**ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES**

**DATE:**     March 30, 2006

**PRESENT:**  Agnes Samples                      Mark Hardt
              Lorrie Steerey                     Sandie Rietz
              Audrey ConnerRosberg               Susan Balter-Reitz
              Keith Edgerton                     Randall Gloege
              Bruce Brumley                      Noreen Lee
              Lewis Rife (student)               Tasneem Khaleel (ex-officio)

**ABSENT:**   Paul Bauer – *excused*             Craig McKenzie – *excused*
              Matt Redinger – *excused*          Dan Hansen (student) – *excused*
              David Garloff (ex-officio)         Curt Kochner (ex-officio)
              Mary Susan Fishbaugh (ex-officio)  Mary McNally (ex-officio)
              Kirk Lacy (ex-officio)             John Cech (ex-officio)
              George White (ex-officio)          Terrie Iverson (ex-officio)

**GUESTS:**   Mike Havens                        Doxey Hatch
              Dan Gretch                         Brent Roberts
              Dan Gross                          Susan Gilbertz
              Matt McMullen

**PRESIDING:** Keith Edgerton, Chair

Keith Edgerton called the meeting to order at 3:43 p.m. in the Chancellor's Conference Room.

The minutes of March 23 were accepted as presented.

I.      ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

**Item 58** MIS 150 Information Access and Organization.  New course.
*Approved by the UCC March 15 and postponed last week*

⇒ Motion by Lorrie Steerey, seconded by Randall Gloege to **accept Item 58.**

Lorrie Steerey noted that this course covers how to access different information using different kinds of software.

⇒ Motion carried.

II.     DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

A.  **Item 65**  Academic Senate Recommendation for a System of Evaluation for Transfer Courses

It was noted that the Registrar will be at next week's meeting to discuss this topic.  The item was deferred to next week.

B.  Retention Survey:  Lorrie Steerey

Dr. Steerey stated that she ran four separate reports from the retention survey data:  each group's results (administration, faculty, and staff) and the averages of all three groups. She noted that she still doesn't have the student data, but it will be easy to add to this report.  She also cited that the lower the score, the higher the importance (1 was most important, 5 least).

The Senate agreed to read the report and discuss it again in a few weeks.

C.  **Item 68**  Academic Foundations Committee Report:  Approved Courses.  3/30/06

⇒ Motion by Sandie Rietz, seconded by Lorrie Steerey to **accept Item 68.**

Mark Hardt, Chair of the Academic Foundations Committee, stated that the Committee carefully examined all courses submitted.  They considered how the syllabi and matrix match each other and how the course, as presented in the documentation, met the objectives of Academic Foundations.  Also the Committee agreed, after a request for consistency from the College of Arts and Sciences Curriculum Council, that Academic Foundations courses should not have restricted or preferred enrollments.  It was noted that most of those restrictions are for elementary education majors, and removing those restrictions may not have any effect on the students but at this time the effects are unknown.

It was noted that the Academic Foundations Committee recommends that the courses with restricted or preferred enrollments change them in order to remain in Academic Foundations.  It was cited that if the Department doesn't want to change the course, then it shouldn't be in Academic Foundations.  It was further noted that if these courses are included with no restrictions, students in those groups should be advised to sign up for courses as soon as they possibly can.

Dean Tasneem Khaleel noted that the Board of Regents is in the process of changing their required general education core.  In the proposed core, students are only required to take 3 credits of English and 3 of communication.  It was noted that the subcommittee working on this had considered making the cultural diversity category the Indian Education for All category, but that idea has been rejected.  However, the BOR core, which has been 30 credits for some time, may go to 33 credits if an Indian Education for All requirement is added as a separate category.  Dean Khaleel noted that transfer and other students will not be allowed to test out of this new core because the outcomes may be different from other institutions.

> ⇒ Motion carried.

Dr. Edgerton stated that he would send a memo to the affected departments concerning the restricted courses.

> ⇒ Motion by Lorrie Steerey, seconded by Randall Gloege **that the Academic Foundations Committee list of courses be brought into conformity with the final Board of Regents approved general education core.**

> ⇒ Motion carried.

D.  Academic Foundations Denied Courses

Michael Havens, Chair of Psychology, stated that they had submitted PSYC 271 Human Relations for the Information Literacy category, and it was denied.  The Department never meant to submit it for that category; they wanted it in Social Sciences.  Dr. Havens also noted that this course is different from COMT 109 Human Relations, which is taught at the COT.  The COT course is mainly concerned with workplace relations, while PSYC 271 is much broader and covers many other topics such a family relations.

It was noted that the English and Philosophy Department also had a course which it failed to resubmit due to departmental communication issues.

> ⇒ Motion by Sandie Rietz, seconded by Randall Gloege that the **Psychology and English & Philosophy Departments be given an opportunity to resubmit their courses** (PSYC 271 and ENGL 260) **because of extremely extenuating circumstances.**

> ⇒ Motion carried.

It was noted that the list of approved, in need of work, and denied Academic Foundations courses was sent out via email last December to all departments.  The academic community should feel well-informed.

D.  Assessment Presentation:  Academic Foundations Committee

The Academic Foundations Committee presented several assessment models, which included capstone, portfolio, the Bozeman model, surveys, and embedded assessment. The Committee noted that they had chosen, and the administration supports, using a combination of embedded assessment and surveys.  NWCCU advocates for using more than one model of assessment to get more legitimate data.  It was noted that student surveys are not measures of quality, but rather of satisfaction.

A presentation on embedded assessment is attached to these minutes.

The Senate agreed that they would think about embedded assessment and go through the presentation again next time.

The meeting adjourned at 4:32 p.m.

rjrm

# Embedded Assessment in Academic Foundations

**Type I:  Data gathered on individual performance in Academic Foundations courses**
Since courses accepted in Academic Foundations were subject to rubric-based approval, overall student performance in these courses is a valid contributor to program assessment.


**Type II: Data gathered from standardized tools used in Academic Foundation courses**
Faculty committees from Academic Foundations subcategory areas will design embedded assessment tools that will be used directly in Academic Foundations courses.  The tools will yield quantitative information and will contribute to student course grades, thus ensuring student motivation.  The tools will be standardized within each Academic Foundations subcategory and will assess intended outcomes specific for that subcategory.


**Type III:  Data gathered from a standardized tool used in upper division majors courses**
Faculty will collaborate to construct a standardized, campus-wide assessment tool that will be administered in upper division courses.  The tool will provide a cumulative assessment of Academic Foundations outcomes in students just prior to graduation.  The quality of student participation will contribute to the grade received in the upper division course, thus ensuring student motivation.


<u>**Advantages**</u>
The approach provides more than one source of data
The approach involves broad faculty involvement
The approach utilizes an existing framework of courses with no need for out of class assessment
The approach creates a likelihood for students being motivated to participate
The approach will yield data that is quantitative
The approach is amenable to many formats (i.e. assessing every student in every course or assessing courses on an alternating basis)
The tools used could be comprehensive, or sub-divided into subtests to avoid being too cumbersome.


<u>**Disadvantages**</u>
Designing the appropriate tools could be difficult
Convincing faculty to participate with enthusiasm could be a challenge
Do such tools assess ongoing skills and understanding?