ECOS meets with the Provost to review the results of the faculty evaluation of the Academic Deans and other Academic Officers. The Provost provides ECOS with an update of issues identified in the review.

ECOS meets with the President to review the results of the faculty evaluation of the Vice-Presidents. The President provides ECOS with an update of issues identified in the review.

7. Timeline (begins on odd numbered academic year)

1. Review and approval of eligible faculty list (Fall)
2. Development of questions (Fall)
3. Meet with Administrators (Fall)
4. Letter to faculty (Fall)
5. Follow-up to faculty not responding (Data collected by Dec)
6. ECOS writes reports and distributes to administrators and their supervisors (Jan-Feb)
7. ECOS gives each administrator the opportunity to discuss the evaluation report (Mar)
8. Faculty Senate approves report (April Faculty Senate meeting)
9. Senate Chair submits final Evaluation Report to President and Provost (April)
10. Senate Chair submits Evaluation Report to Commissioner and the Chair of Regents (May BOR meeting)
11. ECOS meets with the President and Provost for a feedback and utilization report (before June 1)



Faculty Evaluation of the Administration

Vice President of Student Affairs - Teresa Branch

Familiarity: How familiar are you with the duties and responsibilities of the Vice President of Administration and Finance?					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Familiar with none. (If you checked this box, please go to question 10.) <input type="checkbox"/> • Familiar with some. (Please limit your comments to those with which you are familiar.) <input type="checkbox"/> • Familiar with most. (Please limit your comments to those with which you are familiar.) <input type="checkbox"/> • Familiar with all. <input type="checkbox"/> 					
Ratings					
Strongly Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Neutral 3	Agree 4	Strongly Agree 5	Unable to Judge
Administrative Leadership 1. During the past two years, The Vice President provided vision and leadership for improving the quality of student life.					
Diversity 2. During the past two years, the Vice President advocated and promoted diversity on campus and supported and maintained The University's commitment to diversity.					
Communication 3. During the past two years, the Vice President communicated effectively with students, faculty, and staff.					
Supervised Services 4. During the past two years, the personnel and services supervised by the Vice President effectively supported students' needs and worked collaboratively with faculty on issues.					
Ethics 5. The Vice President encourages and models high ethical standards.					
Strategic Plan 6. The Vice President has communicated and implemented the strategic issues of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Partnering for student success b. Education for the Global Century c. Discovery and Creativity to Serve Montana and the World 					

- d. Dynamic Learning Environment
- e. The Planning-Assessment Continuum

Overall Effectiveness

7. During the past two years, under the guidance of the Vice President, the quality of programs and services in the Office of Student Affairs has improved.

8. If you are not familiar with the duties and responsibilities of the Vice President of Student Affairs, what is your perception of the Vice President’s job performance?

Academic Dean Survey Questions

Strongly Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Neutral 3	Agree 4	Strongly Agree 5	Unable to Judge
Academic Leadership					
1. <u>During the past two years,</u> the Dean recognized, valued, and supported faculty members’ teaching					
2. <u>During the past two years,</u> the Dean recognized, valued, and supported faculty members’ service					
3. <u>During the past two years,</u> the Dean recognized, valued, and supported faculty members’ creative activities, scholarship, and research					
4. <u>During the past two years,</u> the Dean supported curriculum development and innovation					
Administrative Leadership					
5. The Dean effectively recruits and retains a <u>diverse</u> faculty					
6. <u>During the past two years,</u> the Dean effectively managed resources for a supportive academic environment					
7. The Dean effectively recruits and retains a <u>diverse student body.</u>					
Communication					
8. <u>During the past two years,</u> the Dean communicated effectively with students, faculty, staff, and external constituencies					
9. <u>During the past two years,</u> the Dean was an effective fund raiser.					
Ethics					

10. The Dean encourages and models high ethical standards

Strategic Plan

11. The Dean has communicated and implemented the strategic issues of:

- a. Partnering for student success
- b. Education for the Global Century
- c. Discovery and Creativity to Serve Montana and the World
- d. Dynamic Learning Environment
- e. The Planning-Assessment Continuum

Overall Effectiveness

12. During the past two years, under the guidance of the Dean, the overall quality of the academic program has improved

Dean of the Honors College – James McKusick

Familiarity:

How familiar are you with the duties and responsibilities of the Vice President of Administration and Finance?

- Familiar with none. (If you checked this box, please go to question 10.)
- Familiar with some. (Please limit your comments to those with which you are familiar.)
- ~~Familiar with most. (Please limit your comments to those with which you are familiar.)~~
- Familiar with all.

Ratings

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Unable to Judge
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------	-----------------

Academic Leadership

1. During the past two years, the Dean promoted academic excellence for students

2. During the past two years, the Dean fostered and supported an intellectually stimulating and cross-disciplinary curriculum for the Honors College

Administrative Leadership

3. During the past two years, the Dean effectively recruited and retained students and faculty participants for honors courses.

4. The Dean supports The University's commitment to diversity by effectively recruits and retains a diverse student body.

5. During the past two years the Dean was successful in external fund-raising

Communication

6. During the past two years, the Dean communicated well with the campus community and the College's faculty and students

Ethics

7. The Dean encourages and models high ethical standards

Strategic Plan

8. The Dean has communicated and implemented the strategic issues of:

- a. Partnering for student success
- b. Education for the Global Century
- c. Discovery and Creativity to Serve Montana and the World
- d. Dynamic Learning Environment
- e. The Planning-Assessment Continuum

Overall Effectiveness

9. During the past two years, under the Dean's guidance, the overall quality of the Davidson Honors College has improved.

10. If you are not familiar with the duties and responsibilities of the Honors College Dean, what is your perception of the Dean's job performance?

Dean of Students

Familiarity:

How familiar are you with the duties and responsibilities of the Vice President of Administration and Finance?

- Familiar with none. (If you checked this box, please go to question 10.)
- Familiar with some. (Please limit your comments to those with which you are familiar.)
- ~~Familiar with most. (Please limit your comments to those with which you are familiar.)~~
- Familiar with all.

Ratings

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Unable to Judge
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------	-----------------

Administrative Leadership

1. During the past two years, the Dean of Students effectively administered the Student Conduct Code.

2. During the past two years, the Dean of Students was an effective liaison between student organizations and the administration.

3. During the past two years, the Dean of Students was effective in addressing drug and alcohol issues on campus.

4. The Dean of Students supports and maintains The University's commitment to diversity.

Communication

5. During the past two years, the Dean of Students communicated effectively with students, faculty, and staff.

Ethics

6. The Dean of Students encourages and models high ethical standards.

Overall Effectiveness

7. During the past two years, the Dean of Students has enhanced interactions with students related to the Student Conduct Code, judicial affairs and other student life programs.

8. If you are not familiar with the duties and responsibilities of the Dean of Students, what is your perception of the Dean of Students' job performance?

PRESIDENT ENGSTROM

Familiarity:

How familiar are you with the duties and responsibilities of the President?

- Familiar with none. (If you checked this box, please go to question 10.)
- Familiar with some. (Please limit your comments to those with which you are familiar.)
- Familiar with all.

Ratings

Strongly Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Neutral 3	Agree 4	Strongly Agree 5	Unable to Judge
------------------------	---------------	--------------	------------	---------------------	-----------------

Academic Leadership

1. During the past two years, the President provided effective guidance and assistance to the University community to achieve long-term academic goals.

2. During the past two years, the President supported faculty through professional development opportunities.

3. During the past two years, the President promoted responsible and participatory governance.

Administrative Leadership

4. During the past two years, the President supported faculty by ensuring the availability of essential infrastructure, facilities, and equipment.

5. The President supports and maintains The University's commitment to diversity.

Communication

6. During the past two years, the President communicated effectively with students, faculty Staff, and external constituents.

Ethics

7. The President encourages and models high ethical standards.

Strategic Plan

8. The President has communicated and implemented the strategic issues of:
- a. Partnering for student success
 - b. Education for the Global Century
 - c. Discovery and Creativity to Serve Montana and the World
 - d. Dynamic Learning Environment
 - e. The Planning-Assessment Continuum

Overall Effectiveness

9. During the past two years, under the guidance of the President, the University has advanced in a positive direction as articulated by the mission statement.

10. If you are not familiar with the duties and responsibilities of the President, what is your perception of the President's job performance?

11. Comments

PROVOST BROWN

Familiarity:

How familiar are you with the duties and responsibilities of the Provost?

- Familiar with none. (If you checked this box, please go to question 13.)
- Familiar with some. (Please limit your comments to those with which you are familiar.)
- Familiar with all.

Ratings

Strongly Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Neutral 3	Agree 4	Strongly Agree 5	Unable to Judge
------------------------	---------------	--------------	------------	---------------------	-----------------

Academic Leadership

1. During the past two years, the Provost provided effective guidance and assistance to the University community to achieve long-term academic goals

2. During the past two years, the Provost effectively conducted searches, evaluations, and retention efforts for faculty

3. During the past two years, the Provost fostered and supported teaching excellence

4. During the past two years, the Provost provided faculty with professional development opportunities

5. During the past two years, the Provost effectively supported and administered program planning and curriculum development.

6. During the past two years, the Provost promoted responsible and participatory governance.

Administrative Leadership

7. During the past two years, the Provost effectively managed the academic sector of the University budget.

8. The Provost supports and maintains The University's commitment to diversity.

Communication

9. During the past two years, the Provost communicated effectively with students, faculty, staff, and external constituents.

Ethics

10. The Provost encourages and models high ethical standards

Strategic Plan

11. The Provost has communicated and implemented the strategic issues of:

- a. Partnering for student success
- b. Education for the Global Century
- c. Discovery and Creativity to Serve Montana and the World
- d. Dynamic Learning Environment
- e. The Planning-Assessment Continuum

Overall Effectiveness

12. During the past two years, under the Provost's guidance, the overall quality of academic programs has improved.

13. If you are not familiar with the duties and responsibilities of the Provost, what is your perception of the Provost's job performance?

14. Comments

Dean of the School of Extended and Lifelong Learning - Roger Maclean

Familiarity:

How familiar are you with the duties and responsibilities of the Dean?

- Familiar with none. (If you checked this box, please go to question 8.)
- Familiar with some. (Please limit your comments to those with which you are familiar.)
- Familiar with all.

Ratings

Strongly Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Neutral 3	Agree 4	Strongly Agree 5	Unable to Judge
-------------------------------	----------------------	---------------------	-------------------	----------------------------	------------------------

Academic Leadership

1. During the past two years, the Dean of School of Extended and Lifelong Learning has promoted academic excellence for online and continuing education programs.

Administrative Leadership

2. During the past two years, the Dean of the School of Extended and Lifelong Learning effectively recruited and retained personnel to provide support services for students and faculty

3. The Dean supports and maintains The University's commitment to diversity.

Communication

4. During the past two years, the Dean of the School of Extended and Lifelong Learning communicates effectively with students, faculty, staff, and external constituents.

Ethics

5. The Dean of the School of Extended and Lifelong Learning encourages and models high ethical standards

Strategic Plan

6. How well has the Dean communicated and implemented elements of the strategic plan within the operations of the School of Extended and Lifelong Learning.

- a. Partnering for student success
- b. Education for the Global Century
- c. Discovery and Creativity to Serve Montana and the World
- d. Dynamic Learning Environment
- e. The Planning-Assessment Continuum

Overall Effectiveness

7. During the past two years, under the guidance of the Dean of Continuing Education, the overall quality of the continuing and distance education programs has improved.

8. If you are not familiar with the duties and responsibilities of the Dean, what is your perception of the President's job performance?

9. Comments