Minutes for Academic Standards Committee Meeting
Friday 1 March 2002, 261 Gardner Hall, 2:10-3:10 pm.

Members Present: Elizabeth Gates, Ted Parsons, Steve Steiner, Beth Frieders
Ex-Officio: David Boyles

Agenda items:
1) Discuss with Dick Schumacher, Dean of Admissions and Enrollment Standards, the information we would like to request and review.
   Beth has contacted Dick Schumacher, who is willing to assist, but was unable to have a discussion with him before the meeting. Dick was unable to attend this meeting. Tabled until next meeting.

2) Discuss election procedures
   Beth contact John Krogman (chair of Faculty Senate), who said that he would have the Senate Elections Committee work on elections for this semester. David Boyles suggested that the colleges do the elections, not Faculty Senate and he would discuss this with John Krogman and report to us at the next meeting.
   We discussed continuity of committee members between this year and next year, so ensure that wheels are not reinvented and to explain the events that transpired this year, and what are thoughts are for doing things as we are. The committee came up with several options: i) some of the current committee members get elected; ii) some of the current members serve ad hoc on next year's committee, at least for a short time to answer questions; iii) David Boyles and David van Buren automatically will be serving ad hoc on next year's committee and thus will be the transition.

3) Approve phrasing of partial cover letter draft, to be sent to departments being reviewed, covering "requested information" and how to handle multiple section/ instructor courses.
   Revision of draft letter is attached.
   Items discussed:
   - We decided that Winterim and Summer session courses or sections also should be included along with Spring and Fall Semester courses.
   - There was concern about the phrasing in the cover letter draft #1 "...the committee may choose to review only a sample of the reports; in this case, at least 50% of the instructors for a course will be reviewed." Thoughts were that faculty and dept chairs might be irritated/ upset at going through all the work to compile info knowing that perhaps only 50% of it would be reviewed. Agreement was to keep the >50% revision in the "official committee rulebook" but to be more vague in the coverletter - see draft #2.
   - We agreed that instructors will remain anonymous during the review process. Files will be sent to the Director of General Education who will encode individual instructors, but keep the codes so that s/ he can inform instructors of committee review outcome.
   - It was decided that each different instructor for a laboratory or discussion section of a course also must submit information for review, if there are multiple instructors.
4) Discuss other ideas and issues to go into the cover letter -- how to phrase competencies/standards.
   - We decided that we would not require submission of graded student work. If an instructor chooses to submit this as supporting documentation, s/he may.
   - The basic general education standards headings need to be included in the letter, referring instructors to the full description in the student catalog.
   - We discussed again what specific information instructors must provide in their packet (mandatory):
     - A syllabus (either a common one or instructor-specific)
     - At least one exam and quiz
     - At least one assignment or activity that clearly assess or address the education standards.
     - A narrative statement. Rationale is that this is where instructors can actually explain how they address the different education standards. Such information may be difficult to relate by simply providing a syllabus or exam, or may be dealt with through in-class discussions or activities for which there is no hard documentation.

5) What does "significant writing component" mean? Should it be the same standard for each discipline?
   Tabled until next meeting. David Boyles will check with UUCC to see if they already have a definition of this.

6) What options can we come up with for the actual evaluation -- do we give numerical scores in categories or submit a written subjective evaluation....
   Tabled until next meeting.

7) Next meeting
   Tuesday 12 March 2002, 8:30 am to ~9:45 am, in 261 Gardner Hall.
   Any volunteers to bring donuts??????