

**Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes**  
**Tuesday, January 19, 2016, 3:30-5:00**  
**STC Boardroom**  
**Faculty Senators**

- Call to order: Megan Chilson, John Xanthopoulos (for Estee Aiken), Linda Lyon (for Sheila Roberts), Megan Kelly, Bethany Blankenship, Michael Franscisoni, Tyler Seacrest, Michael Hengler, Mike Morrow, Bill Janus, Delany Hansen.
  
- Megan K moves to approve the minutes from December 14, and Michael F seconds. Motion Passes
  
- International timeline / checklist (Bill Janus)
  - After many years of not having official policies, the international committee has created a timeline / checklist that establishes a procedure to follow for faculty who want to pursue international travel.
  - This will encourage faculty interaction and conversations related to international travel.
  - Helps ensure we follow existing University of Montana policy
  - This will also determine who can pursue such an experience in cases where there is high demand to do so.
  
- Speech intensive courses in general education
  - While the basic policies have been written, the details of enacting the policies are not there.
  - The general education committee will update faculty senate on progress in Block 7.
  
- Bill Janus wanted to remind faculty that general education reports are due the second week of Block 7. This is from his new role as one of the three faculty members that will guide us through the accreditation process over the next year.
  
- The Curriculum Proposal Process: Changes to the chairs stage of the process
  - The proposal is to change the bylaws regarding when the chairs are considering curriculum proposals. See attached for the new language.
  - Bethany moves to approve, Michael F seconds. Motion passes.
  
- Curriculum Proposals 1-30
  - We did a quick reading of this group of curriculum proposals. These included cleanups in many departments, a reduction in credits to the HHP major, a revision of focus in the history major to reflect current faculty interests, and a major revision of the mathematics major to focus on statistics and computer driven data analysis.
  - There was a questions regarding whether the math revision would overlap with business department classes. Tyler said most likely not but he would check with business.
  - There was a question regarding the elimination of human sexuality as a requirement for secondary education majors, but the required concepts from this class will still be included in other classes.
  
- Website development

- Michael H is compiling a list of feature and design requests for the website, previous experiences trying to update or improve the website, and any other problems or concerns regarding the website. This list would help inform our future discussions with staff and administration.
  - We also talked about the possibility of using an outside firm for website design instead of hiring a webmaster. This could be less expensive and solve the problem of IT personnel turnover that has plagued the website in the past.
- Director of Admissions search
  - Matt Allen is interviewing Monday, January 24, and faculty senate has been invited to meet with him from 1:30-2:15.
- Good of the order
- Michael F moves to adjourn, Megan seconds. We made like amoebas and split!

Draft 1/16/2016

### **Proposed change to the Curriculum Proposal Process**

We propose to make some minor changes to the curriculum proposal process regarding the stage in which chairs sign the proposals. The changes, with reasoning are

1. Make it clear that an electronic signing by chairs is acceptable even if the all chairs meeting is not canceled. The electronic pathway setup by the registrar's office seems to be the most efficient way to handle this stage of the process.
2. Clarify that even if chairs fail to sign the proposal, it still proceeds to the next stage after a period of two weeks. This prevents one or two chairs bogged down by other responsibilities from preventing the process moving forward.
3. Make it so that senators and members of the General Education committee can see proposals early. This lets them see what proposals are coming and plan their time accordingly.

**Current Language:** (Section V.C of the bylaws) “(C) Proposals will be read at a meeting attended by all chairs. The purpose of this reading is to inform all departments (especially those affected by the proposal) of its existence. The chairs will sign the proposal at this meeting simply to acknowledge its existence. This is not to be regarded as an approval of the proposal at this stage. However, the group of chairs may elect to return a proposal to the submitting department at this point in the event that the proposal form is incorrectly or incompletely filled out or if it is determined that the proposal requires new resources that have not yet been discussed with or approved by the Provost. If a chair is absent from the meeting in which the proposal is read and no substitute was sent (and no one was given a proxy vote) it will be assumed that that department has acknowledged the existence of the proposal by default. It is the responsibility of the chairs to take their knowledge of the proposal to their respective departments for discussion. If a department requests that amendments be made to the proposal, it is the responsibility of the chair of that department (or another appointed representative) to attempt to negotiate these amendments with the submitting department by the time the proposal makes its way to its first reading in Faculty Senate (see below). A period of no less than two weeks should exist between the time the proposal is introduced at the Chairs meeting and its first reading at Faculty Senate. In the event that a Chairs and Schedulers meeting is cancelled at a critical time, the introduction of the curriculum proposal may also be accomplished electronically.”

**Proposed Language:** “(C) Proposals will be read at a meeting attended by all chairs **or sent electronically to all chairs**. The purpose of this reading is to inform all departments (especially those affected by the proposal) of its existence. The chairs will sign the proposal at this meeting **or electronically** simply to acknowledge its existence. This is not to be regarded as an approval of the proposal at this stage. However, the group of chairs may elect to return a proposal to the submitting department at this point in the event that the proposal form is incorrectly or incompletely filled out or if it is determined that the proposal requires new resources that have not yet been discussed with or approved by the Provost. ~~If a chair is absent from the meeting in which the proposal is read and no~~

~~substitute was sent (and no one was given a proxy vote) it will be assumed that that department has acknowledged the existence of the proposal by default.~~ It is the responsibility of the chairs to take their knowledge of the proposal to their respective departments for discussion. If a department requests that amendments be made to the proposal, it is the responsibility of the chair of that department (or another appointed representative) to attempt to negotiate these amendments with the submitting department by the time the proposal makes its way to its first reading in Faculty Senate (see below). **Assuming no major problems are encountered, a** period of no less than two weeks should exist between the time the proposal is ~~introduced at the Chairs meeting sent to all the chairs~~ and its first reading at Faculty Senate (or the General Education Committee, if applicable), even if one or more chairs fail to sign the proposal. During this two week period, an electronic version of the proposals should be available to members of Faculty Senate (and the General Education Committee, if applicable). ~~In the event that a Chairs and Schedulers meeting is cancelled at a critical time, the introduction of the curriculum proposal may also be accomplished electronically.~~