

**General Education Committee  
Minutes**

February 24, 2004

<b>Present:</b>	Mark Hardt Connie Landis James Nowlin	Randall Gloege Michael Dennis Squy Wallace
<b>Absent:</b>	Cathey White – <i>ex-officio</i> John Cech – <i>ex-officio</i> Randy Rhine – <i>ex-officio</i> Joe Michels – <i>ex-officio</i> Janie Park – <i>ex-officio</i>	Sandie Rietz – <i>ex-officio</i> Tasneem Khaleel – <i>ex-officio</i> George White – <i>ex-officio</i> Carl Hanson – <i>ex-officio</i> Curt Kochner – <i>ex-officio</i>
<b>Presiding:</b>	Mark Hardt, Chair	

---

Mark Hardt called the meeting to order at 3:40 p.m. in the Lewis & Clark room of the SUB.

The minutes of February 17 were accepted.

I. Double Counting Discussion: Definition

It was noted that if the Academic Senate approves the Gen Ed Proposal, it also needs support from Provost Park. Perhaps the Committee could ask her for a letter endorsing the proposal. It would then be part of the Gen Ed Proposal that goes out to all faculty.

It was noted that double counting is usually thought of as one course that is counted for Gen Ed and cannot be counted in the student's major or minor. It was cited that some students might take a year of biology, or history, etc., and we would make them go back and take a 100 level Gen Ed course? They have already taken more advanced courses, and could be given credit for that. Taking another 100 level course is like a penalty against the student.

It was cited that the Committee should ask for courses that are specifically designed for Gen Ed/Academic Foundations. Therefore, the student should not have to take the same material over again. Current courses in many of the current categories are too specific.

It was noted that a transition period could be implemented, over time moving programs toward no double-counted courses. It was noted that departments may not have time to create a new course, so they may submit the courses they currently offer. The transition period could give them time to develop new Academic Foundations courses.

It was noted that if the Committee receives courses that are truly designed only for Academic Foundations, there should be no double counting. Until that time, however, students should not be forced to take the same thing twice.

It was suggested that students be allowed to double count only one Academic Foundations course that falls in their major.

It was noted that students still have to take 37 credits of Academic Foundations. They could find another course that doesn't double up on what they already have. It was noted that double counting reduces the breadth of knowledge that students are supposed to be getting from Academic Foundations.

It was noted that some faculty may be concerned about losing faculty lines as a result of this new Gen Ed program. It was cited that the new program actually requires more faculty lines, not less. It was suggested that Provost Park could put in her letter of support that Academic Foundations will not serve as a reason to remove faculty lines from a given department.

It was noted that if the Academic Senate and the Provost approve of this revised program, the Committee should ask for a letter from both endorsing the new program. This program should help students and not hurt faculty.

## II. Academic Foundations Faculty

It was noted that the Academic Foundations Faculty would be curricular advisors to the Gen Ed Committee. With the revision of the Gen Ed program, the Academic Foundations Faculty may gain more prestige than they currently have. The Gen Ed Committee could encourage tenure-track faculty to teach Academic Foundations. Students would be thrilled to have senior faculty teaching Academic Foundations courses. Those faculty would hopefully think of teaching in Academic Foundations as an honor.

## III. Academic Foundations Credits

It was noted that the table showing students can take 6-10 credits in some categories may be confusing. It was noted that the upper limit is to guarantee that the two electives (6 credits) the student chooses are not in the same category.

The meeting adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Rita J. Rabe Meduna.