

Minutes

Academic Standards & Events Committee
15th Meeting, February 22, 1984

Present: Peter von Ostwalden, Chairman; Braden, Earnhart, Hassell, McGraw, Munro, Rost, Scriven

The meeting was called to order at 4:10 p.m.

OLD BUSINESS

1. The Minutes of February 15 were approved as corrected:
 - Present: add Rost
 - Number 5., (2)b. was eliminated because further examination of any course is considered irrelevant at this stage of our proceedings.
 - Number 5., (4)b. was corrected to read: "It is not likely that any one department will be overloaded with students."
2. Dean McGraw has asked the Academic Deans and the Provost to provide any input at the Senate Meeting of March 7 that they feel would benefit the issue of Minimum Graduation Requirements.
3. Chairman's Announcements:
 - a. Dr. Viehmeyer will attend our next meeting of February 29 to discuss "Courses Stipulated as Meeting Area Requirements." A second issue, the "Grading System Proposed by the English Department," will be discussed at a later date.
 - b. The Committee was asked if they would prefer to be seated as a group at the Senate Meeting of March 7. The response was negative.

NEW BUSINESS

1. Our discussion of the nine "problem" areas (listed in the Minutes of our Feb.15 meeting) was continued:
 - (6) Reduction of the Social Science Requirement (16 q.h. to 12 q.h.)
 - a. The whole of our Proposal seeks to establish a balance between (the minimum general requirements of) the areas of Humanities, Social Science, and Science/Mathematics.
 - b. If the individual colleges complete the task of adding to our proposed requirements, there will not be a great shift in any degree requirements.
 - c. The "value judgement" of certain departments may be a powerful determining factor in hindering the acceptance of our Proposal.
 - d. Every department could make a strong argument as to why a student would benefit from taking their "course" or "courses." Our Committee could not possibly dictate a proposal that would completely secure the welfare of each individual department.

- (7) Reduction of the Total Hours (60 q.h. to 51-52 q.h.)
- a. The "sliding scale" is not understood by many people. We did not intend to include it in our Proposal.
 - b. The Proposal provides more academic freedom to the individual colleges.
 - c. There is no need to add more hours to our proposed general requirements, as courses that will be taken in a student's major will automatically fill up the overall requirement. A program does not necessarily change along with the minimum general requirements.
 - d. There has always been a concern that the University will increase its general requirements— We have only improved the requirements.
 - e. Any change in the quality, if any, that may be a result of the decrease in required hours from 60 to 51-52 q.h., would be almost impossible to prove. That is not our concern.
- (8) Implementation of an English Proficiency Exam
- a. The English Department seems to maintain that a proficiency exam would be impossible to staff and very difficult to grade. One suggestion is that the English professors establish a simplified, common method of teaching so that the proficiency exam could be more easily administered. A student's style of writing should not be among the concerns of the instructor.
 - b. The English Department would be given as much freedom as would be necessary to develop and implement the exam.
 - c. The English Department should be asked whether, with a provision of additional funds, manpower, or any other necessary resources, they could implement the proficiency examination. A committee could be assembled to judge the quality of such an exam before it is administered.
- (9) Mathematics
- a. The mandation of a general "practical math" course was mentioned. Our Proposal could provide for the establishment of Testing Out procedures.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jo Ellen Hall

Jo Ellen Hall, Secretary
P. von Ostwalden

cc: Dr. B.T. Gillis
Provost

- attachments

(A)

Members: Please study
the enclosed
P.H.V.O.

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

TO Dr. Peter von Ostwalden, Chairman, Academic Standards
and Events Committee (Chemistry Department)

DATE 18 January 1984

FROM Larry E. Esterly, Chairman, Senate Executive Committee

L. Esterly

SUBJECT

Attached you will find a copy of the memo of Dr. L. Allen Viehmeyer, Chairman, Curriculum Division of Academic Programs and Curriculum Committee. After consideration by the Senate Executive Committee at its meeting of 17 January 1984, said memo is being forwarded to the Academic Standards and Events Committee for review of the four stated "questions," and for the possible recommendation of policy and procedure as to the issues raised by these questions.

As, perhaps, the full dimension of these four questions will not be immediately apparent, I would suggest that you, and possibly even the full membership of the Academic Standards and Events Committee, schedule a meeting with Dr. Viehmeyer and Dr. Duane Rost, who serves as general chairman of the Academic Programs and Curriculum Committee.

- cc: Dr. L. Allen Viehmeyer, Chairman, Curriculum Division, Academic Programs and Curriculum Committee (Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures)
Dr. Duane Rost, Chairman, Academic Programs and Curriculum Committee (Department of Electrical Engineering)
Dr. Bernard Gillis, Provost
-

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

TO : Professor Larry Esterly, Chairman
The Academic Senate

FROM : L. Allen Viehmeyer, Chairman *AV*
The University Curriculum Division

DATE January 10, 19

SUBJECT: Courses Which Satisfy Area Requirements

In the course of our committee work, we have encountered the question of whose authority it is to determine which specific courses carry, or may carry, credit toward an area exit requirement. Our committee feels that it does not have this authority and consequently must refuse to approve any course which makes any reference to fulfilling, or possibly fulfilling, an area requirement in its description.

Our committee feels that several questions need to be addressed by the Senate Executive Committee as quickly as possible.

1. Who is to determine which specific courses currently in the University Inventory of Courses satisfy area requirements?
2. Who is to determine which specific courses proposed as additions (or changes) will satisfy area requirements?
3. Who is authorized to draw up lists of courses which fulfill area requirements; by what means are such lists permitted to be disseminated?
4. Can individual departments create subsets of courses from all possible courses recognized as fulfilling an area requirement and require their majors to select only the courses on the restricted list?

cla

(11)
INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

TO Dr. L. Allen Viehmeyer, Chairman, Curriculum Division DATE 26 January 1984
Dr. Peter von Ostwalden, Chairman, Academic Standards and Events Committee

FROM Larry E. Esterly, Chairman, Senate Executive Committee

L. E. Esterly

(A)
SUBJECT: Courses Stipulated As Meeting Area Requirements.

In the instance that the Curriculum Division of Academic Programs and Curriculum Committee, relative to a given course proposal, should have a question as to a particular course being designated as meeting (in part) a university-wide area requirement (in the Humanities, Social Sciences, Sciences, Health-Physical Education, English Composition) and to the degree that the Curriculum Division would be unable further to process the course proposal without clarification on the above question, the Senate Executive Committee recommends that the Curriculum Division, exercising its discretion and at its initiative, secure an advisory opinion from Academic Standards and Events Committee.

cc: Dr. Duane Rost, Chairman, Academic Programs and Curriculum Committee
Dr. Bernard Gillis, Provost

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

TO : Dr. Peter Von Ostwalden, Chairperson
Academic Standards and Events

FROM : L. Allen Viehmeyer, Chairperson AN
University Curriculum Division

DATE February 14, 1984

*Acad. Stds & Ev. Comm,
members: Please, study
the enclosed!*

SUBJECT: Grading System Proposed by English Department
UCD # 84-70 to 84-73, 84-75, 84-76

P.V.O.

Our committee received the enclosed course proposals from the English Department two months ago.

Because these proposals stipulate a grading system which deviates from those listed on pages 49, 50, 51 of the 1983-1984 Bulletin, and because the current grade scan sheets, respectively, the computer program for processing grades, is not designed to handle the proposed grading system, our committee has voiced its objection and concern to the English Department and has maintained that the proposed grading system must be approved by the Academic Senate. The English Department, however, seems to believe that Senate approval of its new grading system is unnecessary.

The University Curriculum Division, nevertheless, feels strongly that no single department should have the ultimate authority to promulgate its unique grading system(s). We firmly believe that the uncontrolled introduction of grading systems is unwise.

The University Curriculum Division hereby requests that the Committee on Academic Standards and Events study the principles and procedures involved and recommend whatever action it deems appropriate.

cla

Enclosures

cc Dr. Barbara H. Brothers, Chairperson, English
Professor Larry E. Esterly, Chairperson, The Academic Senate

(2)

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

TO : The Provost, Academic Deans,
Department Chairpersons

DATE February 3, 1984

FROM : L. Allen Viehmeyer, Chairperson ✓
The University Curriculum Division

SUBJECT: Curriculum Proposals 84-70 to 84-76

The University Curriculum Division is circulating these English curriculum proposals at this time with the knowledge that the A, B, C/NC grading system included in the proposals is a change from the current Senate approved grading system A, B, C/NE. Pending no other objections, these course proposals will be forwarded to the Academic Senate only upon approval of the proposed grading system.

cla

cc Larry Esterly, Chairperson
The Academic Senate

15

The following statement is offered as background information to the revisions of the composition courses which are before your committee for consideration. The changes in the courses which satisfy the university requirement in Basic Composition will, we believe, constitute a program best suited to the needs of our students and our university.

- I. The review of the composition courses was undertaken because of the following problems:
 1. The existing course descriptions fail to reflect current practice in the classroom and/or research about the teaching of composition.
 2. Thirty-six to forty percent of students over the last several years test below the standard deemed necessary for entrance into regular English 550 courses. Current departmental practices of offering developmental sections of English 550 and use of the NE grade have not been successful alternatives to bring these students up to the level required for successful completion of the sequence, as witnessed by the forty to sixty percent attrition/failure rate in English 551.
 3. The administration has requested a review of the A B C / NE grade.
- II. The courses as revised offer the following solutions to these problems:
 1. The description of each course has been rewritten to reflect current theory and practice and especially to integrate reading and writing instruction.
 2. Entrance requirements have been established for 550 to better insure that students have the skills necessary for successful completion of the course; appropriate courses to provide students with the instruction needed to bring them to those entrance standards are offered.
 3. The grading pattern in all courses has been changed to A B C / NC, thus providing a clearer picture of students' progress in the sequence while giving them an opportunity to improve their skills without penalty to the GPA.

CDC # 84-70 Date Rec'd. 12/6/83 IP Code

Academic Program COMPOSITION, ENGLISH Department ENGLISH

Deletion of _____ (Complete A and C)

Addition of _____ (Complete B and C)

Change of ENGLISH 520 (Complete A, B and C)

Chairperson's Signature Barbara Botkins Date 6/13/83

A To delete or change an existing course, attach a clear photocopy or the course description in the current catalog, and list the page number.

520. Basic Writing Workshop. Skills necessary for accurate and effective writing. Focus is on sentences: their syntax, punctuation, and varieties. Students meet three hours a week in class and three hours a week in the writing center. Does not count toward the graduation requirement in basic composition or the humanities area. 4 q.h.

B To add or change a course, provide the course description precisely as it is to appear in the catalog.

520. Basic Writing Workshop. Instruction in the skill necessary for accurate and effective writing. Focus is the writing of syntactically well-formed and properly punctuated sentences and on the development of a variety of effective sentence patterns coherently arranged within compositions. Students meet three hours per week for lecture and three hours per week for individualized instruction. Does not count toward the graduation requirement in composition. Open to students on the basis of English Placement Test Results. Grading for English 520 will be A,B,C/NC. 4 q.h.

C Justify the curriculum proposal, using additional sheets if necessary. Qualified faculty must be listed for a new course. Assurances must be provided that library resources and/or physical plant facilities are or will be available.

FOR JUSTIFICATION, PLEASE SEE ATTACHED SHEET

-- Check if course proposal adoption will affect another academic program in the University.
Cross-list with _____ (department and course number)

Signatures	Approval	Disapproval	Date
School/College Curr. Comm. <u>Lella Liplak</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>10/26/83</u>
Dean <u>B. J. Yozwiak</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>11/1/83</u>
University Curr. Div. Comm. _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
Academic Senate _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____