Members attending: Mary Rose Williams (Chair), David Van Buren, Nancy Turner, Beth Frieders, Phil Sealy, Irfan Ul-Haq, Kevin Haertzen, Shane Drefcinski, Frank Steck.

Mary Rose Williams called the meeting to order at 4:04 PM.

Agenda Item #1—The minutes of the January 7, 2008 meeting were approved.

Agenda Item #2—Announcements:

David Van Buren introduced a letter from System, requesting feedback on granting credit—for purposes of admission to UW-system schools—as a science credit. The issue is to be addressed at the next meeting.

Shane Drefcinski asked committee what to do with Fine Arts and Foreign Languages?
   Should ASC invite representatives from each area in to talk about outcomes (pg. 28 University Catalog)?
   Should outcomes be changed? Or should they be forced to live up to existing outcomes?
   The Higher Learning Commission has already looked at some of these issues and has found:
      Senior survey results are pretty good resource.
      Faculty meet informally to talk about outcomes.
      Math Department gives some very precise exams.
      Ethnic Studies does a “pre-test/post-test” to test outcomes.
      English Comp has done a “one-time” assessment of Freshman Composition papers.
   This also raises the question of Academic Standards Committee to other campus committees such as Assessment Oversight Committee?

   Even within an area, such as Fine Arts, do you measure Art Appreciation differently than Music Appreciation, differently from Introduction to Theater?

David Van Buren further asked, “What makes a course general education versus the first course in a major?”

Phil Sealy recommended that the areas identified be invited to discuss what assessment has taken place. Mary Rose will contact Dan Fairchild regarding Art, Theater and Music. She and Dan will arrange times when they can meet with the committee. At some later time, Women’s Studies and Ethnic Studies will be contacted as well. There was a consensus among committee members to follow this course of action.

Committee Purpose

A discussion of the purpose of Academic Standards:
Phil Sealy suggested there was concern for admission standards in a climate of “open access” admissions policy.
David Van Buren indicated that while faculty controls curriculum, the Chancellor actually has authorization for admissions policy. Academic Standards Committee can only make recommendations to the Chancellor/Faculty Senate.
Beth Frieders reminded Committee of Philip Parker’s report on admissions and retention. Phil Sealy promised to share results of Parker’s report with members of ASC.

Sealy wanted to see the ACT scores of new admits (UWP) to ACT scores of students enrolling at other UW-System schools. This might give us a better idea of the “attrition” that’s occurring, comparing one major to the other and whether these students ultimately graduate from UWP.

David Van Buren suggested we might want to compare graduation rates of all UW-System schools. This would have to include 6 yr. Graduation rates because so few students are graduating in 4 years.

Mary Rose Williams suggested that topics for the next meeting include:

1) Project Lead the Way—UWP’s perspective on giving science credit—for purposes of admission—to UW-Platteville.

2) Questions that need to be asked of institutional researcher.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:00 PM.