Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes  
December 7, 2017, 3:00 P.M. GBB 123

Call to Order   
Chair Bowman called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.   
Registrar Hickman called roll.   
  
**Members Present:** A. Alger, B. Allred, A. Ametsbichler, J. Angle, D. Beck, A. Belcourt, M. Boller, M. Bowman, J. Bunch, A. Chatterjee, S. Clouse, D. Coffin, G. Collins, Z. Cooper, T. Crawford, A. Delaney, A. Elliott, D. Erickson, L. Fern, E. Gagliardi, S. Gordon, K. Griggs, B. Halfpap, B. Harrison, M. Horejsi, J. Hunt, G. Larson, D. Lurie, T. Manuel, H. Martens, M. Musick, A. Nack, H. Naughton, L. Nichols, D. Patterson, J. Pavilack, S. Phillips, G. Quintero, S. Ross, A. Ratto-Parks, Y. Reimer, S. Schwarze, A. Sondag, M. Semanoff, S. Strohl, J. Thomsen, E. Uchimoto, N. Vonessen, A. Ware  
 **Members Excused:** S. Certel, N. Greymorning, U. Kamp, M. Maneta, M. Monsos, M. Pershouse, A. Szalda-Petree

**Members Absent:** J. Banville, S. Bitar, S. Caro, J. Carter, Y. Cho, G. Collins, N. Dawson, M. Hamon, J. Laskin, J. Millspaugh, J. Sears

**Ex-Officio Present:** President Stearns,Interim Provost Edmond,Associate Provost Lindsay

**Guest:** J. Egland, L. France, J. Gee, Haslam, J. Randall, C. Greenfield, B. Hubble, Approximately 40 guests, including representatives from the media.

**Minutes:** The minutes from November 9th were approved.

There was a motion from the floor to appeal the Chair’s decision to move public comment to the end of the meeting. After a brief discussion, the Senate approved moving Public Comment to after Communications.

## Communications

## Communications

* President Sheila Stearns

There is a special cabinet meeting tomorrow from 8:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m. in TODD 203-4. Sector heads will present their responses to APASP recommendations with a public comment period at the end. President Stearns will draft her response for President Bodnar following the meeting. The APASP reports have been valuable for her to learn more information about the units under the President’s sector (Internal Audit, Title 9, Athletics, Legal Counsel, and Campus Compact). Her hope is that the efforts will lay groundwork for ongoing assessment and continue to be useful to the Cabinet and the new President. Her response will be an essay that may identify opportunities for examination, but will not make final decisions. APASP was on a tough timeline and did not complete the entire portfolio of programs.

The Voluntary Severance Offer (VSO) is a means to diminish the University’s personnel expense. The offer was made in October to general fund, non-faculty employees to have incentives to leave. They debated whether the offer should be extended to critical areas, but determined employees should have the choice, and the administration would have to fill in after. We know that approximately 90 individuals have expressed interest. They still have a week to file the separation agreement. The sector heads are considering possible restructuring or alternative ways to provide essential services given the positions vacated. Maria Mangold, the Staff Senate President, reminded the Cabinet that many units have already loss staff due to layoffs and staff have expanded responsibilities. The administration is aware of this and will carefully consider whether a recruitment is necessary or the work can be adjusted. Internal recruitments will be considered first to create movement within the employee ranks.   
  
She and Interim Vice President Keller are working to map a high-level budget for FY 2019 in order to give the Vice Presidents some structure to start planning for the 2018-2019 academic year.   
  
Questions  
  
Senator Ratto-Parks, English: How will the number of employees taking VSO affect the administrations consideration of terminating lecturer contracts?  
  
President: Yes, it is influencing the strategy on lecturers. There will be conversations next week when the final numbers are available to make a better decision.

* Interim Provost Beverly Edmond  
    
  The graduation list was approved. It was available on Moodle for senators to view.

Interim Provost Edmond presented the accreditation core themes as information.

         Engage Students Where They Are

         Invest in People

         Partner with Place

         Support Excellence and Innovation in the Curriculum

         Foster Knowledge Creation and Innovation

Fiscal year 2018 is year one of our accreditation cycle. Our report is due to NWCCU in March.  It must include our mission, core themes, objectives, and assessment strategies.  The revised Core Themes are the Strategic Opportunities created by the Strategic Planning Coordinating Council (SPCC) with a revision to theme four as agreed upon between the SPCC and the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate (ECOS).

Question:

Senator Beck, NAS:  The notice to lecturers that was sent and then rescinded mentioned that the Provost’s Office would populate courses using academic performance solutions data.  Was this also rescinded?

Provost Edmond: Institutional Research has a database called academic performance solutions. The Educational Advisory Board recommended this platform.  The data will be used to assess what courses to offer and when, as well as other academic planning issues.  The template will be populated with tenure and tenure –track faculty. The Deans and Chairs will enter the teaching commitments for fall and spring.  The database will allow the university to look at trends such as class fill rates. It is not setting the schedule.

### ASUM President Braden Fritzgerald and Vice President Brenna Love

Last night ASUM passed a resolution requesting a gender-neutral restroom in every building on campus in support of diversity and inclusivity.  ASUM would like to initiate discussions to make this happen.

The second resolution was ASUM’s response to the APASP process. ASUM will continue to take student feedback on the President’s and Cabinet members APASP responses.   Please send students to ASUM if they have comments or questions regarding the APASP process.   The resolution will be forwarded to the Faculty Senate leadership.   
  
We have worked on many challenges this semester.  It is encouraging to see strong shared governance leadership. This sets an example for the students.  Thank you.

         UFA President Paul Haber

He is greatly relieved that the Montana University System was spared from more revenue cuts during the special legislative session.   He thanked the Governor, the Commissioner, Legislators, President Stearns and members of the administration for their efforts. This should provide some breathing room.

The UFA is fully committed to making the final weeks of Stearns administration and the incoming Bodnar administration successful as we move toward renewal.   The way to do this is through collaboration.  He also has faith that President Stearns will be prudent in whatever budgetary cuts she sees are necessary.  These cuts will be fair and include a rationale.

He urges the faculty and campus community to take a positive view in what we can accomplish together through meaningful collaboration.   The UFA looks forward to collaborating with the other shared governance groups, the administration, OCHE, and others to make happen.

Questions:

There is still some negotiation needed to come together on key contract issues such as compensation.  It will be a while, and may be a later than usual- maybe February.

### Chair's Report

Faculty Senate Leadership is in a unique position to engage in the related processes of both listening and guiding meaningful input.  To give you a sense of what this looks like, on Saturday, Mary-Ann had a discussion with President Stearns about things going on around campus. On Tuesday, She and Chair-Elect Semanoff met with the Provost, and then ECOS met with the President.  Yesterday, she went to two cabinet meetings, and met with the President.  We meet regularly with staff and student senate leadership. We talk to faculty members, are engaged with students, and so on. In other words, Faculty Senate leadership has a unique and broad perspective of campus.  Her intention is to share some of this as it relates to our agenda.   
  
APASP – many of us were expecting the Cabinet to move to implementing cuts after the APASP recommendations.  The President spoke earlier that her task is to submit recommendations and reflections to the new President.  There is no administrative chopping block to be worried about. There will be a special Senate meeting next Wednesday to discuss the President’s recommendations.    
  
The VSO is a non-strategic staff reduction.  It may be painful in the short term.  The faculty senate leadership fully supports the VSO, as did the Staff Senate leadership.   
  
Lecturers - we all know lecturers provide essential services across campus that benefit the university, most of all they benefit our students. Unless we are a lecturer, we do not know what it is like for you right now. However, we can all relate to living with ambiguity and potential loss.  She is sorry for the burden of anxiety, stress, confusion, and anger that has been placed on you this semester.  She has confidence that the union and the administration, including the deans will work together on this issue.  
  
New Football Coach – under new business there is a letter regarding this hire that we will be discussing. She thanked those whose concern for students prompted them to send the letter. She has communicated with the Athletic Director about the concerns and he is in attendance. There was a thorough hiring process. The contract (published in the Missoulian) included clear terms to address the concerns. The [Press Conference](http://gogriz.com/news/2017/12/1/football-coach-hauck-prepared-remarks.aspx) is linked to the agenda as information. The NCAA Faculty Representative Dustin Hollist is also in attendance to answer questions during the discussion.

The [Library collection cancelation](http://www.umt.edu/facultysenate/documents/FSDocs17-18/Dept_Chair_Library_Update_6Dec2017.docx) list and letter sent to Chairs is linked to the agenda as information. The list was determined through a careful review of usage data and faculty and student feedback.   
  
The University is in a period of change and challenge. President Stearns will complete her service in January and we will welcome the new President. Interim Provost Edmond will provide administrative continuity for a short time this spring before ending her service. The search committee for a new provost is proceeding and Chair Bowman is a member. She appreciates both President Stearns and Interim Provost Edmonds service to UM.   
  
She reminded senators that decisions we do not agree with are not inherently wrong or bad. They are just different. To support diversity on this campus we must support and respect diversity of thought. This does not mean there is not an expression of dissent. In fact, the opposite is true. We must speak our different truths, respectfully, honestly, and with integrity. On our agenda today, there may be items that reflect differences. She requests that we maintain what we expect from students, deep and sincere respect for differences, a thoughtful and curious mind that listens to understand, civility, and a willingness to consider that our truth may not be the only truth. As the President of the UFA stated, we all have a shared commitment to the University of Montana and the students we serve. So please keep this in mind as the meeting proceeds.

## Public Comment

* Student Ross Best: He came expecting to talk about defects in the APASP process and public participation in public meetings in general, but he had not looked at the agenda, so was not aware that the public comment period had been moved. Several years ago, he spoke at a meeting of the Public Library Board of Trustees about public participation. After the meeting, the Board changed its bylaws to reduce the time for public comment. The Senate is reacting the same way. After years of ignoring your duties under Montana’s Public Participation Law, you gracefully added public comment to the meeting agenda at the appropriate place. He was the only person to respond. Moving the comment period to the end of the meeting is pathetic. You do not understand the basic concept of commitment to public participation in Montana government. He will try to persuade you to do better in the future.
* Senator Coffin: The disparaging comments are inappropriate. Many people in this room have a lot of respect for public information and transparency and are committed to this.
* Senator Ratto-Parks, English- Assistant Director in the Composition Program, and coordinator of several assessments: She has been on campus for 17 years and has had many roles. During this time, she learned how different roles work at the University and others around the country. Until this year, she did not seriously think about what it meant to be a lecturer. She is here to write books, research, public articles, go to conferences, and teach and mentor students. Many of her colleagues did not realize she was a lecturer and were sympathetic to her tenuous situation.   
    
  In researching the role of lecturers, she began to understand the logic behind the contract decisions. Nationally lecturers do different things than they do at UM. Nationally lecturers have a high teaching load and that is their primary role. Therefore, it could be assumed that it would be easy to redistribute the course load. At UM, lecturers are deeply integrated across the disciplines and are responsible for fundamental responsibilities that are not easy to redistribute, such as mentoring all the WRIT 101 instructors. The responsibly of lecturers vary significantly. The reason for some of this is that over the past 5-7 years many departments have lost tenure-track faculty lines so have compensated by assigning more responsibility to lecturers. Lecturers appreciate having this opportunity to be engaged and invested in the university community. Therefore, when this is considered for elimination there is confusion. Many of the lecturers and tenure-track faculty do not see how redistribution could possibly work.   
    
  We need to think about the relationship in a different way. Lecturers on this campus provide an important stability for the institution. We are not eligible for sabbaticals. We are always here. This groundwork allows UM to pursue the R1 designation. This structure is unique to our campus and we can take pride in it. This perspective deserves some attention.
* Professor Tammy Ravas, Mansfield Library: As one of the signatories of the letter regarding the hiring of Coach Hauk, she empathetically expresses support for Lisa Davey, the graduate student in Communication Studies who distributed an online petition against the rehire and subsequently received threats and had her address and personal information made public. She is very concerned about student safety. What is being done to ensure Miss Davey’s safety considering the threats made against her? She realizes that people have strong feelings regarding Coach Hauk’s return to UM, but no one should have to suffer being doxxed or face physical threats. She is very concerned that the institution is not doing enough to keep her safe or anyone else disagreeing with anything via online petition in the future. What are we doing to keep one another safe?   
    
  The threatening behavior and language used by Mike Schlosser’s against Miss Davey is completely unacceptable and it tarnishes the reputation of the university and Griz Fans. The University has a responsibility to keep its students safe as outlined in the discrimination, harassment, sexual misconduct, stalking, and retaliation policy. UM needs to send an unequivocally strong message that threatening and harassing students is not tolerated. Such a message at the very least should include an immediate revocation of Schlosser’s season tickets. UM’s reputation depends on prioritizing the safety and wellbeing of our students, faculty, and staff. It is her sincere hope that incoming President Bodnar, our current administration, and Athletic Director Haslam take an immediate zero tolerance stance on this matter. Thank you. [applause]
* Student Chase Greenfield and former member of the General Education Committee: He sent a letter last night (appended) regarding two courses renewed for the ethics designation by ASCRC that were not approved by the General Education review and appeal process. He strongly suggests that the courses be removed from the consent agenda so there can be a deliberative discussion later given the other items on the agenda.

## Committee Reports

* After considerable discussion, the two ethics courses were removed from the [Curriculum Consent Agenda](http://www.umt.edu/facultysenate/curriculum/approved/ASCRCCurriculumConsent12-7-17.docx) because they were controversial. The consent agenda was approved.   
    
  The two courses (HSTR 272, *Terrorism in the Modern World* and ANTY 326, *Indigenous Peoples and Global Development*) were originally submitted two years ago for the rolling review. The General Education Committee recommended non-renewal of the ethics designation, but the notice to the instructors was late. The faculty members appealed to the General Education Committee and the courses again were not renewed. ASCRC received this decision in September and removed the courses from the consent agenda. It considered additional revised materials to appeal the General Education Committees decision. ASCRC Chair Coffin worked with the Chair and Subcommittee Chair of the General Education Committee and the instructors. It was a dispute between the parties. He hoped that the revisions made by the instructors would be acceptable to the General Education Committee, but this was not possible. So ASCRC looked at the two syllabi and approved the courses for the Ethics designation on November 21st.

Senator Ametsbichler, MCLL and member of the General Education Committee: The Committee discussed these courses a lot. The instructors were given multiple opportunities to update the form and syllabi, but were not providing the necessary evidence that students were being assessed on the ethics learning outcomes. The issue may have become contentious, but part of the problem is process. What is the role of the Committee, if its decisions can be over turned?   
  
ASCRC Chair Coffin spent a lot of time on these courses. The Committee did review the revised syllabi against the criteria. He is not sure the General Education Committee had the final syllabi, since it refused to consider the revisions, given the timing.

Professor John Eglin, Founding Chair of the General Education Committee and last year’s ASCRC Chair. The General Education Committee is a subcommittee of ASCRC. All its decisions are subject to review by ASCRC. All that has happened here is that a decision of the General Education Committee has been appealed. All the back and forth in this case was to allow the General Education Committee to save face. These are two established general education ethics courses. The criteria for ethics courses has not changed. The instructors and the syllabi of the courses had not changed. And yet the designation was not renewed. ASCRC was simply exercising its function of processing an appeal.

Chair Bowman clarified that ECOS supported ASCRC’s decision.

Senator Greymorning, Anthropology/NAS and instructor of ANTY 326: There is a lot of confusion about this course, which first received the ethics designation back in 2009. The designation was not renewed in 2014, but he was not notified until September 2015. What is interesting here is that the course itself presents a dilemma. [The syllabus was displayed.]  
He had guidance from two philosophers including Emeritus Professor Albert Borgmann to revise the syllabus. He read from an email from Borgmann sent this morning.   
“I’m very sorry to hear about this. I think there is a way to combine the requirements of the ASCRC Subcommittee with the important concerns of your course. Introduce your students to the standard ethics that are dominant in the advanced industrial countries and still play a role in encounters of indigenous peoples and cultures. Standard ethics comes in three versions: 1) utilitarianism- the ethics of pleasure and property; 2) anthological ethics – the ethics of equality and self-determination; and 3) virtue ethics- the basis for mutual recognition and learning. I assume this will figure in the material of concern.”

ASCRC Chair Coffin: The three criteria for the Ethics designation are 1) introducing students to an ethical framework, 2) applying the framework and 3) assessment.

Professor James Randall, Music and Chair of General Education Committee: The General Education Committee has spent a lot of time on these courses. The efforts have spanned three chairs. The subcommittee members take their work very seriously. Both professors made revisions to the syllabi at a late date. Those were presented to ASCRC under appeal. ASCRC did not have the background. It is very rare that the Committee’s decisions are overturned. Both professors have every right to appeal. He does not think ASCRC or ECOS was provided with both sides of the argument and requests that the courses be sent back to committee for fair deliberation.

Professor John Eglin: The matter has been appealed to ASCRC. The General Education Committee reports to ASCRC and ASCRC reports to ECOS. The timeline reference has no meaning when something is appealed. Both courses were revised in response to concerns expressed by the General Education Committee and have been reviewed by the administration to verify the assessment portion that is required for accreditation. They were satisfied. When the revised syllabi were differed back to the General Education Subcommittee, it declined to review them.   
  
Randall:  These are two different cases and present different circumstances.   In the case of Professor Greymorning’ s course, there was a question of whether proper procedure was followed.   Historically when appeals are brought to ASCRC the process is to only review whether proper procedure was followed by the subcommittee.  Why would new information be presented to ASCRC whose members have no experience with the general education criteria?

Eglin: There are interlocking members and some have previous experience on the General Education Committee.

Senator Harrison, English: How did the courses fail to merit the ethics designation?

Randall: The concerns outlined in Chase’s letter were thorough. He recognizes that the most recent revisions made steps in the right direction. An assessment component has been added to the review, so now it must be apparent from the syllabus and the justifications that students are evaluated on the specific learning outcomes of the general education category.

Coffin: When he tried to bring the two sides together, there were two potential procedural errors. The first error was that there was evidence that some members of the general education committee considered the professor’s competence to teach the class. It is important to understand that courses do not belong to faculty members they belong to the university. The department is interested in retaining the designation for the History course. The instructor asked to teach it one more time without revisions before he retired and the General Education Committee denied the request. The designations are important for enrollment. The other procedural error is that there is no timeline. According to the General Education guidelines, there is opportunity for revisions until the course complies with the requirements. So as ASCRC Chair he asked for revisions so the courses met the criteria. He and John acted as intermediaries for the professors because it seemed the criteria kept changing, then a timeline was evoked and the General Education Committee was done reviewing. There are two sides to the story, but when you look at the syllabi, they meet the criteria. That is all ASCRC considered. He does not think the outcome would be different if you sent it back to committee.

Randall: The General Education Committee should have had the opportunity to present the concerns about the courses to ASCRC.

Coffin: We need to look at our committee structure. Given the concerns, he established a record with Director Jessica Weltman, Office of Equal Opportunity with this situation. He did not ask for a determination of whether individuals had been treated with bias or discrimination, he just provided the emails. He will meet with the General Education Committee at the beginning of the semester. The committee structure should be evaluated to improve our communication and procedures because we do not want this to happen again.

Senator Schwartz: It seems that there is a structural problem with the committees, but the members have good faith, so should be able to work this out and bring it to us next semester. There are other items on the agenda to discussed.   
  
The question was called. There were 8 apposed, 7 abstentions, and 34 in favor. The motion to approve the courses was approved.

* The [Motion /catalog language - removal of Intermediate Writing Course Exemption](http://www.umt.edu/facultysenate/documents/FSDocs17-18/Revision27credit_12-7-17.docx) was approved. The reference to 27 credits is historical. In the past 27 credits completed UM’s general education program.
* The [IB Policy](http://www.umt.edu/facultysenate/documents/FSDocs17-18/IB-policy-12-7-17.docx) was also approved. Schools and parents have contacted the Admissions Office asking about IB courses that are not currently on UM’s list. This procedure provides a process and timeline for consideration. This is important to recruit high quality students.
* The updates to the General Education Procedures were postponed.
* Graduate Council’s [Curriculum Consent Agenda](http://www.umt.edu/facultysenate/curriculum/approved/grad_council/GCCurriculumConsent12-7-17.docx) was approved. There were no controversial items.

## New Business

* [Letter in Response to re-hiring Bobby Hauck](http://www.umt.edu/facultysenate/WGSS-Letter-Re-Bobby-Hauck-Rehiring.docx)  
  Professor Hubble, Women and Gender Studies Director: She and Anja Jabour in History drafted the letter with other’s input in response to the situation Professor Ravas spoke too earlier. Originally, it was disseminated to Women and Gender Studies, but it quickly became apparent that the anger and concern was more widespread. The letter has over 30 signatures now and she continues to receive emails of faculty that wish to be included.   
    
  This hit hard, given the current situation on campus. Like Professor Ratto-Parks she is a lecturer, a program director, co-chair of the University Council on Student Assaul and one of the authors of PETSA. Just before the meeting, a number of people who signed the letter received an email from Colleen O’Brien an Athletics employee. “One would think with everything going on at the University (termination notices, APASP) faculty would be focused on their jobs and collaborating with fellow coworkers making sure they are giving 110% to their jobs. Yet 28 faculty members are more concerned about the Athletic Department and the new football coach.”. She is very insulted by this email. It profoundly misunderstands faculty relationships with students and the work that we do outside the classroom. It reads fairly threatening - do your jobs or something is going to happen. This is just very upsetting. It would have been nice if SARC had been consulted on this hire. She watched the Press Conference and appreciates that sexual assault was named. She has had email communications with Director Haslam and has hope that we can work together. However, this should be done in a deliberative way. Athletics needs to reach out to SARC, Title 9, and the University Council on Student Assault.
* The threats against Lisa Davies are not fit to repeat in public. She has children and her address was published online. Some supporters of the hire are reacting with violence and threats. The students are upset. She is an alum, committed to the University and wants to work with Athletics.   
    
  Chair Bowman: Director Haslam and Coach Hauck have offered to come to the Faculty Senate.

Senator Carter: What is being done to help Lisa Davey feel safe?

Athletic Director Haslam: There are a lot of emotions around this hire on both sides. He knew regardless of the decision there would be strong emotions. He absolutely condemns the behavior of Mike Schlosser. He does not speak for everyone, does not have season tickets or a tailgate permit. Director Haslam met this morning with Legal Council and the Campus Police in order to understand what we can do. The Athletic Department is significantly different than it was 8 years ago. We have a Student Athlete Code of Conduct and have several processes in place to prevent sexual assault behavior. The NCAA recently mandated that every student athlete have sexual harassment training. UM has been doing this for five years.

Athletics has a proactive relationship with SARC and Title 9. We are all committed to ensure we do the right thing. Jean Gee, the Associate Athletic Director coordinates all the training with the student athletes.

He apologized to Professor Hubble and others who received the email from the Athletics employee. He just found out about this at the meeting. The employee is an administrative assistant and not authorized to speak on behalf of Athletics.

University Legal Counsel, Lucy France: The next step is for the UM Police to meet with Lisa and her partner and to bring in the Title 9 Office. Schlosser has been contacted by the Athletics Department and asked to stop the abhorrent threats. However, we do not whether the threats have stopped. The Police will talk with Lisa to find out whether there is a criminal or harassment component and then discuss how to keep the campus community safe. We are a little constrained because he is not a member of the campus community. The timeline is immediate, but we need more information. We are also looking into whether he can be banned from campus as a threat to the community.

Senator Chatterjee, Political Science: He is worried that the rehire of Coach Hauck who recruited players convicted of sexual assault will affect recruitment.

Senator Annie Belcourt, Pharmacy Practice and Chair of the University Athletic Committee: The Committee has worked very diligently on this issue. A lot of work has taken place to make ensure campus is safe.

Hubble: Another concern is that the student athletes will again be under scrutiny. Faculty that have concerns about these issues should report to the Title 9 Office.

Senator Beck, NAS: This is part of a larger issue in our community of incivility. He knows first hand because his family was part of a protest regarding the cultural misappropriation that occurs at the Festival of the Dead. He received death threats and all kinds of other threats. There were students involved with the protest as well. They contacted the police department for advice. It is important to know what our students are involved in, because the pushback goes beyond verbal abuse. The UM community needs to be aware of this issue. Thank you for submitting the letter (applause).

* [APASP Recommendations Discussion](http://www.umt.edu/apasp/docs/Recommendations.pdf)

Chair Bowman asked APASP representatives what we should focus on during the special meeting next week.   
  
Professors Ware, DeBoer, and Schwartz joined Chair Bowman at the front of the room.   
The Senate gets to decide what to discuss. The APASP report is available. What do you have questions or concerns about; agree or disagree with?

Everyone should be interested in what happens at the special cabinet meeting tomorrow.

Coffin, ASCRC Chair: Clarified that students in programs that may be recommended for discontinuance will be taught to completion. Any programs that are recommended for changes would go through the normal curriculum review process, so the earliest anything would go into effect would be fall of 2020. ASCRC may consider a spring review for special circumstances for items that must be implemented next fall. If there are any program cancelations, retrenchment or rescission, Section 18 of the contract would be evoked.

APASP representatives were thanked for their hard work and willingness to be self-critical in the report. There efforts are very much appreciated (applause).

Adjournment  
The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Dear Members of the Faculty Senate,

Please review my attached letter regarding the granting of ethics designations for two courses. I believe that both of these have been removed from your consent agenda for this upcoming meeting, but I strongly encourage you to consider what I have written for all future meetings. As public comment occurs for only 10 minutes *after* decisions have been made, I felt that it was important to make my remarks prior to your meeting tomorrow.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours,

Chase Greenfield

UM Student– English Literature and Philosophy

Dear Members of E.C.O.S. and the Faculty Senate,

I am writing to you today regarding what I believe to be a massive disservice to both students and the curriculum review processes of the University of Montana. For context, I served on the General Education Committee for two full years, and A.S.C.R.C. for one and a half years– and have gained a strong understanding of the Faculty Senate processes. As a student, I feel very strongly about the quality and rigor of our curriculum, as well as the effectiveness of our learning objectives at this university.

The objection I raise is the Academic Standards and Curriculum Review Committee’s decision to overturn the General Education Committee’s rejection of two “E–Ethics” designations for ANTY 326 and HSTR 272. The General Education Committee has reviewed these requests for E designations over the past *two years* and has consistently found them to be unsuitable for the designation. It is bewildering to me that the A.S.C.R.C. and E.C.O.S. find this review to be inadequate, and have decided to move forward in granting the designations against the recommendation of the General Education Committee. This is an error that could have devastating consequences for the reputation of the Faculty Senate, and could mislead students in those courses.

These courses have been held in limbo by the General Education Committee for almost two years now, for *one* reason: they fail to meet the learning objectives required of the “Ethics” designation. The General Education subcommittee communicated their concerns (with detailed suggestions of how to modify the courses to meet the designation’s learning objectives) to the request authors. The request authors both *refused* to modify their courses multiple times, and continued to instead argue with the subcommittee about their courses’ ability to meet the learning objectives. The full General Education Committee reviewed the requests, and *affirmed* the decision by the subcommittee to reject the requests for the E-designation. Again, let me emphasize, the request authors refused to modify their courses or to heed the suggestions of the General Education Committee and its Ethics Subcommittee. Do not reward this reluctance to change by giving the two authors what they desire. Do not allow bullying to be rewarded at the cost of academic quality. I firmly believe that this kind of refusal to adapt and change is more damaging to our university and to students than any enrollment drop could ever be. I ask you to combat it.

The appeal, I believe raised the objection of personal bias against the authors of the designation requests, but this appeal sites limited evidence and *does not contradict the fact that these two courses do not meet the learning objectives required of an ethics course*. In fact, no evidence is sited to demonstrate that Professor Drake (HSTR 272) was the victim of discrimination from the General Education Committee (or its subcommittees). Only one sentence of one email (taken out of context) by a *former* member of the General Education Committee is cited as evidence as discrimination against Professor Greymorning (ANTY 326). This is a weak argument to suggest that *both* of these request-writers were somehow discriminated against by the General Education Committee. In fact, it appears far more likely that Dr. Coffin’s personal friendship and partnership with Professor Greymorning resulted in the pulling of these designations up through the process without the consent of the General Education Committee. The bias of friendship betewen Professors Coffin and Greymorning is far more likely than any personal bias against