

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

DATE: May 16, 2002

PRESENT: George Benedict
Sandie Rietz
George Madden
Randall Gloege
Connie Landis
Janie Park (ex-officio)

Doug Brown
David Gurchiek
Keith Edgerton
Alan Davis
Matt Redinger

ABSENT: Mark Hardt

Paul Bauer – *excused*

Bob Carr (ex-officio)
Randy Rhine (ex-officio)
Dan Zirker (ex-officio)
Nicole Alley (ex-officio)

Scott Harris (ex-officio)
George White (ex-officio)
Terrie Iverson (ex-officio)
Lee Peters (ex-officio)

GUEST: Ronald Sexton, Chancellor
Mary Susan Fishbaugh

PRESIDING: Keith Edgerton, Chair

Keith Edgerton called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m. on May 16, 2002 in the Chancellor's Conference Room.

The May 2, 2002 meeting minutes were approved.

I. NEW BUSINESS

A. Academic Senate Process Changes. George Madden distributed copies of the further revised system. A catalog change will be originated by a department *or* a discipline. This way, faculty in departments that contain a number of disciplines will have a chance to bring forward changes without the assent of the rest of the department. The Administration will have no authority to approve or disapprove items until the items reach the Academic Senate. The Senate will then negotiate any changes necessary. It is assumed, however, that at some point, administrators will be at least consulted about or

made aware of changes before they reach the Senate. All levels (department/discipline, college tenure-track faculty, the UCC, the Graduate Committee, and the Teacher Education Committee) will not have approval/disapproval power. All steps before the Senate will be recommending only. Therefore, when an item comes forward, each faculty member will sign approval or disapproval (or recommendations), and state the reasons behind the choice.

The question was then raised as to what would happen if a faculty member or many faculty members simply do not vote (i.e. do not sign) at any of the levels listed above. It was stated that the Senate will have to decide whether to move the item forward or not. It was then noted that there is no standard for how many non-votes it will take to bring the Senate into play.

It was also noted that as in earlier drafts, all non-tenurable faculty would *not* be able to initiate a change in their curriculum, and this will be a problem for departments made up of non-tenurable faculty. It was then noted that under the current system, where the chair of a department signs approval, non-tenurable faculty are represented through that chairperson. Under this new system, non-tenurable faculty are completely unrepresented.

It was cited that the new system would de-formalize the process, so smaller departments and disciplines will have an easier time putting through changes.

It was noted that the Teacher Education Committee would have only recommendation power, not approval. It was cited that the Teacher Ed Committee provides an valuable viewpoint from the community and is supposed to be a liason between the College of Education and Human Services and the College of Arts and Sciences, and between MSU-Billings and the community.

It was stated that if the General Faculty Meetings or some similar college-wide meeting were mandatory, and checklists were implemented (checking whether a faculty member has voted or not), then this new system would work. If the general/college meetings were not mandatory, the system will fail because it's unlikely all the faculty will participate.

It was then stated that the veto power being moved to the Senate, rather than at every level is a positive change. It was also noted that minority groups could bring their opinions to the Senate, if their changes are being filibustered by their department, another department or a college.

It was then noted that this new system will take away opportunities for service, which are so vital to faculty members working toward tenure or rank advancement. Faculty may not want to participate, because they will receive no credit for serving on a committee.

Keith Edgerton then stated that he will write a cover letter to accompany this information, and it will be distributed to department chairs before the beginning of fall semester, so that departments will have a chance to discuss at their pre-semester meetings. It was also noted that the information and cover letter should be emailed to all faculty as well.

A. Gen Ed Committee Report and Recommendations. Mark Hardt, chair of the Gen Ed Committee was not present to give his report.

It was stated that the deadline for completing the changes in the Gen Ed program could be moved to November of 2003, rather than 2002. An addendum could be printed for the Undergraduate Catalog (as this will be an off-year for that catalog).

It was noted that some sort of measurement of outcomes is needed for Northwest accreditation earlier than November of 2003.

C. School/College of Allied Health – Discussion with Dr. Sexton and Dr. Park. Dr. Sexton, Chancellor, thanked the Senate for having him at the Senate meeting once more.

Dr. Sexton stated that the opportunity has arisen for MSU-Billings to implement a School or College of Allied Health. This school/college would begin as a conglomeration of current programs.

Dr. Sexton stated that he has verbally consulted with Geoff Gamble about this issue, and he will support the establishment of this school/college at the Board of Regents. Bozeman is also going to be implementing an identical program.

Currently, there are no costs involved. This school/college is only in the planning stage. MSU-Billings already has many programs that could be under the umbrella of Allied Health, such as the B.S. and Master's in Health Administration, the Montana Center, the Health Occupations programs at the COT, Medical Assisting at the COT, Rehabilitation, the pieces of the Gerontology program, and many more. MSU-Billings has many connections out into the local health care community, and putting all of them together would give the health care community and MSU-B a reference point. The health care community has a list of what programs they would like to see offered locally.

Dr. Sexton stated that we must act quickly to take advantage of this golden opportunity. Dr. Gamble has stated that the health care glass ceiling at Bozeman will now be gone. Dr. Sexton also stated that the B.S. in nursing will remain at Bozeman, as it should.

The question was raised as to why a college, rather than a school that would be a component of a current college is being proposed. Dr. Sexton stated that a separate entity will give the local health care community a connection point, and a college is much more marketable. Also, the relationship MSU-Billings will have with the health care community will be the major promotion point for the Allied Health program.

St. Vincent's is also building a health education center, and they have given MSU-Billings an opportunity to become involved.

Creating this Allied Health College will also give MSU-Billings a chance to beef up all sorts of other programs, from the Sciences to Art.

Dr. Sexton also stated that he will test the waters with individual Regents as to their feelings about a college versus a school. If many of them seem to object to a college, Dr. Sexton will propose a school to the Board of Regents.

⇒ Motion by Sandie Rietz, seconded by Randall Gloege, that the Academic Senate **supports the effort that is moving forward to create a college of Allied Health.**

⇒ Motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 4:42 p.m.

rjr