

TO: Dr. Barbara Brothers, Chair - Academic Standards
From : Ron Tabak, Physics *R.T.*
Jan. 16, 1985

Barbara:

You were absolutely correct at our last meeting - it is time that members put their suggestions into writing! If not, we could discuss these issues forever and accomplish nothing. My suggestions involve two parallel approaches to better academic standards. (1) Send to the Senate specific recommendations concerning (a) the "inconsistencies" we have been discussing in the catalog and (b) problems that Earnhart and others brought out about scheduling and probation. (2) Form subcommittees to examine the specific areas of the general area requirements and make recommendations. Permit me to discuss each of these separately.

[1a] "INCONSISTENCIES"

(i) Military Science 631 - Land Navigation and Outdoor Survival [previously MS 630 - Map Reading and Land Navigation] may not be used to satisfy the science/math area requirement.

(ii) MS 511 and MS 701 may not be used to satisfy the area requirement in Social Studies.

(iii) No course that is crosslisted between two or more disciplines ["Disciplines" = sciences, social studies, humanities, other] and "team taught" can be used to satisfy any university area requirement. {Example: Biology 789/Sociology 789/Chemical Engineering 789 - Man and the Technological Society}

(iv) [This committee still hasn't clarified the status of Music 520 and several speech courses for satisfying the humanities requirement.]

(v) [Other problems that we have discussed.]

[1b] SCHEDULING and PROBATION

(i) The computer software used for student registration and scheduling must be upgraded! For example, the computer should be able to check on whether a student has satisfied the prerequisites for a course and take the necessary action without direct faculty action.

(ii) Each student will be assigned an advisor, whose name will be automatically printed on his scheduling form. The advisor's signature will be required for all students for both registration and "add/drop". A final copy of the student's schedule will be sent to his advisor, who will have 48 hours in which to take further action.

(iii) No dean will reinstate a student after three suspensions. To be reinstated thereafter, the student must have the approval of the provost.

(iv) [Change the order of registration so that freshmen will register first. This will encourage students to satisfy their university area requirements as soon as possible.]

[2] Four subcommittees should be formed to reexamine the general university area requirements. These would include (a) science/math, (b) social studies, (c) humanities, and (d) "controversial" items. By controversial items, I mean such things as whether Health 590 should be a requirement (or any "activity" course, for that matter!), whether or not we should require one or more speech courses, etc. This subcommittee would

also consider whether upper division courses should be used to satisfy area requirements.

I firmly believe that the "problem" of improving the general university requirements is necessarily a problem primarily of the College of Arts & Sciences. If you will recall what happened when this was discussed in the Senate last spring, the most strenuous objections came from Arts & Sciences departments [Health & PE, Geography, Foreign Languages come to mind]. Unless we do something unreasonable like doubling the present number of required courses in the three areas or require that each student be fluent in a foreign language, I don't believe that the other schools will give our final proposal much trouble if the A & S departments are in basic agreement with it.

In order to accomplish this consensus, each subcommittee should interview as many faculty as possible (and all others by questionnaire) in those departments directly involved. For example, the science and math subcommittee should interview faculty from Anthropology, Biology, Chemistry, Geology, Geography, Mathematics, and Physics & Astronomy. They should then write a preliminary proposal that should be forwarded to the science/math faculty for further comments. The next draft should be discussed in this committee [Academic Standards], changes made, and a new draft sent to all deans and chairmen for consideration. After this committee receives their comments, we can modify our proposals, combine them all, and submit it to the Senate for consideration.

My last suggestion is that these subcommittees have some permanence. It is unlikely that all of this work postulated

above could be accomplished by June 85. Therefore, the subcommittees should not be composed of more than one member of the present Academic Standards Committee.