

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

DATE: April 3, 2003

PRESENT:	Doug Brown	Sandie Rietz
	Audrey ConnerRosberg	Paul Bauer
	George Madden	Keith Edgerton
	Alan Davis	Matt Redinger
	Randy Rhine (ex-officio)	Dan Zirker (ex-officio)
	Janie Park (ex-officio)	

ABSENT:	Mark Hardt – <i>excused</i>	Connie Landis – <i>excused</i>
	Randall Gloege – <i>excused</i>	

John Cech (ex-officio)	Joe Michels (ex-officio)
George White (ex-officio)	Nichole Alley (ex-officio)
Terrie Iverson (ex-officio)	Curt Kochner (ex-officio)

PRESIDING: Keith Edgerton, Chair

Keith Edgerton called the meeting to order at 3:37 p.m. on April 3, 2003, in the Chancellors Conference Room.

The March 20, 2003, meeting minutes were accepted.

I. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

This Item was approved by the UCC via electronic vote on April 1.

Item 49 College of Business – Business Core. Modification of a program.

It was noted that the College of Business combined three MIS courses into one, and an adjustment needed to be made in the Business Core.

⇒ Motion by Doug Brown, seconded by George Madden to **accept Item 49** for information.

⇒ Motion carried.

II. ITEMS – FIRST READING

Item 50 Outcomes Report – Sandra Rietz, for the General Education Committee

Dr. Rietz stated that at the last Academic Senate meeting of the Spring 2002 semester, the Senate shouldered the task of Outcomes Assessment. Dr. Rietz volunteered to take on the task, with the help of the General Education Committee.

The Outcomes Matrix that the committee developed is not meant to be limited to General Education courses, but to be used eventually for all courses. The Matrix began as a two dimensional grid with the top value being Bloom's Taxonomy and the left value being the Steps of Human Growth and Development. The grid was then collapsed together, resulting in four categories that are combinations of the Taxonomy and Steps of Human Growth. Faculty can now take a course and go through these categories and say, "Yes, my course does this and this is how."

The General Education Committee worked *very* hard developing this difficult product, and they have done an excellent job.

Dr. Janie Park, Provost and Academic Vice Chancellor, stated that this Matrix is a good idea and will be most useful. Defining the outcomes of a course is hard, and actually measuring (assessing) them is hard to explain and accomplish.

Dr. Rietz stated that the assessment column of the Matrix is not there yet. That is the next step in developing this Matrix. The Committee also need to have select faculty put courses into the Matrix and talk about how the courses fit and do not fit, so the Matrix may be further improved.

Dr. Rietz also noted that the General Education Committee is bringing forward a new Gen Ed Program that runs parallel to the Matrix. Any new course proposed for the Gen Ed Program will have to go through this rigorous assessment.

The question was raised as to who will enforce the timeline laid out in this report. We need someone monitoring the progress of the project. Dr. Park stated that if a faculty member were to direct progress on this project, some reassigned time would be available.

It was then noted that the Gen Ed Committee probably will not want to give this project up. They may be the best ones to direct the outcomes project.

Dr. Park noted that NorthWest wants outcomes for the whole Gen Ed Program, as well as individual courses. The next step will be to collect the artifacts of assessment for the Gen Ed Program.

⇒ Motion by Alan Davis, seconded by Matt Redinger to **forward this report to the Provost pursuant to accreditation maintenance.**

⇒ Motion carried.

Dr. Rietz stated that the next step for the General Education Committee is to take the Matrix to the Gen Ed Faculty first. Then take it to other faculty as well. This unpleasant task must be eased in.

Dr. Park noted that we should begin advertising to the students that when they go through the Gen Ed Program, this is what we expect them to be. Dr. Park also stated she hopes the Senate will charge the General Education Committee to continue with this process.

It was noted that the General Education Committee meets on Tuesdays at 3:30 pm in CEHS 216.

The Senate would like to thank Dr. Rietz and the General Education Committee excessively and effusively for their hard work.

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. Change of Senate Membership.

Keith Edgerton stated that George Benedict, the College of Arts and Sciences Representative, has resigned from the Senate. St. John Robinson will be appointed to finish Dr. Benedict's term, which ends Spring 2004. Dr. Robinson will be at the next Senate meeting.

B. March Board of Regents Items – Keith Edgerton.

College of Allied Health Proposal (ITEM 118-2701-R0103)

Masters of Public Administration offered jointly through MSU-Bozeman and MSU-Billings (ITEM 118-2004-R0103)

Dr. Edgerton stated that the Board of Regents meetings are largely being controlled by John Mercer. Most items on the agenda are in reaction to his thoughts and questions. At the March meeting, which actually ran over into a Special Meeting on April 2, Regent Mercer cross-examined Chancellor Sexton about his salary. Regent Mercer stated that Chancellor Sexton's salary increase exceeded the percentage of the other increases on campus, and he urged Chancellor Sexton to think about using that money elsewhere. President Gamble defended Chancellor Sexton, stating that the Chancellor's salary is low compared to other Billings CEOs.

Dr. Edgerton stated that although he does not agree with Regent Mercer's opinions, Mercer seems to represent the opinion of most Montanans.

Dr. Edgerton also noted that the College of Allied Health was approved without much controversy. The Master's of Public Administration was also on the Board agenda, and it would have been before the Senate now if not for some extenuating circumstances.

Dan Zirker, Dean of Arts and Sciences, noted that this is a joint degree with Bozeman, and they have been back and forth on it for two years now. First they will say *not now*, and a month later it will be *hurry and get it in*. Currently the MPA is at the Graduate Committee.

- **It was learned that the MPA Item is, at this time, remanded back to the Department for revision (note added by Rita Rabe Meduna, April 4, 2003).**

Dr. Park stated that a new program which requires Board approval usually goes through both the Senate procedure and the Board of Regents procedure at the same time. The Department Chair brings the Level II forms for the Board to the Provost's Office, which submits them to the Board. At the same time, the program begins going through the curriculum committees. However, a new program can get approved by the Board before it reaches the Senate, but if a program is approved by the Board, we do not have to implement it immediately, if ever.

The question was then raised as to where the degree will be housed. It was noted that the current Memorandum of Agreement states that the degree is joint, but does not explain where the degree will be housed or if students will have one or both University names on their degrees. The question of which University name, or both, will be on the degree is an accreditation issue, since both Universities are accredited separately.

It was cited that 30-40 new students are expected in this program.

Dr. Edgerton then stated that he hopes the Academic Senate will see this program before the Board of Regents votes on it in May.

C. New Course Form – Final Decision

⇒ Motion by Doug Brown, seconded by Matt Redinger to **approve the New Course Proposal Form.**

⇒ Motion carried.

D. New Course Policy for Online Courses – Discussion

It was noted that a checkbox was added to the form stating: "Check if proposing an online version of an existing course." If this box is going to be on the form, the Senate needs to develop a policy concerning converting courses to online.

It was noted that online courses are not new courses, but versions of the same course. It was cited that different faculty members teaching the same course will result in the same kind of differences.

It was stated that we need to assure that the quality of online courses equal to onsite courses. It was responded that using this form will not accomplish that end.

It was noted that the Academic Computing and Allied Technology Committee discussed this issue and decided that doing this would put expectations on online courses that we do not put on regular courses.

It was then cited that we could make a case that all online courses are different—not better or worse, just different.

⇒ Motion by Matt Redinger, seconded by Doug Brown to **amend the New Course Proposal Form to remove the second checkbox for proposing an online version of an existing course.**

⇒ Motion carried.

The question was raised as to whether we should require all new courses to fill out the Outcomes Matrix (which is currently required on the form), since it is not really ready for all faculty yet.

It was noted that perhaps just new Gen Ed courses should fill in the Matrix.

⇒ Motion by Keith Edgerton, seconded by Matt Redinger to **re-word question two** as such:

What do you want your students to learn and how will you determine if they've learned?

If this is a proposed General Education Course, please fill out the attached outcomes assessment form.

⇒ Motion carried.

D. Online Courses and Scheduling Conflicts – George Madden and Sandie Rietz.

Dr. Madden noted that a brochure was being sent out from the College of Education and Human Services (CEHS) presenting a new 3-year elementary education program that none of the faculty knew about. Faculty should have the right to decide which courses are inappropriate for the online program.

Dr. Rietz stated that along with that problem, faculty in CEHS have been undermined by the administration. A situation, which was discussed at last week's Senate meeting, has arisen where a faculty member declined to teach a course online because she felt it was not appropriate for the online program. That faculty member later found out that another part-time instructor had been hired to teach it, without any notification to the faculty of

the department. Usually the faculty are allowed to choose which part-time instructors they would like to employ, but not in this situation. Later, the original faculty member found her own syllabus with someone else's name on it being used for the course she declined to teach.

Dr. Park noted that the administration did not do this, it was a departmental decision.

Dr. Rietz noted that there is such a hurry about getting all CEHS courses online that faculty are often not being consulted. The question was raised as to where the pressure to hurry is coming from—top down or bottom up?

It was decided that this issue should be discussed next week, as time is running low today.

The Senate would like to congratulate Matt Redinger and Alan Davis, two of this year's winners of the Faculty Achievement Awards. They are well-deserving faculty members.

The meeting adjourned at 5:03 p.m.

rjrm