

**Academic Foundations Committee
Minutes**

March 28, 2006

Present:	Dan Gretch Connie Landis Abbas Heiat Janii Pedersen (student)	Mark Hardt Sandie Rietz Lewis Rife (student)
Absent:	Randall Gloege – <i>excused</i> Bruce Brumley – <i>excused</i> David Garloff – <i>ex-officio</i> John Cech – <i>ex-officio</i> Mary Susan Fishbaugh – <i>ex-officio</i> George White – <i>ex-officio</i>	Susan Gilbertz – <i>excused</i> Tasneem Khaleel – <i>ex-officio</i> Kirk Lacy – <i>ex-officio</i> Mary McNally – <i>ex-officio</i> Curt Kochner – <i>ex-officio</i>
Guest:	Brent Roberts	
Presiding:	Mark Hardt, Chair	

Mark Hardt called the meeting to order at 3:45 p.m. in the Bridger room of the SUB.

The minutes of March 21 were accepted as presented.

I. Discussion/Action Items

A. Results of Summit with Provost and Finalizing Report to Academic Senate

It was noted that the meeting with Provost George White went very well. The Committee's chosen assessment model—embedded—was also chosen by Provost White, in addition to surveys. It is up to the Committee to put together the structure of how the embedded assessment will work.

It was suggested that the Committee present all the same possibilities to the Academic Senate as part of this Thursday's report. That way, the Senators will know the Committee covered many options. It was suggested that a one-slide-per-option Powerpoint would help summarize the options as well.

It was noted that Provost White asked how the information from the student's embedded assessments would get from the instructors to the administration. It was cited that the Committee will probably need help from Information Technology. However, we need to know what kinds of information we will need and how we will handle it before we bring in IT.

It was observed that the Committee has really reached the end of its charge. The Senate should issue a new charge for the AFC to begin the assessment component.

It was noted that the Senate should be fully behind the AFC in forming subcommittees of faculty to create the assessment tool for each subcategory. If they are not, the AFC will likely have problems with cooperation.

It was cited that the assessment tools for each subcategory have to hit all the objectives, as laid out in the Academic Foundations Document, and also five or six important parts of the matrix, chosen by the Department or the subcommittees.

It was noted that some immediate data can be gathered from a table which shows that no matter which combination of courses a student takes, they meet all the objectives of Academic Foundations and the matrix.

It was cited that embedded assessment can also use an upper division tool toward the end of the program. However, that component probably won't be useful until we have two or three years of data from the Foundation segment.

It was noted that it is very important that we begin some kind of assessment, because the federal government is moving toward some policies for higher education just like No Child Left Behind for K-12. If we already have something in place, the government is much less likely to impose something on us.

The Committee agreed the report to Senate will include:

- List of accepted courses with notation on restricted courses – Mark Hardt
- Models of Assessment – Mark Hardt (in Powerpoint)
 - Surveys – Mark Hardt (in Powerpoint)
 - Embedded – Dan Gretch (in Powerpoint)
- Preliminary Data Collection: What we can do – Dan Gretch (in Powerpoint)
- New charge to the Committee (in Powerpoint)

It was noted that the AFC should make a recommendation later on that we develop some standard parts, such as the course description, that all syllabi across campus should have.

The meeting adjourned at 5:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Rita J. Rabe Meduna.