Academic Standards Committee

Minutes of meeting held Wednesday 23 October 2002
4-5 pm, 261 Gardner Hall

Present: (Members) Rosalyn Broussard, Dennis Ciesielski, Christina Curras, Beth Frieders, Julie McDonald, Machelle Schroeder
(Ex Officio) David Boyles, David VanBuren

Meeting agenda

1. Approve minutes of 9 October 2002 meeting (on S-drive and distributed by email from Julie)

   Minutes were approved as distributed. Future minutes will be approved as distributed unless objections are raised.

2. Welcome new LA&E members:
   - Rosalyn Broussard, 3 year term
   - Dennis Ciesielski, 1 year term

   The new members were provided with an overview of the Committee’s duties related to the evaluation of courses meeting general education requirements. It is the role of the Committee to find “glaring exclusions or omissions” to the general education requirements rather than to evaluate individual faculty. As the Committee waits for documents to be submitted for this first review, we are preparing for next year.

3. Approve final(?) version of math memo (distributed by email from Beth and on S-drive)

   The final version of the math memo dated 23 October 2002 was approved. It will be e-mailed to the Department Chair and the Dean with a specific request to forward the e-mail to the department members. A liason will be assigned. (Julie volunteered.)

4. List of Humanities courses compiled by Christina (on S-drive and hardcopies distributed at last meeting):
   - make decision on Phil 3200 (is it humanities?) It no longer exists.
   - other decisions?
     - Second-level-only courses will be evaluated according to the same criteria as any other course. If the second-level-only course fails to meet the standard, the Committee will report such findings to the UGCC.
     - A course that can be used to meet one of two gen. ed. areas (but not both) must be evaluated using the standards from both areas. (Example: Intro to Women’s Studies may be used to meet Social Sciences or Humanities but not both.)
   - divide out the 4 program areas to volunteer committee members to begin creating draft of letter tailored to their program and specific standards as listed in undergrad catalog.
     - English -- Dennis
     - Philosophy -- Julie
     - Women's Studies -- Machelle
     - Ethnic Studies -- Christina
** The volunteers above should have a draft of their letter prepared for the November 13 meeting. This will allow for a final discussion of the department letters at the December 11 meeting.

5. Create 2 sub-groups, each composed of 1 person from each college. Any files to begin review?

   - **Team A** will consist of Beth, Julie, and Rosalyn
   - **Team B** will consist of Christina, Dennis, and Machelle

   - A few files (5?) have been turned in. The Committee would like to have some files brought for the November 13 meeting to read for “practice.” Reading the initial files may also prompt further revisions to the department letters.

6. Admissions Issues - what do we want to do here?

   Reviewing the admissions standards for the University, observing trends, and reporting to the Faculty Senate is the other half of duties assigned to the Committee. The minutes of the April 9, 2002 meeting include a discussion with Dick Schumacher regarding admission standards. There are two categories of admission: regular (which means the student met the admission standards) and discretionary (a student has not met the admission standards but, with Dick’s approval, is admitted).

   The current Committee would like to continue the discussion about admission standards. Mic Viney or Dick Schumacher will be invited to the November 13 meeting. We also feel that there is a need for data analysis. For example: What are the trends? What is the graduation rate among the discretionary admission group? What are the attrition rates? Abdolah Soofi may be invited to a future meeting of the Committee.

   The discussion of admission issues was tabled as the meeting ended.

7. Other

   - Future discussions:
     a) Are we evaluating web-based courses? What is their relation to admissions standards?
     b) With regard to the review of the courses meeting gen. ed. requirements, does a faculty member have an option to appeal the Committee’s findings? For example, if there is a deficiency found in a portfolio, does the faculty member have the right to re-submit documentation. When Dave Boyles contacts the faculty member with the findings of the Committee, does Dave provide the faculty member with a summary of the Committee’s findings or with copies of the reviews done by each individual Committee member?

   - Next meeting will be November 13.