ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

DATE: April 6, 2006

PRESENT:	Agnes Samples	Mark Hardt
	Lorrie Steerey (via phone)	Sandie Rietz
	Paul Bauer	Audrey ConnerRosberg
	Randall Gloege	Bruce Brumley
	Noreen Lee	Craig McKenzie
	Lewis Rife (student)	

ABSENT:	Susan Balter-Reitz – *excused*	Keith Edgerton – *excused*
	Matt Redinger – *excused*	Dan Hansen (student) – *excused*
	Tasneem Khaleel (ex-officio)	David Garloff (ex-officio)
	Curt Kochner (ex-officio)	Mary McNally (ex-officio)
	Mary Susan Fishbaugh (ex-officio)	Kirk Lacy (ex-officio)
	John Cech (ex-officio)	George White (ex-officio)
	Terrie Iverson (ex-officio)	

GUESTS:	Brent Roberts	Gwen Braun
	Cheri Johannes	Dan Gretch
	Leanne Frost	

PRESIDING: Audrey ConnerRosberg, Vice Chair/Chair Elect

Audrey ConnerRosberg called the meeting to order at 3:44 p.m. in the Chancellor's Conference Room.

The minutes of March 23 were accepted as presented.

I.   DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

A. 360 Evaluation of Chancellor Ron Sexton

Dr. ConnerRosberg stated that Rolf Groseth from President Gamble's office contacted her to ask the Senate's opinion: should all the faculty be surveyed regarding the Chancellor's performance review? If not all, who should be selected for surveying?

It was stated that to get all opinions without excluding people, all the faculty should be surveyed. The question was raised as to whether part-time faculty should be included. It was agreed that anyone in the collective bargaining unit (tenure-track, fixed-term, lecturers, etc.) should be part of the survey.

It was suggested that the Senate also ask for the unedited data from the surveys. Dr. ConnerRosberg noted that the faculty representatives to the Board of Regents have told the BOR they want reports on the administrative evaluations, and the BOR was supportive of that. It was suggested that if there is a faculty component to the Chancellor's evaluation, the Senate should compile the data.

The Senate agreed that in addition to the survey including all faculty, we will also ask that the student Senate (ASMSU-B) be involved, ask who has ownership of the information generated, and ask who wrote the survey.

II. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

Item 53 ENGL 301 Business Communications. Change course number to 201.

⇒ Motion by Lorrie Steerey, seconded by Randall Gloege to **accept Item 53.**

Randall Gloege noted that the Academic Foundations Committee decided not to accept 300-level courses for Academic Foundations and the English and Philosophy department feels this is a logical move. It was noted that this will make transferability easier for students.

⇒ Motion carried.

Item 66 Certificate in Automobile Collision Repair and Refinishing Technology. Delete Program.
Item 66.a Certificate in Automobile Collision Repair Technology. Modification of an existing program.
Item 66.b Certificate in Automobile Refinishing Technology. Modification of an existing program.

⇒ Motion by Bruce Brumley, seconded by Mark Hardt to **accept Items 66, 66.a, and 66.b.**

Craig McKenzie stated that these modifications bring the certificates in line with Board of Regents requirements. The Certificate in Automobile Collision Repair and Refinishing Technology had too many credits to be considered a certificate.

⇒ Motion carried.

Item 67 RD 101 Reading Improvement for College Students. Change credits and course description.

⇒ Motion by Lorrie Steerey, seconded by Bruce Brumley to **accept Item 67.**

Leanne Frost, Assistant Director of the COT Academic Support Center, noted that 1/3 of incoming students at the COT are below the 12th grade reading level, so this course will bring the students up to and beyond that level. RD 101 had been taught in the past, but not recently. This change updates the course, including expanding it from 2 to 3 credits. This course is open to any student, not just COT students, and the goal of the course is to improve retention. Ms. Frost noted that this course will not cause the Support Center instructors to exceed the 17 credit rule.

⇒ Motion carried.

III.   ITEM – SECOND READING

Item 68 Academic Foundations Committee Report: Approved Courses. 3/30/06

This item will be postponed until the next meeting.

IV.   DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

A. Transfer Courses: Guest Cheri Johannes, Registrar

Ms. Johannes noted that she has come up with a draft alternative to the Senate's proposal to use the Academic Standards and Scholastic Standing Committee for transfer courses (Item 65). The Office of the Registrar and Admissions hope to make the complex new BOR policies simpler to deal with for faculty. Currently, 59% of all transfers requiring faculty consultation are completed within 10 days, so we are already doing great. Ms. Johannes stated that her proposal asks that all departments have faculty designees for when the Department Chairperson is unavailable to make a determination on a transfer course.

The question was raised as to what happens when a course is inappropriately accepted into a general education category. Ms. Johannes noted that when a course is accepted, it does not go into a global system as approved unless specifically requested. The course acceptance process works student by student. The BOR has also stated that student information must be entered into Banner.

It was noted that the proposal assumes that the Chairperson and the faculty advisor are two different people, when actually the Chairperson is acting as advisor in this situation.

$\Rightarrow$ Motion by Sandie Rietz, seconded by Bruce Brumley to approve the Registrar's proposal on first reading with corrections to the advisor/chairperson verbage.

$\Rightarrow$ Motion carried.

C. Academic Foundations Assessment: Continued Discussion

Mark Hardt, Chair of the Academic Foundations Committee, noted that Provost White has stated that he will not sign off on the list of Academic Foundations courses until an assessment component is included in the report.

Dan Gretch, Academic Foundations Committee member, noted that embedded assessment will yield two sets of data: (1) the grade for the course content, and (2) a subset "grade" that is for specific assessment results. The assessment grade could be reported in the same way regular grades are reported. It was noted that making assessment part of a student's grade does not seem right. It was cited that making it part of the grade, but not make or break, does give the student some motivation to participate and make thoughtful responses.

The question was raised as to who will be the repository of all this data. If the AFC will be the repository, the charge to the Committee will need to be changed to include that new task.

Sandie Rietz, Academic Foundations Committee member, noted that the Committee talked about running a pilot this fall.

It was noted that students who take Academic Foundations courses as electives may throw off the assessment process. It was noted that the computer software designed to collect the assessment data will have to toss out the second course responses from a student taking two different courses in one Academic Foundations category (one as Academic Foundations and one as an elective) so the results will not be skewed by those students.

$\Rightarrow$ Motion by Sandie Rietz, seconded by Lorrie Steerey that the Academic Foundations Committee be charged to develop and run a pilot embedded assessment over the next academic year.

It was noted that if the assessment tool is well done, students will not perceive it as a non-content specific question.

$\Rightarrow$ Motion carried.

D. Academic Senate Fall Retreat: Move Date

The Retreat was originally scheduled for Thursday, August 24, 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. It needs to be moved because of a conference being scheduled by the Provost.

The Senate agreed to move the Retreat to Monday, August 28, 12:30 to 3:00 p.m.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

rjrm