

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

DATE: February 28, 2008

PRESENT:	Agnes Samples	Sandie Rietz
	Kay Streeter	Lorrie Steerey
	Johanna Mitchell	Keith Edgerton
	Gershon Bulgatz	Mark Hardt
	Craig McKenzie	James Ellis (student)
	Tasneem Khaleel (ex-officio)	Mary Susan Fishbaugh (ex-officio)
	John Cech (ex-officio)	

ABSENT:	Jeff Sanders*	Rakesh Sah*
	Bruce Brumley*	Steve Coffman*
	Alicia Esteves (student)*	David Garloff (ex-officio)
	Gary Young (ex-officio)	Karen Heikel (ex-officio)
	George White (ex-officio)*	Terrie Iverson (ex-officio)
	Stacy Klippenstein (ex-officio)	
	* <i>excused</i>	

GUESTS:	Valerie Martinez	David McGinnis
	Jim Hughs	Susan Stewart

PRESIDING: Lorrie Steerey, Chair

Lorrie Steerey called the meeting to order at 3:42 p.m. in the L.A. Building 8th Floor Lounge.

The minutes of February 14 were accepted as presented.

I ITEM – SECOND READING

Item 20 Modification of the 51% rule specified in the MSUB COT Catalog. REVISED

⇒ Motion by Craig McKenzie, seconded by Keith Edgerton to **approve Item 20 on second reading.**

⇒ Motion carried.

II. ITEM – FIRST READING

Item 33 REHA 596 Cooperative Education/Internship. Change credits from 3 or 9 to 3-12.

⇒ Motion by Mark Hardt, seconded by Craig McKenzie to **approve Item 33 on first reading.**

⇒ Motion carried.

⇒ Motion by Mark Hardt, seconded by Keith Edgerton to **waive second reading of Item 33.**

⇒ Motion carried.

III. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

A. VSA (Voluntary System of Accountability)

Guest: Val Martinez, Associate Dean, COT

Ms. Martinez stated that she began this process with Mark Hardt, Chair of the Academic Foundations Committee, who is searching for an assessment tool to measure the Academic Foundations program. One option is a nationally normed exam which can measure what value we add to the student's general education experience. The VSA a project in partnership between the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC). It is an effort to forestall a No Child Left Behind situation for higher education. One of the VSA's initiatives is to create, rather than be forced into, a system of assessment for general education. The tests endorsed by VSA are a dashboard universities can voluntarily participate in to compare to other universities across the nation.

Ms. Martinez noted that she began with a discussion with the AFC, who agreed that one of the VSA tests would not assess our whole Academic Foundations program. However, this would be yet more data we can use for our accreditation visit with NWCCU this fall. The two major tests endorsed by the VSA which apply to MSUB are the CAAP (Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency) created by ACT or MAPP (Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress) created by ETS. The CAAP test may be preferable because we already use the ACT COMPASS test for admission into our math and English courses. We could use COMPASS as a pre-test and CAAP as a post-test. One important issue in considering one of these assessments is its impact on faculty workload.

Ms. Martinez noted that her ideal outcome from this Senate meeting would be an agreement that the AFC create a task force to review and adopt one of the VSA endorsed instruments which can then be run as a pilot this semester.

Dr. Hardt noted that these VSA assessment tools do not fully assess our Academic Foundations program. We still need to do that. Ms. Martinez noted that none of the assessment tools currently available are capable of assessing our Academic Foundations program. She also noted that it is important to have at least one outside measure rather than only looking at ourselves and saying we're good enough.

It was cited that we, as faculty, need to go back and rededicate ourselves to the diversity of thought on campus—the many different teaching paradigms—and then say that this test is an evaluation of just one dimension of those teaching paradigms.

Ms. Martinez noted that she is here to start a dialogue on whether these tests are appropriate for MSUB.

The Senate agreed that the AFC should have further discussion and study of the VSA assessment instruments before the Senate takes any action.

B. Power Plant Program

Guest: Jim Hughs, Director of Process Plant Technology Program

Item 4 AAS in Power Plant Technology. New program.

Item 4.a PPT 250 Power Plant Basics. Delete course.

Item 4.b PWRP 201 Power Plant Equipment and Operations. New course.

Item 4.c PWRP 203 Energy Sources and Conversion. New course.

Item 4.d PWRP 210 Turbines, Accessories and Basic Operation. New course.

Item 4.e PWRP 214 Power Generation. New course.

Item 4.f PWRP 216 Electrical System Components and Protections. New course.

Item 4.g PWRP 218 Advanced Plant Operations and Troubleshooting. New course.

Item 4.h PWRP 296 Cooperative Education/Internship. New course.

⇒ Motion by Keith Edgerton, seconded by Sandie Rietz to **take Items 4, 4.a, 4.b, 4.c, 4.d, 4.e, 4.f, 4.g, and 4.h off the table.**

It was noted that the Senate's issue last fall with this new program was the budget of only a half-time faculty line.

Dean John Cech, College of Technology, stated he has presented to the Provost a plan to fund a full-time faculty line for two years with funds from the Department of Labor grant. Also, as part of the COT's budget cuts, the underperforming Medical Assistant program will be cut and part of those funds will be salvaged in the Power Plant program. The question was raised that after the grant funds run out in two years and the Power Plant program is not performing, will it be deleted? Dean Cech stated it would be deleted.

Jim Hughs, Process Plant program Director, noted that they have worked with the IBEW (International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers) as well as industry to make sure the curriculum was both up-to-date and agreeable to their training procedures. IBEW is quite happy with the program because they will be able to use it as a screening process for their apprenticeship program—if a student can make it through the two year program, they will have a jump start on the apprenticeship program.

It was agreed that the Senate is satisfied that the first two years of the program will be funded with soft money, that half of the faculty line is permanent in the COT budget for the next three years, and that if the program does not perform it will be deleted.

The question was raised as to how the Senate can vote for a new program when we are already having to cut so much out of the academic affairs budget. Dean Cech noted that we have to protect our current FTE and also find ways to grow additional FTE, and the Power Plant program is one way to do that.

⇒ Motion to approve carried.

⇒ Motion by Craig McKenzie, seconded by Sandie Rietz to **waive second reading of Items 4, 4.a, 4.b, 4.c, 4.d, 4.e, 4.f, 4.g, and 4.h.**

⇒ Motion carried.

It was noted that the Senate Budget Committee needs to take into consideration faculty lines that are generating FTE.

C. Membership of the Academic Senate Budget Committee

It was noted there is simply no interest among the faculty in the College of Allied Health Professions to serve on the Budget Committee. Perhaps the bylaws could be amended to fill such vacancies with faculty from other colleges, because faculty on the committee ultimately represent the faculty as a whole, not just their college. Dr. Steerey will work on an amendment to the bylaws and send it out for review.

D. Review of CQI Annual Program Reviews

Mary Susan Fishbaugh, CQI Committee Co-Chair, noted that the annual reports are a way to reverse the trend of reports for accreditation visits or BOR reporting being done all at once. That is, we do no reporting and then all of a sudden we have to summarize the last seven or even ten years. Instead these reports will be written annually to help smooth the reporting process. The reports will contain: how programs are linked to our strategic initiatives and the program goals, departmental numbers such as majors and enrollments in classes, and alignment with national and/or state standards as applicable. Department Chairs have reported writing these reports is a valid exercise. The reporting process will also serve as a regular self evaluation.

Tasneem Khaleel, CQI Committee Co-Chair, noted that these reports are designed to see that programs are meeting their outcomes, and if they aren't, what we can do to help them meet their outcomes. These reports will also help us decide how many students each program should be graduating, rather than having graduation minimums imposed on us.

Dr. Fishbaugh noted that they would like the Senate to (1) look at the reports and make suggestions, such as including the negative with the positive and to (2) evaluate the reports for redundancy and other problems. This process is a way for the Senate to review the programs it has approved.

It was noted that perhaps the Senate should meet with the programs one or two years before their seven-year review is due for an in-depth discussion and analysis.

It was cited that the Senate should have a discussion at the next meeting as to what our appropriate and supportive role in the program evaluation process is.

E. Other

It was noted that we have a few Deans who rarely show up for Senate meetings. It would behoove the Deans to attend Academic Senate meetings.

The meeting adjourned at 4:59 p.m.

rjrm