

**Academic Foundations Committee  
Minutes**

February 6, 2007

<b>Present:</b>	Oliver Chen Mark Hardt Susan Baack James Ellis (student)	Dan Gretch Connie Landis Jane Howell Alicia Esteves (student)
<b>Absent:</b>	Abbas Heiat – <i>excused</i> David Garloff – ex-officio Gary Young – ex-officio Karen Heikel – ex-officio George White – ex-officio	Tasneem Khaleel – ex-officio Mary Susan Fishbaugh – ex-officio John Cech – ex-officio Stacy Klippenstein – ex-officio
<b>Presiding:</b>	Mark Hardt, Chairperson	

---

Connie Landis called the meeting to order at 3:43 p.m. in the Bridger room of the SUB, and then handed the meeting over to Mark Hardt.

The minutes of December 5 were accepted as presented.

I. Discussion/Action Items

**A. Academic Foundations Catalog Copy (including Writing, Technology, and Experiential Learning Requirements)**

It was noted that the AFC should recommend to the Senate that a list of WR courses be put together and that students actually be required to take one or two of them.

It was noted that the current general education section of the catalog has this to say about technology requirements: “Basic computer literacy competencies are demonstrated by passing a general computing exam.” Surely students have not been tested on this at all and probably never have.

It was also noted that the bullets listed for technology literacy (from the current general education) are more appropriate to a computer science major:

*Prior to graduation students are expected to:*

- *demonstrate basic understanding of what computer systems are and how they work*
- *pass a basic computer vocabulary test*
- *demonstrate how to operate a microcomputer in a work-related situation (i.e., use a windows-based environment, be proficient in word processing; be able to use electronic mail, perform network searches)*
- *describe how computer applications impact everyday life and their major area of study*
- *describe current trends in information technology and their social implications*

It was noted that the entire technology section needs to be re-written, and it should say something like “students should be proficient in the use of computers and other digital applications as needed for their majors.” Connie Landis and Jane Howell agreed to revise the technology requirement for the next meeting.

It was noted that once the AFC has revised the Writing, Technology, and Experiential Learning Requirements, we should recommend to the Academic Senate that Departments and Programs identify WR, TN, and EL courses and that these be reflected in plans of study/advising sheets.

## **B. Assessment Measures Received in December, 2006**

It was noted that two different assessments were received for COMT 130 Introduction to Public Speaking: one for the main campus and one for the COT. They should probably be combined.

It was noted that the Committee members should probably contact via email the instructors who have not turned in their assessment instruments. It was stated that a standard introductory paragraph for these emails to instructors would be very handy. Dr. Hardt stated that he would work something up.

It was observed that some of the assessment instruments are not specific, i.e., they state that an objective will be assessed by “exam results” or “projects.” If the instruments are not specific enough, we should send them back for revision.

It was agreed that the Committee members will review the assessment instruments and bring the questionable submissions up in the next meeting.

The question was raised as to what happens if an instructor or department refuses to do assessment. It was noted that the assessment is an integral part of Academic Foundations and if the course is not being assessed, it can't be in Academic Foundations.

## **C. Scale for Assessment Results**

It was cited that if a 10-point scale is used, there will be difficulty recording results of multiple choice questions. It was noted that the instructor could enter the percentage of students who got the question right. Or, the instructor could simply enter a 10 for a correct answer and a 0 for an incorrect answer. It was further noted that we could also use decimal points on the 10-point scale, if it would make people more comfortable.

It was noted that it would be useful to have a measurement at both the beginning and end of each semester, although that is up to the instructor.

It was stated that the difficult part will be deciding the cut-off for low scores. What is the lowest score an Academic Foundations course can get?

It was cited that we will have to make sure the instructors understand the scale. It was remarked that the score on Academic Foundations objectives will be no different than a grade.

It was observed that we will have to track results by individual student so the results can be manipulated in different ways: gender, ethnic groups, transfer vs. non-transfer students, etc.

It was stated that the scantron machines we have now can give question-by-question results when used in conjunction with the software Information Technology has obtained. It was noted that the instructor doesn't necessarily need to enter all of the assessment results during the semester. That inputting can be done in the summer, and by someone besides the instructor.

The meeting adjourned at 5:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Rita J. Rabe Meduna.