

Faculty Senate Minutes  
 October 17<sup>th</sup>, 2018  
 PBB 108  
 3:10- 4:30 pm

<b>Name</b>	<b>Represents</b>	<b>Attended</b>
Richards, Abigail	Chair	X
Walker, Brett	Chair-elect	X
Anderson, Christina	AR/Film & Photography	X
Anderson, Ryan	EN/Chem Engr	X
Austin, Eric	LS/Political Sci	X
Belasco, Eric	AG/Ag Econ	X
Brody, Michael	ED/Education	X
Carr, Patrick	AG/Research Centers	X
Dana, Susan	Business	X
Dunbar, Edward	HHD/Health & Human Dev	X
Gao, Hongwei	EN/Electrical & Comp. Engineering	X
Gedeon, Tomas	LS/Math Sciences	X
Herman, Matthew	LS/Native American Studies	X
Izurieta, Clemente	EN/Computer Science	X
Kosto, Alison	Extension/Off Campus	X
Little, Jeannie	AR/Music	X
McDermott, Tim	AG/Land Res	X
McMahon, Tom	LS/Ecology	X
McPhee, Kevin	AG/Plant Sci & Plant Path	X
Meyer, James	LS/History & Phil	X
Slye, Teresa	Gallatin College	X
Stowers, Steven	LS/Cell Biology & Neuroscience	X
Thomas, Amy	LS/English	X
Yamaguchi, Tomomi	LS/Sociology & Anthro	X
Yeoman, Carl	AG/Animal & Range	X

<b>ALTERNATES</b>	<b>Dept</b>	<b>Attended</b>
Amendola, Roberta	EN/Mech & Ind Engineering	X
Ragain, Melissa	Art	X
Rossmann, Doralyn	Library-Alternate to Alternate	X
Sproles, Eric	LS/Earth Sciences	X

<b>OTHER ATTENDEES</b>	<b>Dept</b>	<b>Attended</b>
Provost Mokwa	Office of the Provost	X
Hatfield, Pat	AG/Animal & Range Sciences	X
Wittie, Michael	EN/Computer Science	X

- I. Call to Order
  - A. Meeting was called to order at 3:10pm
  
- II. Approval of the October 3, 2018 meeting minutes
  - A. Kevin McPhee moves to approve. Jim Meyer seconds. No opposed. Approved
  
- III. Informational Items
  - A. Hate Group Trolling
    - 1. Identity Ervopa posters on campus earlier this month
    - 2. Southern Poverty Law Center's evaluation  
<https://www.splcenter.org/fighting-hate/extremist-files/group/identity-ervopa>
  - B. Report back on Dean Hoo Graduate School Meeting
    - 1. To reserve credits, must complete 90 credits, GPA of 3.25 to reserved credits
      - a. Would this have to be an exception for the Seamless program?  
They should have about 89 credits by the time they would want to reserve credits.
    - 2. Current Policy
      - b. Reserve 9 cr. For grad degree
      - c. Manually designated GR at registrar
      - d. GPA for UG/GR calculated separately
      - e. Transcribed separately
      - f. <http://www.montana.edu/gradchool/forms.html>
    - 3. Strong Advising necessary
      - a. Credits need to fit within a graduate program of study
      - b. Understanding of applicability only to MSU degree, other universities may not accept our credits
      - c. Calculation of two separate GPA's
    - 4. Criteria to evaluate dependent on goals of the program
      - a. Recruit students to PDH programs?
      - b. Produce MS students in 4+1 format? Publications?
      - c. Coursework-only Masters?
    - 5. Senate subgroup-Further discussion with interested parties?
    - 6. Abbie Richards would be happy to get a group together to discuss this and she will have a further discussion with Provost/President.

Slight change to orders of the day. Move **“VI. Committee Assignments”** next in the agenda prior to **“IV. Old Business”**

- IV. Old Business
  - A. FYI: Courses approved in FS Steering Committee
    - 1. CULA 165: Baking and Pastry

2. HSTA 220IH: Shaping of America: History of American Religion
3. BCH 553: Proteins II
4. EDCI 550: Ethics & Advocacy for School Librarians
5. EELE 509: The Art of Biochips: Solving Healthcare Problems with BioMEMS
6. EGEN 511: Engineering Methods for Teachers
7. EARTH 562: Advanced Geomorphology

B. BS/MS Computer Science

1. Proposal: Allows BS students to reserve 12 undergraduate credits toward MS Program after admission
2. Proposal: Waives GRE requirement
3. Rationale: Reduce barriers into CS MS Program
4. Rationale: Enhances size & quality of the CS MS Program
5. Graduate Council Conclusion:  
“UGC believes that an exception should be granted for this program proposal but does not endorse a general change of policy across graduate programs.”
6. Carl Yeoman: Why did grad council not approve the change of policy across the board? They were talking mainly about the 9-12 credit difference as an “exception”. Did not want to endorse a change to the broader policy,
7. If you were asking for more than the 9 credits, an exception would have to be made, which means paperwork. No other exceptions exist for this proposal.
8. Tomas Gedeon: How is Seamless different from 4+1? It is an Admissions issue, but it is the same.
9. Hongwei Gao: Do they need to take the GRE again? No, that requirement has been removed in this case.
10. Brett Walker: If someone wanted to take these credits to another university, could they treat them as AP credits, in a way? It would depend on the school they were transferring to and their requirements.
11. Michael Brody asks that the Provost comment on this. Provost Mokwa: These would basically be dual enrollment courses. From this point forward, campuses don’t have to bring these proposals forward to BOR or OCHE, provided there is not change to the programs/courses themselves. We are the only campus that have the 9 credit limit. Students should be able to transfer them easily. This will not have to go forward to the BOR and OCHE. Timothy McDermott: With these reserved course credits, would another MUS school be held to accepting these credits? You want to tell students that they may, or may not be able to transfer them, depending on where they are going.
12. Tomas Gedeon moves to approve. Clemente Izurieta seconds. None opposed. Approved.

V. New Business

A. New Courses

1. Undergraduate:

ARTH 342: Modern Art

BCH 381: Biochemistry Lab

CHMY 340: Environmental Chemistry

CULA 131: World Cuisine

CULA 220: Dairy Foods and Culturing

CULA 265: Purchasing and Cost Control

ECNS 316: Economics of Crime and Risky Behaviors

EELE 418; The Art of Biochips-An Intro to BioMEMS

EGEN 494-001; Engr Peer Academic Leader Foundations

EMEC 440: Biomechanics of Human Movement

2. Graduate:

ENGR 694; Seminar

GPHY 507: Topics in Political Ecology

M 520: Access and Equity in Mathematics Teaching

TE 530: 3D Modeling and Animation

B. ANRS-BS: Ranching Systems Program

1. Proposal: Create preeminent Ranch Management Program in Intermountain West

2. Proposal: Systems-level approach that integrates course work with experiential/hands-on learning

3. Proposal: Topics include: Livestock production, natural resource management, economics and business, leadership, communication, lifelong learning, critical thinking

4. Mission: "is to sustain and preserve the agricultural heritage of the Northern Great Plains and Intermountain West, by graduating students who have the passion, breadth of knowledge, and diversity of skills needed to employ prudent ranching practices that create value and improve the natural resources vital to our land."

5. Concerns: The original concern was overlap between: A) Agribusiness Management Concentration (Ag Econ & Econ), B) Livestock Management & Industry Option (Animal and Range Sciences, C) Farm and Ranch Management Option, and D) Rangeland Ecology & Management Option

6. Concerns: Hands-on component and systems approach set the new program apart.

7. APWG met to discuss this program proposal: No overlap with other programs

8. Pat Hatfield is in attendance to answer any questions

9. Eric Belasco: Carved out something separate than what already existed. Management of human resources. Hands-on component. Feel good about it.

10. Clemente Izurieta: Do you have to look at the internship to make sure it is something that will fit the requirement of the course? Each internship will have its own learning outcomes. Want to pay the ranch for their work they

are doing with the student. Want the student to come back to the university with the information.

11. Tim McDermott: This sounds like it will be popular. Do you have ranches lined up to place these students? We will have more ranches that want to participate than we have interns.
12. Michael Brody: Unclear on the “systems” approach. “Holistic systems approach”. 27 credits of accounting, business, etc. 26 credits of ecology, 27 of animal science. Becomes broad based. Michael Brody: Each course is separate and somehow, they fit together; systems thinking. How do you teach that kind of relational reasoning?

### C. Workload Policy

1. Providing Feedback
  - a. Would like to have a policy that we can vote on November 28<sup>th</sup>, if not before
  - b. Next meeting, Oct 31 would like to hear feedback
    - i. Read documents carefully
    - ii. Discuss them with your colleagues
    - iii. Actionable suggestions: Provide specific language changes in writing
    - iv. Can email suggestions to [arichards@montana.edu](mailto:arichards@montana.edu), [brett.lawrence.walker@gmail.com](mailto:brett.lawrence.walker@gmail.com)
    - v. There will be a final draft for this committee to look at
    - vi. All variations of drafts are on FS website for review
2. Each unit will develop a Workload Plan for teaching, scholarship and service assignments that is consistent with the guidelines accompanying this policy. The plan must specify the types of assignments and the distribution of POE in each area of responsibility.
  - a. Unit specific
3. The unit plan shall also include **the circumstances that would justify variation** from the typical workload for faculty. The College’s Dean and the Provost will review and approve each unit’s Workload Plan.
  - a. Concern: What it means by circumstances
    - i. Response: Discussed at JAGS-circumstance definition a part of the Workload Plan Guidelines (e.g. faculty using course buy-out as part of a sponsored project)
  - b. Suggestion: Include a link to Faculty Modified Duties
    - ii. Response: Shall have link in Workload Plan Guidelines
4. The Workload Plan may be reviewed and/or updated at any time. Any change to the unit’s Workload Plan shall be submitted in writing to the College’s Dean and the Provost. Plans will also be reviewed and updated, if appropriate, at the time of the unit’s program review/accreditation.
  - a. Concern: The alignment of unit workload plan review and accreditation may not be the same.
    - i. Response: That is OK-plans can be reviewed/updated at any time. At minimum they must be reviewed at the time of

accreditation. If the mission of a unit changes, the plan can be modified.

- ii. That way you can review as you prepare. Amy Thomas: Must be reviewed A MINIMUM at the time of accreditation and updated as is appropriate. Would like to see this clearer.

5. Unit Workload Plans SHALL:

- a. Advance unit, college and university goals as stated in the University Strategic Plan and the Academic Plans of the unit.
- b. Consider unit curricular needs; retention and graduation goals; accreditation requirements; student credit hour requirements for academic programs in the unit and for general education and service courses; unit sponsored research commitments and resource constraints.
  - i. Michael Brody: “consider” needs to be added to the beginning of some of the sentences so that it reads correctly
  - ii. Concerns: Be aware of other factors that come along
    - Response: “plans may be reviewed and updated at any time”
- c. Provide flexibility and responsiveness to the needs of individual faculty and units (over time, over career state, across the mission, across individuals).
  - i. Concern: what are the “needs” of individual faculty?
    - Rationale: intentionally left vague/flexible, saving examples for the Workload Plan Guidelines
- d. Align with tenure and/or promotion and annual evaluation guidelines.
- e. Assure that all faculty contribute to the teaching, scholarship and service mission of the institution.
- f. **Recognize** **Align** with the teaching, scholarship and service activities identified in the [Faculty Handbook](#) and the Role and Scope Document of the Unit.
- g. Include expectations associated with scholarship activity that align with the indicators and associated quantitative and qualitative measures specified in the unit Role and Scope Document. Expectations shall be informed by discipline-specific national performance data and identified peer units.
  - i. Which comes first: R&S or WLP?
    - Faculty Handbook > R&S > WLP (WLP shall not contradict R&S)
  - ii. Eric Austin: Forces us to look at all the documents. Brett Walker: Does not offer specificity. Does not mention fairness.
  - iii. Michael Brody: Much of the document is abstract
  - iv. Abigail Richards: This document is not meant to contradict R&S documents

- h. Include quantitative and qualitative expectations for faculty in each area of workload assignment that align with the mission of the university, the faculty member's discipline, and the specific role assignments of individual faculty.
  - i. Hongwei Gao: How do you qualitatively measure service? Can you use quantitative "and/OR" qualitative? Michael Brody: There is a big difference. In his department they have both, so "and/or" would not work for them. Eric Belasco: "and/or" would give units the opportunity and flexibility to use whichever one is more appropriate.
- i. Can email further feedback to [arichards@montana.edu](mailto:arichards@montana.edu), [brett.lawrence.walker@gmail.com](mailto:brett.lawrence.walker@gmail.com)

VI. Committee assignments

A. Parking and Transportation committee-vacant

B. Recreation Sport and Fitness Advisory Board-Eric Austin

C. Core 2.0

- 1. Meets Monday's 9-10; twice monthly; anticipate 3-4 hours a month of work outside of your meeting
- 2. One additional at-large member to be nominated by Faculty Senate and selected from the faculty to ensure broad representation across the disciplines.
- 3. A faculty senate rep would provide legitimacy to the work and would help ensure the committee really does have voices that represent the diversity of thought present on our campus
- 4. Current committee make-up:
  - a. Tami Eitle-Academic Affairs
  - Craig Carr-Agriculture
  - Dean Adams-Arts and Architecture
  - Amber Raile-Business
  - Colleen McMilin-EHHD
  - Mike Wittie-Engineering
  - Jenny Green-CLS
  - Sara Rushing-CLS
  - Sally Moyce-Nursing
  - Shannon Willoughby-Honors
  - Janet Heiss-Arms-Gallatin College
  - Matthew Regan-Library
  - Meg Konkel, Colleen McMilin-NTT Faculty
  - Vacant-Faculty Senate
  - Vacant-ASMSU
  - Meg Konkel-US
  - Michelle Miley-Writing Center
  - Ken Silvestri-Center for Faculty Excellence
  - Tony Campeau-Registrar

5. Revisiting all the old core learning outcomes
6. What should the core areas mean and what outcomes belong under each
7. When Martha Potvin was here, Brett Walker was on the committee to revamp the old core. That work was scrapped. This group is taking up that challenge.
8. Steering committee has discussed this and feels that we should pull someone who is from an area that is not yet represented, such as Humanities.
  - a. Jim Meyer is interested
9. Susan Dana moves to nominate Jim Meyer. Tomas Gedeon seconds. None opposed. Approved.

D. Center Guidelines sub-committee

1. Seven – about one per college
2. Email a nomination or yourself to [arichards@montana.edu](mailto:arichards@montana.edu) by October 30<sup>th</sup>
3. Will be looking at guidelines that Research Council has made and determine if guidelines are sufficient in aiding faculty senators in the endorsement of center proposals. If not sufficient, this sub-committee will suggest additional guidelines.

VII. Public Comment

- A. Provost Mokwa: Appreciates all of the work that has gone into updating/creating the new Role and Scope documents. Many departments have gone through their second round of review.

VIII. Adjournment

- A. Meeting adjourned at 4:19pm

The next Faculty Senate meeting is on October 31, 2018 in SUB 233