

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

DATE: February 19, 2004

PRESENT: Lorrie Steerey
Audrey ConnerRosberg
Keith Edgerton
Alan Davis
Connie Landis
Randy Rhine (ex-officio)
Tasneem Khaleel (ex-officio)
Amanda Mears (ex-officio)
Carl Hanson (ex-officio)

Sandie Rietz
Mary Susan Fishbaugh
Randall Gloege
Mark Hardt
Matt Redinger
George White (ex-officio)
Janie Park (ex-officio)
Victor Sargent (ex-officio)

ABSENT: St. John Robinson
Paul Bauer – *excused*

John Cech (ex-officio)
Terrie Iverson (ex-officio)

Joe Michels (ex-officio)
Curt Kochner (ex-officio)

GUEST: Michael Dennis

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 February 5 were accepted with corrections.

It was noted that Item 30 has been pulled from the agenda.

I. Report from ASFAC Meeting

Keith Edgerton stated that the faculty members of ASFAC met last week and made a suggestion to the Chancellor that there be a faculty representative on the Chancellor's Cabinet, Provost Council, and all retreats held for strategic planning. Chancellor Sexton stated he would discuss this proposal with his Cabinet.

II. ITEMS – FIRST READING

Item 19 HHP 540 Sport Leadership. Change course title and catalog description.

Item 19.b MS in Sport Management. Modify an existing program.

It was noted that these two Items have been on the Senate agenda for months and no one has opposed them. It is time to move them on.

Carl Hanson noted that the change in the Master's program creates two "tracks" for students: Coaching & School Leadership or Marketing & Development. This allows for more flexibility for the students. In the past, the program tried to fit all students into the same mold, and it was not working well.

⇒ Motion by Matt Redinger, seconded by Lorrie Steerey to **approve Items 19 and 19.b.**

⇒ Motion carried.

⇒ Motion by Connie Landis, seconded by Matt Redinger to **waive second reading of Items 19 and 19.b.**

⇒ Motion carried.

III. ITEMS – FOR INFORMATION

Item 29 Emeritus Nomination of Dr. Victoria Coffman, Professor, Department of Communication and Theatre, College of Arts and Sciences. For information.

⇒ Motion by Lorrie Steerey, seconded by Sandie Rietz to **accept Item 29.**

⇒ Motion carried.

IV. DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Letter to George Madden

The letter was agreed upon and will be sent.

V. ITEMS – FOR INFORMATION

Item 31 REVISED Committee Roster – 2003-2004 to include new RACE membership. For information.

⇒ Motion by Sandie Rietz, seconded by Lorrie Steerey to **approve Item 31.**

⇒ Motion carried.

VI. DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Time Block Scheduling Problems (Tuesdays at 3:40 to 5:10 p.m.)

It was noted that if Tuesday afternoons are taken, it also takes out Thursday afternoons. This causes even more problems. It was cited that the science labs have to be scheduled on Tuesdays, because we only have a limited number of lab rooms, and many classes to schedule in them.

It was noted that the only really available time is Friday afternoons.

It was stated that the Senate is assuming that if a time is set, faculty will use it.

⇒ Motion by Randall Gloege, seconded by Sandie Rietz to **rescind the designated time of Tuesdays at 3:40 pm to 5:00 pm as a sacrosanct faculty meeting time.**

⇒ Motion carried with one opposed.

B. Tenuring Deans

Keith Edgerton noted that at some campuses, the feeling is that deans who hold tenure have a stronger bond with faculty. Without tenure, decisions can be made out of personal fear of firing instead of what's best for the University.

It was noted that the dean would be tenured as a faculty member in a department, not as a dean. Also, this change would have to be negotiated into the CBA. The deans would have to go through a post-tenure review process. It was noted that they would most likely be evaluated both as a faculty member and as an administrator, and that does not seem fair.

It was noted that Bozeman sometimes offers tenure as part of the salary package when they are hiring a dean. It was noted that if a University does not have much in the way of salary to offer, it can offer tenure as a perk.

It was cited that if a dean is tenured in a department, he or she can then claim a faculty position in that department and the department then has to budget for that.

It was stated that tenuring deans may encourage them to be a faculty advocate, and to argue more effectively for a faculty view. It was noted that tenuring deans does not necessarily mean they will become faculty advocates, or stronger faculty advocates.

Janie Park, Provost, noted that none of the deans here are afraid of losing their jobs because they know they can get a job anywhere else on a moment's notice and get more

pay as well. Dr. Park cited that the only real benefit of tenuring would be to offer it as a recruiting device.

It was cited that offering tenure to a newly hired person is dangerous. It was further noted that if the dean is to become tenured, he or she would have to carry at least a half-time teaching load and go through the tenuring process.

It was stated that the dean may seem like he or she is not advocating for a given department, because he or she is busy advocating for some other area. Faculty need to stick up for themselves.

It was noted that the faculty need to know more about what the deans do, and the deans also need to know more about what the faculty do in their areas.

It was suggested that instead of tenuring deans, improve the administrative evaluation process. This would also improve communication between the faculty and deans.

C. Draft Memo to Faculty – Finals Week Policy

From the Academic Senate and Provost

Academic policy from the Board of Regents and the Commissioner as well as federal financial aid regulations require our semesters to be 15 weeks in length during the academic year (Fall and Spring Semesters). Those 15 weeks include 64 instructional days and 4 days of finals.

Semester-length courses must convene during finals week to meet this standard.

Please examine your course syllabi to guarantee that this 15-week requirement is met by your semester-length courses. Exceptions need to be approved by your chair and dean and reported to the Provost.

⇒ Motion by Lorrie Steerey, seconded by Matt Redinger to **approve the memo, adding the phrase** “and must comply with the published final exam schedule” to the end of the second paragraph.

⇒ Motion carried.

It was cited that the final in a course does not have to be during finals week—it can be the week before—but the class must meet during that final class time.

VII. ITEMS – FIRST READING

Item 22 Revision of General Education Program – Proposal from the Gen Ed Committee.

Mark Hardt, Chair of the General Education Committee, stated that a lot of time and work has gone into this proposal, so please review it with an open mind. It is presented with two interests: the University and the students. Please don't think about how this is going to impact you and your department. As it stands now, no one can defend the current Gen Ed program, not faculty, not administrators, even North West has concerns. If this proposal is rejected, a great deal of hard work will be lost, but more importantly, faculty will most likely lose control over any General Education revision.

Michael Dennis, General Education Committee member, stated that this proposal is a work in progress and is not finalized. If it is approved by the Senate, it will go to all faculty. Dr. Dennis also noted that at its deepest level, this is not that big of a change.

Sandie Rietz, General Education Committee member, noted that the outcomes assessment component is a result of some of the best academic discussion she had ever experienced.

Randall Gloege, General Education Committee member, noted that the Committee wants to encourage integrated courses for the future of General Education (to be known as Academic Foundations).

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

rjrm