

## ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

**DATE:** September 18, 2008

<b>PRESENT:</b>	Jeff Sanders	Bruce Brumley
	Kay Streeter	Lorrie Steerey
	Craig McKenzie	Keith Edgerton
	Gershon Bulgatz	Mark Hardt
	Matt Redinger	Steve Coffman
	Rob Barnosky (student)	Tasneem Khaleel (ex-officio)
	Gary Young (ex-officio)	Mary Susan Fishbaugh (ex-officio)
	John Cech (ex-officio)	Kirk Lacy (ex-officio)
	Karen Heikel (ex-officio)	D'Ann Campbell (ex-officio)

<b>ABSENT:</b>	Rakesh Sah*	Sandie Rietz*
	David Garloff (ex-officio)	Terrie Iverson (ex-officio)
	Stacy Klippenstein (ex-officio)	

\* *excused*

<b>GUESTS:</b>	Brian Reed	Joe Howell
	St. John Robinson	Sue Balter-Reitz
	Lisa Kemmerer	Bernard Quetchenbach

**PRESIDING:** Lorrie Steerey, Chair

---

Lorrie Steerey called the meeting to order at 3:44 p.m. in the Beartooth room of the SUB.

The minutes of September 11 were accepted as presented.

### I. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

#### A. MUS Transferability Initiative

It was stated that at yesterday's Provost Council meeting, Linda Wham of Information Technology reported on a meeting she had attended in Helena about the technical side of the Transferability Initiative. Apparently not only will general education courses be on a

list, but all courses across the University System. Campuses will only be allowed to offer courses if they are on the common course list, and any course that is not on the list must have special authorization from the Commissioner of Higher Education. It was cited that this amounts to making all units of the system the same, because all courses will be the same. It was further cited that the Commissioner's Office apparently expects all the courses to be ready by January 1, 2009, and students will be enrolled in them by Fall 2009. Provost D'Ann Campbell noted that Ms. Wham was told this is the way it's going to be and we do not have a choice in the matter.

It was cited that all along, those faculty attending the transferability councils were under the impression that the goal of those meetings was to identify equivalent courses and then give them the same rubric and number. They were repeatedly assured that a prescriptive masters list would not be made. The goal was never to standardize all courses across the system. The faculty members present today noted that they were finding common courses and writing common outcomes, not making a master list which everyone must use.

It was noted that in the History Councils, they decided not to worry about formulating common course numbers, but just to agree on common course outcomes. They did accomplish that goal.

It was cited that in the Philosophy Councils, they were deadlocked and could not agree on common courses. They never met again after the stalemate. The council's leader then stated they had agreed to several points when in fact they had not. The individuality of courses, especially from smaller units to large, does not really permit exact equivalent courses.

It was noted that the Biology Council never came to an agreement on any courses. The Math Council agreed on two courses, and the Management Information Systems (MIS) agreed on one course.

It was noted that in some councils, faculty were asked to make decisions for other campuses. Faculty were also told that this process would replace the ordinary curricular process on each campus—that the campus processes would be overridden.

It was stated that Bill McGregor, Director of Transferability Initiatives, has said that this master list of courses will happen whether the units participate or not, whether we want it or not. If the campuses don't conform, he will change the courses for them. It was cited that aside from the change in goals of the councils, there is also the issue of the councils not being finished with their lists of equivalent courses. There are whole areas missing outcomes and course lists. There is also an issue with course numbering, because there are very few numbers left available that are common to all the units.

Dr. Steerey noted that the faculty senate chairs will be meeting at next week's Board of Regents meeting to discuss this issue, as well as faculty salaries. It was suggested that we find out if there is as much confusion on the other campuses, and then approach the

Commissioner of Higher Education about what the actual goal of the transferability initiative is. It appears right now that the goal is to homogenize as much as possible all campuses across the Montana University System.

It was cited that we have never seen the legislative mandate that started the transferability initiative. Perhaps we should look at that as well.

It was noted that the website referenced by Ms. Wham (<http://www.homepage.montana.edu/~transfer/phpBB3/index.php>) links to the lists which have been established. Faculty are asked to check this website and see if it is what they have been doing at their council meetings.

It was noted that it appears the purpose of the councils has gone from identifying common courses to cutting anything that is not on the common course list. That is the part we were not told. If the purpose of the councils has been changed, they need to start their work all over again. Ultimately, if this master list becomes the rule, it infringes on academic freedom, which is written into all the faculty contracts across the system.

Senators and any faculty are asked to email their concerns to Dr. Steerey and Provost Campbell by Monday morning. Dr. Steerey will then create a list of questions for Commissioner Stearns when they meet at the BOR next week. Provost Campbell noted that we also have a brand new Deputy Commissioner of Academic & Student Affairs and there is no agenda for the Academic & Student Affairs meeting at the BOR, only a discussion of how the transferability initiative will be implemented.

#### **B. Graduate Committee and Proposed Chair of Graduate Studies Sue Balter-Reitz, Chair, & Sharon Hobbs, Vice Chair**

Sue Balter-Reitz noted that when George White became Interim Provost, he also kept the directorship of Graduate Studies. Basically, the office operated without a director in that time. When Dr. Campbell was hired, she asked the Graduate Committee to create a director position description for a director separate from her office. This gave the Committee a chance to think about a different model for the position.

The Committee proposes a one-year experiment to create a “Chair of Graduate Studies.” The Chair of the Graduate Committee would serve as the Director of the Graduate Studies Office to help guide where we want our graduate studies to go, as well as keeping the program under the guidance of the faculty. Dr. Balter-Reitz is here for the Senate’s input and approval of this experiment.

⇒ Motion by Keith Edgerton, seconded by Matt Redinger to **approve the Graduate Committee’s one-year experiment for a Chair of Graduate Studies.**

Dr. Balter-Reitz noted that she and Vice Chair Sharon Hobbs plan to share the responsibilities during this first year. Provost Campbell stated that she has offered reassigned time for Dr. Balter-Reitz and Dr. Hobbs. Responsibilities will include signing

graduation forms as well as attending Provost Council and Academic Senate meetings. It was noted that Dr. Balter-Reitz is also a department chair this year, and she responded this is the reason she and Dr. Hobbs will be sharing the position. This year will be an experiment to see just how much time this job will take up.

⇒ Motion carried.

⇒ Motion by Keith Edgerton, seconded by Steve Coffman to **amend the Academic Senate bylaws to add the Chair of Graduate Studies as an ex-officio member of the Senate.**

⇒ Motion carried.

## II. ITEM FOR INFORMATION

### **Item 2** Graduate Committee Report 2007-2008

⇒ Motion by Matt Redinger, seconded by Bruce Brumley to **accept Item 2 for information.**

Dr. Balter-Reitz noted that they are attempting to convert to electronic plans of study to reduce the amount of paper pushing, but there have been some technical problems. Last year was a Graduate Catalog year, and the Committee worked to get outcomes for each program listed in the catalog. The name change idea (to Graduate Council) was withdrawn at the first meeting this fall. The proposal to give Graduate Studies equal status comes from the fact that graduate students are 10% of our FTE but the program receives no recruitment dollars and access to other resources. The entire Graduate Studies budget is based on the \$40 application fee.

⇒ Motion carried.

### **C. Proposed CQI Committee Alteration: A New Name, A New Purpose**

It was noted that the CQI Committee discussed whether they actually wanted to become what the Senate was proposing. They also worked on writing bylaws and proposed a new name, SPAA (Strategic Planning, Assessment, and Accreditation Committee). A three-year commitment was proposed for the chairperson: chair elect, chair, and immediate past chair. Two- or three-year terms were proposed for the members. The group also discussed ongoing accreditation efforts, BOR reviews, and program reviews as they relate to the new possible charge. It was also noted that the Senate is concerned with the progress and maintenance of the faculty, and we don't want the same people always serving on these committees.

**D. ASMSUB Meetings**

The Senate needs a representative to attend ASMSUB meetings occasionally to update them on what is going on with the Senate and the faculty in general. Keith Edgerton agreed to attend the meetings the first Thursday of the month.

The meeting adjourned at 4:52 p.m.

rjrm