

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

DATE: March 23, 2006

PRESENT: Agnes Samples
Susan Balter-Reitz
Noreen Lee
Dan Hansen (student)
John Cech (ex-officio)

Audrey ConnerRosberg
Bruce Brumley
Craig McKenzie
Tasneem Khaleel (ex-officio)

ABSENT: Mark Hardt – *excused*
Sandie Rietz – *excused*
Keith Edgerton – *excused*
Matt Redinger – *excused*
David Garloff (ex-officio)
Mary Susan Fishbaugh (ex-officio)
Kirk Lacy (ex-officio)
Terrie Iverson (ex-officio)

Lorrie Steerey – *excused*
Paul Bauer – *excused*
Randall Gloege – *excused*
Lewis Rife (student) – *excused*
Curt Kochner (ex-officio)
Mary McNally (ex-officio)
George White (ex-officio)

GUESTS: Tammi Miller
John Culbertson

Jane Howell

PRESIDING: Audrey ConnerRosberg, Vice Chair/Chair Elect

Audrey ConnerRosberg called the meeting to order at 3:47 p.m. in room B57 of the College of Technology.

The minutes of March 16 were accepted as presented.

I. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

Item 52 AAS in Construction Technology—Carpentry. New program.

Item 52.a CARP 120 Carpentry Basics and Rough-in Framing. New course.

Item 52.b CARP 130 Exterior Finishing, Stair Construction, and Metal Stud Framing. New course.

Item 52.c CARP 140 Introduction to Site Layout. New course.

Item 52.d CARP 150 Carpentry Practicum I. New course.

- Item 52.e** CARP 220 Interior Finishing. New course.
- Item 52.f** CARP 230 Advanced Roof, Floor, Wall, and Stair Systems. New course.
- Item 52.g** CARP 250 Carpentry Practicum II. New course.
- Item 52.h** TRID 110 Fundamentals of Construction Technology. New course.
- Item 52.i** TRID 112 Blueprint Reading for Construction. New course.
- Item 52.j** TRID 115 Using a Construction Calculator. New course.
- Item 52.k** TRID 120 Concrete Forms, Reinforcement, and Handling. New course.
- Item 52.L** TRID 125 Introduction to Flooring Installation. New course.
- Item 52.m** TRID 130 Basic Rigging. New course.
- Item 52.n** TRID 131 Metal Building Construction. New course.
- Item 52.o** TRID 190 Introduction to Residential Wiring. New course.

⇒ Motion by Noreen Lee, seconded by Susan Balter-Reitz to **accept Items 52, 52.a, 52.b, 52.c, 52.d, 52.e, 52.f, 52.g, 52.h, 52.i, 52.j, 52.k, 52.L, 52.m, 52.n, and 52.o.**

John Culbertson, Construction Technology Instructor, stated that this program is a basis for a statewide construction program—a blue print for other COTs. In the future, the COT may develop additional options in construction, such as plumbing and electrical.

⇒ Motion carried.

- Item 58** MIS 150 Information Access and Organization. New course.

It was noted that Lorrie Steerey, who was unable to attend today's meeting, requested that this item be postponed until next week.

- Item 63** DSGN 248 Computer Presentation and Animation. Change prerequisites and course description.

⇒ Motion by Noreen Lee, seconded by Susan Balter-Reitz to **accept Item 63.**

Craig McKenzie noted that this course has been submitted and accepted for Academic Foundations, but it has prerequisites. This change will remove those prerequisites.

⇒ Motion carried with 1 abstention.

II. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

A. Hiring Protocols at MSU-B (Academic Senate Initiative #3): Guest Jane Howell

Ms. Howell stated that Keith Edgerton had asked her to come to the Senate and explain what the Hiring Task Force will be doing. It is headed up by Ms. Howell and Janet Simon, Director of Human Resources. This recruiting and hiring task force will be looking at all levels and processes of hiring, from classified staff to administrators. The task force is quite small because Provost George White has asked for a report by the end

of this semester. Right now the task force includes Ms. Simon, Jackie Salvesson of Human Resources, Mary Jaynes of IT, Shelly Loveless of the COT Library, and Ms. Howell. The committee would also like a faculty representative.

Ms. Howell noted that the most important thing we do in this process is make sure we recruit and hire the best people we can. Some issues include the amount of paperwork and signatures required before a hire can be made. We should increase the use of electronic communication to save time, as well as use the Human Resources Office to their greatest efficiency.

It was noted that the largest problem in hiring faculty is often that we can't start a search in the fall, and so miss out on the best pool of candidates. Ms. Howell noted that often that wait is due to budget approval, which this task force unfortunately cannot change. However, each discipline seems to have a different time frame for hiring: some need a year, some only six months. The task force looks to gather data from each discipline to work out a recommended time line, and then a process to ask for exceptions from that time line. It was noted that the COT often hires people from industry, and those candidates are not looking for a job more than a year into the future. Departments need to have a choice on how long the search needs to be—a year or perhaps just four months. Flexibility is important.

It was observed that in administrator searches, often three or four candidates are brought in, sometimes for several days each. On the other hand, faculty searches are allowed to bring only one candidate at a time and if that person is unacceptable, only then can the department bring in another candidate. We should find a way to get more faculty candidates on campus.

It was cited that once a faculty search leaves the dean's office, often there is no word on it for weeks. You have to call the Provost to find out what the status of the search is.

It was noted that the Senate wants to stay informed on faculty hiring, and also be involved in deciding which lines will be searched. It was cited that recently, departments have been in a race to see who can find their candidate first. If your department finds a good candidate, that candidate can be hired while another department which may have needed their position more are told they have to stop searching because the other lines have already been filled. How did we get to that process?

It was commented that in classified positions, sometimes a given staff person is doing as much work as a staff person who is at a higher level. They are both doing the same amount of work, but the lower-level person is paid less. How are those levels determined?

Susan Balter-Reitz stated that she would be interested in serving on the task force.

B. System of Evaluation for Transfer Courses: Guest Tammi Miller

Dr. ConnerRosberg stated that she asked Ms. Miller to talk to the Senate about the transfer process.

Ms. Miller, Associate Registrar, stated that the BOR policies have been implemented in the Office of Admissions and Records. Advisors in the Advising Center evaluate incoming transfer students' transcripts. Courses that are not in the transfer guide go to the faculty for evaluation, and a notice is also sent to the student. The BOR are very specific about what data must be tracked: the date the transfer application is processed, the date a transcript goes to a faculty member for evaluation, and the date the transcript comes back. Faculty are very responsive in this process. The challenge comes during breaks and summer. Ms. Miller recommends that if a department chair is not available, some other faculty member should be designated to handle transfers. The Academic Standards and Scholastic Standing Committee cannot serve as a back up, because if a student is to appeal their transfer courses, they go to the Academic Standards Committee. The Committee can't be involved in the beginning if they are in the appeal process.

The question was raised of inappropriate transfer of courses. Dean Khaleel noted that it happens fairly often that a transfer student's advisor will accept a course that is inappropriate for general education, or for upper level when it is not an upper level course. This error is not caught until the student applies for graduation. Ms. Miller noted that since this process is still very new, she was unable to tell the Senate how often this situation arises. The Senate agreed to ask Cheri Johannes, Registrar, to come to a meeting to further discuss this issue.

Ms. Miller noted that if transfer students' courses are in the transfer guide, we are meeting the 10 day limit set by the BOR.

The meeting adjourned at 4:32 p.m.

rjrm