

Minutes of the Meeting of the Academic Affairs Committee  
Wednesday, February 28, 1977  
3:00 p.m. Conference Room, Dean of Engineering

Present: Dr. Hill, Dr. Swan, Dr. Scriven, Mr. Quinby,  
Dr. Baldino, Dr. Koughl, Mr. Skarote, Dr. Edgar,  
Dr. Hovey, Dr. Richley

Actions:

1. Mr. Quinby moved approval of the February 14 minutes.  
Seconded by Dr. Baldino. Unanimously approved.
2. Military Science:

Dr. Hill contacted Mrs. Phillips to see if the Military Science proposal will be on the Senate agenda. It was not possible to put it on the March 7 agenda.

Dr. Richley asked if the objections raised by Dr. Dobbelstein will delay progress towards passage.

Dr. Scriven answered that the objection was withdrawn. The Military Science curriculum proposal will be appended to the Senate minutes. Since there were no objections, the proposal will become effective in the new catalog.

3. General Education:

Dr. Hill summarized: we have decided to appoint an advisory committee to study the General Education requirements. We still have to develop guidelines for the composition of the committee.

Dr. Baldino suggested the committee be composed of members from each College, equally distributed. He felt that since the Senate is weighted, equal representation on this committee is vital to insure impartiality.

*that membership is composed of 1 member from each school*  
Dr. Hovey was concerned that faculty members could enter the committee with definite political philosophies established, this could produce a clash of ideals, a jumbled output. He suggested inviting people from outside the University and not limiting ourselves to faculty.

Dr. Baldino pointed out that one never leaves his beliefs or values at the committee room door. It is naive to think people will drop their prejudices for any reason. The easiest way for this committee to become political is for it to be weighted. Turf-guarding is not that dangerous, and recruiting people from outside the University would require great judgement and care.

Dr. Richley argued that the outcome of this deliberation will have credibility, or not, according to the way the committee is structured. This committee will probably have at least a year's work ahead of them. He suggested speaking with a variety of people, the Executive committee, the Deans, the Senate, to insure their knowledge of our actions.

Mr. Quinby asked what criteria will be used for selection of committee members.

Dr. Richley answered that the motion was, the Chair will structure an advisory committee. He suggested asking each College to suggest possible members. This is a political issue and a long range project, it needs to be done carefully.

Dr. Swan wondered if there was any merit in having a student serve on the committee.

Dr. Richley answered that we should make the opportunity available to them. It is not logical to exclude them.

Dr. Hill was interested in the idea of someone from outside the University, perhaps someone from another Institution who has gone through this revision process. We need open, flexible people.

Dr. Baldino felt that we must have faith in the committee we appoint. He added, we can commit the error of inviting too many members.

Dr. Swan suggested; two members from each College - we appoint one and the faculty will appoint one, three members from this committee to comprise the new one. There will be one vote for each College. The members of the committee will elect the Chairman.

Dr. Richley thought there would be a problem having only one vote from each College, but two members.

Dr. Hovey pointed out that committee has to be a workable number, 13 members may be too large.

Dr. Swan thought that this number would insure that an adequate membership would attend meetings.

Dr. Baldino suggested one representative from each College, plus a student elected by Student Government.

Dr. Hovey again suggested someone from outside the University.

Dr. Swan wondered if there was a political purpose in including a student member.

Dr. Baldino answered that sometimes a student's attendance at committee is hard to justify. However, they are an integral part of the University and should serve.

Dr. Swan pointed out that there will be much work required of the committee members, and a background is necessary.

Dr. Edgar explained, the administration does not have any views on structuring the committee. He added, I am very interested in the results. I feel experienced people from the fields from which General Education is usually developed are necessary. I think an experienced, senior student could add insight. I also think we will have trouble in Arts and Sciences if there are only two people to represent the entire College.

Dr. Richley pointed out that this is an advisory committee, and will have the resources to draw on needed information, including faculty and administration.

Dr. Baldino thought that it is not vital to make sure everyone serving has a background in General Education. We have to have faith in the new committee and its Chair.

Dr. Richley agreed with this.

Dr. Edgar added, you need someone who is willing to think about General Education.

Dr. Hill concluded, I'll try to have some kind of proposal on the composition of the committee, next week.

#### 4. Honors Program:

Dr. Altinger and Mr. Baer were present to discuss this matter.

Dr. Altinger summarized: the first Honors Program consisted of just one seminar. In 1977 a new program was formed, plus a committee to make recommendations. I was appointed as director by Dr. Edgar.

The basic program is to provide for gifted students, special programs to meet their special needs. The Senate really had no program for them, they relied on various departmental honors courses. Now, 21 hours in three departments will grant special recognition.

Dr. Scriven asked, when your program was proposed in 1976, was it your hope that various departments would develop honors sections, has this thinking changed?

Dr. Altinger answered, no, Ms Loud's proposal is just that. I'm planning special courses for honors in various departments thru 1982.

Dr. Scriven asked if the Honors Committee was recommending Ms Loud's proposal.

Mr. Baer answered yes.

Dr. Baldino asked if every course is potentially an honors course. Does it just require extra work?

Mr. Baer answered, at our last meeting we discussed who would determine what constitutes honors work. There are many courses which will not be considered.

Dr. Edgar added, the first proposal states it is an agreement between student and faculty. It could differ in each department, will an honors course have to be committee approved?

Dr. Baldino asked if each department will set up its own criteria of what constitutes honors work?

Dr. Hill was concerned with what seems to be ambiguity between and among statements in the proposal. He asked for an explanation of how it could be set up.

Dr. Altinger answered, a student must stand out in the teacher's opinion. The teacher will decide on the amount of work required. Completion would require an "H" be added to the grade report.

Dr. Baldino pointed out that theoretically a "C" student could take advantage of this program, and be automatically an honors candidate.

Dr. Altinger answered that it is up to the department to decide what will constitute honors work.

Dr. Edgar pointed out the required 3.5 GPA in honors courses.

Dr. Altinger pointed out a very real educational need for programs for gifted and talented students.

Dr. Richley felt that the potential for a student reaching goals is usually available. In an honors classroom, the atmosphere is conducive to honors work, and the whole class moves ahead. However, I have trouble seeing the honors concept working on an individual basis, in a regular classroom.

Dr. Hovey asked what current problems in the program suggested the new proposal.

Dr. Altinger answered that this proposal came to the Honors Committee, and he is passing it on to us for opinion.

Dr. Edgar added, I'm not quite sure this is in accordance with the Senate definition of Honors Programs.

Mr. Baer felt that some sort of standard for dealing with honors students must be set up by individual departments.

Dr. Baldino answered that in other Universities there are special sections, designated honors, and taught by committed, competent teachers.

Dr. Richley felt that the most disturbing aspect is the loss of association with other gifted students.

Mr. Skarote agreed that people of similar abilities will work much better together.

Dr. Swan asked if there were no standard for entrance into the Honors Program.

Dr. Altinger answered, it varies according to the department.

Dr. Baldino thought it a very relaxed set of standards.

Dr. Altinger answered that some students need the chance to achieve on this level. The University should not deny them this chance, no matter what the GPA.

Dr. Edgar pointed out this can be handled in other ways.

Dr. Baldino agreed, for example, senior Individual Study Programs.

Dr. Altinger pointed out that there are some standards for entrance, for example, consent of the instructor.

Dr. Hovey asked if this proposal would have the effect of diluting the existing program.

Mr. Baer didn't think so.

Dr. Hill asked if the Honors Committee has come up with any criteria to define honors work, and if there are no guidelines.

Dr. Altinger answered, we have not come up with guidelines because there is so much variance from department to department.

Dr. Hill asked if the Honors Committee has approved this proposal.

Dr. Altinger answered no, we are meeting tomorrow for further discussion. I thought the AAC could provide needed information on which we could base a decision.

5. The next meeting was called for next Wednesday, 3:00-4:30 p.m.
6. The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.