

**Academic Foundations Committee
Minutes**

November 16, 2004

Present:	Mark Hardt	Randall Gloege
	Connie Landis	Susan Gilbertz
	Noreen Lee	James Nowlin
	Abbas Heiat	Barb Pedula
	Amanda Mears (student)	Lewis Rife (student)
Absent:	Carl Hanson – <i>ex-officio</i>	Tasneem Khaleel – <i>ex-officio</i>
	John Cech – <i>ex-officio</i>	Randy Rhine – <i>ex-officio</i>
	George White – <i>ex-officio</i>	Joe Michels – <i>ex-officio</i>
	Janie Park – <i>ex-officio</i>	Curt Kochner – <i>ex-officio</i>
Presiding:	Mark Hardt, Chair	

Mark Hardt called the meeting to order at 3:46 p.m. in the Lewis & Clark room of the SUB.

The minutes of November 9 were accepted as presented.

I. New Membership Needed

Stan Wiatr has volunteered to join the Committee as the Natural Sciences representative from Arts and Sciences.

II. Discussion/Action Items

A. Presentation to Academic Senate (for November 18 meeting)

The Committee would like to thank Susan Gilbertz who drafted the presentation. The presentation is attached to these minutes.

It was noted that this program hangs on the hope that students will be properly advised. Right now they are not, and that problem needs to be fixed.

It was cited that one thing the Committee can do is train the advisors in the Advising Center—something they welcome. A lot of training can be done before the catalog with the Academic Foundations program goes out.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Rita J. Rabe Meduna.

Academic Foundations: Clarifications and Instructions

Drafted November 16, 2004

Based on feedback from the Academic Senate and from various departments and individuals, the Academic Foundations Committee recommends that the following set of guidelines and clarifications be approved by the Academic Senate and then advanced to all colleges and departments:

- A. Re-formatted Academic Foundations' guide shows that MSU-Billings Academic Foundations' requirements have been adjusted to meet Board of Regents' requirements

MSU-Billings Academic Foundations' Categories and Credit Requirements	Board of Regents' Categories and Credit Requirements
I. Academic Skills (9 credits) I a. Math (3 credits) I b. English (6 credits in writing)	Math (3 credits) English (3 credits)
II. Natural Sciences with lab(s) (7 credits)	Natural Sciences with labs (6 credits)
III. Social Sciences (6 credits)	Social Sciences (6 credits)
IV. History and Cultural Diversity (6 credits) IV a. History (3 credits) IV b. Cultural Diversity (3 credits)	History (3 credits) Cultural Diversity (3 credits)
V. Arts and Humanities (6 credits) V a. Fine Arts (3 credits) V b. Humanities (3 credits)	Fine Arts (3 credits) Humanities (3 credits)
VI. Elective (3 credits) The Elective Academic Foundation course must be selected from courses approved for categories I-V with the stipulation that a student will take no more than 2 courses with the same rubric. (Thus, if students choose to take 2 SOCL courses to fulfill the Social Science category, the students will not be allowed to take a SOCL course to fulfill their Elective Academic Foundation requirement.)	
MSU-Billings Academic Foundations Total = 37 credits	Board of Regents Total = 30 credits

B. Committee Decisions Regarding General Implementation of Academic Foundations:

Concern	Decision	Rationale
<u>Concern 1:</u> The unnecessary proliferation of minors.	<u>Committee Decision:</u> Drop the initiative regarding the Academic Foundations minor.	By dropping the minor, the overall program is more assessable.
<u>Concern 2:</u> Many programs anticipated problems and confusion with regard to the issue of double counting. The committee was not certain this issue was the business of the committee.	<u>Committee Decision:</u> Make no restriction on how Academic Foundations credits are applied toward program requirements.	So long as each student fulfills the academic foundations requirements listed, it is not a concern of this committee how specific program requirements are designed.
<u>Concern 3:</u> The courses eventually selected in the Academic Foundations categories will not necessarily be appropriate for all students because some students will be ready for advanced coursework.	<u>Committee Decision:</u> Allow advisors to substitute higher-level courses in Academic Foundations categories, so long as the higher-level course is categorically relevant (i.e., Biology for majors rather than Biology for non-majors).	Advisors should continue to have the flexibility to advance students' intellectual capabilities.

C. Process Clarification for Selection of Specific Courses in Categories I-V:

Concern	Goal	Committee Guideline
<u>Concern 1:</u> In contrast to the existing General Education Requirements, the proposed Academic Foundations program reduces the overall number of approved courses.	<u>Goal:</u> Limit the overall menu to approximately 30-40 courses across all categories (I-V).	<u>Committee Guideline:</u> Approve 6-8 courses per category (I-V).
<u>Concern 2:</u> Encourage College-level planning and coordination, especially as a means of streamlining the selection of specific course for the specific categories.	<u>Goal:</u> Allow Colleges to submit a package of courses for considerations.	<u>Committee Guideline:</u> Accept from each college no more than 10 courses per category (I-V).
<u>Concern 3:</u> Submission of course proposals for Academic Foundations	<u>Goal:</u> Clarify submission process regarding new courses versus existing courses.	<p><u>Committee Guideline:</u> College packages should include the following:</p> <p>A. New courses: Departments will submit the following documents for new courses to the Academic Foundations Committee (via their College Curriculum Committee and the UCC):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Course rubric, title, and number • Course syllabus • A one-line description for potential inclusion in the catalog • Completed “Outcomes Assessment” document (see Attachment #4 Outcomes Assessment Framework) • Explanation of how the proposed course meets the intended Purpose of Academic Foundations (see Attachment #2 Academic Foundations) <p>AND/OR</p>

		<p>B. Existing courses: Departments will submit the following documents directly to the Academic Foundations Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Course rubric, title, and number • Course syllabus • A one-line description for potential inclusion in the catalog • Completed “Outcomes Assessment” document (see Attachment #4 Outcomes Assessment Framework) • Explanation of how the proposed course meets the intended Purpose of Academic Foundations (see Attachment #2 Academic Foundations)
<u>Concern 4:</u> Availability of approved courses across university programs and campuses.	<u>Goal:</u> The committee is dedicated to providing students with a variety of options in each category.	<u>Committee Guideline:</u> When credible submissions are advanced from more than one college, the committee will avoid approving courses from only one college
<u>Concern 5:</u> Timelines—Programs must know which specific courses are approved as fulfilling Academic Foundations requirements in order to properly adjust program requirements.	<u>Goal:</u> Select specific courses and advance to Faculty Senate for approval by the end of Spring Semester 2005.	<p><u>Committee Guidelines:</u></p> <p>Accept course submissions through January 28, 2005.</p> <p>Begin selection process in February, 2005.</p> <p>Bring recommendations to Academic Senate no later than March 28, 2005.</p>
<u>Concern 6:</u> The matrices that are used for submission of courses include areas that are not applicable to some disciplines.	<u>Goal:</u> Clarify the manner in which the matrix should be completed.	<u>Committee Guideline:</u> The committee DOES NOT EXPECT that viable courses will fill every space on the matrix. Please complete pertinent areas only.
<u>Concern 7:</u> The Academic Foundations program must be assessable, as per Northwest’s concern.	<u>Goal 1:</u> Use matrices to develop initial course assessment tool for inclusion in the program	<u>Committee Guideline:</u> Develop effective assessment tools prior to implementation of the program and develop guidelines for program improvements. (The capstone is not currently being considered as an assessment tool.)

	<u>Goal 2:</u> Develop an instrument to assess the effectiveness of the program	
--	--	--