

Minutes
Academic Standards Committee
School of Education

Meeting #1

September 19, 1978

Present: P. Baldino, A. Moore, M. Moran, F. Feitler, C. Smith,
C. Vanaman, K. Picciano, G. Drew

P. Baldino: As chairperson, P. Baldino read the charge which had been given to the Committee previously by A. Moore. Subsequently, he stressed the importance of the Committee's addressing itself solely to the charge and stated that it would be vital for the group to use candor. He also felt that all policies pertaining to academic standards would need to be codified. C. Smith and C. Vanaman were asked to provide the Committee with a historical sketch of the prior Academic Standards Committees.

C. Smith: The last three School of Education deans have had different perceptions of the responsibilities of the Academic Standards Committee.

C. Vanaman: The following points were made:

1. When the Academic Standards Committee has asked the entire School of Education faculty for action on items, controversy has arisen.
2. In the last eleven years, an effort has been made to use criteria other than G.P.A. for admission to the School of Education, i.e., interviews, test scores, etc. . .
3. Concerning admission requirements, attention must be given to the Buckley Amendment, but we must also comply with O.B.R.'s tendency to promote more rigorous admission and retention standards.
4. For secondary education majors, the G.P.A. criteria is not too important because most of their academic work is done in Arts and Sciences.
5. The rising G.P.A. is a national phenomenon.

M. Moran: Something besides G.P.A. is needed as criteria for admission to the School of Education. Interviews would be desirable.

A. Moore: The following points were made:

1. A basic charge to the Committee is to develop criteria for admission and retention.
2. There is need for policy statements with accompanying procedures for implementation. For example, what procedure would be used if the interview technique were initiated?
3. Criteria should be directly related to the actual teaching activities.

September 19, 1978

4. Criteria cannot conflict with Y.S.U. policy.
5. Criteria cannot be discriminatory.
6. Academic Standards Committee must decide what issues are to be decided upon by the entire School of Education faculty.
7. Can consider criteria like the National Teachers' Exam, health exams, and speech tests.
8. The current School of Education admission policy must be enforced.

F. Feitler: The following points were made:

1. It is important to ask what it means to have standards.
2. Standards and policies are two different entities.
3. There are different issues involved in the requirement for admissions as compared to retention as compared to graduation.
4. It is important to ask about the advantages and disadvantages of the various options open to the School of Education.

G. Levitsky: It is doubtful if model programs are in existence. So called standards, are actually procedural policies or schemes.

K. Picciano: Inconsistent procedures for waiving requirements is an example of an old problem in the School of Education. Decisions are often arbitrary. For example, if substitutions are made for Speech 554 for some people, why not all?

P. Baldino: The following steps need to be taken:

1. All Y.S.U. printed statements pertaining to admission, retention, and graduation need to be codified.
2. Statements need to be obtained from NCATE and the Ohio State Department of Education regarding their views on admission, retention, and graduation criteria other than G.P.A.

G. M. Drew
Secretary, pro tem

nt