

- 1. Submit all proposals to the Office of Academic Affairs.
- 2. The Senate President will log items and forward them to the appropriate Senate subcommittees.
- 3. The Senate subcommittee will send the proposal to the Senate.
- 4. Senate proposals will be considered by the Full Faculty.
- 5. If approved, the proposal will then be forwarded to the Provost/Senior Vice Chancellor.

Proposals that require action to approve/disapprove/table or remand will be sent back to the Senate according to the monthly meeting schedule.

TITLE: Proposal to Add a Life Science Teaching Minor and a Life Science subcommittee takericulture Teacher Eel proposal # 00.39 room Teacher

PROPOSAL:	ifa Sajanaa Minar and a tanahina minar in Lifa Sajanaa ta
be added to the curriculum.	Life Science Minor and a teaching minor in Life Science to
Action Signatures:	$A \cap A$
Action Signatures: 4/2/2001	1/1/ (Kaln 1/20)
Submitter Date	College Chair/Bean Date
Alueine Vallus TEC	Approve Disapprove DateD1
Committee Chair /	
(c.C.) T. Welch	Approve Disapprove Date
Committee Chair Acad Senate	1
Faculty Senate President	Approve Date
	5/11/21
Provost Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic A	Approve Disapprove DateDate
Rayised: 1/7,5/99	<b>,</b>
	V
- All by land	approve Droapproved
chânculor	
	714101
	Date



## **Program Revision Form**

$NEW \underline{X} DROPPED \underline{\hspace{1cm}} MAJOR REV$	ISION	_ INFORMATION O	NLY	_
Department AVIS + Science Program Area Blo	logy		_Date_ <u>3</u> -	-26-01
Please provide in the space below a "before and af the program noted. Attached appropriate Course R			vith the ch	nanges in
Minor in Life Sciences (Non-te	aching) Rec	uired Courses		
<u>Current</u> Propos		•		
No current program		Cell Biology	4 cr	
		Cell Biology Labora		
		Microbiology	4 cr	
	BIOL 221		. 51	3 cr
		Botany I Laboratory	2 cr	2 41
•	BIOL 322		2 01	4 cr
	DIOE SEE	Or		4 01
	BIOL 314	General Ecology		4 cr
	BIOL 348			3 cr
		Zoology Laboratory	2 cr	3 01
		2 Physiological Chem		3 cr
	CILLIVITI	2 i nysiologicai Chem Or	iisu y	<i>3</i> C1
	NSCI 201	Essence of Science	<u>3 cr</u>	
	Т	otal credits		26
Teaching Minor in Life Science	ence Require	ed Courses		
<u>Current</u> Propos	ed			
None		Cell Biology	4 cr	
		Cell Biology Laborat	tory 1 cr	
		Microbiology	4 cr	
	<b>BIOL 221</b>	<b>4.</b>		3 cr
		Botany I Laboratory	2 cr	· ·
		General Ecology		4 cr
	BIOL 348			3 cr
		Zoology Laboratory	2 cr	5 <b>G</b> I
\$34 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Methods of Teaching		
		Secondary Science	2 cr	
	CHEM 11	2 Physiological Chem		3 cr
		Total		28 cr

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

None



TO: Will Rawn

Duane Klarich

FROM: Roger Barber

RE: The Proposed Minors in Life Science

DATE: May 11, 2001

I have disapproved the proposed teaching and non-teaching minors in life sciences. This memo is intended to inform you of that decision, and to explain my reasons for doing so.

I disapproved the two new minors for the following reasons:

--almost all of the program offerings in science were examined last year as part of the period program review conducted by the Board of Regents. That review occurred because the programs did not attract and graduate an acceptable number of students, at least as that number is determined by Regent policy. Two of the programs, biology and a teaching degree in general science, were eventually maintained at MSU-Northern, but only after extensive revisions were approved by the Commissioner's Office and the Board of Regents. In other words, the science programs at MSU-Northern are fragile, and must become more productive and viable in order to survive future Regent review.

--the new minor programs would have to be approved by the Board of Regents, under an extensive Level 2 process, since they are not attached to existing degree programs. (IE, MSU-Northern does not offer a major in life sciences.) Both the Commissioner's office and the Board of Regents will be understandably suspicious of new program offerings in science when the existing programs are weak and struggling to hang on. Almost certainly, the minors would not receive the necessary Board approval.

--at this point in the life of the institution, when resources are scarce, the science faculty, in my opinion, should spend its time trying to strengthen and stabilize the programs it currently has rather than offering a smorgasbord of degrees for every taste and interest.

I would be happy to explain my decision further, if you have any questions.