

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
Monday, April 17, 2017, 3:30-5:00
STC Board Room
Faculty Senators

- Call to order: Megan Chilson, Erin Zavitz, Delena Norris-Tull, Megan Kelly, Linda Lyon, Shane Borrowman, Tyler Seacrest, Kurt Steadman, Karl Ulrich, Charity Walters.
- Delena moves to approve the minutes from April 3, Erin seconds. Motion passes.
- Letter from the General Education Committee
 - This letter concerns two incidences where general education classes were taught without ever getting input from the General Education committee. One instance involved a pair of experimental courses (BIOO 291A and 291B) that were approved by the provost at the time, and the other involved a permanent course (HTH 110) that did go through the Curriculum approval process but missed the General Education committee step.
 - Regarding BIOO 291A and 291B, it was agreed that even experimental courses need to be brought before the General Education committee if they are counting as general education credit.
 - Regarding HTH 110, we agreed it is worth examining next year whether the current curriculum approval process needs tweaking. Also, Charity recommended looking for a better technology solution for facilitating this process.
 - Tyler would bring this response back to the General Education committee.
- Student Evaluations
 - We are still concerned about how the current student evaluations are not truly anonymous due to students recognizing handwriting. We decided to send these concerns to the student evaluation committee and get their response next year.
- Informal Student Complaints
 - We are concerned informal student complaints are being handled in a way that is less than ideal. We are concerned that faculty are being reprimanded without following a proper process.
 - While the Labor Management Committee needs to work with the provost on this issue, Faculty Senate can work with the Dean of Students to clarify the Student Handbook about how such disputes are resolved. Megan Kelly and Delena agreed to be on a small committee to look at this second side of the issue.
- Curriculum Proposals (First Reading)
 - CP 10: Adding acceptable rubrics to integrative biology option.
 - CP 12: Technology pre-requisite changes in education.
 - CP 13: Course number change for "Web Design for Educators" (summer course).

- CP 14: Adds course to parallel student teaching for instruction and grading of Teacher Work Samples.
 - While this is a new class, the credits taken by students for student teaching would be reduced for no net increase of credits for these students
 - It was suggested that the CP clarify how the compensation for this work compares to student thesis and internship credits that faculty take on.
 - CP 15: Provides a method for students to indicate their internship concentrated on special education.
 - CP 16: Adjusts the Farrier Science Certificate to meet changing demand
 - While being reduced, the number of credits is still within normal bounds for such a certificate.
 - CP 17: New writing course for educators
 - This course is for students who are having issues passing the extemporaneous essay for admittance to the TEP program
 - The English department has already sent Education a letter containing concerns about this proposal, and is waiting a reply. Concerns that were brought up during the meeting included the teaching as overload and the seemingly developmental nature of the course
 - It was suggested that perhaps some of the technical writing classes that English teaches could also fulfill this need.
 - CP 18: Name change for Aquatic Vertebrate course
 - No substantive concerns but we did suggest moving the ``Draft'' label from the document.
- CP 9: Math Pathways
 - This curriculum proposal concerns creating a pathway for completing a student's required math general education class in a way that requires less of an algebra pre-req.
 - Karl moved to approve, Megan Kelly seconded.
 - Motion passes unanimously.
 - Good of the order
 - With enrollment up, can we increase entrance requirements?
 - Not likely without significantly changing the mission of the university, but individual programs can have increase entrance requirements.
 - Perhaps we can catch unprepared students faster (for example, block 2 instead of block 4)
 - What if the university is ``at capacity''? Can we deny students admission?
 - No, but we can and do put caps on individual classes. It could be the case a student enrolls but has no courses to take. This seems a bit odd to say the least, so Megan Chilson was going to ask about it at Chancellor's Cabinet.
 - New senators come to the next meeting; we'll vote for chair, vice chair, and secretary.

- Linda moves to adjourn, Delena seconds. We then left to enjoy the however much time is left until summer vacation. (If I had to take a wild stab, I'd say there was 382 hours and 15 minutes left. But who's counting? Certainly not me!)

April 3, 2017

To: Faculty Senate

From: General Education Committee

Re: Items of concern

Cc: Chancellor Weatherby, Provost Hedeem, Registrar Walters

During this academic year, two items have indirectly come to the attention of the General Education Committee whereby two separate courses were approved for General Education credit without ever having been seen by the committee, let alone approved. While we do not know all the details of either situation, it does trouble us that this has occurred. In reality, it's the lack of knowledge of the details which is our greatest concern. In addressing these two issues, the General Education Committee is concerned about *process*, not *content*. We are not at this point questioning the academic integrity of the courses or instructors or even if they do or do not belong within the General Education Curriculum. We simply have no information regarding these courses, their content, a curriculum proposal, or their validity as Gen Ed classes.

This past Fall, a B100 rubric course was offered for General Education credit. There were actually two courses listed, B100 291 A: Animal Science and Physiology, and B100 291 B Animal Science and Reproduction. Not only were these classes not evaluated, let alone approved, by the General Education Committee, the Biology Department was completely unaware that they were being offered under one of "their" rubrics. What makes the situation even more puzzling is that the schedule also indicated that the two courses would count for Gen Ed credit for "Business and Equine Science majors only". To our knowledge, there has never been a course listed in this manner at Montanan Western. It is also our understanding that the Faculty Senate was not aware of these two courses.

A second case involves HTH 110 Personal Health and Wellness. This class is now listed as one of the General Education class choices under the area of Behavioral and Social Sciences. This is not listed as a one-time experimental class but is in the current catalog when it was not in the 2015-16 catalog. No curriculum proposal for this class came through the Gen Ed Committee. What's more, the committee member from HPSS, the department that includes Behavioral and Social Sciences, was not aware of the class or its inclusion in the Gen Ed curriculum.

The General Education Committee is requesting an explanation from Faculty Senate (or others) as to how these two situations occurred, and some assurances that in the future the General Education Committee will not be bypassed.