

MINUTES OF MEETING OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

February 23, 1978

4:00 p.m.

Present: Shuster, Kougl, Quinby, Hill, Skarote, Scriven, Richley, Vogel, Edgar

Actions:

Minutes of the last meeting were moved for approval by Dr. Scriven and seconded by Mr. Quinby. Motion passed unanimously.

1. Recalculation of the grade point average

Dr. Scriven reported that after discussing the recalculation with his colleagues he decided that the wording of the Paraska memo should remain as it is. He felt that employers may be confused by transcripts with only two of several repetitions of courses being involved in recalculation.

The committee discussed the possibility of either substituting a term other than "post baccalaureate" in the proposal or perhaps a general reference to taking undergraduate courses would be appropriate.

Dr. Vogel stated that he felt that the statement concerning recalculation in the catalogue is less discriminatory than that which is proposed.

The item will be put back on the agenda for further discussion.

2. Continuing Education Unit

Guests: Dr. Snozek, Elementary Education
Dr. Baldino, Foundations

Dr. Snozek stated that she was not opposed to the concept of the continuing education unit but that she was concerned about the guidelines set up for awarding it. She felt that the draft did not account for what will happen to a course which a department has rejected. (Reference is made to Senate proposal of February 3, 1978) She questioned who would have the autonomy to decide what would happen to the course which awards CEU's. She stated that she felt the draft needed guidelines for quality and also for autonomy of the academic department in awarding CEU's.

The committee questioned her on what she felt would happen if a department rejected the credit and the CED decided to offer the course without credit.

Dr. Snozek responded that there would be a question of who would teach the course. She said that she felt that people outside the university do not understand the difference between an academic credit and a CEU credit. She felt that this misunderstanding might eventually lead to the granting of academic credit for a CEU course.

The committee questioned Dr. Snozek whether she would accept CEU if guidelines were incorporated.

Dr. Snozek responded that she would accept CEU if the guidelines were to insure the quality of the courses and the autonomy of the academic departments relative to awarding them.

The committee asked her if she felt CEU was a concern only with the School of Education.

Dr. Snozek responded that she felt it should be a total university concern.

The committee questioned whether school systems would recognize CEU's for financial promotion.

Dr. Hill responded that some schools in New York state already recognize CEU's and that some local superintendants indicated that they would also, according to a report from Dr. Feldmiller. *check*

Dr. Baldino stated that school boards can recognize what they want to. He said he felt that "academic value" mentioned on page 5 of the proposal might lead to academic credit.

The committee questioned whether there were national guidelines for CEU.

Dr. Baldino indicated that there were limitations of where CEU credits shall be awarded but no guidelines of when CEU credits should not be awarded.

Dr. Snozek offered to send the committee guidelines set up by other educational institutions. She said that she did not feel that the CEU would not benefit Y.S.U. or that it couldn't work but she felt that the proposal needed quality guidelines in order for it to do so. She said that she felt that the proposal should be studied before passing through the Senate.

Dr. Baldino suggested that the CEU proposal should be studied in conjunction with a review of the 1972 Senate description of Document of Operations of Continuing Education, to alleviate any conflicts.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.