FACULTY SENATE
SEPTEMBER 9, 2015
346 LEON JOHNSON
4:10 PM – 5:00 PM
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY-BOZEMAN, MONTANA
Minutes

Members Present: Adams (Art), Arnold (Ag Ed), Babbitt (Chair), Babcock (Chair-elect), Berry (CE), Bolte (Music), Branch (English), Brown (JJCBE), Burrows (Ext), Cantalupo (Ext), Gannon (Chem Eng), Greenwood (Math), Hendrikx (Earth Sci), Herbeck (Ed), Herman (NAS), Hostetler (GC), Larson (MIE), Lawrence (ChBC), Lu (PSPP), Martin (Mod Lang), McMahon (Ecology), Meyer (Hist & Phil), Merzdorf (CBN), O'Neill (Arch), Prashant (Ag Research Cntrs), Repasky (ECE), Ricciardelli (Film & Photo), Rossmann (Library), Running (Nursing), Scott (Psych), A. Smith (HHD), V. Smith for Brester (Ag Econ), Sterman (Library), Swinford (Soc/Anthro), Wiedenheft (MBI), Wilmer (Poli Sci), Zabinski (LRES)

Others Present: Martha Potvin, Kellie Peterson, Chris Fastnow, David Singel, Patrick Widhalm, Jerry Sheehan, Robert Maher

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

The September 2, 2015 Faculty Senate minutes were unanimously approved.

Faculty Senate will not meet on September 16, 2015; senate leadership will be attending the Board of Regents in Butte.

Courses and Programs – Chair-elect Babcock

- Courses and programs needing senate approval are posted for 10 working days.
- Policy on voting on courses. After courses are posted on the Faculty Senate web site for 10 days, they will be voted on by the faculty senate steering committee, unless there are no negative comments, in which case it will be brought to the full senate for discussion and vote.
- Undergraduate Course to be voted at next steering committee meeting
    - PSCI 438 : National Security Policy Decision-Making (Special Topics course)
- Of the four programs listed on the FS web site, two have minor considerations:
    - A name change: "Agricultural Relations" to "Agricultural Communications, Leadership and Extension;" and,
    - ARTB-BA: Bachelor of Arts in Art - Art Education K-12 Broadfield Option

        - Involves some reduction of courses.
- The CPC (Curriculum and Programs Committee) voted to approve these changes, and the Academic Programs Working Group (APWG), a subgroup of CPC will discuss. Babcock will present APWG's findings at future FS meeting.

Announcements – Chair Babbitt

- The Board of Regents will meet 9/16 – 9/17 in Butte. The agenda, as it applies to MSU, includes:
    - Second reading of the Psychology PhD;
    - First reading of the Extreme Gravity Institute;
    - Center for Communications and Science;
    - Health and Safety Center;
    - Second reading on the building of the Norm Asbjornson Innovation Center parking garage;
    - First reading of MSU's capability to buy, rather than lease, a concentrated research space in Tech Park;
    - First reading on the consolidation of two dining halls; and,
    - Tenure and promotion approvals.
- Prior Learning Assessment Policy - Comments from senators during the Sept 2, 2015 Faculty Senate meeting re: PLA were sent to Sue Jones, Director / Two-Year Ed Mission Integration in the Office of the Commissioner of Higher Education (OCHE) - Essentially the policy documents (301.19, Pg. 2 Paragraph 2) Principles & Standards (A. Educational Principles, Item 2), and the expanded Policy Recommendations (Page 5, under Educational Principles, Item 2) have been changed to read: "The evaluation and transcripting of the learning schedule take into consideration the degree objective of the student as well as the learning outcomes articulated by the academic program, institutional and state system requirements. Consideration will be given to not awarding excess PSA credit that might not benefit a student's degree objective." Discussions ensued:
    - The percentage cap seems to be 25% and is BoR policy.
    - Meyer asked if the percentage could be lowered. Was the wisdom of offering an entire year of PLA rather than capping it at a lower number discussed? This appears to be another way that education is being taken out of classrooms. Is it too late for senate to vote on a lower percentage?
    - Larsen stated that many faculty share Meyer's sentiment and believe PLA is something being handed to faculty that is not a grassroots effort.
    - Babbitt stated that if faculty believe a course truly requires one-on-one in the classroom and the material is not something that can be learned another way, then the course outcomes and numbers should be changed. PLA will be fully transcripted and the main service to the student is to inform them that their PLA might not bring all they need to know to continue with their degree requirements.

- The PLA policy include AP.
- Potvin – Many discussions would need to take place if faculty were to vote on lowering the 25%. Some of MSU's best students come to the university with AP and dual credits; those fall under the 25%. The BoR wants each campus to develop their own policies. In the past, accreditors asked MSU to have a policy to define credit and credit hour; some faculty teach by outcomes more than by seat time. MSU adopted an interim policy that only examines seat time by credit. As the next accreditation cycle approaches, MSU will have to have a policy in place for competency-based learning or PLA.
- Singel – If a student comes to MSU with 40 credits, they can bring in more but we won't know until they actually take another 40 credits. How will we manage that?
- Babbitt – We need to take into account where they are trying to go and don't give them a bunch of credits in the wrong discipline.
- Anticipate a change in major.
- Bolte – Do we accept any credits coming in, or do we have the ability to say that they do not meet our program requirements?
- Potvin – If it is common course numbering, you accept it.
- Branch – I thought we decided that the dept had the capacity to accept credits, but they are not necessarily going towards departmental requirements.
    - Babbitt- The policy is vague; I believe we can still say that, but adapting course outcomes would be a better method.
- Swinford – To change course outcomes would require statewide discussions of course-by-course, or change the number.
    - Babbitt – If there isn't 80% overlap then you must change the number.
- Meyer – Will this be voted on elsewhere and then faculty is handed the policy?
    - Babbitt – The policy will be developed with faculty input and be bought back to Senate.

<u>Faculty Handbook</u>

- <u>Resignation and Retrenchment</u>
    - Babbitt – Wording is the same as in the old Faculty Handbook. Just wording changes, such as "Employee" to "Faculty members."
    - Larsen – In 200.00 (2.b.), second paragraph: "Each campus may develop separate procedures to implement these policies." Where do "these policies" reside?
    - Potvin – We don't have (retrenchment) policies yet, in place. Once we do, we can work on process.
    - Motion to approve→seconded→all in favor→unanimously approved.

- <u>Faculty Annual Reviews</u>

- The J(oint) A(cademic) G(roup) S(teering Committee) is still working on the document.
- The P(romotion) & T(enure) document will be coming up soon.

D2L – Chair Babbitt/Jerry Sheehan

- MSU has the opportunity to negotiate a two-year extension of D2L.
- Are faculty satisfied with the software?
  - Wilmer uses online quiz function to give exams. When grading, instructor comments are relegated to a small box. The software does not allow comments/edits in specific areas which, if it had the capability, would be more helpful for students.
- Sheehan - Background
  - D2L mishandled data migration and MSU is now able to discount our contract while increasing our services. Other campuses asked if we would go back and negotiate the benefit for an additional year (making it a two-year contract). The net savings would be about $60,000/year. Things to think about:
    - Do we want to negotiate the savings for an additional year?
      - We are authorized, up until 2018, to conditionally enter into annual contracts, but we do have an annual out-clause.
    - To find out if the new process will meet our needs, it would take an academic year.
    - The justification for this extension is that any decision to move away from our current learning management system would require an open procurement process, bringing up a new system, moving content and training faculty. These processes would take a minimum of a year after the procurement assessment is completed.
    - ITC is asking to identify the appropriate forum to discuss this issue with faculty senate. The university wants to make sure that faculty input guides any extension, even for just one year, of the current contract. There is some time constraint on this offer and ITC would appreciate the chance to include faculty in committees that will assess this tool as soon as possible.
  - Discussions ensued:
    - Years of this contract? Current contract expired July 2015; current offer is in until 2016; requests from other campuses would like to extend it an additional year.
    - Level of service? Last year, and after the hours of 8 am – 5 pm when two employees fielded inquiries about D2L, problems with the tool would entail submitting a ticket to D2L, directly during off hours, and the issue would be addressed the next day. The majority of D2L activity usually takes place after 5:00 pm,

and this was a cumbersome process.
    - What are other tool alternatives? CANVAS is another learning management tool and is a stripped down version of D2L. It does not have all the functionality but may have things in it that are more accessible. D2L has mobility applications that are still being assessed by ITC. We have about 1500 courses in D2L and if we move to another tool, the migration might not bring all the functions into the new environment.
- Motion was made to endorse continuing with D2L→seconded→all in favor→unanimously endorsed.
- Sheehan will get back to senate about committees who will be assessing D2L this year, about changes we might want and possible changes from D2L in two years time.

Faculty Review of Administrators – Chair Babbitt

- Background
    - FS has conducted reviews of deans, dept heads, VPs and the president since its inception.
    - Faculty participation, in the past, was 10-12%.
    - Last year, the President suggested providing feedback to the senate as to the outcome of the reviews. With that intent and after senate leadership drafted a policy for the reviews and brought to Deans' Council, it was edited and stalled.
    - Senate moved forward and reviewed the President and Provost with a 50% participation rate, the results of which were brought to senate last year in a closed meeting. Follow up will happen this semester.
    - How to proceed this year with reviews of administrators, and in the future?
        - V. Smith stated that senate must review senior administrators. The issue of reviewing deans and dept heads seems to be a much more localized issue within colleges and departments; it is clear that they must be done, but it doesn't make sense that senate must be the reviewer.
    - Babbitt – Should senate review every VP?
        - V. Smith asked if the senior administrative team is defined by those positions currently held.
    - Babbitt – Last year's participation was 50% which was the result of senate leadership providing feedback on the survey results and insuring complete anonymity; there were also fewer reviews sent to faculty (only Provost and President were reviewed last year).
    - Zabinski – What is the object of the senate reviews and what happened after we discussed them? How interested are administrators in seeing the reviews, and how much to do they serve as a platform for discussion, etc.?
        - Babbitt – There are two platforms for the reviews senate

conducts; one provides a pathway for improvement and it is formative; the other would include the senate review as a component of a 360 review involving personnel, staff, peers.

- Last year, it was discussed to have the senate review became part of the 360 review. These summative reviews can determine a person's future employment at the institution.
- A formative review would provide the person being reviewed the opportunity to address top priorities for improvement, which could be brought back to senate for discussion and provide feedback on their progress.
    - V. Smith – Steering Committee could discuss this process and bring forward some proposals to FS.

- Babbitt – Do we want to run the reviews the way senate wants to or do we want to hook up to the 360?
- Adams – Steering might want to highlight the differences between the two processes.
- Repasky would like the steering to speak to report on how the reviews are being used and whether results are being heeded.

- Zabinski asked admin what they thought of the reviews. The reviews are part of partnership in which we want to facilitate communication.
    - Potvin – Conversations last year were not productive because:
        - Should negative comments show up in the media, results would not be formative.
        - Negative results that were shared in open meetings were anonymous and interpreted by admin as professionals hiding behind their comments.

      If there is a way to gather input and provide comments in general areas for strengths and weaknesses for a dean or senior administrator.
        - Many times, admin believe they are communicating very well when, in fact, there is a breakdown of communication at some level below us, so it is important to know how we are perceived and how well we are communicating with the dean, dept heads, etc.
        - The President believes a 360 review from all campus constituencies could produce a well-rounded picture; an annual review would be valuable as well. As long as it is done in the spirit of constructive input, it would be appreciated and valued.
- Babbitt – Reidy and Babbitt reviewed survey results for admin last year and composed a letter addressing those high frequency answers to specific questions. This letter was not brought to senate, as it is confidential, but it's substantive points were discussed; raw comments

were not presented in senate last year, only summaries of collective comments that were shared by several respondents were discussed in the letter. The raw comments are confidential and were not shared with anyone beyond the chair and chair-elect and the supervisor. Babbitt will bring a plan back and gather feedback in a closed senate session in the near future.

Open Discussion of Faculty Senate Priorities – Chair Babbitt

- Babbitt stated that this topic will be present on all agendas and for senators to please think about what is important to them to discuss at the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm.

Randy Babbitt, Chair
Michael Babcock, Chair-elect