

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

DATE: September 14, 2006

PRESENT:	Agnes Samples	Rakesh Sah
	Sandie Rietz	Bruce Brumley
	Audrey ConnerRosberg	Lorrie Steerey
	Johanna Mitchell	Keith Edgerton
	Gershon Bulgatz	Noreen Lee
	Craig McKenzie	Tasneem Khaleel (ex-officio)

ABSENT:	Matt Redinger	
	Mark Hardt – <i>excused</i>	
	David Garloff (ex-officio)	Mary McNally (ex-officio)
	Mary Susan Fishbaugh (ex-officio)	John Cech (ex-officio)
	Bob Carr (ex-officio)	George White (ex-officio)
	Terrie Iverson (ex-officio)	Stacy Klippenstein (ex-officio)
	Kevin Majewski (student)	

GUEST: Dan Gross

PRESIDING: Audrey ConnerRosberg, Chair

Audrey ConnerRosberg called the meeting to order at 3:45 p.m. in room B57 of the College of Technology

The minutes of April 27 were accepted as presented. The minutes of the retreat on August 28 were approved with a correction.

I. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

Held over from 2005-2006

Approved by the UCC 4/19/06

Item 71 COMT/HHP/HADM 482/582 Women, Media & Health. New course. Online only.

⇒ Motion by Keith Edgerton, seconded by Noreen Lee to **accept Item 71 for information.**

⇒ Motion carried.

Item 90 New programs proposed by the Department of Sociology, Political Science, and Native American Studies to the BOR in July: Major and teaching major in Political Science, major in Criminal Justice, BA and BS teaching majors in Sociology, major in Native American Studies. For information only.

Item 91 New program proposed by the Department of Biological and Physical Sciences to the BOR in July: BS Major in Broadfield Science with teaching option. For information only.

⇒ Motion by Keith Edgerton, seconded by Bruce Brumley to **accept Items 90 and 91 for information.**

It was noted that these are not curriculum proposals, but rather a “heads up” that these programs are being proposed to the Board of Regents.

Dean Tasneem Khaleel confirmed that these proposals, with the exception of the major in political science, are on the September BOR agenda. The political science proposal was dropped for now because it was not a strong proposal—it will be resubmitted in January, 2007. Most of the courses in the criminal justice proposal already exist, but there will be a few new courses added if the program is approved. No Child Left Behind has necessitated the revival of the major in broadfield science teaching option, but it will require no new courses.

⇒ Motion carried.

Item 1 Emeritus Nomination of Dr. C. Adrian Heidenreich, Professor, Department of Native American Studies, Political Science, and Sociology, College of Arts and Sciences. For information.

Item 3 Committee Report 2005-2006: Commencement Committee.

Item 4 Committee Report 2005-2006: Graduate Committee.

Item 5 Committee Report 2005-2006: Undergraduate Curriculum Committee.

Item 6 Course number changes correcting errors for the COT catalog:
DIES 110 Introduction to Hydraulics. Change course number to 112.
DIES 115 Introduction to Diesel Fuel Systems. Change course number to 117.
DIES 130 Diesel Engine Overhaul. Change course number to 132.
For information only because changes have already been made.

Item 8 Committee Report 2005-2006: Research and Creative Endeavor Committee.

⇒ Motion by Lorrie Steerey, seconded by Keith Edgerton to **accept Items 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 8 for information.**

⇒ Motion carried.

II. ITEMS – FIRST READING

Approved by the Graduate Committee 8/29/06

Item 7 IPC Grad courses. Delete the following courses:

IPC 510 Managerial Communication
IPC 520 End-User Data Management
IPC 530 Managerial Decision Making
IPC 540 Research Methods
IPC 550 Organizational Information Systems
IPC 560 Empowerment in Productive Organizations
IPC 570 Service Marketing
IPC 580 Information as a Strategic Resource
IPC 590 Internship
IPC 591 Independent Study
IPC 595 Field Experience

⇒ Motion by Keith Edgerton, seconded by Bruce Brumley to **approve Item 7 on first reading.**

Lorrie Steerey stated that the master's degree program has been deleted, but they had not yet deleted the courses associated with the program.

⇒ Motion carried.

⇒ Motion by Lorrie Steerey, seconded by Keith Edgerton to **waive second reading of Item 7.**

⇒ Motion carried.

III. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS: OLD BUSINESS**A. The BSLS**

It was noted that the Senate has concluded that this program is being closely monitored and it is doing what it is supposed to do. Dean Khaleel noted that there are currently 154 students in the BSLS program, which is down from past years. She noted that most students in the BSLS program are specifically pursuing a BSLS, not just avoiding requirements in other bachelor's programs.

B. In-Class Courses that are Really Online (2005-2006 Academic Senate Initiative)

It was noted that this problem appears to be an isolated incident. It was cited that the COT does offer a few courses that are listed as face-to-face but are taught online, but there have been no student complaints. It was noted that we should honestly advertise the type of course we offer. It was observed that the Senate cannot make a blanket policy without possibly infringing academic freedom. Each situation must be looked at separately.

IV. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS: NEW BUSINESS**A. Transfer of Credits for AAS degrees and Certificates: Transfer students must complete 51% of core program requirements at MSU-B (page 26, COT catalog)**

It was noted that this requirement seems unfair, since east campus students are only required to have 25% of their courses from MSU-Billings. Dr. Conner Rosberg brought this issue up with the Chancellor, and he noted that there must have been some rationale for the policy. Also, programs can request exemptions from this rule. It was cited that the process to request an exemption is highly difficult. It was stated that the specific BOR policy related to this issue should be found so the Senate will know the history.

B. UCC Issues (from the 2005-2006 report):

- 1. Level (upper/lower) of courses**
- 2. Relationship of UCC and AFC**
- 3. Disputes between academic departments**

It was noted that the UCC would have to work on a case-by-case basis to decide the appropriate level for each course proposal. It was cited that we must trust our colleagues to do their jobs well.

In regard to the AFC's interaction with the UCC, the AFC should be seen as a department overseeing an academic program—the Academic Foundations program—and should be on equal standing with the other academic departments.

It was observed that the UCC should be above departmental quarrels. If two departments cannot agree on a curriculum proposal, the UCC should send it back until the departments can agree.

It was agreed that the Senate will send a memo of response to the UCC regarding these issues.

C. Student Satisfaction Survey

Dr. ConnerRosberg noted that the Provost Council has been discussing the four main things that came out of the survey: retention, recruitment, advising, and e-learning. There are four subcommittees formed to address each one of these items for our accreditation visit.

It was noted at the Back-to-School conference, people from New Student Services did a presentation on recruitment and retention. It would be useful for the Senate to see that presentation.

D. Academic Senate Budget Committee

Dr. ConnerRosberg stated that she asked the Chancellor about reinvigorating the Senate Budget Committee. The Chancellor stated that he started a new budget committee outside of the Senate because according to the Senate bylaws of the Senate Budget Committee, “The vice chancellors and the Budget Analyst/Supervisor of the Budget Office are ex-officio members only.”

We don’t need the administration’s permission to re-start the committee, but the administration will not attend the meeting without voting rights.

It was noted that a group could get together to discuss how to build a budget committee. Keith Edgerton agreed to lead this group, and Sandie Rietz, Lorrie Steerey, Johanna Mitchell, Agnes Samples, and a colleague of Dr. Samples.

E. Meeting with President Gamble Next Week

It was noted that initiatives that go to the Board of Regents, appropriations for monies, and other proposals, all have to go through Bozeman. There have been occurrences where our proposal dies and then Bozeman uses the idea to get funding for themselves. There is no reciprocity that we get to review their proposals. It was cited that we think of Bozeman as our sister campus, but Bozeman treats us like a parent campus—a “Because I said so” situation. We should ask Dr. Gamble about this problem as part of our discussion of the relationship between MSU-Billings and MSU-Bozeman.

The meeting adjourned at 4:52 p.m.

rjrm