MINUTES

Of The Meeting

Of

THE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Thursday, February 7, 1980
3:30-5:00 p.m.
Room 215 Engineering Science

Present: Dr. Baldino, Dr. Hahn, Dr. Hill, Dr. Hovey, Dr. Khawaja, Dr. Kougl, Dr. Munro, Dr. Richley, Dr. Scriven

ACTIONS

1. Dr. Hill called the meeting to order. He asked for the committee's pleasure with the minutes. Dr. Baldino moved, and Dr. Munro seconded.

   A committee member had a question about the statement on page three, second to last paragraph from the bottom. The first sentence was changed to "A committee member then asked the guests what it is they want from the Academic Affairs Committee."

   Another member referred to page two, paragraph two, and suggested the word "specified" be inserted before the word electives. The amendment was made.

   The minutes were approved unanimously.

2. The chairman invited discussion about the grading system for competency-based courses. He asked Dr. Scriven to explain why he feels the I is appropriate to use.

   Dr. Scriven said he went back to the minutes of the Senate that were recorded prior to the adoption of the PE; the I grade was mentioned and the fact that it could be used in extenuating circumstances.

   Dr. Hill asked if it would be his judgment that some message go out that the I could be used.

   Dr. Scriven said it would be appropriate to respond.

   Dr. Hill asked if the committee generally agrees that as far as they can determine, the use of the I will alleviate Mary Loud's concerns.

   Dr. Hill asked if any action is needed other than to have either Dr. Scriven or himself point out to her that the I grade is an option.

   Dr. Khawaja moved that one of the two men inform Mary Loud. Dr. Richley seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

3. There was brief discussion concerning the Honors issue before inviting the guest, Miss Brownlee, into the meeting for formal discussion.

It was stated by one member of the committee that this refers to Honors Day and has nothing to do with the Honors Program.

There was discussion as to whether it falls under the charge of the Academic Affairs Committee. It was finally established that it does come under this committee's charge.

Miss Brownlee was invited into the room. Dr. Hill asked Miss Brownlee to give a little background on the rationale for the new proposed rules and to make any comments that she would like to make relative to them.

She said that she served as a member of the Academic Events Committee. Two years ago (1978) they studied the rules and regulations that she had always based the honors on, and they came up with a few suggestions.

(1) The original ruling was that a student must have completed 18 hours at Y.S.U. to be eligible, regardless of rank. They did not feel that was right, so they came up with a proposal that it be changed. They felt that freshmen should have 18 hours but beyond that, upperclassmen should have completed more than 18 hours to be eligible for honors.

(2) Next, it was felt that one must be in attendance at Y.S.U. for the quarter in which the honors is determined, the winter quarter prior to the spring Honors Day Program. (She said this has always been a rule; it is just written a little different. The original said the student must be in attendance, but it did not say what quarter.)

(3) They proposed that freshmen, sophomores, and juniors would be computed on the top 1 percent by school; and that seniors, anyone having 3.8 or above, would be eligible. The rationale was that there could be a number of people in a small school who have a 3.8 and are not eligible for honors because enrollment in that school is very small, and perhaps only one student would be awarded an honor. If that student had a 3.9, it would be unfair to the students having 3.89, etc. (The language should probably read, top 1 percent or those having 3.8 or above, whichever is larger.)

A member of the committee referred to letter f. of the rules that remain the same; he said that if the word "count" were inserted at the end of the sentence, it would make it less confusing.

A member asked what the significance of the winter quarter is. Miss Brownlee said that is the quarter in which the honors will be determined.

Another member questioned why the student must be in attendance winter quarter, if the computations are made during that quarter, but are based on fall quarter information.

Miss Brownlee said she asked Mrs. Smith, who was on the Committee originally, and she indicated that they felt that the fall enrollment was the highest enrollment, which is true still. They felt that this is the enrollment count that they should base the percentage on.

A member asked if it would be difficult or possible to have the computer supply a list of people at the end of fall rather than those currently enrolled. Miss Brownlee said it could be done.

It was established that they are using fall quarter to get the 1 percent.

Miss Brownlee said that the computer center generates a listing of all those in school at the end of the winter quarter by school, by rank, and by point average. Then, she simply goes through and makes sure of the top 1 percent, which is based on the enrollment count of the fall quarter, takes the top 1 percent and checks their records.

A member asked why could not the end of the winter quarter numbers determine the 1 percent.

Another member responded by saying it is probably the thinking of the past that more people would receive honors this way.

The member then asked, why not inflate the number from 1 percent to 1.2 percent? Everything could be based on the count and grade point at the end of the winter. He said, it seems disjointed.

Miss Brownlee said there would be no objection; that was just how it was originally done, and the Committee did not see any reason to change it.

A member said that he sees a problem no matter where the line is drawn. A person could attend spring or fall quarter for ten years and get a 4.0 and not be eligible simply because of the mechanism of enrollment and not because of academic performance.

It was asked how they fit the December graduates into the winter group. Miss Brownlee said it is done manually.

A member of the committee asked if it would be any trouble to change it to the winter quarter. The guest said, no.

A member said that before this committee makes a determination, he thinks that it should look at numbers and see how many fewer we are talking about.

Miss Brownlee said it will reduce the number considerably.

A member said that the winter count as opposed to the fall count and changing the minimum for upperclassmen will both reduce the number.

It was said that the only students this would affect would be transfers. It was asked what proportion of students are transfers. It was felt perhaps 10 percent.

Dr. Hill asked for additional discussion. There were no additional questions, so Miss Brownlee left.

4. There was continued discussion after the guest left. Dr. Hill asked if the committee would like to take action today or wait until the next week so that they may have additional time to think.

   A member asked if it would be out of line for the committee to recommend to the Academic Events Committee that for the Honors Day Convocation for 1980, the rules currently in effect be continued; and that the committee will attend to the concerns during the year since there is not time enough to consider it and put it through the Senate before Miss Brownlee must begin preparation.

   Dr. Scriven moved, and Dr. Richley seconded. It was accepted by the committee; the motion was approved.

5. The committee turned to the item on the agenda about the McCracken proposal. Dr. Hill said that it does not appear that all the requested changes were made.

   Dr. Hill said that the proposal has also been submitted to the Curriculum Committee, which is loath to move until hearing from this committee; however, their deadline for the catalog is this week. He said that since there is not enough remaining time at this meeting to come to any consensus, the committee may want to consider meeting again the next day if it is felt that it is important enough to merit doing so.

   He also proposed advising the Committee to go forward and do whatever is necessary, and then afterwards, this committee would make any objections it has.

   A member said he had talked to McCracken earlier that day; he said it is not needed until the end of spring quarter.

   It was decided to wait until next week.

6. The motion to adjourn came from Dr. Hovey and was seconded by Dr. Richley. The meeting was adjourned.