ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

DATE: January 27, 2005

PRESENT: Alan Davis   Mark Hardt
              Lorrie Steerey   Paul Bauer
              Audrey ConnerRosberg   Mary Susan Fishbaugh
              Keith Edgerton   Randall Gloege
              Bruce Brumley   Connie Landis
              Matt Redinger   Amanda Mears (student)
              Emily Valenzuela (student)
              Tasneem Khaleel (ex-officio)   Janie Park (ex-officio)

ABSENT: Sandie Rietz – *excused*   Noreen Lee – *excused*
              Carl Hanson (ex-officio)   Joe Michels (ex-officio)
              George White (ex-officio)   Randy Rhine (ex-officio)
              John Cech (ex-officio)   Terrie Iverson (ex-officio)
              Curt Kochner (ex-officio)

GUEST: Sue Barfield

PRESIDING: Keith Edgerton, Chair

Keith Edgerton called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m. in the Chancellor's Conference Room.

The minutes of December 9 were accepted as presented.

I.   DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

A. Student Voting Rights on Academic Senate

⇒ Motion by Lorrie Steerey, seconded by Alan Davis to **give two students one vote on the Academic Senate.**

It was noted that this is the *Academic* Senate, not the *Faculty* Senate, so the students have a right to be represented. If this were the Faculty Senate, students would not be involved. It was cited that the Senate does welcome the students' points of view.

$\Rightarrow$ Motion carried with 1 abstention.

B. RACE Committee Report: Sue Barfield

Sue Barfield, Chair of the RACE Committee, stated that this year the Academic Senate helped increase the total funding from $10,000 to $25,000, and so each project could be funded up to $3,000. Also, the application cycle has been moved from spring to fall, so the successful applicants will have the whole year to spend their funds, rather than just three months. The Senate also revised the application form.

This fall there was an increased number of proposals, probably because of the bigger funds as well as the sizeable amount of advertising. Last year 9 out of 12 proposals were funded. This year 13 out of 23 were funded.

Dr. Barfield then presented some of the issues the committee encountered:

1. Multiple submissions on the same project
Last year ¼ of the funding went to one project, and the same project again this year had several proposals which were great. Should the Committee continue to fund projects that are ongoing?

2. Comparing different needs: equipment, travel, training, etc.
The Committee did have some suggestions for alternative funding through departments, but does the Senate feel there should be priority on anything?

3. Changes in funding after grants awarded
There have been incidences where the proposal asked for funds for equipment, and things change and the faculty member would like to move that funding to travel. Should this be allowed? Should a certain percentage be "moveable," as many large grants allow?

It was noted that the application form should have a spot to indicate how many times funding has been applied for on the same proposal.

It was cited that ongoing projects that apply many times could still be funded if they are competitive with the other applications. This would also result in better applications because of the competitive nature of the process.

It was observed that some moveable monies could be built into the process for next year, but for this year, if the funds are not spent on what they were intended they should go back in the pot for redistribution next year.

It was noted that a limit could be set on the number of times a single project could apply. Once the pilot phase has been started to get some preliminary data, faculty could then go for much bigger external grants.

It was stated that faculty should also receive feedback about why their application was turned down, so they can make a better application next time. Dr. Barfield stated that many faculty spoke to her about their unsuccessful grants.

Keith Edgerton stated that multiple applications on the same project would not be necessary if we could give larger amounts. He will speak to the Chancellor about getting increased RACE funding.

The Senate asked that Dr. Barfield return later in the semester for a final discussion of these issues.

C. Capstone Numbering Standard

It was noted that last semester the UCC wanted to know if there should be a standard number for capstone courses. Amanda Mears noted that the students don't care what number the courses are, they will know what the courses are for. It was cited that with the increased emphasis on outcomes assessment, there may be a need for capstone courses in all programs. It was noted that instead of changing the course numbers, we could add a notation like (CS) to all capstone courses.

> ⇒ Motion by Lorrie Steerey, seconded by Mark Hardt that the **Senate not set a standard capstone number.**

> ⇒ Motion carried with 2 opposed.

> ⇒ Motion by Connie Landis to **add a (CS) notation to all capstone courses.** Motion died for lack of a second.

D. Revisit Three Changes Rule

It was noted that this year several course changes came through where there was one huge change, which basically made a new course, while other courses came through with three small changes that did not significantly change the course. The three changes doesn't make sense all the time. It was noted that the rubric and number should be considered one change.

The Senate will bring forms next week and further discuss.

E. Academic Legitimacy of the BSLS

Lorrie Steerey stated that she has had business students who get to their senior year and don't want to complete the final work. They switch to the BSLS because it's considered an "easy way out." They then go out and apply for a job, saying they have a business degree when they don't. The problem here is that AACSB (the Business accreditation agency) requires that any program that has more than 25% of the credits in business must be accredited through AACSB. These students who transfer out of the COB are getting this degree when they should not be able to.

Keith Edgerton stated that he has had students who were in the History teaching program who switched to the BSLS because they didn't want to fulfill the language requirement.

It was noted that the BSLS seems to offer a real, old-fashioned Liberal Arts education, but it is actually a catchall for people with an accumulation of courses who want a degree. The BSLS should really be more rigorous, more like an honors program.

Dean Khaleel cited that the majority of BSLS students have a Thematic Concentration in Business & Communication, and they started out intending to get that degree. They did not switch to that program in a last minute panic. Also, most of these students are online.

It was suggested that we look at Missoula's and Bozeman's BSLS programs to see the differences and find out if ours is significantly weaker.

Mary Susan Fishbaugh noted that the BSLS is great for people who have almost completed an education or human services degree, only to find out in their final semester practicum that they are all wrong for that profession. They can switch to the BSLS and get a degree for the years of work they have already done.

It was cited that a component could be built into the BSLS so students can't transfer in at the last minute. Perhaps they have to declare the BSLS as their major a year before graduation. It was noted that many students will then just drop out of programs because they don't want to or can't finish the one they are in, but can't get another degree.

Lorrie Steerey volunteered to submit a revised BSLS program in two weeks that would solve some of the problems referenced above.

F. Academic Foundations Update

Mark Hardt, Chair of the Academic Foundations Committee, noted that the Committee thought the Senate was going to notify the faculty, so no notice has gone out. **Because no notice has been given, the Senate decided that the Academic Foundations deadline will be moved to March 14, 2005** (rather than February 28).

Dr. Hardt and Dr. Edgerton will work together on a notice to all faculty, chairs, and deans.

The meeting adjourned at 5:12 p.m.

rjrm