Academic Standards Committee  
**Minutes** of meeting held Wednesday 23 April 2003  
4-5:15 pm, 261 Gardner Hall

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

**Meeting agenda**

1. Approve minutes of 9 April 2003 meeting (on S-drive and distributed by email from Julie)  
   OK as distributed.  (One small typo.)

2. Comments about committee report to UUCC (on 16 April)  
   UUCC will take up the discussion in the fall.  At that time, ASC should ask UUCC to take immediate action on enforcement issues.  *(ASC will have to prioritize the issues.)*

3. Faculty Senate vote to change membership (vote on 22 April)  
   The Faculty Senate approved the change in membership.  BILSA and LAE have elections in progress.

4. Discussion of admissions issues, what to do and where to go now – refer to the following (all available on S-drive)  
   - minutes of last meeting  
   - my email to Abdol Soofi on 9 April  
   - email memo by Abdol Soofi dated 10 April  
   - PowerPoint presentation distributed by Abdol on 10 April

   Beth obtained copies of the Admission Requirements for Fall 2003 (although document mistakenly says Fall 2004).  
   She summarized her discussion with Dick Shumacher, Dean of Enrollment Management:

   The guidelines under the 1\textsuperscript{st} bullet of Category I are mandated by the Board of Regents (although each campus does have some flexibility in interpreting what constitutes each type of course).  The 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 3\textsuperscript{rd} bullets are criteria set by UWP.  
   
   The existence of Category II (Discretionary and Exceptional) are allowed by the Board of Regents, but criteria for Category II is determined locally.  
   
   Another Board of Regent mandate is that no more than 17\% of the student body can be admitted in the Exceptional category.  (UWP is at approximately 3\%, and this is in traditional on-campus students, not in distance ed or transfers.)  
   
   As for the local UWP policy/procedure:  
   Dick Schumacher would discuss admission issues with other system deans, particularly, Stout, LaCrosse, and Whitewater.  Dick then makes recommendations
for admission standards to the Vice-Chancellor who then makes a recommendation to the Chancellor. (Thus, it seems that only 3 people are involved at the local level in determining admission standards.)

The consensus was that, in addition to starting to collect data now given the new admission standards, we still need to try to collect old data to start looking for trends in admissions. We must be very careful, however, to separate admissions issues from recruitment issues. On the other hand, if, perhaps, we note that we are low in a particular admission category, our recommendation may include references to recruitment.

The new director for Admissions had not yet been announced. However, when the position is filled, it will provide a great opportunity for ASC to discuss admission procedures with the new director. We will not, necessarily, be interested in discussing day-to-day monitoring issues. Our primary objective is to have a voice with the new director in creating the admissions process. This is a greater objective than generating a multitude of recommendations.

Future issues to discuss:

-- What does the administrative code and the University bylaws say about the faculty role in administrative policies or processes, particularly admissions policies or processes?

-- Where do distance ed students fit? Transfers? Exceptional (since many are non-traditional)?

-- Should College 101 be required of some/all students? ASC should contact Becky Peters (and perhaps Joanne Wilson) regarding student attitudes about College 101.

5. Other (things to do)

-- Christina volunteered to receive the portfolios that would be submitted in the fall. ASC will send an email notice of this at the beginning of the fall term.

-- ASC members should look over the portfolios they reviewed to find examples of “good” portfolios.

-- The original version of the submitted portfolios will be kept for the upcoming NCA review. However, each ASC member should shred the copies of the portfolios they had received. Some of our colleagues submitted copies of exams that they do not want released.

-- Set-up meeting with new director of Admissions.

6. Thanks to all who have served!!!