

Faculty Senate Minutes
 January 29th, 2020
 SUB Ballroom D
 3:10-4:30pm

Name	Represents	Attended
Austin, Eric	Chair	x
Brody, Michael	Chair-elect	x
Amende, Kevin	EN/Mechanical/Industrial Engr	x
Anderson, Christina	AR/Film & Photography	x
Anderson, Ryan	EN/Chem Engr	x
Borys, Nick	LS/Physics	x
Carson, Robert	EHHD/Education	x
Creel, Scott	LS/Ecology	x
Dana, Susan	Business	x
Ellis, Colter	LS/Sociology & Anthropology	x
Fick, Damon	EN/Civil Engineering	x
Gao, Hongwei	EN/Electrical & Computer Engr	x
Gedeon, Tomas	LS/Math Sciences	x
Haynes, George	Extension/On Campus	x
Herman, Matthew	LS/Native American Studies	x
Hill, Andrew	AG/Agricultural Economics	x
Hurt-Avila, Kara	EHHD/Health & Human Development	x
Izurieta, Clemente	EN/Computer Science	x
Little, Jeannie	AR/Music	x
McPhee, Kevin	AG/Plant Sciences & Plant Pathology	x
Meyer, James	LS/History & Philosophy	x
Slye, Teresa	Gallatin College	x
Stowers, Steve	LS/Cell Biology & Neuroscience	x
Thomas, Amy	LS/English	x
Thompson, John	LS/Modern Languages	x
Watson, Bradford	AR/Architecture	x
Wilmer, Franke	LS/Political Science	x
Young, Scott	Library	x

ALTERNATES	Dept	Attended
Babbitt, Randy	LS/Physics	x
Moyce, Sally	Nursing/On Campus	x

OTHER ATTENDEES	Dept	Attended
Adams, Dean	Director, Center for Faculty Excellence	x
Brokaw, Galen	Professor, Modern Languages	x
Eitle, Tami	Vice Provost	x
Harvey, Tim	Associate Dean, JJCBE	x
Intemann, Kristen	Professor, History & Philosophy	x
Mokwa, Robert	Provost, Office of the Provost	x
Ranalli, Mark	Dean, JJCBE	x
Waterton, Nigel	Assistant Professor, Education	x
Wilson, Chelsey	Bracken Center for Excellence, JJCBE	x

- I. Call to Order
 - a. The meeting was called to order at 3:10pm
- II. Approval of the January 15th meeting minutes
 - a. Clemente Izurieta moves to approve. Tomas Gedeon seconds. None opposed. Approved.
- III. Informational Items
 - a. None
- IV. Old Business
 - a. CORE Update and Endorsement <http://ou.montana.edu/msu-core/proposed.html>
 - i. Proposed Core:
 - A. **Essential Elements of a Montana State University Education**
MSU students engage in learning through the MSU Core and their major areas of study. The Core integrates education in communication, thinking and problem solving, and local and global citizenship with knowledge and experiences in the natural, social and mathematical sciences, the arts, and the humanities. Through the MSU Core students develop an enhanced understanding of themselves, their effectiveness as communicators, thinkers and problem solvers, and their

responsibilities as members of the larger local and global communities. These Core qualities deepen the experience of the MSU undergraduate education, enhance health and well-being, enrich disciplinary pursuits, and establish MSU's graduates as lifelong learners and engaged citizens. <http://ou.montana.edu/msu-core/proposed.html>

B. MSU CORE Qualities & Outcomes

1. MSU Graduates are Effective Communicators
2. MSU Graduates are Thinkers and Problem Solvers
3. MSU Graduates are Local and Global Citizens

C. Notes on Implementation:

1. Existing Core Courses – Will retain their current designation. Update courses CIM to reflect how the course links to outcomes and artifacts. Instructor initiated updates and linked to assessment process.
2. New Courses – New course proposals identifying learning outcomes, linked to assignments (same form or parallel forms pending Banner/CIM update)
3. Faculty Learning Communities – Composed of Core Instructors

D. Questions/Comments:

1. Jim Meyer: Impression is that the proposed core is not very different than what we have already. In fact, it's probably worse. More hoops to jump through. Will have core designation revoked from our courses and will have to reapply. Could take thousands of hours to work on and it's not very different at all, even a little bit worse. Glad the conversation has gotten this far, but feel we are changing it just to change it. It will be on the backs of the faculty to do this and it does not benefit them at all. Don't feel it is good for faculty. Completely open to the idea of creating a new core, but just changing it for the sake of changing it and replacing it with something that is similar, if not worse, than what we already have.
2. Amy Thomas: Teaches mostly core classes. To me, what this is asking us to do is going from a list of 40 outcomes to three outcomes. Think they make sense. Issues of assessment and recertification is what the debate is about, but it is not connected to this in my eyes. (reads statement from another professor-Rebecca Jones) Appreciate the outcomes of the core. Benefits student learning. Sincerely hope it is approved so that the curriculum can be rewritten.
3. Chair Austin: There will be a staggered process for courses to come up for consideration, to be sure it still fits and the assessment piece is added. Will not "lose" your designation and will not have to start over from scratch. There will be some

work associated with it, but that is not what we are working on right now.

4. Tami Eitle: Up for conversation. Committee was in conversations with faculty. Worked on pilot assessment together. If you are up for assessment this fall, it will just be an update or change in CIM.
5. Tomas Gedeon: Q core: currently have to assess learning outcomes. In the future I have to do the same, plus I have to do these three core outcomes? Tami Eitle: Q will cover Thinking and Problem Solving. That is what it would be assessed on.
6. Franke Wilmer: Do you have to get re-designated, or not? Who decides who has to you and who doesn't? Any course that has a designation currently will keep that. There will be a roll out of the assessment process courses will come up in a staggered three-year process. Assessment coincides with re-designation.
7. Chair Austin: Procedural piece is not set in stone, still evolving.
8. Frank Wilmer: Some courses have drifted pretty far from the original core outcomes.
9. Can we object to the procedural issues at some point? There is a Faculty Senate rep on the core committee.
10. Jim Meyer: Why are we voting on this is piecemeal? Sounds like we won't have a chance for another vote. Also, have to meet TWO of these three outcomes, not just ONE. Will, at some point, have to resubmit the courses to be re-designated. Do respect the time everyone has worked on this, but it still doesn't seem much different. Would like to hear it from someone, what these differences are.
11. John Thompson: Has the diversity wording been voted on? Learning languages is part of diversity. Don't see the point of taking those seven words out, especially if it is the main component of Diversity. Tami: core courses will remain core courses and be assessed, no matter what we do here. Core courses will not need to be re-submitted for core, but they will have to go through assessment to demonstrate how they are teaching the core qualities associated with their designations.
12. Scott Creel: Agree with the languages issue. Will the language match the intention of many of the core courses? Think the language is broad enough. Do not think that will be an issue.
13. Part of what has been informing this process is the assessment piece. How do we do it in a way that is manageable and also fits the assessment piece at the same time?
14. Are we doing this to satisfy an administrative "thing", or does this help the faculty? Do not see how the assessment informs the faculty about their class.

15. Understood this came from the fact that the students do not understand why they need to take core courses. If they can leave feeling like they've learned what the core outcomes say, they feel they've really learned something.
 16. Are there also regular learning outcomes, or do these three core outcomes take the place of that. Presumably you would have learning outcomes for all of your courses. Then you'd have these three for core courses. We did a pilot last semester. Will bring those findings to the faculty. Looking at learning outcomes and how the students are doing on those. What would do differently? This group would review and vote on anything new or anything that changes.
 17. Chair Austin: There are two options at this point. You could take this info back to your units, and move forward at the first meeting in February, or we could entertain a motion to move forward today.
 18. Jim Meyer: The fact that the core committee has been meeting for two and a half years, who are we only voting on three outcomes. Don't feel that the committee has anything concrete or fixed. Don't see how we could vote to approve something so sketchy and incomplete.
 19. Chair Austin: We can pause this conversion and return to this in our next meeting.
 20. By "pausing" we are not continuing the conversations. Does the senate want more specifics? Would that get the conversation moving further than we have?
 21. Question: If we deny today, can we still revisit this, or is it now or never?
 22. Chair Austin: We can take it back up. However, any new courses that want core designation are not being reviewed until we get something in place. There is ongoing business that we need to progress.
- E. Ryan Anderson moves to approve the core outcomes as they are today. Kevin McPhee seconds.
- a. Further Discussion:
 - b. Franke Wilmer: Assessment is going to take place regardless of what we do. Think that these three outcomes bring a cohesiveness to the core that was missing before. Bringing connection and engagement.
 - c. Scott Creel: Worried about Q courses. As written it doesn't really require quantitative skills. Are they too simple?
 - d. Tami Eitle: We had listening session last semester and it doesn't sound like many were able to come to those. These things will still exist the way they did before. You will still be teaching what

you feel is important in your core course. We trust the experts in their field and content area. This is just a cohesive way of telling students what the core is about: breadth of knowledge. Overarching, you have these things that our community told us were important things for all students to learn while at MSU.

- e. Every student still needs to take all core areas? Yes.
- f. Scott Creel: Worried that the committee will not see a core course the same way the instructors do. That is not the intention. There will be ongoing discussions about what will happen next. Many students have more than one R when they leave the university.
- g. Question has been called. Three opposed. No abstentions. Motion carries.

b. Integrated Master of Science in Optics and Photonics-Randy Babbitt

- i. 4 plus 1 ½
- ii. Take info back to units. If concerns or questions, bring them to Eric or Michael. Will act on those concerns in steering committee.
- iii. Questions for Randy Babbitt
 - A. Would get the undergrad degree in four years, with a master's with the extra 1 ½.
 - B. 12 credits that can be reserved? Changed from the current 9? Yes.
 - C. There are two similar programs called "seamless" programs and they have the 12 credits as well.
 - D. You can only transfer in 9 credits at the graduate level. Those rules still stand.
 - E. 6 credits of 400 level courses (departmentally). Even if at 400 level, you have to reserve them. You cannot double count them.
 - F. Will move forward at steering next week if do not hear any issues.

c. Master of Science of Innovation and Management-Tim Harvey, Associate Dean

- i. M&IE: What is the difference between this and the engineering management degree? They are very similar.
- ii. This does need to go to BOR, so we do need to vote at some point.
- iii. Susan Dana moves to approve. Seconded by Hongwei Gao. None opposed. No abstentions. Approved.

d. Center Review Guidelines Discussion

Faculty Senate **Interim Guidelines for Approval of Center ["Entity"] Proposals and Periodic Review of Activities**

These Interim Guidelines are intended to guide Faculty Senate in approving a proposed Center. They are not criteria, but instead are guidelines to help inform and frame Senate's consideration of center proposals pending the adoption of a formal process by MSU.

In this document, “entity” means a center, institute, bureau, station or similar entity requiring approval by the Board of Regents pursuant to Policy 218, 220 and/or other applicable Regents policy.

i. Designation

- A. The entity should be appropriately designated (i.e. as a center, institute, etc.) in accordance with MSU policy. ~~to meet the definitions and functions described in the MSU Policy on Forming and Reviewing entities and Institutes [which does not yet exist]~~
- B. Questions: Is this version six now? The document on the website hasn't been updated. You can share it with your colleagues.
- C. Is this for new centers? What is the process? There is a five year review guideline. Would not be going back and looking at centers that were already here for years. Want to make sure we have some means of reexamining centers that may have stagnated, or had not activity. U of M has this policy in place already.
- D. Historically there hasn't been a process to assess the centers that are grant established. We are not proposing to add those types of centers into the mix. Does that include anyone who throws money at a project, or is it specific types of grant funding? Understand that grant funded centers have their own policies.
- E. Keely will be posting the newest draft of these document within 24 hours.

Faculty Senate - Guidelines for Approval of Center Proposals and Periodic Review of Activities

ii. Contribution to the Mission of the University

- A. The entity should have the potential to make significant contributions to the teaching, research/creative activity, and/or engagement missions of the University
- B. The entity should have the potential to enhance the reputation of the University by providing state-wide, regional, national, or international leadership in teaching, research/creative activity, and/or engagement
- C. The entity demonstrates a commitment to a culture of diversity, equity, and inclusion
- D. The entity has a systematic plan for regular assessment of its contributions to the mission of the University

iii. Governance

- A. The entity has policies that ensure research, academic, and curricular independence, including an explicit commitment to compliance with all MSU policies
- B. The entity has systematic and credible mechanisms for regular independent review of its activities, that include an external advisory council and/or an external review board
- C. If the entity hires faculty and/or staff, the entity has hiring processes that ensure independence from the entity's external funding source(s)

- D. The entity will issue a public annual report of funding sources, expenditures, and measurable outcomes
 - iv. Financial Stability
 - A. The entity should have a plan for ~~and the potential to be~~ becoming self-supporting through external funding and other revenue sources after a reasonable initial period (approximately 3-5 years)
 - B. The entity should have a contingency plan for how it will manage potential major funding shortfalls that could threaten the entity's continuity (e.g. unexpected withdrawal of funds by the primary funding source)
 - v. **Standards and Criteria for Approval of Continuation of entity (5-year review)**
 - A. Entities will be reviewed every 5-years for adherence to MSU policy, the guidelines described herein, and the review criteria outlined in its initiating proposal. This review process will follow procedures established in the University's Operating Policy on entity Review.
 - vi. **Discussion and Adoption Process**
 - A. Formally - First and Second Reading, Discussion, Motion, Simple Majority Vote
 - B. Informally – Can you live with the guidelines?
 - 1. Are there “deal-breakers” that are missing or that must be removed?
- V. New Business
 - a. Center Proposal-Science, Technology, Ethics and Society (Kristen Intemann)
 - i. Mission: to produce interdisciplinary knowledge about the social, ethical and policy dimensions of science, technology, mathematics, and medicine, particularly how STEM research may impact rural and our American Indian communities.
 - ii. Many of the new guidelines that haven't been put in place yet have been added to this center proposal.
 - iii. Contribution to the Mission of MSU: Three main goals:
 - A. Research
 - B. Engagement and Outreach
 - 1. Benefit all stakeholders
 - C. Learning
 - 1. Ethics training on campus
 - 2. Partnering with other research groups
 - iv. Contribution to Strategic Plan:
 - A. Goal 2:2: Expanding interdisciplinary scholarship, which has the metrics and actions of “securing at least one new interdisciplinary training grant or center grant for each Grand Challenge area by 2024.”
 - B. Grand Challenges:
 - 1. Carrying for our Environment
 - 2. Wellness in our communities
 - 3. Food and Fuel Security

4. Securing the Future of Montana – cybersecurity, governance and policy

- v. Research: Six areas of focus:
 - A. Ethics and AI/Autonomous Systems
 - B. Ethics of Data Science
 - C. Science, Technology, and Sustainability (food and water security, energy security, environmental ethics)
 - D. CRISPR and Genetic Technologies
 - E. Rural Health Challenges
 - F. Diversity and Inclusivity in STEM/Ethical Design
- vi. Governance: Director & Associate Directors
 - A. Michael Reidy
 - B. Blake Wiedenheft
 - C. Beth Burroughs
 - D. Kristen Intemann
 - E. Brock LaMeres
 - F. Mary Ann Cummings
- vii. Governance: Faculty Advisory Board
 - A. Kristen Intemann-Chair
 - B. Brooke Bocast, Sociology & Anthropology
 - C. Beth Burroughs, Mathematical Sciences
 - D. Mary Ann Cummings, Computer Science
 - E. Edward Dratz, Chemistry
 - F. Paul Gannon, Chemical & Biological Engineering
 - G. Brock LaMeres, Electrical Engineering
 - H. Tim LeCain, History
 - I. Sara Mannheimer, Library
 - J. Bruce Maxwell, Land Resources & Environmental Sciences
 - K. Gretchen Minton, English
 - L. Jamie McEvoy, Geography
 - M. Michael Reidy, History
 - N. Elizabeth Shanahan, Political Science
 - O. John Sheppard, Computer Science
 - P. Blake Wiedenheft, Microbiology & Immunology
 - Q. Scott Young, Library
- viii. MUS partners:
 - A. Academic Technology & Outreach
 - B. Center for Faculty Excellence
 - C. Institute on Ecosystems (IoE)
 - D. Ivan Doig Center
 - E. Math & Science Resource Center
 - F. Montana Engineering Education Research Center (MEERC)
 - G. MSU Extension
 - H. Native Land Project & Indigenous Research Methods

- I. Wheeler Center
- J. Maureen and Mike Mansfield Center, Ethics and Public Affairs Program at U of M:
 - 1. Dane Scott (Director), Forestry and Conservation
 - 2. Christopher Preston, Philosophy
 - 3. Robert Saldin, Political Science
- K. Department of Philosophy at U of M
- ix. External Advisory Board
 - A. Dr. Matthew Brown, Director of Center for Values in Science, Technology and Medicine, University of Texas, Dallas
 - B. Dr. Deepwanita Dasgupta, Director of STEM Ethics at the Borders Program, University of Texas, El Paso
 - C. Kevin Elliott, Professor, Philosophy and Fisheries & Wildlife, Michigan State University
 - D. Dr. Angela Potochnik, Director of Center for Public Engagement with Science, University of Cincinnati
- x. Current and On-going Activities
 - A. Symposium in a year and half from now
- xi. Financial Sustainability
 - A. VPR-EDGE 3 year HASS Grant
 - B. External Grants-aggressively pursuing external grants
 - C. MSUAF: Private Donors
- xii. Please take this back to your units for discussion. We will talk about it again as a Senate.
- b. New Courses
 - i. [EDCI 565: Methods of Teaching: K-8 Mathematics](#)
 - ii. [EDCI 566: Methods of Teaching: K-8 Science](#)
 - iii. [EDCI 567: Methods of Teaching: K-8 Language Arts](#)
 - iv. [EDCI 568: Methods of Teaching: K-8 Social Studies](#)
 - v. Robert Carson can answer any specific questions about these courses.
 - vi. Questions or concerns to Eric or Michael
- c. Program and Course Changes
 - i. [ARTZ 131: Ceramics for Non Majors](#) (Deactivation)
 - ii. [ASBO-MINOR: Minor in Astrobiology-Non-Teaching](#) (Catalog update, course options update)
 - iii. Questions or concerns to Eric or Michael
- VI. Announcements and Updates
 - a. NCUR Update
 - i. NCUR is at MSU March 26-28th
 - ii. No classes March 26 (Thursday) & March 27 (Friday)
 - iii. Please encourage students to attend NCUR on those days –its free for MSU students

- iv. Faculty and graduate students needed to moderate ~ 400 eighty-minute sessions. An email request w/ schedule sign-up will be sent to all faculty next week
 - v. Find out more: A volunteer fair is scheduled for Thursday Feb 6, (10-2 pm) in SUB Ballroom A.
 - b. Carl Yeoman – Provost’s Distinguished Lecturer, February 11 at 7:00, Hager Auditorium:
An Important Microbial Community Lives in All of Us
- VII. Public Comment
 - a. None.
- VIII. Executive Session – Honorary and Posthumous Degrees
 - a. Summary of the nomination and review process
 - b. Honorary Degrees – Andreas Thorsen
 - c. Posthumous Degree - Tony Campeau, Registrar
- IX. Adjournment
 - a. Tomas Gedeon moves to adjourn. Meeting was adjourned at 4:40pm

Reminder: Next Faculty Senate Meeting

February 12, 2020

3:10-4:30 PM

SUB Ballroom C