

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

TO Members, Academic Standards and Events Committee

DATE Feb. 3, 1984

FROM P.W. von Ostwalden, Chairman

SUBJECT Our response to Concerns raised in Academic Senate meeting of 2-1-84.

It will be important for our Committee to respond to the concerns and allegations raised at the last Senate meeting. One of us (W. McG.) has made the very commendable effort of instantly formulating some thoughts for a possible reply. Please, study these thoughts (copy enclosed) and be prepared to add to them, or offer modifications, so that we may be able to draft an effective set of answers to be presented by me at the next Senate meeting. We shall discuss this matter at our next meeting on Wednesday, February 8, 4:00 p.m. in Dean McGraw's conference room.

Thank you,



P.W. von Ostwalden

Notes for Standards and Academic Events Committee

1. Response to Yozwiak points.

- a. Sixty credit hours? We must answer this.
change to 48 hrs in all the areas. but every committee decides
- b. Curriculum should prompt altering the facilities, not the reverse.
- c. At no time did we contend that it ^{is currently} was impossible for hours to be added by the individual colleges. We simply think a renewed emphasis upon it is necessary in light of the faculty's need to have direct input into the special programs with which they are associated. By restricting hours to the bare, ground floor requirements, we recognize the growing complexity of the Institution.

Yes, Speech may have to add some faculty resources, but testimony from that Department indicated that it would not be an inordinate addition since % of the student body currently take a course in Speech Communication.

2. Response to points made by Professor Loud

- a. The increased hours in the area of the Humanities it seems to me would increase the likelihood of not only greater interest in foreign languages but in their literature as well.
- b. (Her objection to requiring English 551 before any 700 level course can be taken). Were we to agree to this, it seems to me that it would likely be a concession to foreign language while defeating the purpose of assuring that all students learn how to write as early as possible in their college career. All subsequent work is thereby aided. The work of the vast majority of the students is at issue here and we probably should not be concerned about assuring a few students the right to take 700 level courses as freshmen.

3. Humanities requirement generally.

- a. Perhaps we overlooked the fact that there is some non-English literature in the English Department by virtue of their humanities division. Perhaps an amendment could be offered to the effect that any English Department literature course is appropriate including the humanities courses. We would still be encouraging English and American literature because that is where the preponderance of courses lie but it would not state English and American literature only which, to my mind, is perhaps too restrictive. The humanities courses expose the student the German, French, Italian and Scandinavian literature in translation. This is good.

4. Health and Physical Education

- a. Perhaps someone should point out that the hearings revealed considerable sentiment for dropping H & PE altogether. Our retention of four hours reflects the fact that we were indeed influenced by the testimony of the H & PE faculty.

5. Mathematics

- a. It was our feeling that although in certain subject areas there is a parallel in content and rigor between high school and college, mathematics is not one of these. The majority of students who have had high school mathematics have not had the depth and rigor provided in the comparable college course. Also, mathematics is one of the best courses to assist the student in learning to think systematically and logically and to develop the type of mental skills which can be utilized in all his college work and beyond.

6. General observations.

- a. When taking this together with the new admissions standards, there has been a substantial change, (in response to those who say these represent insignificant improvements.

The requirements have been modified and/or strengthened in light of: 1. today's students' needs; 2. the best consensus we could deduce from the testimony provided in the hearings, and; 3. our own judgment as a committee.

Some of the arguments and reasoning which we are beginning to hear on the floor of the Senate, perhaps, would be more appropriately handled in the college curriculum meetings where the type of broad-based education for the business student, the education student, the engineer and the musician should be discussed.

It is important that someone other than members of this Committee speak for the proposal, particularly those who do not appear to have a vested interest.

jn
2/2/84