ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

DATE: September 15, 2022

PRESENT: Suzette Nynas   Matt Queen
              Mara Pierce   Jennifer Lynn
              Scott Butterfield   Susan Gregory
              Rachael Waller   John Pannell
              Austin Bennett   Paul Pope
              Melissa Boehm   Heather Thompson-Bahm
              David Russell (student)   Jim Barron (ex-officio)
              Tami Haaland (ex-officio) Tom Manthey (ex-officio)
              Sep Eskandari (ex-officio) Sue Balter-Reitz (ex-officio)
              Jana Marcette (ex-officio) Darlene Hert (ex-officio)

ABSENT: Rakesh Sah*   Susan Gilbertz (ex-officio)
              Vicki Trier (ex-officio)* Susan Simmers (ex-officio)
              Kim Hayworth (ex-officio)
                          excused

GUESTS: Kathleen Thatcher   Joann Stryker
              Amber Peretz   Cheri Johannes

PRESIDING: Jennifer Lynn, Chair

_____

Jennifer Lynn called the meeting to order at 3:40 p.m. in the Chancellor's Conference Room.

I.   ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Board of Regents will meet on campus next week.

Please keep using the EAB early alerts, and encourage your colleagues to as well!

The ResearchFest on faculty research will be October 13 at Craft Local. Abstracts are due September 23.

II.   ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES

The minutes of April 21 & August 25 were accepted as presented.

III.   PROVOST REPORTS

Dr. Eskandari stated that he looks forward to collaboration and partnership with the Academic Senate.

The Provost (and Chancellor) continue to invest in faculty professional development, including the CARE and PTSE grants. A faculty committee will be formed to review all such applications for development funds.

Provost Eskandari noted that the sabbatical application process was opened today, for sabbaticals in 2023-24. He noted that they have funding for one City College sabbatical, as well. It has not been employed in many years.

The campus has hired 15 tenure-track faculty in the last year. While he cannot promise another 15, he emphasized the importance of hiring tenure-track faculty.

Regarding searches, he would like all faculty to engage in some implicit bias training. There is a session announced by HR for next month, and there will be more in the future.

The Dean searches for COE and COB will be launching soon.

Provost Eskandari stated that Navigate and Early Alerts have been coming in, and we know they work. Cheri Johannes, Registrar, does a lot of the work behind the scenes. Dr. Johannes noted that part of the new software also enables a response and resolution being sent to the originating faculty member. Dr. Eskandari is also looking into a voluntary mentorship program with the new Retention Director, Katharine Moffat.

Sue Balter-Reitz, Special Assistant to the Provost, noted that the search for the Executive Director of the Center for Teaching and Learning will soft-close soon. They are looking for someone who understands faculty identity, needs, and responsibilities. They do need a few more faculty on the search committee.

Finally, Dr. Eskandari noted they are forming a group to strive for continuous improvement in DFWI courses.

IV.   OTHER REPORTS

MSUB Data Governance Council: Joann Stryker, Institutional Research
Last November a charter was created for the DGC. The group:
- Ensure validity, access, security
- Information is an institutional asset
- Prioritization of efforts

- Last year worked on process flow for data projects and updated Data Standards (policy)
- Currently compiling comprehensive project list for prioritization and data agreement with MSUB Foundation
- Meets last Tuesday of month at 9:00 a.m.

They are seeking one faculty member from each campus. Tenure status is not important. Those interested and nominees can be forwarded to Dr. Lynn.

V.   ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

Item 1 Committee Report for 2021-2022: General Education Committee.

Item 2 Committee Report for 2021-2022: Undergraduate Curriculum Committee.

Item 3 Committee Report for 2021-2022: Commencement Committee.

Item 4 Committee Report for 2021-2022: Academic Standards & Scholastic Standing Committee.

Item 5 Committee Report for 2021-2022: Library Committee.

⇒ Motion by Austin Bennett, seconded by Melissa Boehm to **accept Items 1 through 5.**

⇒ Motion carried.

VI.   DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

A. Sabbatical Committee Request from Provost
The Senate needs to submit 10 names within 2 weeks. Please work with your fellow Senator and find 2 tenured faculty from your college to nominate.

The Provost's website also has summaries of previous sabbatical projects.

B. Assessment and the Curriculum Process
Kathleen Thatcher, Director, Assessment & Accreditation

Ms. Thatcher stated that assessment and outcomes included in curriculum proposals should be in a state ready to print in the catalog when they arrive at Senate. Senators play a critical role in the quality of what is in our catalog. With that in mind, she and Dr. Lynn will be meeting with colleges and departments to share information on writing good outcomes. There are also a variety of resources available on the Assessment & Accreditation intranet page.

The goal is to create outcomes that:
- are program focused
- are clear, specific, and observable
- describe the knowledge and skills achieved.

C. Campus Process for Proposing New Programs
Sep Eskandari, Provost & Sue Balter-Reitz, Special Assistant to the Provost

Dr. Eskandari noted that there are many steps beyond Academic Senate when proposing a new program. There is so much we have to justify, so they are front-loading all that work and research in this process.

Dr. Balter-Reitz stated that the draft process presented today includes three basic phases: an idea, research, and external proposal. The research phase is really to help us make the strongest argument possible for the viability of a new program. This includes doing outreach to other units in the system.

Comments and suggestions can be sent to Dr. Eskandari and Dr. Balter-Reitz.

D. Faculty Professional Development Committee: Request from Provost for members
As Dr. Eskandari mentioned in his report, this new committee is being formed to review faculty professional development proposals. The committee will be one tenured faculty member from each college. He will provide criteria, but all the decisions will be made by the committee.

He noted that the City College CBA does not mention faculty professional development at all, but they will be represented on the committee and are welcome to apply for funds.

Dr. Lynn asked the Senators to work with their colleagues to find one faculty representative from their college for this committee.

The meeting adjourned at 4:42 p.m.

rjrm

--- DRAFT ---
Development of New Programs
Brief Summary of Process

Updated: September 2, 2022

I. Idea Phase

1. Develop a short paragraph describing the program and a working title. Be sure to align the program with college and university priorities.

2. Request a meeting with the Department Chair and College Dean to brainstorm the proposal and determine how the new program fits with the College's mission and resources.

3. Engage the MSU Billings OCHE Liaison with any questions about the OCHE new program process.

4. Engage internal stakeholders including department faculty, faculty members from other departments, the Assessment and Accreditation Director, workforce/career directors, and College Dean in developing the MSU Billings Planning form, and consider how the proposal fits within the annual Academic Planning and Priorities Statement (created each May). **(Planning form in development, will be finalized as the process is determined)**

5. Begin conducting research and accumulate data related to (1) existing similar programs in Montana, region, and nation; (2) drivers and evidence of demand for the new program; and (3) program cost and viability (see below: II. Research Phase).

6. Present the idea to the Academic Senate as part of the conversation related to new academic programs. The Academic Senate generally has two meetings a year, one in the Fall semester and one in the Spring semester, dedicated to discussing early and preliminary ideas related to new academic programs ("New Programs Meeting").

II. Research Phase

1. Existing Similar Programs

    a. What similar programs exist in Montana? In particular, are there similar existing programs within the Montana University System (MUS)? If a similar program exists at another MUS campus, it is important to reach out to appropriate faculty at the other campus and learn about their experiences with the program, as well as inform them about the possibility that MSU Billings may be considering instituting such a program.

b. If appropriate (e.g., for fully online programs), research on similar programs should be expanded to include programs in other states (in particular, neighboring states).

c. What is the mode of delivery in those existing programs?

d. What is the enrollment in those existing programs? It would be helpful to have data for the last three years.

2. Drivers and Evidence of Demand for Program

   a. Provide data on the number of jobs available annually in this field, as well as starting salary projections. This data set is very important. A variety of sources can and should be consulted to obtain this information (e.g., Institutional Research, Career and Employment Services, Montana Department of Labor and Industry, US Bureau of Labor Statistics, etc.).

   b. Recommendations from community members and/or employers. If this is the case, what support is expected from these entities (e.g., paid internships or other supports for students)?

   c. Recommendation from advisory boards/committees.

   d. If the program is a frequent request from students, include the names and career objectives of students who have asked for the program in the last three years.

   e. Any other evidence that would be relevant.

3. Program Cost and Viability

   a. Provide a complete list of courses needed for program. Include both existing and new courses.

   b. Provide a detailed curriculum plan for the new program (term by term plan for the courses that must be taken). Highlight the new courses in the academic plan.

   c. Provide a course rotation schedule for new program, ensuring there is alignment with existing course rotation schedules utilizing the existing courses.

   d. Provide a plan for staffing the program courses (both current and new) by existing faculty.

   e. Provide data related to the average class size and enrollment capacity for sections of existing courses. Include data for the last three years.

   f. Comment on department and faculty willingness to increase class enrollment capacity to accommodate new students in the new program.

   g. If new courses are required for the program, can they be taught by existing faculty? If existing faculty will teach new courses required by the program, what courses will not be taught by those faculty members to accommodate the new courses?

   h. If new faculty (full-time or part-time) are required to deliver the program, please information related to the starting salary for faculty in this discipline. Please also provide the projected teaching load and schedule for the new faculty.

        i.   Detail any new physical resources (space, equipment, etc.) that would be required by the program.

III. Internal Proposal Phase

1. Submit the MSUB Planning Form to the College Dean.

    a. Attach all the documentation related to research done for the new program (see above: II. Research Phase).

    b. College Dean adds the Planning form(s) to the agenda for a Deans Council meeting for consultation and discussion.

    c. Based on input from the Deans Council, College Dean creates a feedback statement for the proposal contact.

2. Submit appropriate paperwork to the Academic Senate.

    a. Consult with the OCHE Liaison to determine if the program is Level I or Level II (this will determine what is presented to the Academic Senate.

    b. Once the Academic Senate has weighed in, move forward with appropriate OCHE paperwork.

IV. External Proposal Phase

1. Draft the appropriate OCHE paperwork and submit it to the College Dean.

    a. If a program is Level 1, determine if it is a campus approval or OCHE approval and provide appropriate paperwork.

    b. If the program is a Level II, include an Academic Proposal Request, Curriculum Proposal, Fiscal Analysis and Supporting Documentation. Engage external advisory boards, the MSU Billings Foundation, Assessment and Accreditation Director, among others in this work.

2. Submit paperwork to MSU Billings OCHE Liaison who will provide feedback.

3. Once the paperwork is ready to submit, the OCHE Liaison will work with the Provost to finalize the submission.

4. During this phase, the program contact may be asked to make a brief presentation (3–5 minutes) to the Montana University System (MUS) Chief Academic Officers (CAO) group in support of the proposal. These presentations are generally via virtual meetings. Questions raised by the CAO group are generally related to primary driver and motivation for creating the new program (e.g., in response to local and/or state-wide workforce needs), prospective student demand for the program, expected student enrollment (headcount) in the program, whether or not the program

duplicates an existing program within the MUS, required resources (existing and additional), and employment outlook and salary projections for program graduates.