

Minutes of the Meeting of the Academic Affairs Committee
Wednesday, March 7, 1979
3:00 p.m. Conference Room, Dean of Engineering

Present: Dr. Hill, Dr. Baldino, Mr. Skarote, Dr. Scriven,
Mr. Quinby, Dr. Edgar, Dr. Hovey, Dr. Kougl,
Dr. Richley

Actions:

1. Dr. Baldino moved acceptance of the amended minutes of February 28. Seconded by Mr. Quinby. The revised minutes were unanimously approved.

2. Nursing Program:

Dr. Hill summarized the concern; discussion seems to indicate that there is not a new major, as defined by the catalog.

Dr. Richley asked if the question was in name only. The content and level of the new program is different.

Dr. Hovey asked if we could simply give the program a new name, "Professional Nursing", and if the content is sufficiently different to encourage the BS in AS graduates to return for the new BSN Degree.

Dr. Hill answered, if we feel the content of the new program does constitute a new major, we could recommend an exception be made, and suggest a catalog footnote.

Dr. Richley felt that the concept of exception making should be deemphasized and that there should be a strong policy which would require tremendous justification. He felt that departments must be able to prove a significant difference in majors. He suggested, exceptions may be made by the Academic Vice President, who may call on this, or other committees, to justify his approval.

Dr. Scriven was concerned that by referring such cases to the Academic Vice President, individuals may try to convince him of their eligibility for a new degree.

Dr. Richley added that the new program must fulfill all requirements for a major. There are approximately 30 additional hours, an 80% increase over the old program.

Dr. Hill wondered if a former student decides to take the new program, will he be taking new courses, in terms of course content? He added, I don't see how this new program can legitimately be called a new major.

Dr. Scriven added, I don't think the initial majority of students entering the new program will be BS in AS graduates.

Dr. Hill agreed, I don't think many BS in AS Degree holders will want to take the additional hours for the new degree.

Dr. Scriven wondered if all those additional hours were needed, or if the new degree could probably be granted with 27 hours.

Dr. Richley suggested the department identify laterally equivalent courses, so we can see exactly what will be required. We need to know the numbers and titles of these similar courses.

Dr. Scriven agreed that we need to know the specific courses the BS in AS people would have to complete to receive the new degree.

Dr. Hovey asked if we know how many BS in AS graduates are expected to return for the new degree?

Dr. Baldino answered that he didn't think the number expected was large.

Dr. Richley added, when I'm advising students, horizontal courses are flexible and can be substituted for one another.

Dr. Hill received consensus to ask for additional information concerning the questions raised. It may be helpful to have someone attend a meeting to answer these questions.

Dr. Richley added, to make a specific allowance for one department seems to be the wrong way to handle the situation.

Dr. Edgar was concerned with their plans for phasing out the old degree program.

Dr. Scriven answered, according to the department, they have been notifying people for two years. However, I know there will be juniors and seniors, who will be cut off from the old program without completion.

Dr. Richley answered, they have discussed the new program with every student. The implication is that students will be able to finish the old program, or they have been consulted and have decided to go into the new program.

Dr. Hill asked if we know an approximate date for the phasing out of the old program.

Mr. Skarote asked if there was enough of a difference in the two programs, for the catalog ruling not to apply in this case.

Dr. Hill answered that the additional 27 hours does not constitute a new major. He added, we have a technical issue over the number of hours and other criteria which constitute a new major.

3. General Education Advisory Committee:

Dr. Hill summarized; I compiled this draft in an attempt to meet the interests of the various schools and still keep the committee size workable.

Mr. Quinby asked Dr. Hill if he was asking the Deans for specific recommendations.

Dr. Hill answered, I'm suggesting sitting down with the Deans to discuss the appointments and make them aware of our concerns. I would eventually make the decision from their recommendations.

Dr. Baldino asked if he had imposed conditions on who these six individuals might be.

Dr. Hill answered that the Deans may propose whomever they choose. He suggested it may be wise to appoint a new member of the AAC to serve as the new committee Chairman, so as to be able to follow the work of the new committee to its close.

Dr. Edgar was concerned with point number three under Committee Charge of the draft. He suggested the emphasis should be on present general education policy, rather than historical development. We may need recent trends considered, as part of a new developmental program for general education requirements.

Dr. Richley agreed, they may see item #3 as a significant part of their charge, whereas it is not that vital.

Dr. Hill disagreed and thought the historical aspect a very vital concern.

Dr. Edgar added, they have to relate the historical aspects to the particular program in our School.

Dr. Hill added, if the charge remains basically the same, items #1 and 3 could be changed in order.

Dr. Scriven was concerned that we don't put limiting factors on the committee.

Dr. Hovey asked Dr. Hill what he expected the final product to look like, will it be ready for insertion in the catalog?

Dr. Hill answered that he did not think the committee should be hemmed in by format.

Dr. Baldino pointed out that there are two minimum requirements; 1) a concept of general education for this University, and 2) what requirements in general education will be expected for students.

Dr. Hovey added, their ultimate outcome will be what is put into the catalog.

Dr. Richley agreed, the end result of this expenditure will be the general education requirements for this University, as evident on pages---- in the catalog.

Dr. Hill pointed out that he wanted to leave the committee free to operate with minimum restrictions.

Dr. Hovey argued that eventually it will have to be presented in a consticted form, why not tell them this.

Dr. Baldino added, focussing on this one aim, pages in the catalog, may lead to patchwork determination.

Dr. Richley argued that their prime concern is the effects of general education requirements in the catalog, so why not initially aim for this?

Dr. Hovey was concerned that the committee may decide to establish an entirely new program, one not envisioned in the current catalog entry. Loose philosophising will not lead to the concrete documentary we need for the catalog.

Dr. Richley suggested that as soon as the committee is structured, we should acquaint the Senate, the Executive Committee, and others of its formulation.

Dr. Baldino thought that the most irrelevant part of the committee's duties would be those pages in the catalog. The catalog is a result of and not a pre-consideration of the study.

Dr. Edgar agreed with Dr. Baldino, obviously the catalog insertion will be a result of the study. I don't think the committee will deviate substantially from their charge.

Dr. Hill agreed and again voiced concern over restricting the committee's work.

Dr. Baldino felt that a rethinking of what general education is about is the major concern. If this is done well, the catalog insertion will fall into place.

Mr. Quinby agreed that philosophical discussions are vital to reach this end. He also wondered if a time limit was mentioned, or should be.

Dr. Edgar felt that we would need periodic reports of progress.

Dr. Hovey was concerned with some past experiences with advisory committees. Their reports were so ambiguous that no one could figure out what direction they took.

In response to a question, Dr. Hill suggested that it may be a year or a year and a half before the committee work is completed.

Dr. Richley was concerned with the amount of work to be done, more time than imagined may be required for completion.

Dr. Baldino suggested a status report by January 1, 1980.

Dr. Hill felt there should be a report every quarter, as minimum.

Mr. Skarote felt there should be some kind of deadline set.

Dr. Hovey asked what kind of staff support the committee will receive.

Dr. Hill answered that Dr. Edgar will provide resources.

Dr. Scriven felt that the committee was in agreement, Dr. Hill should begin formulating membership according to the draft.

Dr. Scriven moved: That the Chairman proceed in identification of the Advisory Committee consistent with the revised draft.
Seconded by Dr. Richley. Unanimously approved.

4. Meeting times for next quarter were established; Wednesdays, 3:00 - 4:30 p.m.

5. Speech:

Dr. Hill summarized; there was no positive or negative action taken on the Speech course proposal in the Senate. It was presented to the AAC, and I don't think we should deny any committee requests for clarification, regardless of our interpretation of the need for the request.

6. The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.