### **ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES**

**DATE:** April 7, 2005

**PRESENT:** Alan Davis Mark Hardt

Sandie Rietz Audrey ConnerRosberg

Mary Susan Fishbaugh Randall Gloege Bruce Brumley Noreen Lee

Connie Landis Amanda Mears (student)
Emily Valenzuela (student) Carl Hanson (ex-officio)
Tasneem Khaleel (ex-officio) Janie Park (ex-officio)

**ABSENT:** Lorrie Steerey – *excused* Paul Bauer – *excused* 

Keith Edgerton – excusedMatt Redinger – excusedJoe Michels (ex-officio)George White (ex-officio)Randy Rhine (ex-officio)John Cech (ex-officio)Terrie Iverson (ex-officio)Curt Kochner (ex-officio)

**GUEST:** Andrew Zoeller, student

PRESIDING: Randall Gloege, Vice Chair

Randall Gloege called the meeting to order at 3:44 p.m. in the Missouri room of the SUB.

The minutes of March 31 were accepted as presented.

### I. ITEM – SECOND READING

**Item 65** New Form: Format for New Certificates.

⇒ Motion by Sandie Rietz, seconded by Audrey ConnerRosberg to **approve Item 65 on second reading.** 

 $\Rightarrow$  Motion carried.

#### II. ITEM FOR INFORMATION

**Item 67** AAS in Surgical Technology – University of Montana COT Program offered at the MSU-Billings College of Technology. For information only.

- ⇒ Motion by Alan Davis, seconded by Mark Hardt to accept **Item 67 for information.**
- $\Rightarrow$  Motion carried.

#### III. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

## A. Create Faculty Task Force on Budgeting – Lorrie Steerey

As Dr. Steerey was unable to attend today's meeting, this Item will be postponed until next week.

# B. Disband the Academic Computing & Allied Technology Committee – Randall Gloege

Dr. Gloege noted that he no longer feels that this Committee should be disbanded. The Committee doesn't meet very often, but it should remain as a potential resource if an issue arises.

### C. Issues with Academic Senate Manual for Curriculum

**Item 31** Manual for the Preparation of Curricular Materials for Consideration by the Academic Senate. Revised.

It was noted that the Academic Senate revised the Manual for Curriculum last year, and it was then forwarded to the Provost. Provost Park and Chancellor Sexton agreed that the Deans should have more input than just "to review" curriculum changes. They agree that the Deans should recommend just like the other members of the shared governance process.

It was noted that the Deans should have a right to compose a dissenting opinion. It was remarked that even if a Dean does not approve of a proposal, it still goes forward.

The Senate decided that consistent language should be used for all recommending bodies, including the Dean. The Manual will be revised by Mrs. Rabe Meduna to say "review and forward with appropriate recommendations" for all groups in the shared governance process, including the Deans, and brought back to the Senate for approval.

# D. General Faculty Approval of Bylaw Change (Student Voting on Academic Senate) – If No General Faculty Meeting, Online Vote?

Dr. Park stated that she will not call a spring General Faculty Meeting. The Senate agreed that an online vote would be the next available option. Mrs. Rabe Meduna will conduct the online vote, and Keith Edgerton and Amanda Mears will be asked to come up with a rationale for the bylaw change.

## E. Re-examine MSU-Billings Online Program

Mary Susan Fishbaugh noted that the FACC (Faculty-Administration Collaborative Committee) has a subcommittee working on online issues right now. The subcommittee's report can be brought to the Senate once it is completed. So far the subcommittee has done reviews of the online numbers and received guidelines, policies, and assessment strategies from departments. The subcommittee is looking at issues like sections, faculty ability to teach online, adding seats to classes, extra compensation for faculty, mentoring, and who should be teaching the courses (i.e., faculty should select who teaches each course). They are making an effort to maintain quality and integrity regardless of who teaches the online courses.

## H. Prorating the Teaching Load and FTE of Multi-Disciplinary Courses

Mark Hardt stated that he promised Susan Barfield he would bring this issue to the Academic Senate regarding new Academic Foundations courses. Dr. Barfield has an idea for a course taught by five or six different faculty. The problem is giving proper credit to those faculty. Dr. Hardt asked the Senate if they have any ideas for a creative way to distribute credit load for multi-faculty courses.

It was suggested that faculty may need one credit to even out their teaching load, and getting one from another college may be the easiest way to do that. If it is less than one credit, perhaps it could be counted as service or creative endeavor.

Dr. Park noted that the real issue is dollars. Can we pay four faculty to teach one class? Integrated courses tend to be very large classes because of this issue, and we as an institution try to avoid large classes.

The question was raised as to whether an integrated course taught by multiple faculty is really better. Do the students really get more out of the course? It was noted that the lecture format results in talking heads that change through the semester. If there is interaction between or among the faculty, the students do end up with a better course. It was suggested that other institutions' students who have had such courses may have some insight into whether MSU-Billings should use such a format. It was also suggested that the students (of MSU-Billings) be polled for their opinions on integrated courses. It was noted a survey of MSU-Billings students would mostly be asking the students about something they have not experienced.

The Senate decided to ask Dr. Barfield to attend a meeting where this gigantic issue could be further discussed.

The meeting adjourned at 4:42 p.m.

rjrm