

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

DATE: April 21, 2005

PRESENT:	Alan Davis	Lorrie Steerey
	Sandie Rietz	Paul Bauer
	Mary Susan Fishbaugh	Keith Edgerton
	Bruce Brumley	Noreen Lee
	Connie Landis	Matt Redinger
	Amanda Mears (student)	Carl Hanson (ex-officio)
	Tasneem Khaleel (ex-officio)	

ABSENT:	Mark Hardt – <i>excused</i>	Randall Gloege – <i>excused</i>
	Audrey ConnerRosberg – <i>excused</i>	Emily Valenzuela (student)
	Joe Michels (ex-officio)	George White (ex-officio)
	John Cech (ex-officio)	Randy Rhine (ex-officio)
	Janie Park (ex-officio)	Terrie Iverson (ex-officio)
	Curt Kochner (ex-officio)	

GUESTS:	Mike Diede	Steve Coffman
	Susan Barfield	

PRESIDING: Keith Edgerton, Chair

Keith Edgerton called the meeting to order at 3:42 p.m. in the Missouri room of the SUB.

The minutes of April 14 were accepted with corrections.

I. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

Approved by the UCC 4/13/05

These are corrections for errors found in this year's catalog.

Item 68 BA Major in Communication Arts: Mass Communication Option.
Modification of an existing program.

Item 68.a Minor in Communication Arts: Mass Communication Option. Modification
of an existing program.

Item 71 Minor in Business Geographic Information Systems. Modification of an existing program.

⇒ Motion by Lorrie Steerey, seconded by Bruce Brumley to **accept Items 68, 68.a, and 71 for information.**

Steve Coffman, Chair of Communication and Theatre, stated that in these two programs (68 and 68.a) COMT 340 was put in the requirements instead of COMT 322. These program changes are just to fix those errors.

Lorrie Steerey noted that a course that is required in the Minor (Item 71) was deleted, so this change fixes that problem.

⇒ Motion carried with 2 abstentions.

II. ITEMS – FIRST READING

Approved by the Graduate Committee 4/14/05

Effective Date: Summer 2005

Item 78 MS in Athletic Training. Modification of an existing program.

Item 78.a HHP 562 Graduate Athletic Training I. Change course description.

Item 78.b HHP 561 General Medical Assessment. New course.

⇒ Motion by Lorrie Steerey, seconded by Noreen Lee to **approve Items 78, 78.a, and 78.b on first reading.**

Mike Diede, faculty member in the Department of Health and Human Performance, stated that this is an unusual instance where accreditation helped a program. HHP 562 had too much content for one course, so these changes split out the content into two courses. The new course will be offered in the summer so there is no effect on faculty load. The question was raised as to whether we can force students to take a class in summer (this new course will only be offered in summer). It was noted that undergraduate students cannot be forced to take summer classes, but this is a graduate program and the students in the program expect to have contact hours with various sports, some of which are only played in the summer.

⇒ Motion carried with 2 abstentions.

⇒ Motion by Matt Redinger, seconded by Noreen Lee to waive second reading of **Items 78, 78.a, and 78.b.**

⇒ Motion carried with 1 opposed and 2 abstentions.

III. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

A. RACE Committee (Sue Barfield)

Sue Barfield stated that the Senate had asked her to come back and discuss the issues the RACE Committee has encountered. The three main issues are: (1) Should faculty be able to submit applications year after year on the same project? (2) Should multiple faculty be able to submit applications on the same project? (3) Is there any priority among equipment, training, travel, and research?

The Senate noted that there was some discussion of these issues earlier this year, but no policies were formed.

It was agreed that the following statements and questions will be added to the RACE Application Form:

1. Priority will be given to projects which have not been previously funded.
2. Projects will be funded a maximum of two years.
3. Have you applied for any outside funding?
4. Who are your co-researchers on this project?

It was noted that there really shouldn't be any prioritization among the various types of projects. That decision should be left to the Committee, and it is a hard one.

B. Further Discussion of Prorating the Teaching Load and FTE of Multi-Disciplinary Courses (Sue Barfield)

Dr. Barfield stated that she has an idea for a new Academic Foundations course taught by multiple faculty. The question is, how will those faculty be compensated? It was noted that if it is a 3 credit class with 3 faculty, each faculty should get 1 credit. If there are more than 3 faculty, that presents a problem.

It was stated that this issue cannot really be resolved by the Academic Senate. It is a bargaining issue to be taken up with the administration. It was suggested that Dr. Barfield go ahead and propose the course. If it is approved, the administration will have to find a way to fix the compensation problem.

IV. ITEMS – FIRST READING

Item 77 Manual for the Preparation of Curricular Materials for Consideration by the Academic Senate. Second revision (change Dean review to recommend).

It was stated that if the Dean doesn't like a curriculum proposal, he or she should take that issue to the UCC and defend that position.

⇒ Motion by Lorrie Steerey, seconded by Matt Redinger to **leave the review wording for Deans in the Manual, and not change it to recommend.**

⇒ Motion carried with 1 opposed.

V. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

Approved by the UCC 4/13/05

Item 66 BS in Business Administration. Modification of an existing program (online program).

Item 66.a BUS 485 Business Case and Simulation Capstone. New course (offered only online).

⇒ Motion by Connie Landis, seconded by Sandie Rietz to **accept Items 66 and 66.a for information.**

Lorrie Steerey stated that she informed the Senate earlier that the College of Business wanted to offer an online degree. The program has been approved by the Board of Regents, and they would like to offer it this summer.

⇒ Motion carried.

VI. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

Dr. Edgerton distributed the rationale (below) that will be sent to all faculty for the online vote of the bylaw change for student voting.

***Rationale for Changing the Academic Senate By-Laws
To Include a Student Voting Member***

1. *Student input on many, if not most, academic issues, is critical. Allowing a student voice in the academic process is in keeping with the true spirit of shared governance.*
2. *Enfranchising the student voice sends a positive message to the entire student body that the faculty are seriously committed to receiving student input in our academic deliberations and decision-making.*

3. *Student enfranchisement provides faculty with a unique perspective on the impact of academic decisions, a perspective that faculty sometimes neglect or of which we are simply unaware.*

⇒ Motion by Lorrie Steerey, seconded by Matt Redinger to **approve the rationale.**

⇒ Motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 5:03 p.m.

rjrm