

**FACULTY SENATE**  
**November 14, 2007**  
**REID HALL 104**  
**4:10 AM – 5:00 PM**  
**MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY-BOZEMAN, MONTANA**  
**Minutes**

**Members Present:** Bailey, Becker, Cherry, Christopher, Dyer, Fleck, Gerlach, Gipp, Hansen for Wojtowicz, Jacobs, Lei, Livingston, Longcope, Lynch, Marshall for D. Weaver, C. McClure, M. McClure, Mokwa, Neeley, Prawdzienski, Starkey for Zhu, Taylor, Watson

**Members Absent:** Ag/ED/AOT, Amin, Ashley, Bandyopadhyay, Bangert, Bennett, Ecology, Jackson, Johnson, Leech, Nursing On-Campus, Peed, Pinet, Political Science

**Others Present:** Jeff Adams, Roger Barber, Fedock, France, Sheila Stearns, Lansverk, Gretchen McNeely, William MacGregor, Lori Sturey (MSU-Billings), Weiland

Chair Shannon Taylor called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM. A quorum was present. The minutes from November 7, 2007 were unanimously approved.

***TRANSFERABILITY – Commissioner of Higher Education, Sheila Stearns***

- Regarding the \$50M base increase from backfilling tuition, the COHE conducted a Listening Tour to ask Montana citizens where they wanted the funding to go.
- **LISTENING TOUR** - The Tour was conducted from August 29– November 1 (18 communities/48 separate sessions) as part of the two-year planning cycle for the Montana University System. The Board of Regents used the listening sessions as a way to hear from hundreds of Montana citizens from Eureka to Glendive.
- The first question posed was whether their priorities for higher education, as summarized in the Board’s strategic plan, are on the right track, and what related or new issues should affect future planning.
- The recommendations from participants ranged from short-term (next legislative session), to long-term, to 2015-2020.
- **MAJOR THEMES**
  - **K-12 Collaboration**
    - Increase opportunities for concurrent enrollment for high school students
    - More clarity about the need for remediation; how to minimize
    - MUS needs better communication with K-12 sector, with counselors, with student information for feedback to high schools on student success in MUS
  - **Transferability**
    - High school to college (advanced placement, dual enrollment)
    - Two-year colleges to universities
    - Between all colleges and universities
    - Appearance that Montana’s post-secondary institutions do not communicate with each other very effectively
  - **Quality Liberal Arts Education**
    - Reminder that the overall value of a general high-quality liberal arts education should not be crowded out of the priorities
  - **Faculty and Staff Recruitment/Retention**
    - Major issue voiced by the campus communities
    - Obvious loss of ability to recruit employees and faculty in many fields
    - Promote grow-your-own faculty and staff, e.g., master’s prepared nurses to sustain nursing programs
  - **Affordability/CAP (College Affordability Plan 2007-2009)**
    - Affordability continues to be a major issue
    - CAP was appreciated although not well understood by all
    - Concern about tuition levels compared to surrounding states, especially at two-year colleges
    - Cost of textbooks

- **Workforce Development**
  - Need for short term training opportunities
  - Flexible/prompt response
  - Aging workforce – change more quickly to meet the needs of the job market
  - Not all Montana jobs require a 4 yr. degree
  - Health care providers important in every geographic area, at all levels and kinds of expertise
  - Promote more partnerships with employers
  - Economic impact of MUS units with their regions very evident; comments in every site
- **Two-year Education**
  - Image problem: stigma attached to the two-year colleges by many parents, students, high school counselors
  - Confusion about what are the differences between community colleges, colleges of technology, and tribal colleges
  - Interest in keeping tuition lowest at community-based two-year education
  - Major interest in Ravalli County about advantages, costs, and necessity for a new community college, and about role of UM-Missoula
  - Optimal structure of 2-year education in Montana?
  - Cost inequities
- **Research:**
  - A sense in a few communities that it is very important, especially nearby research stations
  - In another community, the exact opposite: a question as to whether the agricultural experiment stations still needed, relevant
  - Research especially at UM, MSU, and Montana Tech, promoting the start-up of new businesses in Montana
- **MUS Organization**
  - Community college trustees would appreciate more communication
  - Some concern that four-year units are too restricted by a bureaucratic connection to UM or MSU
  - Duplication questions: not enough! (e.g. health care programs) or too much? (equipment-intensive workforce programs)
- **Regional Enrollment**
  - All regions concerned about declining high school enrollments
  - Tuition strategy to attract more young people to the state via Montana's colleges and universities
  - Ability to recruit students outside of Montana, not use resources to chase the same in-state FTE
  - Adult education: promote more access (ease and affordability) to non-traditional students for life-long learning and career re-tooling
  - More user-friendly evening and weekend programs
- **Relationship with Legislature**
  - Continue to work on communication in advance of and during legislative session
  - Better communication about results and accountability to promote trust
- **DISCUSSIONS ENSUED:**
  - Is out-of-state student recruiting complimentary to Montana's institutions of higher learning? *Attracting non-resident students to institutions that have infrastructure capacity, is good for Montana especially in towns and cities that have graying populations.*
  - Do you think, once outside of Bozeman, Montana citizens are aware of the strength, size, and impact of scientific research we do, or is their perception of research based on the functions of just the Ag stations? How do we get that word out better? *There is a growing awareness but not where it should be. During the Listening Tour, there was very little discussion about research, and that needs to be better communicated throughout the state. The Ag Stations, however, have made a large sector of our state aware of research. The Value Added advantage to any community is having a vibrant faculty doing research.*

***LEARNING OUTCOMES TO ENABLE COURSE TRANSFER – Bill MacGregor, Sheila Stearns***

- The Transferability Initiatives (TI) councils met, recently, and their goals were:
  - To launch the initiative using four commonly transferred courses;
  - To gain a sense of the scope and scale of the overall transfer project based on outcomes;
  - To make significant progress toward consensus about each course under discussion in each council;
  - To act as liaison for faculty who will communicate about what they teach and what they expect in their courses in order for those expectations to be shared throughout the system. TI council goals are to come to a consensus about main learning outcomes associated with courses that are to be transferred as equivalents throughout the state; and not and honor significant differences in learning outcomes of apparently similar courses on different campuses; and
  - To attune TI council members to emerging accrediting standards which emphasize evidence-based demonstration learning outcomes and help participants prepare for upcoming accreditation reviews on their campuses.
- TI council processes are the guiding mechanisms for the success of the TI and advocates that leadership for the curricula in the system comes from faculty. TI council leadership and coordination, however, comes from within the TI council. It sets its objectives, schedules its work and delivers its results with the support of the COHE.
- The documentary context for the TI comes from the MUS and AAC&U (Association of American Colleges and Universities). The TI operating principles are a balancing act which consists of optimizing opportunities for student progress and success; respecting prior student work; treating transfer students as if they were native students; and to honor academic emphasis, rigor and quality at each institution.
- The first four TI councils who met were Math (College Algebra); Communication (English Composition); Business (Accounting 1 & 2); Biology (Anatomy & physiology 1&2).
- Participation included:
  - Faculty from MUS
    - Baccalaureate & graduate institutions
    - Community Colleges
  - Faculty from Tribal Colleges
  - Faculty from Private Institutions
  - Staff & Administration
- Framing the work of the TI councils included such concepts as:
  - Student Learning Outcomes (distinguishes one course from another by articulating what students should know and be able to do upon successful completion of the course) – how does this standard of comparison for course equivalency differ from others (such as course content, instructor qualifications, instructional facilities/environment)?
  - Considering how other differences among potentially transferable courses may affect comparability of student learning outcomes such as credits, level (100/200/300/400), focus and purpose, modality (e.g., online, variation in lab delivery, etc.), and pedagogy.
  - Considering differing uses for transferred credits such as general education (core requirements); program (major field) requirements (including accreditation issues; and electives.
- Council goals were to come to a consensus about main learning outcomes associated with courses that are to be transferred as equivalents throughout the state; and, note and honor significant differences in learning outcomes of apparently similar courses on different campuses.
- MUS transfer data arrays and students transfer advising web interfaces which are based on existing transfer data may be viewed at: [http://msudw.msu.montana.edu:9020/wfed/owa/musxfer.p\\_text](http://msudw.msu.montana.edu:9020/wfed/owa/musxfer.p_text)  
<http://mus.edu/che/transfer-ai/transinit.asp>

*Signature*

Shannon Taylor, Chair

*Signature*

Gale R. Gough, Secretary