

MINUTES
Of The Meeting
OF
THE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Tuesday, May 13, 1980
3:00-4:30 p.m.
Room 215 Engineering Science

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

ACTIONS

1. The chairman called the meeting to order. The minutes were considered. Dr. Munro moved approval, and Dr. Baldino seconded. The vote was taken; all were in favor, with one abstention by Dr. Hovey. The minutes were approved.
2. Dr. Hill advised the committee members that the Business Administration proposal would not be discussed since the information anticipated was not received in time for the meeting.
3. The chairman referred to the annual reorganization of the committee and asked if it is the pleasure of members to continue to conduct business as they have until it is confirmed at what point the committee should be reorganized.

A member said that if the new committee does not really function until Fall of 1980, the current committee is the official committee until August. He said that holding a meeting before the end of the Spring Quarter is merely a suggestion; it is not in the Bylaws or Charter, so this year's committee is still the official committee until the end of the school year.

A member suggested inviting the new members to the last meeting of this committee.

A member suggested that Dr. Baldino invite them since his name appears alphabetically at the top of the list, or Dr. Hill, as chairman, invite them.

It was decided that Dr. Hill would do the inviting.

4. The proposal on the audit was discussed at this time.

A member said that he thinks there is a fundamental issue here and the committee must keep in mind that there are two sides to it. He said that one is the fact that the auditor not only pays the fee but

in effect is doing something for the course. He said that what has to be enforced is really not this aspect of the problem. He said that the problem that has come to his attention, having looked at records and having made recommendations over the years, is that the auditor should be faithful to the course. He said that he thinks this is a matter of faculty enforcement or faculty autonomy.

A member posed the possibility that an auditor of a physical education course may be denied participation by the instructor.

A member said that another problem is that a student may change from a regular grade to audit up to the sixth week of the quarter; this student would have put in a lot of work, while the audit student may not have shown up for class since the beginning of the quarter.

The member said that he personally feels that the exams and participation ought to be the right of the student. As far as other things are concerned, he said, he does not see why the student who is auditing should be treated differently in testing.

A member said that the only complaints that he has heard from colleagues has been that they do not feel that it is right for the student to receive an audit grade when he/she has not shown up for class all quarter.

The member had a question about the wording of the proposed amendment to the policy, "The permissible participation of an auditor in class activities is left to the discretion of the instructor." He asked if this is meant to be a positive kind of action that he/she can take or a negative sort of action.

A member said that the committee did deal with the audit a few years ago and decided to make no changes in the policy.

A member said he would be willing to talk to Dr. Rand, see what brought this about, and bring that information back to the committee next meeting. He said he does not think the committee really understands the background of it.

A member cited a case where an audit student was asking an abundance of questions to the point that he was holding the class back; this student was not really prepared for the class. He said that this student kept insisting that it was his right to participate when the instructor told him he was disrupting the class.

A member said that he agrees with the second sentence of the proposed revision but does not like the first sentence.

A member said that the more restrictions and rules that are put in, the more individual cases are going to violate the rule. He said that it should be left as general as possible.

The chairman asked Dr. Scriven if he would like to gather the information for the committee, or if he would like to have some of the deans come in. Dr. Scriven said that he thought that Dr. Hill might speak to Dr. Rand and find out what is behind this.

Dr. Hill then asked if Dr. Scriven or any other member of the committee has data concerning the attendance of audit students. Dr. Scriven said he does not have such data but that he could give him the number of audit students.

A member said that he thinks the author of the memorandum and anyone who has data should be invited to attend the meeting.

There was continued discussion.

A member said that he feels that when problems arise with the audit, there should simply be adjudication between the chairperson and faculty member. He said that he feels the added statements merely complicate rather than clarify things. He said that the statement irrespective of the added two sentences is a perfectly permissible and workable policy.

A member said that he feels it should be left alone.

A member said that the purpose of the audit is to help students who are insecure about getting back into academic studies slowly move into the academic world. He said that creating more restrictions will hinder this purpose.

It was again suggested to have the author of the memo present and Dr. Scriven bring data indicating how really bad the extent of complaints have been, where they have been, and so forth. There was consensus.

A member suggested that while this is being done, the whole matter of the audit be considered, particularly whether or not there should be attendance requirements.

Dr. Baldino volunteered to gather data on the audit policies of other schools. There was consensus that he do this.

5. The honors students proposal was considered next. Dr. Hill asked if the committee wishes to continue, to have students come in, or postpone until Dr. Scriven is present.

There was discussion of the same points previously discussed.

A member suggested that the committee send it back agreeing with numbers one and two, suggesting including all students from all quarters, and scratching the part about seniors in number three.

Dr. Hill said that he thinks the problem has been that this has been dealt with in a disjointed way by the committee thus far. He suggested that if the committee is going to try to finish it up this year, the committee should begin to go about it in a rather consistent way. He asked what committee members wished to do; if they wished to have students come in, etc.

A member said that he agrees with the suggestion to write up the committee's recommendations and bring it to the next meeting.

Dr. Hill asked Dr. Munro to write up the rough draft and said he

would look it over and add to it if need be. Dr. Munro agreed.

6. Dr. Khawaja said that he has one closing statement before adjournment. He said that he would like the committee to think about something for him. He said that he is going to write a proposal about credit/no credit. He said that the present situation is that the only time a student may change to credit/no credit is at registration. He said that it is unfair that we allow a student up to six weeks to drop the course, but do not allow the same privilege to these students.
7. Dr. Hovey made the motion for adjournment, and Dr. Kougl seconded. The meeting was adjourned.