

# ACADEMIC SENATE PROPOSAL TRACKING SHEET

**(Document To Be Originated By Academic Senate Secretary On Canary Color Paper)**

**All proposals MUST have their originating college faculty body (Ex. Nursing, Technical Sciences, Arts & Sciences, Education) approval and must be signed by the submitter and the college chair/dean before being submitted to the academic senate secretary.**

1. Submit all proposals (using the appropriate Academic Senate program/degree and/or course revision forms) to the Academic Senate Secretary.
2. The Academic Senate Secretary logs and numbers items and forwards them to the appropriate Academic Senate subcommittee(s): Teacher Education (if applicable), General Education (if applicable), or Curriculum.
3. The Academic Senate subcommittee(s) consider(s) the proposal. If approved, the proposal is forwarded to the next committee. If a committee disapproves the proposal, the originator may request that the item be forwarded to the next body for consideration. The committee will provide written rationale to the originator when a proposal is disapproved and the proposal is returned to the originator.
4. The Academic Senate considers the proposal and approves or disapproves. If approved, the proposal is forwarded to the Full Faculty for consideration. If the Academic Senate disapproves the proposal, the originator may request that the item be forwarded to the Full Faculty for consideration. The Academic Senate will provide written rationale to the originator when proposals are disapproved and the proposal is returned to the originator.
5. The Full Faculty considers academic senate approved proposals. If faculty approve, the proposal will then be forwarded to the Provost. The Provost approves or disapproves the proposal. If approved, the proposal is then forwarded to the Chancellor.
7. The Chancellor approves or disapproves the proposal.

**Subcommittee and Academic Senate college representatives will notify their respective colleges' of the progress of submitted proposals or the proposal may be tracked via the web page --**

**<http://www.msun.edu/admin/provost/asproposals.htm>**

**Documentation and forms for the curriculum process is also available on the web page:**

**<http://www.msun.edu/admin/provost/asforms.htm>**

**\*\*\*\*\* (If a proposal is disapproved at any level, it is returned through the Academic Senate secretary to the Chair/Dean of the submitting college who then notifies the originator.)**

Proposal # <u>05-03</u>	Title: <u>ENGL 099 - New Course</u>
-------------------------	-------------------------------------

(proposal explanation, submitter and college chair/dean signatures on attached program/degree or course revision form)

Received by ACAD Senate Forwarded to Teacher Ed Council	Date <u>9/30/05</u>	Approved _____ Disapproved _____	
Forwarded to Gen Ed Committee	<u>9/30/05</u>	Signature _____ Approved _____ Disapproved <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Date <u>10/13/05</u>
Returned to ACAD Senate Forwarded to Curriculum Committee	<del>9/30/05</del> <u>11/1/06</u>	Signature _____ Approved _____ Disapproved <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Date <u>11/9/05</u>
Returned to ACAD Senate for Vote	<u>1/24/06</u>	Signature _____ Approved _____ Disapproved <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Date <u>3/21/06</u>
Sent to Provost's office for Full Faculty vote Voted on at Full Faculty meeting	<u>3/22/06</u> <u>3/28/06</u>	Signature _____ Approved _____ Disapproved <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Date <u>3/28/06</u>
Forwarded to Provost for Approval/Disapproval	<u>3/28/06</u>	Signature _____ Approved _____ Disapproved <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Date <u>3/29/06</u>
Forwarded to Chancellor for Approval/Disapproval	<u>3/29/06</u>	Signature _____ Approved _____ Disapproved <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Date <u>3/29/06</u>
Copies sent to originating college and registrar's office C:/data/proposaltracking sheet ACAD 10 10 01	<u>3/30/06</u>	Signature _____ Approved _____ Disapproved <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Date <u>3/29/06</u>

\* Show classification and definition needed

## COURSE REVISION FORM

NEW  DROPPED  MAJOR REVISION  FOR INFORMATION ONLY

College Education, Arts & Sciences, and Nursing Program Area English Date 8/16/05

Submitter John Snider Chair/Dean Carol A. Kestubek Date 9-27-05  
Signature Signature (indicates "college" level approval)

Please provide a brief explanation & rationale for the proposed revision(s):

A significant number of our students here at Montana State University-Northern do not write at the university level. 124 students as of 8/4/05 scored 17 or below on the English area of the ACT 62 students scored 14 or below. The consensus of the English faculty is that we have a significant number of students who are deficient in their writing skills. Our university is an open admission university and as a consequence many of our students are not academically prepared for university work. Therefore, we need to include more remedial courses in our curriculum.

Please provide the following information:

**College:** Education, Arts & Sciences, and Nursing  
**Program Area:** English  
**Date:** 8/16/05  
**Course Prefix & No.:** ENGL 099  
**Course Title:** ~~Remedial~~ Writing  
**Credits:** 3 *Developmental*  
**Required by:**  
**Selective in:**  
**Elective in:**  
**General Education:** Prerequisite for ENGL 111  
**Lecture:** 3  
**Lecture/Lab:**  
**Gradable Lab:**  
**Contact hours lecture:**  
**Contact hours lab:**

**Current Catalog Description (include all prerequisites):** N/A

**Proposed or New Catalog Description (include all prerequisites):**

This course is required for students whose writing skills are below the university level. The course reviews grammar and punctuation and then emphasizes sentence and paragraph formation and the development of a coherent essay. Students must pass the class with a C- or better to pass into ENGL 111. Students will be placed into English 099 if their ACT score is 17 or below or if their SAT score is 440 or below. Students who have not taken the ACT or SAT exam will be required to take the university writing assessment exam and will be placed into ENGL 099 if their score is 3 or below based upon the Montana University System Holistic Scoring Rubric.

**Course Outcome Objectives:**

**Additional instructional resources needed (including library materials, special equipment, and facilities). Please note: approval does not indicate support for new faculty or additional resources.**

## Montana University System Holistic Scoring Rubric

- 6 These papers clarify a position on the issue defined in the prompt, providing extensive and compelling evidence. Organization is unified and logical, with effective transitions. Language use is fluent with well-controlled sentences, clear and effective expression of ideas, and precise word choice. While there may be a few errors in grammar, usage, and mechanics, an outstanding command of language is apparent.
- 5 These papers clarify a position on the issue defined in the prompt, providing moderate and relevant evidence. Organization is unified and coherent and transitions are used. Sentences are almost always well controlled, expression of ideas is usually clear, and word choice is often precise. While there may be a few errors in grammar, usage, and mechanics, a good command of language is apparent.
- 4 These papers state and support a position on the issue defined in the prompt with some elaboration or relevant explanation. Organization is generally clear. Sentences are usually well controlled, expression of ideas is usually clear, and word choice is appropriate for the topic. A competency with language is apparent, even though there may be some errors in grammar, usage, and mechanics.
- 3 These papers state and support a position on the issue defined in the prompt with a little elaboration or explanation. Organization is clear enough to follow without difficulty. Sentences are usually well controlled, expression of ideas is at times awkward or unclear, and word choice may at times be inaccurate or inappropriate. A basic control of language is apparent, even though there may be frequent errors in grammar, usage, or mechanics.
- 2 These papers show significant problems in one or more areas. They may state a position on the issue defined in the prompt but support may be minimal or irrelevant. Organization may lack clear movement or focus, making the writer's ideas difficult to follow. Sentences may often be unclear, expression of ideas may often be awkward or unclear, and word choice may often be inaccurate or inappropriate. Numerous errors in grammar, usage, or mechanics show poor control of language and may at times impede understanding.
- 1 These papers have severe problems in one or more areas. The writer may not state a position on the issue defined in the prompt or provide support. Problems with organization and lack of focus may make the paper very difficult to follow. Sentences may seldom convey meaning clearly, expression of ideas may be very unclear and confusing, and word choice may often be inaccurate or inappropriate. Severe problems with grammar, usage, or mechanics show very poor control of language and may significantly impede understanding.
- 0 These papers cannot be scored with the rubric (completely off-topic, illegible, inappropriate or obviously interrupted)

**INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** ACAD SENATE  
**FROM:** CURRICULUM COMMITTEE  
**SUBJECT:** PROPOSAL O5-03  
**DATE:** NOVEMBER 11, 2005  
**CC:** GREG CLOUSE, GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE CHAIR

The Curriculum Committee met to discuss this proposal on November 9, 2005. The committee agreed with the General Education Committee's recommendation on October 13, 2005.

The Curriculum Committee held concerns that information needed to provide fair and accurate evaluation of the students' writing skills was not provided under "additional instructional resources" and the course outcome objectives were not submitted.

Therefore, the committee felt that it could not approve.

## Sandra Copenhaver

---

**From:** Darlene Sellers  
**Sent:** Friday, January 20, 2006 10:18 PM  
**To:** Gregory Clouse  
**Cc:** Joanna Kurtz; Vickie Clouse; Darlene Sellers; Julie Strobel; Katherine Williams; Sandra Copenhaver; Steven Don; Theresa Petersen; Byron Ophus  
**Subject:** RE: Disapproved proposal  
**Attachments:** 05-03memo.doc

Greg, Attached is the memo send forward (hard copy attached to proposal) explaining the action taken by our committee on the Senate Proposal 05-03 (to disapprove). I hope that our concerns supported your committee's decision for "disapproval".

Darlene J. Sellers, Ph.D., LCPC, NCC  
Associate Professor of Counselor Education  
Montana State University Northern  
Havre, MT 59501

ATTENTION: The information in this email may be CONFIDENTIAL and PRIVILEGED. If you have received this email in error, please delete it and notify the sender immediately. Thank you.