Memo 687 Page 2744

## ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

**DATE:** November 14, 2019

Scott Butterfield **PRESENT:** Jim Barron Cindy Dell Heather Thompson-Bahm Sarah Keller Vern Gagnon Sam Boerboom Austin Bennett Savannah Merritt (student) Taylor Kurkoski (student) Christine Shearer (ex-officio) Kurt Toenjes (ex-officio) Elaine Labach (ex-officio) Robert Nava (ex-officio) Vicki Trier (ex-officio) Melinda Arnold (ex-officio) Suzette Nynas\* Kelly McCoy\* **ABSENT:** Keith Edgerton\* Jennifer Lynn\* Rachael Waller\* Susan Simmers (ex-officio) Kim Hayworth (ex-officio) Darlene Hert (ex-officio) \* excused Melinda Tilton **GUESTS:** 

Patricia Vettel-Becker

Kathleen Thatcher Sougata Das

PRESIDING: Jim Barron, Chair

Jim Barron called the meeting to order at 3:46 p.m. in the City College Health Science South Conference Room.

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Monday, November 18, there will be 600 elementary students here to watch an MSUB women's basketball game. Also, athletics ticket books are available. These tickets are good for any sport. Hand them out to friends and neighbors!

Seniors who wish to graduate in Spring 2020 must apply by tomorrow (November 15). Please remind your students. There is a rumor that graduation applications are no longer being audited due to staffing shortages. This is not true; all graduation applications are still being audited.

### II. ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES

The minutes of October 31 were accepted as presented.

### III. PROVOST REPORT

Dr. Arnold reported that the BOR meet next week, and our college name changes are going to be approved.

### IV. CONSENT AGENDA

Item 29.a EDSP 301 Tchng Stdnts w Lrning Disab. Change course description.
Item 29.b EDSP 302 Tchng Stdnts w Emot Beha Disor. Change course description.
Item 29.c EDSP 303 Tchng Stdnts w Intellect Disab. Change course description.
Item 29.d EDSP 402 Individualizing Curriculum. Change course description.
Item 29.e EDSP 461 Positive Behavior Supports. Change course description.
Item 29.f EDSP 462 Spec Ed Law, Policy, Practice. Change course description.
Item 29.g EDSP 205 Adult & Child Interactn Skills. Delete course.
Item 29.h EDSP 496 Service Learning: Spec Ed Clin. Delete course.

**Item 30** EDSP 310 Spprtng Div Lrnrs thru Collab. Change course number to 410, change prerequisite, and change course description.

**Item 30.a** BS Ed Broadfield Major in Elementary Education. Modification to an existing program.

**Item 30.b** BS Ed Elementary Education/Reading Double Major K-8, K-12 Reading Endorsement. Modification to an existing program.

 $\Rightarrow$  Motion by Vern Gagnon seconded by Cindy Dell to **approve the consent agenda.** 

 $\Rightarrow$  Motion carried.

## V. ITEMS – SECOND READING

Item 20 GPHY 262 Spatial Sciences Technology and Applications. New course.

Item 20.a GPHY 263 Spatial Sciences Technology Laboratory. New course.

Item 20.b GPHY 111 Intro to Physical Geography. Delete course.

Item 20.c GPHY 112 Intro to Phys Geography Lab. Delete course.

Item 20.d GPHY141 Geography of World Regions. Delete course.

Item 20.e GPHY 440 Geography of Montana. Delete course.

Item 20.f GPHY 460 Urban Policy and Development. Delete course.

**Item 20.g** BA Major in Environmental Studies. Modification to an existing program. REVISED

 $\Rightarrow$  Motion by Cindy Dell, seconded by Sam Boerboom to **approve Items 20** through 20.g on second reading.

 $\Rightarrow$  Motion carried.

VI. ITEMS – FIRST READING

**Item 25** BGEN 240 Introduction to Business Data Analysis. New course. **Item 25.a** BSBA Business Core. Modification to an existing program.

 $\Rightarrow$  Motion by Vern Gagnon seconded by Cindy Dell to **approve Items 25 and 25.a on first reading.** 

Several questions were raised about City College students matriculating into the College of Business programs, and whether the new course replicates content already being taught at City College. It was agreed that the analysis in the new BGEN 240 is not included in the City College course. However, students who may need the content of CAPP 131 Basic MS Office, which is being removed from the COB Core, can take CAPP 120 Introduction to Computers. It was further noted there is no staffing plan for the new BGEN 240 included in the proposal.

It was cited that BGEN 240 will be a prerequisite for BGEN 315 Applied Business Decisions. However, a curriculum change to add it as an official prerequisite was not done.

 $\Rightarrow$  Motion by Cindy Dell, seconded by Vern Gagnon to table Items 25 and 25.a at this time.

The Senate would like clarification on the pathway alignment for City College students moving to the COB program, substitutions, a staffing plan, and the addition of BGEN 240 as a prerequisite for BGEN 315.

Item 23 Minor in Art. Modification to an existing program.

 $\Rightarrow$  Motion by Vern Gagnon, seconded by Sarah Keller to **approve Item 23 on** first reading.

It was noted that this does not create any new programs; it's just two tracks within the minor. However, the more things our advisors have to learn, the more chances there are for mistakes. Also, two tracks means the program may need two sets of learning outcomes. It was noted that none of our minors currently have program learning outcomes.

 $\Rightarrow$  Motion carried with 2 abstentions.

 $\Rightarrow$  Motion by Cindy Dell, seconded by Sam Boerboom to waive second reading of Item 23.

 $\Rightarrow$  Motion carried with 2 abstentions.

# VII. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

### A. Memo from GEC: ETS Test (attached to these minutes)

Dr. Barron noted that for the past few years, Gen Ed was being assessed using the ETS test. Senate passed a policy to be effective Fall 2020 that all students will be required to take the ETS test. MSUB is no longer using the ETS test, mainly due to the high cost. As a result, we will not have Gen Ed assessment data this year.

Melinda Tilton, Co-Chair of the GEC, noted that the Committee never intended the ETS test to be the only assessment. Also, the GEC will be working with our Assessment Director to pilot some kind assessment in the Spring.

## **B.** Faculty Review of Administrators: Update & Discussion

The ad hoc committee has been putting together an instrument for the review of administrators, and as part of that, the committee has been asking for information and collaboration with administrators. The Senate wants an instrument that is going to cover what administrators actually do, perhaps beyond their position descriptions, and feedback that will be useful to administrators. This is not intended to be a one-time thing to accomplish a certain goal or to "get" someone, but rather an annual event and a way for faculty to register their opinions.

It was noted that past evaluations of administrators were unfair and inappropriate to the positions evaluated. One evaluation was actually lost. We want better.

The question was raised as to how this information will be used, and how will it be disbursed. Not all decisions have been made, but no raw data or comments will be released. The aggregate data will likely be shared with the faculty, and with administrators' supervisors. It was noted that the data from student evaluations of faculty are not shared with the entire faculty, so why should administrators' data be shared? This is something the ad hoc committee will have to consider. However, if there is no dissemination of data, it makes the evaluation less than valid.

The question was raised as to why this is the Senate's responsibility. Evaluation of administrators is not in the Senate bylaws. It was noted that the AAUP guidelines state that the faculty senate is usually the group who does this. The bylaws can be changed.

The evaluation data will be anonymous, and a group will need to be assembled to review it. This group should likely include administrators.

The question was raised as to who will be evaluated. Again, not all decisions have been made, but academic affairs will definitely be included: Deans, the Vice Provost, the Provost, and the Chancellor. Other positions can be included, and some campuses in Montana do that. Department chairs will not be included, as they are faculty within the bargaining unit. It was noted that department chairs are not evaluated as chairs, but only as faculty.

It was agreed that the evaluation rubric will be clearly defined first, so all administrators may know the rules before this undertaking begins. Further, all the details about who will process the results and what will be done with the results will be decided before any survey is conducted. Confidentiality will be addressed in a meaningful way.

### VIII. NEW BUSINESS

ASMSUB President Savannah Merritt announced that they are sending eight students to next week's BOR meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

rjrm



**General Education Committee** 

TO:	Jim Barron, Chair Academic Senate
FROM:	Melinda Tilton & Bernie Quetchenbach, Co-Chairs General Education Committee
RE:	ETS Test

We are writing to alert you to a situation regarding General Education assessment at MSUB. As you know, MSUB has been gathering assessment data for the General Education program from administrating the ETS test. After years of reviewing alternatives, the Committee determined that ETS was the instrument that most closely reflected MSUB's General Education program; while we are not especially committed to standardized testing as a means of assessment, considerable effort was expended to compare available instruments. In their most recent visit, NWCCU endorsed the General Education program and found no problems with the program's assessment method.

Recently, the committee was informed that ETS would no longer be used for assessment. The University has no in-place plans for a replacement, and, since the committee has not been given a reason for discontinuing the ETS, we have no clear sense of what to look for in a replacement assessment method. This puts the General Education program in the position of having no source for assessment data for this year, and perhaps for the foreseeable future. The Committee has never seen the ETS test as in itself a sufficient permanent assessment instrument for General Education, and we continue to examine assessment tools such as e-portfolios, but, as far as we know, we will not have any assessment data for the General Education program for at least the current academic year.

MT/BQ/rjrm