

FACULTY SENATE
OCTOBER 2, 2013
346 LEON JOHNSON
4:10 PM – 5:00 PM
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY-BOZEMAN, MONTANA
Minutes

Members Present: Babbitt (Physics), Bennett (English), Bolte (Music), Bonnand (Library), Burrows (PSPP), Cantalupo (Ext), Christopher (HHD), Dougher (PSPP), Durham (COB), Engel (LRES), Gannon (Chem & Bio Eng), Gibson (NTT), Greenwood (Math), Herbeck (Ed), Hostetler (GC), Hughes (Cell Bio & Neuro), Igo (Ag Ed), Kaiser (ECE), Kohler (Chem & Biochem), Larson (M&IE), Lynch (Psych), Martin (Mod Lang), Miller (CE), Moreaux (ARS), O’Neill (Arch), Reidy (Hist & Phil), Rossmann (Library), Schachman (Nursing), Smith for Brester (Ag Econ/Econ), Swinford (Soc/Anthro), Waller (Hist & Phil), Wilmer (Political Science), Wiedenheft (IID)

Others Present: Robert Hietala, Robert Mokwa, Ron Larsen, Martha Potvin, Robert Peterson, Chris Fastnow, Larry Carucci, Leila Serman, Nicol Rae, Kim Obbink, David Singel, John Savage, Terry Leist, Richard Rehberger, Tim LeCain

Chair Mokwa called the meeting to order at 4:10 pm, and a quorum was present. The minutes from September 25, 2013 were unanimously approved.

Announcements

- Chair Mokwa asked senators to review the draft letter distributed, referring to the Faculty Handbook, and be ready to discuss at the next FS meeting on October 9, 2013.

Course Approval – Chair Mokwa

- Chair Mokwa made a motion to have a consensus vote in favor of accepting the eight (8) courses that have been posted on the Faculty Senate website for two weeks →seconded→unanimously approved. He asked senators to review the four (4) courses, with special attention to the document, “Merger of Departments of Microbiology and Immunology and Infectious Diseases” which the BoR will review on October 18, posted on the senate website under the heading: Academic Items for Review. Contact Michael Reidy with comments: mreidy@montana.edu

Credit Hour Policy: Part B – Chair Mokwa

- Chair Mokwa, from discussions with senators, posed the question to senate, “Do we need Part B?” It appears online courses are covered in Part A as shown on the second page, in the second bulleted paragraph. Part B has two key components:
 - Addressing what kind of additional information is needed when a new course is proposed; and,
 - What kind of reviews will be conducted on these new courses once they are offered?
 - Other things added for things in terms of reviews of all of our courses and AP credits, credits associated with exams, etc.
- The evolution of the credit hour policy was given. Ron Larsen stated that the Dept of Education created an opportunity for universities to use an alternative approach to the traditional seat-time based approach. Using that as the impetus to write Part B so as to provide MSU with that option, Larsen stated that there isn’t anyone on campus who cares about it and if the senate is not concerned with it, it does not need to be in the document.

- Discussions ensued:
 - Chair Mokwa stated that the BoR 309.1 addresses seat-time based approach for evaluating credit hours. The policy alludes to types of courses that do not fit into the traditional seat-time based approach. It speaks to what a credit hour is and relates it to hours of classroom time with a factor of two - the time students are spending outside of the classroom.
 - Ron Larsen stated that discussions and eventual implementation of a credit hour policy is coming from our accreditation entity. It originated from Dept of Education as a result of some institutions' loose interpretation of how they define credit which, inevitably, affects the financial aid students are receiving and federal resources. Therefore, MSU needs to have a definition of and a policy about credit hours. (Currently, only a statement occurs in the university course catalog.) Larsen went on to say that senate voted for an interim policy, Part A, and discussions about Part B are not necessary for the purpose of a defined policy.
 - Chair Carucci furthered that the Credit Hour Policy, Part B, learning outcomes-based language, was already in the version Larsen wrote and presented to senate in January 2013, who subsequently charged Faculty Affairs with tying it to seat-time based instruction.
 - Bennett would like to see non-traditional class be verbally/numerically designated and identified as such.
 - Durham stated that the two bullet points at the end of Part A are requirements that ensure and demonstrate that 45 hours of attention, time and engagement are being fulfilled, and believes senate is on the right track discussing whether to include/exclude Part B. Provost Potvin disagrees and cited the example of a student who is able to demonstrate that they have achieved a certain level in pre-calculus, e.g., via modules of independent learning which are skilled-based and is an outcomes based approach, and is not dependent on seat-time, is able to achieve the desired level and is, therefore, able to move to the next level.
 - Larsen suggested a modification in the language of Part A, second bullet, by adding "blended courses" and, in Part B, in the second paragraph of the introduction, he suggested removing "seat-time based," and speak about student work, instead.
 - Peterson does not see a need for a Part B, but suggests further a comprehensive policy, with this additional level of review, which includes all the courses. He believes it is too divisive and parochial to figure out what is not traditional. Literature that states using seat-based-time as a comparator is not valid. He doesn't believe additional review outside of the departmental reviews, need to be done. However, if we have to have an additional level, and to encourage and maintain innovation and creativity, he advocated implementing a comprehensive policy that includes all reviews on all courses, since we do not know where the technology will bring teaching in two (2) or even five (5) years.
 - Chair Mokwa asked senate to keep the two, assessment for a new course, what we would like to see and therefore submit a proposal and how we are going to review learning outcomes or the results of the course/effectiveness of the course, very separate items. He stated that we have a detailed process for newly proposed courses and in that process, many of these types of courses are already being reviewed. As a member of the C&PC, Chair

Mokwa conducted rigorous and in-depth reviews of these new, innovative blended, on-line courses that were considered non-traditional.

- Chair Mokwa asked Larsen to speak more on accreditation and what the requirements would be for reviewing courses and their outcomes in the future. Larsen stated that documenting and publishing learning outcomes for all courses is the accreditation issue, currently, and MSU has to collect and demonstrate that those things exist. The accreditation would like to see a statement that says courses have been reviewed and decided whether they are working, or not. If not, we need to show that we have responded in some way. If, however, assessments reveal things are working correctly, then deciding to do nothing is a valid assessment result. Larsen believes MSU will be asked, in the future, to assess the learning in our courses. Larsen trusts and prefers that faculty who teach courses to conduct their own assessments without administrative intervention.
- Smith stated that the university requires a comprehensive review of every department once every seven years, including the teaching program. Further, that review requires that external reviewers be used to carry out the review. This is a regular university and system wide requirement for external reviews of every department. There is no need for any additional such reviews.
- Larsen stated that at the end of a three-year cycle, the Chem & Bio Eng Department uses the review opportunity as a calibration process for courses that fit into the curriculum and faculty embrace it.
- Larson asked if a departmental review is sufficient for the university. Provost Potvin stated that if information is kept at the department level, that is good but right now accreditation wants to see outcomes on every syllabus.
- Chair Mokwa would like to see Part C (AP, CLEP, Course Challenge), the last paragraph of the policy, set aside as part of the Credit Hour Policy definition process until more data on how well student are doing after testing out of some classes is gathered. Chair Carucci noted that Part C is already being implemented at MSU.
- Chair Mokwa motioned to set aside Part B for now, send Part A back for edits discussed in senate, so that a permanent, independent version may come back for a final vote → seconded → all in favor → unanimously in favor.

Gallatin College - Bob Hietala, Dean

- A county-wide two-year 1.5 mill levy will be voted on to raise \$369, 000 in annual funding. It will accommodate program and enrollment growth, which helps to build a skilled workforce in Gallatin and Park Counties. This amount meets the BoR requirement for local support. Previously, in the last three years, the City of Bozeman funded the college at the 1.5 mill level.
- When the college was approved in May 2010 to conduct a two year education as Gallatin College, the BoR stated that they had to get an equitable amount of local mill levy support, and they were referring to the five counties in Montana that have MUS two-year colleges: Cascade (Great Falls), Missoula, Silverbow (Butte), Lewis & Clark (Helena) and City College (Yellowstone) – these communities have had a local 1.5 mill levy since the 1960's.
- Models being proposed for these two-year institutions, emulate those from around the country for two-year education.
- Funding will target additional one and two year programs. It will allow the purchase of equipment, machinery, specialized facilities for program development that comes with new programs, and support for the development of additional dual enrollment from local high schools.

- Economic growth and demographics in Gallatin County, point to an anticipated GC enrollment that could reach 2,000 in the future.
- Cost? The tax impact of \$100,000 in a set property value is \$2.08 annually; \$200,000 in a set property value it is \$4.15 annually.
- Many ask how a two-year college differs from, or is the same as, a four-year institution.
 - Focus of two-year college is local – Gallatin, Park counties and those in the surrounding area. A four-year college gets students from all around the country and sends them out over a much broader area.
 - Tuition - \$99/credit; the university is \$165/credit.
 - Finances are separate from MSU and GC pays an overhead for MSU support.
 - Governance is similar and is integrated, as evidenced by membership in Faculty Senate.
 - Members of GC are part of a collective bargaining agreement with four other two-year colleges in the state.
 - P&T is managed through the collective bargaining agreement.
 - Faculty workloads, according to contract, work and teach 30-32 credits per year. They do not have research responsibility but do have a service component.
 - The accreditation falls under MSU.
 - Program approval process falls under MSU.
 - Student population is different.

As there was no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:09 pm.

Signature,
Robert Mokma, Chair

Signature
Michael Reidy, Chair-elect

Minutes were transcribed by Gale R. Gough, Administrative Associate, Faculty Senate.