

MINUTES
Of The Meeting
Of
THE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Thursday, January 31, 1980
3:30-5:00 p.m.
Room 2067 Cushwa Hall

Present: Dr. Baldino Dr. Kougl
 Dr. Hahn Dr. Munro
 Dr. Hill Dr. Richley
 Dr. Hovey Dr. Scriven
 Dr. Khawaja

ACTIONS

1. Before calling the meeting to order, Dr. Hill advised the committee of two amendments to the minutes: To Dr. Hahn's statement on page two was added "the requirement of 15 elective hours is not consistent with the statement, '...may choose six or more hours...'" On page four, Dr. Hovey's statement was completed by adding the words, "report to the Senate that the Academic Affairs Committee made an interpretation, or the matter be presented to the Senate for their vote."

Dr. Hill asked if there were any other changes.

Dr. Munro referred to his statement on page 2, paragraph 6, of number 5; he said the correct initials are actually ECPD.

Dr. Hill asked for a motion on the minutes. Dr. Munro moved acceptance. Dr. Scriven seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.

2. There was discussion about the minutes. Some members expressed that a detailed account of the meeting is not necessary, while others felt it necessary for the sake of future reference.

One suggestion was to record only the actions. Another suggestion was to record only actions and pertinent discussions. It was recommended by one member that perhaps names simply be omitted from statements.

A consensus was not reached; it was left up to the discretion of the chairman.

3. Dr. Slawewski arrived. He distributed a sheet containing the curriculum for the degree of Bachelor of Engineering with the major in metallurgical engineering.

Dr. Hill began the discussion. The question was asked if the department name would be changed if there is no longer any materials science.

Dr. Slawecki said, yes.

Dr. Slawecki was asked to explain about the electives. He said that since they have no electives now, there will be uniform electives.

Dr. Slawecki was ^{specified} asked if it is intended to follow-up or generally make available from his department a listing of the electives from which a student may choose.

Dr. Slawecki replied by saying they won't be listed on the curriculum for guidance of the students, but that they will be listed with the courses that are already listed in the catalog.

A committee member expressed that it was a feeling that there was going to be a change in the name of the courses without any change in the course description. He asked if this is justified.

Dr. Slawecki said it was so, and he gave an example.

Dr. Slawecki pointed out that originally all of these courses were under metallurgical engineering. There were three options; because two of the three options were materials science, the name was changed to materials science. He said that what is being done now is simply a conversion back to the original name of the program.

Dr. Slawecki said that though it seems like a minor change, to his department it is a profound one when it comes to accreditation. As materials science, the inspectors sent are scientists rather than engineers who can better appreciate the various aspects of the program.

A member asked if it has to be approved at the state level and had he talked to Dr. Edgar about this.

Dr. Slawecki said that to his knowledge the name change has never been approved on the state level. He said he had talked to Dr. Edgar, and it was mentioned during their conversation that "perhaps" it should go to the Board of Trustees, but state level was not mentioned. Dr. Slawecki also pointed out that since it is not a new program, it may not be required to go to the state level.

The questioning ended. Dr. Munro made a motion to approve and recommend it to the Senate. Dr. Richley seconded the motion. Dr. Hill asked for further discussion. The motion was approved.

4. There was preliminary discussion of the Honors Program before the two guests were scheduled to arrive.

The committee reviewed together a schedule of the Honors courses offered, a copy of which was given to each member before the meeting began.

Dr. Hill asked if the committee would like to talk about the protocols.

It was voiced that they are not too exclusive.

5. Dr. Hill invited the guests, Dr. Altinger and Mr. Baer, into the meeting. The discussion began.

A question was asked about the distinction between a Honors seminar and Honors course.

Mr. Baer replied that the seminar is offered when a proposal is received. It is listed under University Honors Seminar; it is a separate listing under the 700's in the Arts and Sciences.

A question was posed about the University Honors Seminar, asking if this is something that is limited to one such seminar that is offered at a given time.

Dr. Altinger said that that is pretty much what it is. Dr. Altinger said that there is a proposal before the University Curriculum Committee to extend the Honors seminars to 500, 600, and 800 listings.

It was asked if the seminars would have three different levels. The guests indicated that this was correct.

A member said that the impression was that University Honors Seminars would be offered only by the College of Arts and Sciences by virtue of the fact that that is how it appeared in the catalog.

Dr. Altinger said they are trying to get the listing out of the Arts and Science section. The seminar can be taken by any school in the University.

There was a question raised on point number three of the Minimum Standards for Honors Courses and Seminars. It was felt that it should read Honors "courses" or "seminars" rather than Honors "program."

It was asked if the student has to be in the Honors Program to take the Honors Seminar.

Mr. Baer said, "Not necessarily; these standards were built in to be flexible."

There was considerable discussion concerning the content of the Honors courses, whether it would be just different from other courses or of greater depth.

Dr. Altinger then said it is a matter of judgment call. He said that what it comes down to is three different criteria: acceleration, depth, or amount of work.

A committee member commented that the very word "Honors" connotes a certain quality about the course rather than the student. He said he would like to see standards that describe criteria that identify the course instead of the student.

A committee member then asked the guests ~~if what they are wanting is~~ ^{it is they want from} ~~the AAS revision so that the committee can endorse it.~~ The two said that they want the support of the Academic Affairs Committee before taking it to the Senate.

Dr. Hill asked if they would be willing to do some more work on these areas that have raised questions. They agreed to expand on the areas indicated.

There were additional questions from the committee. Then Dr. Hill said he feels the committee is saying that there are two parts to this, the matter of content and rigor.

Dr. Hill said that after the proposal goes to the appropriate curriculum committee, it is not stated if it goes to the Senate and who finally approves it.

The guests said that it follows the same procedure as a non-honors, with the exception that the Senate Curriculum Committee will hopefully send a copy to the Honors Committee.

It was asked if the Honors Committee is the final word. They answered, saying that the Honors Committee is not the final word; if they object, as with any other course, it will eventually go to the Senate floor.

A member of the committee asked what the criteria for getting out of the program would be. They replied that the student would not be pushed out in any way, but that the program is flexible.

6. Discussion continued for a short time. Then adjournment was moved by Dr. Richley and seconded by Dr. Khawaja.

The meeting was adjourned.