Members Present: Burrows (PSPP - Extension), Cantalupo (Ext), Caton (Business), Dougher (PSPP), Engel (LRES), Greenwood (Math), Herbeck (Ed), Hostetler (Gallatin College), Igo for Frick (Ag Ed), Kaiser (EE), Lansverk (English), Lynch (Psych), Letiecq (HHD), Martin (Mod Lang), Maxwell (LRES), Neumeier (Physics), Newhouse (Art), Karzcewska for O’Neill (Architecture), Olson (ARS), Reidy (Hist & Phil), Ricciardelli (Film & Photo), Rossmann (Libraries), Schachman (Nursing)

Others Present: Larry Carucci

Chair Lansverk called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM. A quorum was present.

Announcements – Chair Lansverk

- Committee vacancies: Space Management needs two (2) faculty members.
- Chair Lansverk reminded FS members to participate in the administrative reviews and to inform their colleagues to do so, as well. It matters that each person takes the survey who has been notified so the data is comprehensive enough to be valuable.
- Results for the FS survey for the Tobacco Free Campus Policy Ten (10) supported the policy; 11 supported it with accommodations to smokers; 3 were against it. Chair Lansverk encouraged those who did not take the survey that they would be able to voice their position on it by going to the website and commenting.
- The BoR voted “Yes” to: the Operating Budget, raises for those units who have completed contract negotiations (does not include Bozeman as they do not have their bargaining agreement in place), $16M bonding for dorm renovations. Regent Buchanan was the only descending vote regarding raises going to administrators. Chair Lansverk spent time with Dennis Jones during the BoR meeting and noted that, since his visit to campus last February when he gave his presentation, the performance based funding targets have moved from 5% to 25%. Chair Lansverk reminded the group that FS had responses to performance-based funding literature and he would be happy to share it with them. MUSFAR met with the BoR and focused mostly on establishing relationships.
- FS unanimously approved the degree name change, Masters of Health Promotion & Education, to Masters of Science & Health & Human Development Option in Family Food and Community Health Sciences.

Continued Discussions about Curriculum/Program Approval Process

Although faculty are intimately involved in the development of the curriculum at the college/department level, the Provost has requested that FS take a more active role at program development/assessment at the university level. Currently, certain steps in the process are confusing and cumbersome; FS would like it clarified and streamlined, keeping in mind our accreditation requirements. Currently, many committees on campus involved in the process: New undergrad courses and programs come from departments/colleges→Undergraduate Studies Committee, chaired by Provost’s Office (chief conduit for catalog
Faculty Senate (via AAC which reviews proposals for new majors, minors, degrees, programs and centers) → Dean’s Council → Provost’s Office, and finally to the BoR. Core 2.0 proposals, on the other hand, go to a CORE Curriculum Committee (and subgroups), also chaired by the Provost’s Office. Graduate Council reviews graduate courses, and FS should decide how to think about graduate courses.

The two new proposed plans first presented to FS during the August 31st meeting, were reintroduced. The first process, excluding the college/departmental level, involves a “single” committee charge from Faculty Senate, with two tracks, where all undergraduate programs and courses would be approved, as well as requests for changes, additions, deletions of courses and programs on a continuing basis. One track, the CORE Committee would branch off from FS, as would the second track, Academic Affairs. All colleges would have their own curriculum committees, as it would streamline the approval process at the university level. Deans should be involved and provide information about current course status in their departments to those wanting to introduce new programs. FS leadership would like to have an easy form to fill out, online, with information about how the course approval process works. FS would like all departments/colleges represented on the AAC. Some departments are looking into program attrition, dropping those courses no longer applicable and adding new courses that are relevant. Some types of review and assessment processes are being examined.

The second process is essentially the status quo, the main changes being that the Program Approval Committee (equivalent to the current FS Academic Affairs Committee) and Course Approval Committee (equivalent to UG Studies Committee) would be chaired through the Faculty Senate. College curriculum committees would not be a requirement. The CORE committee structure would remain intact.

The Faculty Senate meeting ended at 5:00 pm, as there was no further business.
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