

Academic Foundations Committee
Minutes

January 25, 2005

Present: Mark Hardt
Noreen Lee
Susan Gilbertz
Emily Valenzuela (student)

Connie Landis
Barb Pedula
Lewis Rife (student)

Absent: Stan Wiatr
Randall Gloege *∧ excused*
Carl Hanson – *ex-officio*
John Cech – *ex-officio*
George White – *ex-officio*
Janie Park – *ex-officio*

Abbas Heiat *∧ excused*
Tasneem Khaleel *∧ ex-officio*
Randy Rhine – *ex-officio*
Joe Michels – *ex-officio*
Curt Kochner *∧ ex-officio*

Presiding: Mark Hardt, Chair

Mark Hardt called the meeting to order at 3:50 p.m. in the Madison room of the SUB.

The minutes of December 7 were accepted as presented.

I. Discussion/Action Items

A. Faculty Notification of Committee/Academic Senate Decisions

The Committee was under the impression that the Academic Senate would be notifying the faculty of the changes made in December. It was decided that Mark Hardt and Keith Edgerton, Chair of the Academic Senate, should work together on getting the information out.

It was noted that this Committee should not have to direct the colleges in preparing a package of courses. The colleges wanted to submit packages, and so it is their responsibility to put the packages together. It was noted that the courses should be approved by the College Curriculum Committees.

- Motion by Lewis Rife, seconded by Connie Landis to add signature lines on the Academic Foundations form for the College Curriculum Committee and the Dean.

- Motion carried unanimously.

B. Criteria for Course Inclusion/Exclusion

It was noted that there should be no competition for how many blanks a single course can fill in the matrix. That should make no difference between courses chosen for Academic Foundations.

Preferences for Academic Foundations Courses:

Assessability— Will the course be assessable?

Staffing— Will there be instructors to teach the course?

Basics— Is the course a *foundational* course or too specific?
— Prefer a more basic, college entry-level course

Balance— Need diversity of choices for students

Meets Goals— Does the course meet the needs listed in the bullets?
— Does the course cover what we want them to learn?

Priority— Choose as many high-priority (as indicated by college) courses as possible

It was noted that the Committee members don't know everything about all subjects. How can we judge the best courses? It was noted that these courses are initiated by departments, and the departments and colleges will do some self-selecting. Also, it behooves the departments to explain to the Committee why each course is worthwhile for students to have in their Academic Foundations.

It was stated that hidden prerequisites must be avoided. It was also noted that we must keep the courses rigorous and maintain the integrity of the University.

It was observed that we need a variety of courses because we have a variety of students who have a variety of skill-levels in different disciplines. We have to meet their needs and challenge them, but also we need to have interesting courses that will catch the interest of students.

It was stated that even if this Committee comes up with a