

FACULTY SENATE
April 9, 2014
346 LEON JOHNSON
4:10 PM – 5:00 PM
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY – BOZEMAN, MONTANA
Minutes

Members Present: Babbitt (Physics), Bolte (Music), Brester (Ag Econ), Christopher (HHD), DeWeese for Newhouse (Art), Durham (JJCBE), Gannon (Bio & Chem Eng), Herbeck (Ed), Kaiser (ECE), Kohler (Chem & Biochem), Larson (M&IE), Martin (Mod Lang), McMahon (Ecology), Miller (CE), O’Neill (Arch), Olson for Moreaux (ARS), Reidy (Hist, Phil & Religious Stds), Ricciardelli (Film & Photo), Rossmann (Library), Schachman (Nursing), Swinford (Soc), Wiedenheft (Micro & Immuno)

Others Present: Larry Carucci, Robert Mokwa, Ron Larsen, David Singel, Renee Reijo-Pera, Leila Sterman, Frances Lefcort, Brett Walker

Chair Mokwa called the meeting to order at 4:10 pm, and a quorum was present.

Senate Business and Announcements – Chair Mokwa

- The minutes from April 2, 2014 were unanimously approved.
- Announcements:
 - Candidates for the VP/Dean of Agriculture will be on campus and faculty are encouraged to attend open meetings.
 - The new policy for reporting suspected legal, regulatory or policy violations was presented in University Council and should be posted on the legal counsel website for a thirty-day comment period.
 - On April 23, 2014, 10:00 am, SUB Ballroom C, an open all-councils meeting will take place.
 - New Courses and Programs – Chair-elect Reidy
 - Senators voted to accept the following courses:
 - ACT 240 - Intermediate Basketball
 - ECIV 309 - Building Information Modeling in Construction
 - ENSC 260 - Evolution and Environmental Science
 - GPHY 329 - Environment and Society
 - WGSS 494 Seminar - Expert Voices Speaker Series
 - All Grad courses will be voted on next week.

Nominations Open for Faculty Senate Chair-elect Position

- Chair Mokwa announced nominations are open for the FS Chair-elect position. Voting in senate for this position will take place on April 23, 2014. Email mreidy@montana.edu for questions.
- There is a financial benefit tied to this position.

Center for Mental Health, Research and Recovery (CMHRR) Second Reading - Frances Lefcort

- Frances Lefcort provided a progress update for the CMHRR:
 - Yesterday, members of Dean's Council voted to accept the proposal; after FS approval, it goes to the Provost's office and then to the BoR for a first reading during their May 22, 2014 meeting. A second reading and approval by the BoR would occur in July. Lefcort iterated that the CMHRR is a work-in-progress and that:
 - It is a center for any and all programs on campus that are able to contribute and Lefcort welcomes collaboration from all faculty and their departments;
 - The center's intent is to develop technologies and treatments for mental illnesses;
 - It will conduct basic research of neural mechanisms underlying mental illness; and,
 - There will be a clinical outreach and translational component.
- Discussions ensued:
 - Larson asked about the procedures and thresholds for presenting a center through the BoR – any negatives or risks associated with this process? Reijo-Pera stated that the process and guidelines are clearly articulated for centers on all MUS campuses. Securing one on the MSU campus involves faculty support and sufficient interest in establishing a center.
 - What about space and F&A returns? Reijo-Pera believes that demonstrating the center's feasibility is tantamount and before receiving F&A returns; the day MSU receives returns is when the center would, most likely, be well established. An informal document with all pertinent information will be sent out ahead of time to find out who is interested and who supports the center.
 - Babbitt asked if there was internal support for the center to get it started. Reijo-Pera stated that in suggesting the center to the BoR, one must show support. So far, support from individual grants include NIH, and applications for joint support have been crafted.
- Chair Mokwa asked for a motion to approve the center→seconded→all in favor→unanimously approved the CMHRR.
- Questions about the center may be directed to Frances Lefcort: Lefcort@montana.edu

Honorary Degree Policy – Larry Carucci

- New language in the policy crafted by Faculty Affairs would allow any nominees to be candidates for the Honorary Degree, but allows a preference to be given to a nominee with a direct Montana connection. In the case of two (2) candidates, the preference would be given to the nominee with the direct Montana connection.
- Motion to approve new wording→seconded→all in favor→one “nay” vote→unanimously accepted.

Guidelines for Level of Review for Curriculum Changes – Ron Larsen

- Guidelines to create a new course/program are well-established. However, modifying such courses/programs are not as clear hence, the evolution of the guidelines document.

- To date there have been 469 change-forms that have crossed Larsen's desk; some have been minor and some have been significant.
- Changes that are minor vs. significant is the driving force for the guidelines document and Larsen is asking senators for their input on what constitutes "minor changes," "significant changes," and to help define "scope."
- Larsen stated that if there are substantial changes, then he proposes looking at the scope of the change.
 - In Chemical Engineering, e.g., courses may be changed by the dept head as they are of departmental scope, only, and only departmental approval is necessary
 - In Math, however, changing a pre-req, course, content, e.g., affects many entities and that would need a university scope modification with a full review process, including C&PC and Faculty Senate approval.
 - How to define scope?
 - Looking at the curriculum lists and examining what curriculum is required for the course.
 - Examining what students have taken the course in the past; what departments are they from?
 - Presently, it is easier to make a query about students than the curriculum. MSU has new software for curriculum management, and Larsen believes it will allow MSU to declare scope based on curriculum apps.
- Discussions ensued:
 - Bolte asked about the minor course changes. In music technology frequent changing of adjuncts, instructors are done manually, on a form, and highlighted in red ink. Will that process change? Larsen stated that the process will change, the new form will show indicated changes in one place and will replace all highlighting on the old form. A goal is to also have a computer fill out the known information on the form and faculty would only have to document the changes.
 - Kohler noticed in the guidelines document that grad courses are clustered in one place for university review. He asked if grad courses were being treated equally with undergrad courses and what the review processes are for them. Larsen stated that the intent is to have minor and departmental changes. If, however, one gets to a university-level change with a grad-level course, it goes to Grad Council instead of C&PC. The same process applies to new grad courses. Regarding a college-level change, if it is a departmental or college scope, reviews stop at the college or department level. The dean of the grad school is the final sign-off for grad level courses; Larsen is the final sign off for undergrad courses.
 - Course deletions- what happens when a faculty member teaches a specialized course discontinues teaching it, and it is still listed in other programs? Larsen noticed that if the course is taken throughout the college/university, then students should be notified of its discontinuation.
 - Larson mentioned that in some MIE programs, students request a use of a course as a professional elective, and it might not be listed; the use of past practices might not cover all definitions of whether it is a departmental scope vs. a university scope. Larsen is not sure of a complete solution. He suggested that the course selection by the student might have go through the review process, and that takes a lot of time and effort. Singel asked if the analysis of the course be just informational, or would there

be some discussion: If a college review is required, then the college curriculum committee would review it and sign off on it.

- Carucci asked about minor course changes such as instructors or class formats and, depending on what an instructor has in mind, redesign could vary greatly. Larsen stated that the learning outcomes or course description would trigger the review rather than the instructor. Carucci noted that the process would be feasible if the learning outcomes are being fulfilled by the course rather than being listed pro forma and the instructor is teaching something different.
- Carucci suggested workload changes be listed.
- Kohler asked if the changes in instructors are being reported/approved by the Provost, as some courses have large populations of instructors teaching them. Larsen stated that current forms have a place to report that information and he approves them; faculty may also be reporting those changes directly to the Registrar. Kohler recommended a streamlined process whereby department heads would approve the instructor change.
- Babbitt noted that “changes in semester” should also be included in the guidelines document.
- How does an instructor change pre-reqs? Larsen stated that would be categorized under “substantial change.”
- There are some standardized schedules and if a course is a moving target, it is difficult to schedule such a course. Larsen stated making such changes impacts the entire scheduling system, and perhaps a notification process might need to be implemented.
- Conflicts on Tuesdays and Thursdays, with 15-minute overlaps, is becoming problematic. Larsen noted that the new software will make all course changes through the catalog management system and keep Banner updated.

As there was no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm.

Signature,
Robert Mokwa, Chair

Signature
Michael Reidy, Chair-elect