

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, January 20, 2015, 3:30-5:00
STC Boardroom, Faculty Senators

- Call to Order—Dana Cotton, Bethany Blankenship, Mike Morrow, Ava Mastandrea, Michael Francisconi, Brandon Hansen, Tyler Seacrest, Megan Chilson, Kurt Steadman
- Approval of minutes from December 15—Estee moved to accept the minutes, Eva seconded. Minutes approved.
- Announcements
 - First Chancellor’s Cabinet—Beth would like an invitation to individual departments
 - AAC—meetings will be 3:30-5:00 on the second and fourth Tuesdays of each block
- New Business
 - Communications from Stephen Lodmell—see Appendix A (“OCHE New Program Submission Process: Level II”)
- Unfinished Business
 - Bylaws revisions (B. Blankenship)—see Appendix B
 - Credit Policy Language for Syllabi—Each department will disseminate this policy language as it sees fit.
 - CP 1-20 Voting
 - Michael moved to accept CP 1. Estee seconded. CP 1 accepted.
 - Kurt moved to accept CP 2-4. Michael seconded. CP 2-4 accepted.
 - Bethany moved to accept CP 5-15. Michael seconded. CP 5-15 accepted.
 - Mike moved to table 17-22. Bethany seconded. CPs tabled.
 - CPs 23-30, first reading

- Good of the order/Q & A
- Adjourn—Dana moved to adjourn. Michael seconded. Everyone made like atoms and split.

OCHE New Program Submission Process (DRAFT)

Level II proposals

Issues with current process:

1. Need for earlier communication within the MUS in the proposal development process
 - a. 3 year program plans signal intent but how they are implemented can be inflexible or incomplete.
 - b. The role of the Chief Academic Officers (CAOs) comes too late in the current process.
 - c. The MUS leadership needs earlier involvement in the planning and coordination of new proposals.
2. Need to include the Research VPs (VPRs) where appropriate (proposals for research centers/institutes).
3. Need for clarification of role and timing of the Campus, CAO's, MUS leadership, and the Board within the academic planning and approval process.
4. The need to strike a balance between ensuring appropriate levels of planning, input and approval with an efficient process that strengthens internal campus approval processes and is conducted in a timely manner.

Level II proposals require approval of the Board of Regents and are:

1. Re-titling a degree (ex. From B.A. to B.F.A)
2. Adding a new minor or certificate where there is no major or option in a major
3. Establishing a new degree or adding a major or option to an existing degree
4. Forming, eliminating or consolidating a college, division, school department, institute, bureau, center, station, laboratory or similar unit
5. Re-titling a college, division, school department, institute, bureau, center, station, laboratory or similar unit

Overview of process differences in addressing issues

Current Process

New Process

1. Development and information sharing of new program proposals	
Annually campuses submit a 3-year Academic Program Plan to OCHE listing proposed programs. The Program Plan consist primarily a program title. These are posted to the web	On-going submission from campuses of 2-page Intent to Plan document to OCHE that outline the general nature of the proposed program relative to the campus and the MUS, the need for, and the expected size of the program These are posted to web.

2. Earlier MUS review and discussion of proposed programs	
<p>No formal process – campuses can currently review other campus proposed program titles by accessing web. System-wide discussion only happens after the full Level II proposal is submitted to OCHE.</p> <p>Research center/institute proposals are formally reviewed by CAOs.</p>	<p>Intent to plan documents reviewed monthly by CAO committee before extensive resources are invested in the development of Level II documentation.</p> <p>Research center/institute proposals are reviewed by both CAOs and VPRs</p>

3. Efficiency in the Board Approval Process	
<p>BOR approval process begins with campus submitting 3-year academic program plans to OCHE.</p> <p>Process</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Submission of 3-year academic program plans. b. Submission of Level II proposal forms to OCHE for bi-monthly BOR meetings. c. Review by CAO's (meet once every 2 months) before each BOR meeting. d. Informational item BOR meeting #1. e. Action Item BOR meeting #2. 	<p>BOR approval process begins with campus submitting Intent to Plan to OCHE.</p> <p>Process</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Submission of intent to plan to OCHE – on-going submissions. b. Review by CAO's (next monthly meeting). c. Submission of Level II proposal forms to OCHE. d. Review by CAO's (prior to BOR meeting). e. Action item at next BOR meeting.

XIII. Review of senior academic administration

Biennially, ECOS shall initiate a review of the senior academic administration by the faculty, to include academic administrators at the level of dean and above. The results and any recommendations will be brought to the Senate for discussion and appropriate action. The review is intended to be an appraisal of job performance as it bears on matters of academic and administrative leadership. It is not intended to be a comprehensive review of all official responsibilities. The review may be made through selected interviews, questionnaires or other appropriate techniques.

In addition to bringing the results before the Senate, ECOS is to present the results of the review in writing to those reviewed. The individual under review will be allowed to submit a written response to the review. Following a preliminary discussion of the results of the review with the Chancellor, ECOS will assemble a formal report to give to the Chancellor, including responses to the review, with a covering letter stating the purposes and method of the faculty's review of the senior academic administration of the University of Montana Western, including discussion of the limitations on its use. The report will be copied to the President of the University of Montana and the Chair of the Board of Regents.

XIII. Review of senior academic administration (revised)

Biennially, ECOS shall initiate a review of the senior academic administration by the faculty to include academic administrators at the level of dean and above. The review is intended to be an appraisal of job performance as it bears on matters of academic and administrative leadership. It is not intended to be a comprehensive review of all official responsibilities. The review may be made through selected interviews, questionnaires or other appropriate techniques.

ECOS will share questionnaires, surveys or other review apparatus with Faculty Senate during a regular senate meeting. Senators may approve by vote the review apparatus at that meeting or may table the apparatus for vote until the meeting immediately following.

ECOS will share questionnaires, surveys or other review apparatus approved by the Senate at a formal meeting with all administrative personnel to be reviewed. The administrators may suggest additions to or alterations of the questions on the review apparatus at that meeting. If suggestions or additions are suggested, ECOS must return the revised document to Faculty Senate for approval by vote.

Once the review apparatus has been approved, ECOS will distribute it (either by paper or on-line) to all faculty (full-time, part-time, all ranks). ECOS will collate the data. The results (including all survey responses) will be brought to the Senate for discussion at a closed session for Senators only. (Survey responses will be made available only to Senators. Senators will not photocopy or distribute survey results.) Faculty Senate will then compose a written recommendation based upon the survey results to be included in a formal report (see below).

In addition to bringing the results before the Senate, ECOS will present the results (including all survey responses) in writing and in person (either individually or in a group meeting) to those reviewed. The individual under review will be allowed to submit a written response to the review.

ECOS will collate survey responses, administrators' written responses, and the recommendation of Faculty Senate into a formal report to give to the Chancellor, with a cover letter stating the purposes and method of the faculty's review, including discussion of the limitations on its use.