

- Motion by Lewis Rife, seconded by Bruce Brumley, that the Committee refer PSYC 271 back to the department with an explanation of what was unacceptable about the proposal and how to fix it. Dan Gretch will be the contact person.

- Motion carried.

The Committee agreed the revised proposal should be returned to the AFC by the next meeting, April 11.

ENGL 260 World Foundations of Literature for IV. B. Cultural Diversity (Item 74)

It was noted that the previous proposal had too narrow a course description for the Cultural Diversity subcategory, so the Committee denied the course. Due to communication problems within the Department of English and Philosophy, the course was not revised and resubmitted.

- Motion by Bruce Brumley, seconded by Janii Pedersen to accept ENGL 260 (Item 74) for the Cultural Diversity subcategory.

It was noted that there are some assorted authors listed in the syllabus, but not the matrix. It was cited that the matrix tends to be more general.

- Motion carried with 1 abstention.

- Motion by Randall Gloege, seconded by Bruce Brumley to waive second reading of ENGL 260 (Item 74).

- Motion carried with 1 abstention.

II. Discussion/Action Items

A. Debriefing: Academic Senate Report

It was noted that the Senate meeting seemed very positive, most likely because the Committee already had Provost White's approval of the assessment strategies.

Dean Khaleel also brought up during the meeting the further revised Board of Regents general education core. The Indian Education for All requirement has been removed from the Cultural Diversity category, and communication is still listed with English (6 credits for one English/communication category). The AFC noted for the Senate that there are already some communication courses accepted in Academic Foundations, and it would not be hard to change the categories. The Senate passed a motion that once the BOR core is approved, MSU-Billings' categories will be brought into conformity with the BOR core.

It was cited that the Committee did not receive a new charge from the Academic Senate, but the first charge in the bylaws does say "as needed." This will cover any further activities we take on, including assessment.

It was noted that Dr. Gretch presented his Powerpoint on embedded assessment, but there was not much time left in the meeting. The Senate asked if the AFC would return next time and present embedded assessment again.

B. Discussion of Embedded & Survey Assessment Model Implementation

It was observed that we should start organizing the committees for each subcategory. The question was raised as to whether the Senate or the AFC will do the organizing. It was noted that the Senate should not really form the committees, but some directive or announcement from the Senate will probably be needed. When the matrix process first began, many faculty did not believe we would get to this stage. We now have to get them to buy into this process.

It was noted that the AFC should probably develop some guidelines or examples of assessment tools for the committees. They should be creating something entirely unique to their subcategory, but may need a format.

It was stated that these committees should not be called steering committees, as we already have many of those on campus. Calling them councils would give an air of importance.

It was noted that AFC members could meet with the councils as consultants, but not directors.

It was noted that the AFC has not discussed surveys yet. It was noted that since surveys are mostly a measure of student satisfaction, we could use the existing surveys from the College of Arts and Sciences. It was cited that a correlation can then be made between the objective embedded assessment data and the student surveys—are successful students also satisfied students?

The meeting adjourned at 4:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Rita J. Rabe Meduna.