

University Committee on Academic Policy
Minutes of the Meeting
September 4, 1997

Present: B. Ames, M. Turner, J. Banks, F. Lindahl, R. Fisher, P. Lappan, J. Lucas, R. Schiffman

Others: B. Steidle

Minutes prepared by: R. Schiffman

1. The meeting was called to order at 10:22 a.m.
2. The agenda was revised to delete item 6.
3. The minutes of the meeting of April 24, 1997 were approved after the last sentence in item 6 was changed to read: "Chairman McCornack presented the final report orally to the committee."

4. **Presentation of the Slate of Candidates:**

The slate of candidates was presented as attached with the addition of Rachel Schiffman as Secretary for the Fall semester. Acceptance of the slate was moved by Dr. Lappan and seconded by Dr. Banks. The motion passed unanimously.

5. **Comments from the Chairperson:**

Dr. Lindahl welcomed the members of the committee.

6. **Comments from the Assistant Provost:**

At the opening of the term there are over 42,000 students. More freshmen than expected enrolled, most likely due to lower attrition rates during and following academic orientation. There were approximately 1900 transfer students which is in the expected range. There was lower than expected enrollment of graduate students. The exact reasons are unknown. This may be market driven; a good economy often decreases graduate school attendance. It is unknown at this time how the decrease is distributed between MA/MS students and PhD students. There has been an increased emphasis at the masters' level in some programs but the numbers do not appear to have increased. There were small decreases in the medical schools but this was planned. Final information will be available on enrollments after the quarter term mark.

The opening of school went well. The change in Welcome Week to Welcome Days was based on recommendations made last year. Approximately 10,000 students moved in on Thursday, August 21. This went very smoothly despite the numbers and the rain. The main problem was having vehicles moved once belongings were unloaded. About 2500 students moved in by special permission before Thursday and about 1000 students per day from Friday to Sunday moved in. The largest number moved in on Thursday. The Assistant Deans reported that attendance at College/unit sessions was up considerably. Similarly, attendance at other required and recommended sessions (e.g. Residence Life) and activities (e.g. party at the Aud) was also

increased. There are fewer triples than in the past. This is due to prior planning to accommodate shifts in gender patterns and special programs.

Dr. Steidle solicited comments from the faculty about the situation in classes for the first class in light of the major construction on campus during the past year and summer and of the addition of 25 high tech classrooms. SIS was also increased in capacity to eliminate delays in the system. Dr. Ames reported problems with rooms but was able to work things out with the scheduling office. Dr. Lappan reported that the Math Department was overenrolled with the result of lack of seats in classrooms. In addition, sections were assigned to rooms with smaller number of seats than the enrollment limit and finding rooms to accommodate additional sections was also problematic. Dr. Steidle responded that renovations in rooms to accommodate handicappers and active learning (i.e. movable chairs) result in decreased seating capacity. Dr. Lappan reported that the number of students enrolled in MTH 1825 decreased slightly while the number who placed into calculus increased. Dr. Lucas reported that the addition to the Engineering building was open and almost fully functional. Dr. Lucas expressed concern that there were few honors students enrolled in the Honors section which he teaches. The honors students were distributed among all sections of the course. There was concern that students were not advised to enroll in the honors sections. There was also concern expressed that some of the new residential ventures were not as full as expected. Dr. Steidle speculated that reasons might include: the first concern of students is to optimize their schedule; directives might not be clear; there might be conflicts with other classes; and there might be decreased class availability (there were not as many drops and adds during the first week). Dr. Banks' concern in full classes was students who attend the first 3-4 classes and then expect the instructor to give permission to enroll. Dr. Steidle suggested reliance on the University policy that students not enrolled are not permitted to attend class. Dr. Banks also had concerns that honors students are not receiving much advisement. Dr. Steidle responded that the summer orientation has intense advisement but it is difficult for students to get into general advisement during the first week due to overlap with the end of summer session and late orientation and advisement. There will be some discussion about altering the calendar for Spring and Summer sessions. Dr. Banks expressed astonishment that IMC cannot accommodate orders via e-mail. IMC reports they do not have the email capacity to do this.

7. **Agenda Items for Future Discussion:**

These are primarily taken from the Annual Report.

Policies related to the Virtual University: These include residency requirements, number of courses allowed, and length of time. This committee will address the undergraduate implications. Dr. Lindahl will contact the Graduate Council to determine if there are any concerns about the virtual university and if these are common to both groups.

Proctoring Problem: This may not be a prominent item. It may not be a problem at all or it may be a problem only for certain units. Problems will need to be handled at the unit level.

Periodic SIRS review: There is a question about whether the Committee wishes to address this at all. Concern was expressed that there were no quality of teaching questions on the form. Some units use the standard University form. Other units have developed their own form(s) some of which address quality and course related issues separately from faculty evaluation. There remains a lack of clarity about the purpose of SIRS: development vs. evaluation. There are no complaints from students except they do not see the impact of SIRS and the number of forms that need to be completed. The CIERT report stated that students, faculty and Assistant Deans all had

different perspectives on the use of SIRS. There was felt to be a need to give students a voice but the issue remains on the purpose of SIRS. There are differences in SIRS between those done in the major and those done on general courses with the major receiving higher ratings. It is difficult for students to appreciate the “general education” courses. In some surveys of graduates one year after graduation, the types of skills learned in general courses are those cited as necessary compared to the focus of end of program surveys in which technical skills related to major are cited as most needed.

Calendar Issues: Many constituencies are reviewing varying aspects of the calendar: the impact of Welcome Days, the lag time in January, the overlap of end of summer with Fall semester. When the conversion to semesters was planned, faculty cited strong preferences for an equal number of days each semester and for Fall term to start on Monday in order to not miss labs, hence the pre Labor day start. There is more congruence with U of M for Spring semester than for Fall.

Grades: There has been a slight creep in the distribution of honors at graduation. The most recent reports indicate there has been more than 20% graduating with honors. The standard of < 20% was set by UCAP in the early 1970's. The GPA needed to produce the 20 % has been adjusted over the years. There are also only 2 categories of honors at MSU while other institutions have 3 categories. Dr. Steidle will provide more data and present options at a later meeting.

Diversity in Faculty Load: There was a question about the distribution of faculty responsibilities (teaching, research, service) in different units and departments. This was felt to be an issue for discussion at the unit level. Dr. Steidle stated there probably would not be a single University standard for all units.

8. The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

University Committee on Academic Policy
Minutes of the Meeting
September 18, 1997

Present: J. Banks, F. Lindahl, P. Lappan, R. Schiffman, C. Stewart, D. Pysarchik,
J. Krehbiel

Others: B. Steidle, (Assistant Provost), J. Shepard (MSU Union), C. Gancio (MSU
Bookstore), S. Gribben (MSU Bookstore), J. Bond (HFN)

Minutes prepared by: R. Schiffman

1. The meeting was called to order at 10:20 a.m.
2. The agenda was approved.
3. The minutes of the meeting of September 4, 1997 were approved.
4. **Comments from the Chairperson:**

Dr. Lindahl welcomed the members of the committee who were not at the last meeting. He suggested review of the section of the minutes of September 4 for the agenda items for the semester. Additional agenda items can be emailed to the Chair.

5. **Comments from the Assistant Provost:**

Today is the last day of drops with reimbursement. Revised numbers for enrollment will be forthcoming. Although last year's committee did not think the sample survey of academic preparation of entering students needed to be done every year, the two questions added to an AOP survey this year about foreign language shed some additional light on the foreign language backgrounds of incoming freshmen. The findings were:

- 95.8% had some foreign language
- 7.9% - 1 year
- 34.9% - 2 years
- 30.7% - 3 years
- 25.6% - 4 years

The percent of students with at least 2 years of foreign language (87%) is up 6% higher than indicated by the sample survey. The foreign language class enrollments reflect the interest of students in continuing.

At the next meeting Dr. Brandenburg from the College of Agriculture & Natural Resources will discuss proposed changes in the Ag Tech program similar to those made recently in the Vet Tech program. This will be a preliminary discussion. A package of materials about the Ag Tech program will be sent to the Committee before the discussion.

6. **Discontinuation of the Food: Technology and Management Major**

Motion by J. Banks with second by P. Lappan to discontinue the Food: Technology and Management Major.

Dr. Steidle briefly reviewed the history of the major which was created during the semester transition. The major was ambitious but it did not draw the number of students expected. The materials sent to the faculty outline the process used by the College of Human Ecology to review the deletion of the major. This review included students. There is nothing being deleted that students cannot get in the other food science majors. Dr. Banks asked how representative was the vote of faculty. Later in the meeting Dr. Jenny Bond indicated that the number represented about half of the faculty. Ballots had been sent to all faculty members.

7. **Book Ordering Process**

A discussion with J. Shepard, Director of the MSU Union, C. Gancio, General Manager of the MSU Bookstore and S. Gribben, Customer Service Manager of the MSU Bookstore about making the book order process and customer service at the MSU Bookstore more expeditious and satisfying for faculty. The bookstore was privatized in 1994 and is now operated under contract by Follett College Stores. Committee members indicated that many stopped using the on campus bookstore because of poor service. Members identified problems with books many of which continue to this time -- not enough books ordered for the expected class size, late notification of out of print books, slow processing of late orders, and no desk copy loans. Mr. Shepard indicated that it is expected that the Bookstore would satisfy the needs of faculty, staff and students and that there would be outstanding customer service. The purpose of the discussion today is to learn and understand the concerns of faculty about textbook acquisition and to seek guidance to improve the service.

Drs. Steidle and Lindahl commented that the inventory for supplemental (trade) books has substantially improved. Dr. Steidle also commented on the improved lay out of the store following renovations. Mr. Shepard indicated that the supplies section was not as extensive as in the past but served the purpose.

Mr. Gancio described the book acquisition (ordering) process and distributed a packet of materials with the timeline for the Spring semester process. The process includes sending computer generated orders to the faculty or departments (depending on how orders are processed in each department). The order is then returned to the Bookstore via campus mail, fax, email or Web. Copies of the orders are made and provided to the three other bookstores. The order is then reviewed. If the order is preprinted and there are no changes, it is processed. If the order is not preprinted or there are changes, the ISBN and titles are verified. The next step is to search for used books. Once the number of used books are estimated, an order is sent to the publisher for new books. The shelves are prepared to receive the books. The largest vendor for books is students. They are the

used book market. Last year \$600,000 was returned to students. Mr. Gancio would like to see that number closer to one million. The Bookstore can buy more books back from students but they must know early if the book will be used again. If a book is used in the next semester, the student receives 1/2 of the value; if it is not used or the bookstore does not know if it will be used, the student receives the wholesale value.

Copies of the Bookstore Web pages were reviewed. Faculty will be sent a copy of the shelf form to review. This will be early enough to make corrections. Mr. Gancio also distributed a guide to book ordering that is given to new faculty at orientation and a planner with publisher names and phone numbers. There will be a book fair for faculty at Kellogg Center. Publishers will have displays of their new books.

Mr. Shepard indicated that 4,965 books were adopted in the Fall semester. There are usually fewer books ordered in the Spring. The deadline for book orders in Spring for Fall semester is to allow for buy back of books from students by the end of the semester. Mr. Shepard indicated that 31% of orders were submitted by the March 15 deadline and only 47% of orders by buy back time. By the first day of AOP, 90% of book orders for Freshman classes were in but only 61% of total orders. By July 4, 69% of orders were submitted and 85% by August first (immediately prior to the UPS strike). This meant that 15% of books were ordered after the UPS strike. By the first day of class 98% of books had been ordered.

Some suggestions were offered as to why faculty were not responding including: waiting until the end of a course to evaluate a new textbook, information about an out of print book not being received soon enough to make a change. Committee members indicated the need to receive accurate and early responses about the availability of textbooks. Dr. Krehbiel indicated that Vet Med has been using another textbook acquisition process but would be interested in discussing options including a medical textbook outlet in Fee Hall.

Dr. Pysarchik asked about sharing book orders with other bookstores. Mr. Gancio indicated that MSU shares the orders with other bookstores but there is no communication about the number of books each store will carry. Hence there is no guaranteed way of assuring that the number ordered is equal to the number needed. Members of the Committee suggested an attempt at "cooperative competition" with sharing of the number of texts ordered by each store. Mr. Gancio indicated that he expected that only one of the other stores would cooperate but that he would try this. The goal would be to have the textbooks for all students for the first day of class.

The issue of the availability of desk copies for faculty who have not received theirs from publishers was discussed. Mr. Gancio indicated that the Bookstore could "loan" a desk copy to faculty (as is done by at least one other bookstore). The copy could be returned when the desk copy is received by the faculty. The copy returned must not be the copy marked as a "free" copy. Mr. Gancio does not buy or sell books marked as free copies. Members expressed concern that the faculty would then be reluctant to mark the book. Mr. Gancio was willing to consider accepting a marked book as a used book for resale or perhaps requesting the publisher for credit for providing the desk copy. There would also

need to be some mechanism for charging the faculty if the desk copy was not returned or other arrangements made.

Dr. Lindahl stressed the need for Bookstore staff to provide personalized care for faculty with individual or special book orders as well as course book orders. Mr. Gancio indicated that the Bookstore does handle 10-15 special orders per week. These can be processed quickly and sent to faculty by a variety of means.

There was concern expressed that books are taken off the shelves too soon and returned to publishers. Mr. Gancio explained that given the timelines the shelves need to be prepared for the next semester and that there is limited space to keep inventory. This is mainly a problem for upper classes who tend to not buy all of their books at the beginning of the semester (as opposed to freshmen who tend to buy all books early). It may be possible to return books in predominately freshmen courses but keep for others. Some books are not used in some courses until the second half of the semester. Dr. Stewart indicated that there was individual faculty and student responsibility to order and purchase books in a timely manner. One suggestion was to widely advertise when books would be taken off shelves and returned. This could be done in classes and through advertisements in the State News. Dr. Steidle questioned the possibility of "just in time" delivery, as is increasingly common in business. Mr. Gancio indicated that publishers have not done this except for some medical publishers.

Dr. Banks questioned the condition of books for buy back; some students are reluctant to mark texts fearing it will impede their ability to sell the book back to the store. Mr. Gancio indicated that the amount of writing/marketing in a book does not affect its buy back potential.

8. The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

University Committee on Academic Policy
Minutes of the Meeting
October 2, 1997

Present: F. Lindahl, P. Lappan, R. Schiffman, C. Stewart, D. Pysarchik,
A. Herringa, D. McMillan, S. Kennedy, R. Fisher, M. Turner, B. Ames

Others: B. Steidle, (Assistant Provost), R. Brandenburg, (CANR), S. (Registrar's Office)

Minutes prepared by: R. Schiffman

1. The meeting was called to order at 10:25 a.m.
2. The agenda was approved with the items reordered.
3. The minutes of the meeting of September 18, 1997 were approved.

4. **Comments from the Chairperson:**

Dr. Lindahl called attention of the members to the discussion item about the bookstore from the last meeting. He encouraged members to send comments and concerns to him particularly if anyone wishes to have representatives return to the Committee.

5. **Comments from the Assistant Provost:**

Dr. Steidle indicated that the chair was unable to attend meetings of the Academic Council this semester due to his teaching schedule. Academic Council allows substitution with voting privilege for members of the Appointed Council. Consultation with the Academic Governance office confirmed that Committee Chairpersons are not covered by the substitution rule.

6. **Proposed Changes in Selected Agricultural Technology Programs**

Associate Dean Brandenburg referred the Committee to the materials in the meeting packet and distributed some additional materials to acquaint the Committee to the Agricultural Technology Programs and to the proposed changes. AT programs are an alternative form of education and skill development for those generally not interested in Bachelors' degrees. The programs vary widely in composition and focus. The one common thread is the certificate received at the end of the program. With the semester transition there was some tightening in the AT programs. All AT courses, which are 0-level courses, are now reviewed at the Department and College level but not by UCC. A review of AT programs recommended addressing inconsistencies in practices across the programs. An additional recommendation was to examine an array of AT courses, which are 0-level courses, considered to be equivalent to regular undergraduate courses and to move these through the regular review process to change the level. In this way students

in AT could receive regular undergraduate credit for these courses and could transfer them in the usual way. Students who transfer into MSU from community colleges receive credit for courses equivalent to some AT courses. Dr. Steidle questioned why ANR agreed to accept such community college courses as transfer courses. Dr. Brandenburg responded that many of these courses are indeed equivalent to the AT courses. Dr. Brandenburg indicated that AT does want to have some of the courses taken at MSU recognized for credit. Departments are now in the process of reviewing AT courses that might be equivalent to 100 and 200 level courses. These are courses which deal with academic issues and content as opposed to courses that focus on skill development. The result would be that AT students would get academic credit for some courses and could transfer these courses in the usual way.

Dr. Steidle indicated that this issue would eventually come to this Committee for action on related policy changes. The Committee would not be reviewing the courses but rather the policies about transferability of these courses to programs at MSU. Dr. Steidle reviewed the transition of the Veterinary Technology program from AT to CVM and to a two year program with courses at the 100-200 level including some general education. At the end of two years the student may receive a certificate or continue into the BS program in Veterinary Technology. CVM also collaborated with Lansing Community College for students to receive a certificate and with the addition of the general education courses an associate's degree. Admission standards were also tightened at the same time. There is a question as to whether the inclusion of more courses at the regular undergraduate level should spur regular college level admission. Another concern has been that, in some cases, AT students have been in "regular" classes, i.e., there has been a blending in some courses which are considered to be equivalent. [This is not consistent with University policy.]

Dr. Brandenburg indicated that the number of students who presently transfer into "regular" student status is small (10%). Students in many of the programs have no interest in obtaining degrees. There is a great variety of students in the AT programs; some have prior degrees in other fields while others have no interest in obtaining a degree.

Dr. Steidle indicated that the policy dimension included the total credits which should be offered at the 100-level and the transferability of these credits. Among the sub issues are whether any general education type courses should be included in the programs and whether the AT students could move freely about the University.

Dr. Turner asked Dr. Brandenburg whether response from this committee would alter what AT does to position itself or whether the current status was to be accepted. Dr. Brandenburg indicated that his purpose was to seek advice on issues related to policy prior to having the faculty work on specific changes. He noted that some course work in which students are involved is well formulated and often resembles, or is taken in conjunction with, existing regular courses. The AT students are disadvantaged in these cases by not being able to claim credit above the 0-level. Students and graduates have indicated that in some cases they would like to have credit. Dr. Steidle indicated that the

AT programs envisioned would have two layers, some with 0-level and some with 100 level credits.

Dr. Fisher asked how many parallel courses there were. Dr. Brandenburg indicated that it varied by program with some like horticulture having a higher proportion but those dealing with animals having few, if any, parallel courses. The overall proportion of parallel courses is probably less than 20% for some programs and perhaps 33% for others. Dr. Steidle indicated that the transfer of credits is not done until the point at which the student indicates that he/she wants to transfer to regular status. AT students have a unique code as do the AT courses.

Dr. Fisher asked about the cost of the courses. Dr. Brandenburg responded that the students pay the same tuition as regular students including matriculation fees. AT students also have orientation programs, welcome days, graduation ceremonies and live in the residence halls. They are considered, and consider themselves to be, alumni. Dr. Fisher also asked about transfer of courses to other institutions. Dr. Steidle responded that it depended on the other institution. However, if 0-level courses are accepted at other institutions, they would not transfer back to MSU for regular credit as all transcripts are separately reviewed.

Dr. Ames asked if the audience for these programs were recent high school graduates or adult learners. Dr. Brandenburg responded that it was mixed across the AT programs. In some cases the programs attract adults/mature students seeking second careers while in other programs. The students are traditional college age with few planning to continue for the bachelor's degree.

Dr. Pysarchik asked about the credit allocation of courses being considered for transfer. Dr. Brandenburg responded that most AT courses were 3 credits and most of the courses considered for conversion were 3 credit courses. There are some 2 credit courses but these are often 9 week courses with practical experiences which makes them equivalent to 3 credits.

Dr. Steidle repeated that the topic is presented at this time to the Committee to identify the issues and provide guidance. The issues thus far are the desirability of the conversion, the transferability of these courses, and the admission criteria. The timetable this Fall is to identify the courses to be converted, the guidelines and the ground rules. Dr. Lindahl suggested the Committee could place this as a regular item on the agenda for full Committee discussion or it could be discussed in a subcommittee prior to the full Committee. Dr. Turner indicated this request was unique and might benefit from a broader discussion to raise other issues or identify other aspects. The Committee will discuss this proposal at a future meeting.

7. Notification of Instructor in Cases of Administrative Withdrawal:

Dr. Steidle referred to the letter referred to the Committee by the Steering Committee concerning an administrative change of a student's grade without instructor notification. Dr. Steidle explained that the case represented a series of errors rather than a reflection of normal practice. The errors included: (1) A new assistant dean arranging with faculty for incomplete grades for a student who was ill. {One of the faculty involved agreed but established a deadline for completion of the work. When the deadline passed, the instructor changed the grade from "I" to "0.0".} (2) The administrator then allowed the student to retroactively withdraw from two of four courses. University policy allows retroactive withdrawal only in extremely extenuating circumstances, and never permits partial withdrawal. (3) The registrar's office did not recognize that the Administrative Action did not have an instructor signature.

Dr. McMillan from the Registrar's office stated that the Registrar's office does not change grades. In the case of some traumatic personal situations grades are removed. These grades may be changed to "W" but this is not a pick and choose process. The Registrar's office should know the rules which require an instructor's signature. In this particular case, the person who reviewed the form does not regularly do this and did not catch the lack of authorization signatures.

Dr. Schiffman asked if this was an implementation problem versus a need for policy/procedure changes. Dr. McMillan indicated that from the Registrar's office perspective this was an implementation problem. He indicated that the procedures are in place and, if followed, there should be no repetition. The Committee accepted the explanation and concluded that no policy changes were necessary.

8. ASMSU Resolution on Martin Luther King Day:

Dr. Steidle noted that this was a calendar issue discussed in the Committee in 1995-1996. Relevant committee minutes were included in the meeting packet. Mr. Kennedy indicated that ASMSU sent the bill to the Academic Assembly because students wanted a day off to celebrate the achievements of Dr. King. The present policy about not requiring class activities on that day which could negatively impact a student who chose to attend activities was not well known among faculty or students. Mr. Herringa added that the vagueness of the current policy is a problem and that some students feel they must be in class on that day. The primary concern is that students be allowed to attend functions. Mr. Herringa added that it was understood that this could be a "no class" day as opposed to a University holiday. Dr. Steidle explained that declaring a University holiday had broad implications and cost impacts. This would need to be negotiated into contracts and would affect many other areas. The Martin Luther King Day policy reflects the same expectations as the religious observance policy. Students are required to make arrangements with faculty in advance to attend functions.

Dr. Turner stated that the current policy and the array of activities are designed to provide for learning activities which unravel when instructors take advantage of situations. There is not a good association with religious holidays. The issue is student

competence about cultural issues which do not get addressed in the University or society. It might be reasonable to think about a broader crafting of a day of activities to reflect not only on Dr. King but on the broader issue of multi-cultural awareness. It might be worth while to explore group conflict, and to structurally build means for students and faculty to be involved. Dr. Steidle asked if attendance would be mandatory in order to serve the purpose. Dr. Turner responded that it would be the same as a normal class.

Dr. Turner continued, indicating that the day could focus on cultural competence with students from other cultures participating. He indicated that this could be a broad, value-added activity which could be generalized to other conditions. Dr. Stewart indicated that this could be a day with activities such as colloquia. There is a danger that the day becomes nothing more than a day off. The focus should be broadened to give all students the advantages. At this time only Dr. King has a national holiday, so being more inclusive can address a number of broader issues. Dr. Steidle indicated the Committee should address any issues in the ASMSU bill. One issue will be how to assure broad student participation.

The discussion will be continued at the next meeting.

9. The meeting was adjourned at 11:55 a.m.

University Committee on Academic Policy
Minutes of the Meeting
October 30, 1997

Approved 11-13-97

Present: F. Lindahl (chair), B. Ames, J. Banks, A. Herringa, S. Kennedy, J. Kolkman, J. Krehbiel, P. Lappan, J. Lucas, C. McHugh, C. Stewart, M. Turner.

Others: B. Steidle, (Assistant Provost)

1. The meeting was called to order at 10:25 a.m.
2. The agenda was approved.
3. The minutes of the meeting of October 2, 1997 were approved.

4. **Comments from the Chair**

Dr. Lindahl welcomed Judy Kolkman (COGS) and Charles McHugh (ASMSU) to the committee.

5. **Comments from the Assistant Provost**

Dr. Steidle chose to hold her comments at this time.

6. **Proposed changes in Selected Agricultural Technology Programs**

Dr. Steidle reminded the committee that they were serving in an advisory mode and no action would be taken at this meeting. This discussion followed from Associate Dean Brandenburg's meeting with UCAP on October 30, 1997. Dr. Lindahl provided a review of issues raised at the last meeting:

- (a) should some O-level courses be changed to 100-level courses in the AT program?
- (b) should there be a cap on the total number of credits students can transfer from O-level courses when they move into "regular" student status, given the establishment of 100-level courses?
- (c) should admission standards to the AT program be tightened if students are to be in classes with regularly-admitted students? Consistent with its original purpose, the AT program admits students with a wide variety of backgrounds.
- (d) should any general education courses be required?

Dr. Steidle provided some background material. The AT program is over 100 years old, and was designed for particular populations who wanted particular information to apply back home. The program fits within the university's Land Grant mission. Certificates, not degrees, are awarded students in the program. Now programs are offered in 6-8 different areas. In 1992 the Veterinary Tech. program split off from the AT program and was re-configured. Similar courses offered at community colleges can lead to an Associate degree. This is not the case at MSU. Any proposed new 100-level courses will be reviewed by UCC. Currently up to 28 credits can be transferred to a degree program in the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources. Usually the Associate Dean acts as an advisor to facilitate this.

Dr. Turner asked whether grading will be affected if some students enrolled in O-level courses and some in 100-level courses are in the same class. He stressed that it seemed advisable to drop the O-level course when a similar course is offered at the 100-level.

Dr. Lindahl noted that ca. 400 students are enrolled in the program and ca. 10% transfer into regular programs.

Dr. Ames suggested that if courses are offered at the 100-level, O-level courses in the program should not be transferable. If a program offers only O-level courses those should be transferable according to the present arrangement.

Dr. Krehbiel noted that when Vet. Tech. faced a similar situation it raised its admission standards, and intensified its curriculum. Attrition decreased.

There was general consensus that some general education courses should be required, e.g. ATL and basic Math.

There was also general consensus that opportunities should not be denied interested students.

7. Continued Discussion on ASMSU Resolution on Martin Luther King Day

Mr. Herringa reiterated the discussion on Oct. 2, 1997 about students' confusion growing out of the vagueness of the university policy on "no class" days. Dr. Lindahl noted that James Madison College works around this issue by offering activities related to Dr. Martin Luther King in the evening. Dr. Stewart noted that the issue of student participation is problematic. Definite programming, with high visibility is needed to attract students. Students should experience the day as a day of participation rather than just as a day off. Dr. Steidle noted that varied activities have been planned in the past, and high profile speakers had come to speak on campus, but general attendance has been low. There has never been, however, a full day set aside with carefully organized and orchestrated events celebrating Dr. King. Mr. Kennedy emphasized that student participation in the organizing of such events is essential. ASMSU programming Board is discussing this currently. Students tend to attend student-organized events more than administration-organized events. Ms. Kolkman suggested that classes might be canceled and events scheduled at a particular time of the day, e.g. 11.00 am. - 1.00 pm. so as to better demarcate the events and encourage attendance. Activities must be well advertised. Dr. Turner noted that this is an excellent opportunity for the university to show that the legacy of Dr. King can be spread over the social climate of our society, and the whole university community. Planning and participation should not fall only on people of color. To ignore the ASMSU Bill that MSU celebrate Dr. Martin Luther King Day as a national holiday is to send a negative message, and to uphold the status quo. Education includes greater cultural consciousness. Dr. Lindahl suggested further discussion was needed on how faculty can be more creative in integrating recognition of Dr. Martin Luther King—especially when their disciplines are not directly concerned with such issues.

A "sense of the committee" resolution to the following effect was adopted by consensus: that UCAP recommend to the Steering Committee that the University cancel classes for a designated, substantial bloc of time on Martin Luther King Day; that the focus of the celebration be the legacy of King, as it applies to all; that there be a substantial effort, including students, faculty, and academic units, to plan the celebration of the legacy; that the occasion be treated as an opportunity to increase the cultural competence of our students. Dr. Lindahl indicated that the "sense of the committee" resolution would be transmitted to the Steering Committee.

8. Living/Learning Programs and the "Serious Student"

The issue was referred to the next meeting because of lack of time.

9. The meeting was adjourned at 11.55 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Jenifer Banks, sec. pro. Tem

University Committee on Academic Policy
Minutes of the Meeting
November 13, 1997

Present: F. Lindahl, P. Lappan, R. Schiffman, B. Ames, C. McHugh, D. Glance, J. Banks,
J. Krehbiel, R. Brandenburg

Others: B. Steidle, (Assistant Provost), S. McMillan (Registrar's Office), C. Gancio, S.
Gribben, J. Sheppard (MSU Bookstore)

Minutes prepared by: R. Schiffman

1. The meeting was called to order at 10:25 a.m.
2. The agenda was approved.
3. The minutes of the meeting of October 30, 1997 were approved with changes in Item 7 in order to convey the recommendation of the Committee to have activities scheduled at certain times of the day rather than a complete no class day for the observance of Martin Luther King day.

4. **Comments from the Chairperson:**

The recommendation of the Committee about the M. L. King day observance must be to the Steering Committee by 11/25. It may then need to go to Academic Council. The activities on that day should be broadened to stress cultural competency, involve students in all aspects, have support from the Provost, and allow creativity for students and faculty. This may not be done this year if it needs to be considered by Academic Council. There needs to be a significant amount of time identified during the day for it to be meaningful.

5. **Comments from the Assistant Provost:**

Dr. Steidle deferred comments until the Living/Learning Programs agenda item.

6. **MSU Textbook Services:**

Representatives from the bookstore want to report back to the Committee on the six items raised during the discussion at a prior meeting. With regard to timely response about textbook availability, a course tab will be placed with the books indicating the status of the order as of 11/1. A computerized list will be sent to department chairs about the book orders received as of 11/1. This list will be sent out again in December and January. The bookstore will not assume there are no books for a class unless this is confirmed by the faculty. The shelf tag for the book with the status of the order will be on the shelf with a copy to the faculty member.

On the issue of cooperative competitiveness, the other bookstores would not agree to share information about how many books would be ordered. Therefore, it will not be possible to determine if enough books will be available. The third topic concerned desk copies. A memo was sent to faculty indicating that desk copies would be ordered.

Better quality staff have been hired to address the issue of faculty assistance in the bookstore. In addition, the phone system is being upgraded. There will be five lines devoted to textbooks. For the concern about publicizing the deadlines for buyback of textbooks, an ad was not placed in the State News but the date was prominently posted in the store and was added to the web site. The bookstore has the latest return date.

The bookstore would like to accommodate faculty who wish to identify book adoptions one year in advance but can not do it yet. They would like a subcommittee to develop policies and procedures that protect the bookstore and the faculty. There will be a book fair during the week after Spring break in the Union. Publishers will be there with books out for the Fall. The print facility for campus will also be there with course pack information.

The buyback totals were higher for Spring 1997 than for Spring 1996. There was an increase in used book buying which represented more than \$13,000 in savings for students. A higher percent of book orders (55%) than last year were in by 11/1.

Committee members expressed disappointment that other book stores would not cooperate to ensure an adequate supply of books. The representatives replied that formulas for ordering are used and SBS and MSU also look at the class history of books sold with the same faculty. The bookstore is also expanding their textbook services with the MBA program and the Vet School to handle 100% of the book order. They cannot do this for all faculty because of limited storage space. The bookstore returns from 3.5 -4% of invoice. A question was asked about offering books at a discount or lower price than competitors. This is difficult to do because of legislation prohibiting cornering the market. There is a small profit margin on textbooks leaving little flexibility. Other stores would also lower their prices as well. The bookstore since privatization is on a level playing field with others. Excellent inventory management is the key.

A question was asked about students not buying books. The response was that in non competitive markets 28% do not buy books. Course packs sell less than 50%. The bookstores were still willing to share book orders so that while quantities may not be known, titles are. The bookstore would like to have an advisory committee with representatives from students and faculty. The committee will meet on a regular basis to dialogue with the bookstore. The Committee will discuss at a later meeting.

7. **Schedule Book Transition:**

S. McMillan indicated that the hard copy of the schedule book will be eliminated. The book was inaccurate by the time the term began with 20% of courses having changed. The University printed 65,000 books using 13.5 million sheets of paper with a very low utility for any given student. There has been an interim version on the web for the coming year with a generally positive response. Hard copies of the schedule book will be greatly decreased for next year. Students will get a bound carrier for policy information that was in the front of the schedule book.

For the summer semester, since only 50-60% of students enrolling would be attending school here in the Spring, there will be a book with all information. For 98-99, there will be no schedule book. Enrollment and registration instructions booklet will be given to all students with deadlines. There will be separate graduate and undergraduate listing of courses printed on March 1 but this will not be updated. The schedules are now on the web but are incomplete because no rooms have been assigned.

A question was asked about students' access to computers for enrollment. The response was that at this time there is no interface between the web schedule book and enrollment. Students will continue to enroll by computer or phone. It is planned for 99-00 to have an interface between the web schedule and enrollment. There may also be a link to the catalog and perhaps to syllabi so that course descriptions would be available. A question was asked about content based searching for key words in the title or course descriptions. This could be eventually built in for links between catalog, schedule, and enrollment. There has been no change in the appointment system for enrollment which seems to be working.

8. **Definition of Residency:**

The University has a definition for residency which has been in place for many years. Given the changes in recent years, this definition needs to be revisited. This affects students at all levels, in many programs, for Honors recognition. This should be a joint effort of UCAP and the Graduate Council. A joint subcommittee with three members from each will be formed to redefine residency. A recommendation from the subcommittee will be brought to each committee for action. C. McHugh, P. Lappan, and one other UCAP member will serve.

9. **Living/Learning Programs and the "Serious Student":**

Brochure was distributed describing the programs. Living/Learning programs are connected to but not synonymous with "serious student". The concern of Living/Learning programs is how freshmen are integrated into the University. The freshman experience has improved over the last few years with the program opportunities. There are an array of opportunities for freshmen to integrate into the academic community. About 1/2 of freshmen have ATL which are small courses as are some math courses. Other courses are large/very large introductory courses. There are expanded residential opportunities from 1-2 year programs like ROSES, RISE and ROIAL and the longer 4 year programs like James Madison and Lyman Briggs.

The second year of the freshmen seminars yielded great seminars but relatively few takers. There were more students in the credit seminars than in those offered for no credit. The preprofessional seminars were popular and some non credit seminars. The credit seminars are low cost since they are only 1 credit.

There were novel scheduling concepts with the FIGS program that linked small classes with large ones. This was difficult to do because placement in some courses was not known in advance and freshmen didn't understand the curriculum well enough nor were these options well enough explained to be attractive. There was an attached mentor for each section as a guide and helper for academic work. One of the student representatives who had participated in FIGS commented that it worked well in the small class but not in the large class where the link was not mentioned. The mentors seemed overburdened and it would be important that the mentor be related to the field.

Another option available is Class Connections where students living in a contiguous area study together in a course. There seemed to be a reluctance to get involved in collective activities and the greatest requests were for courses, like math, that were not identified for this experience.

There was discussion that incoming freshmen may not understand the book describing the programs. This may be due to the timing of the mailing coming at the end of high school when there are many other activities. It may be better to do during AOP when it is easier to reach students. There may also need to be a better balance between semesters for freshmen seminars. Offer more in the second semester when students are a bit more acclimated and can perhaps appreciate. Recruitment for seminars may need to be on advisor recommendation during AOP. Another suggestion was made to start the seminars 1-2 weeks into the semester like an Honors option. Once the schedule of other courses is established freshmen may find they have time to take a seminar.

10. The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 noon.

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF
JANUARY 22, 1998

Present: J. Banks, R. Brandenburg, S. Hoerr, J. Kolkman, J. Krehbiel, F. Lindahl,
P. Lappan, J. Lucas, R. Schiffman, C. Stewart

Others: B. Steidle (ex officio), W. Latta (Space Facilities Planning and Management)
M. Vande Berg, (Office of Study Abroad)

Minutes prepared through composite records.

1. The meeting was called to order at 10:25 a.m.
2. The agenda was approved, with the movement of item 8 (Study Abroad) to item 6, following Classroom Conditions.
3. The minutes of the meeting of November 13, 1997 were approved without amendment.
4. Comments from the Chairperson:

The Chairperson reported on the Academic Council action regarding the amended resolution sent to the Steering Committee regarding Martin Luther King, Jr. Day. The modification proposed by UCAP, to cancel classes for a substantial bloc of time on the holiday and to focus all-University programming during that period, was amended on the floor of Council to cancel classes for the entire day. The other elements of the UCAP proposal were maintained in the final proposal. At the evening celebration in honor of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., President McPherson announced his intention to recommend to the Board of Trustees that the Academic Council resolution be adopted, with the understanding that this will be done for a three-year period during which time there will be an evaluation of the degree of University-wide participation.

5. Comments from the Assistant Provost:

Dr. Steidle informed the group of a new free, WEB-based note-taking service. The intent of the sponsors is to hire student note-takers, who would be compensated from advertising revenues. Advertising will presumably be incorporated as part of the notes. Dr. Steidle asked that the UCAP members of the sub-committee on residency policy provide her office with their schedules so that a meeting time can be established.

6. William Latta of the Office of Facilities Planning and Space Management joined the committee to discuss how his office was attempting to derive faculty input on classroom modifications and related faculty needs. He noted the existence of a cross-functional group

that had been organized to address classroom readiness and major improvements. Latta distributed several documents indicating the specifics of projects (both alterations and technological improvements) to be completed by August, 1998. He also distributed copies of the Classroom Help card and the Classroom Connection homepage, and invited the group to encourage their colleagues to report on conditions that warranted investigation. Several members of the group commented positively on recent experiences with service.

7. Mick Vande Berg, of the Study Abroad office, led a spirited discussion of the changes in and expansion of overseas study programs. He reported that two years ago, about 86% of the programs offered by MSU were MSU-faculty led programs, mainly of short duration. With the presidential initiative to increase the number of students studying abroad, there has been: (1) a swift increase in the total number of programs; (2) an emphasis on semester-length programs; (3) the development of relationships with new host institutions and teaching by indigenous faculty; (4) development of programs in which regular MSU requirements can be satisfied so as not to extend the total time to degree; (5) an in-process definition of the different sorts of arrangements, to include MSU faculty-based programs, MSU-sponsored programs, exchange programs, and external programs in which MSU students can participate. The purposes of study abroad include academic differentiation and gains, expanded professional opportunities, intercultural understanding, and profound personal changes in the students.

Vande Berg noted that the general obstacles to going abroad are fear, finances, and (program) “fit.” It is OSA’s task to make it easy for students to participate in quality study abroad, wherever possible at a cost near that of on-campus costs plus airfare. College-based programs increasingly try to incorporate equivalent MSU offerings. The use of indigenous faculty helps to keep the cost down in a number of locations. It is also important that OSA convey information that is timely and accurate and help the students with their planning. There is more attention to “leveraging”, with regard to financing; often, a small grant is sufficient to make up the difference in need or to compensate some for the loss of local job opportunities. A fund-raising campaign has generated scholarship assistance for these endeavors. OSA is also responsible for assuring the review of the quality of all of the programs and has a process in place to deal with safety review and notification issues. There were many questions posed and faculty were invited to solicit OSA’s assistance in pursuing program development options.

8. The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 noon, with other agenda items deferred until the next meeting.

UCAP1.22.98.doc

University Committee on Academic Policy
Minutes of the Meeting
February 5, 1998

Present: Folke Lindahl (chair), Adam Herringa, Sharon Hoerr, Peter Lappan, James Lucas, Dawn Pysarchik, Rachel Schiffman, Cy Stewart, Moses Turner

Others: Barbara Steidle (Assistant Provost)

1. The meeting was called to order at 10:25 a.m.
2. The agenda was approved.
3. Minutes of the meeting of January 22, 1998 are being reconstructed. They will be distributed with the next agenda.

4. **Comments from the Chair**

Lindahl did not have any comments at this time.

5. **Comments from the Assistant Provost**

Steidle commented on the emerging discussion on SIRS forms, as generated by students' requests for access to the forms. Provost Simon addressed the issue at the last meeting of the Academic Council. She indicated an intent to look at it from a series of perspectives: What should we be looking for as outcomes? What information would students find most useful? The faculty recently discussed this during one faculty discussion session.

Steidle's research indicates that MSU has had some form of student evaluation since 1949. The last iterations took place in the period between 1969-1976. UCAP has been heavily involved with the development of the current system, although not solely responsible for the development of the forms, per se.

One of the dimensions in the Provost's thinking on the issue is the nature of the materials that can now be made readily available and that would provide students with a great deal of basic information on courses. For example, an increasing number of faculty are putting syllabi and class materials on the WEB. In some of these, students are given information that goes beyond the standard assignments and testing information, for example, to information that enables them to analyze their test results with the purpose of comprehending why they made the errors..

Turner asked if there is another question students are asking. Are they learning what they expected to learn? Are faculty living up to their responsibilities? Are the faculty getting off easy?

Herringa believes that students want to hold faculty responsible. Students want to come out of a class knowing more than when they went in—a lot of students don't believe this is happening.

Stewart believes students simply want to know if they will be able to relate well to a particular faculty: Will they have a reasonably enjoyable time in class? Does the faculty enjoy teaching? Are they good lecturers? Does the faculty member care about the student?

Hoerr feels we should release the SIRS to students. She said other universities give them out.

Steidle reported that out of a poll of 11 major universities, only 3 presently automatically make the results public. Three do not publish under any circumstances, and the others leave it up to the faculty's discretion. The universities that do publish results, use a standard set of questions for all classes. The approximate ratio of use of the University form to local forms is currently about 60:40.

Turner asked what would happen if SIRS were made public. The intent of the SIRS forms were to assist departments and faculty in instruction improvement. He doesn't believe the SIRS forms give a clear picture of the course or of the instructor.

Lindhahl expressed a concern about professors teaching toward SIRS. Stewart replied that he thinks that is great. It's good to teach toward that, making positive goals.

Hoerr thinks it would be a PR disaster for instructors to refuse revealing results of their SIRS forms.

Steidle pointed out that there are many variables related to the issue of publication of SIRS, for example, do you deal differently with new instructors and grad assistants as opposed to experienced instructors? New instructors are likely to be downgraded in relation to experienced instructors. Some of this is a natural part of learning, yet this affects evaluations of faculty. Faculty work load may also play a part in this.

Pysarchik suggested that the current SIRS forms be improved. We need to explore how involved the students are in their own learning processes? They also have a role to engage themselves. Our current SIRS forms do nothing to capture this. Students need to get to the next level. Maybe we would have a more holistic approach to teaching/learning.

Lucas questioned the purpose of the SIRS. Isn't it for professors to use to help improve their own instruction. If we consider publishing the results, we need to ask if the form really says what we want it to say.

Steidle said that the discussion illustrates exactly why discussions are on-going. How do we address all of these issues? We need to capture the thinking of all of the parties as to what SIRS should incorporate, and for what purposes.

Herringa said that it is not the students' intent to have the commentary questions published. They want to know basic things about the instructor. Is it fair for a student to be subjected to a professor that can't teach?

The SIRS discussion ended here, but the issue will return to UCAP at a later date.

6. It is UCAP's duty to review graduation with honor and high honor. Steidle prepared some reports for viewing and discussion. Noting the increase of students graduating with honors from 19.6% to 23% in a two year period, she shared some theories for this inflation. OPB tried to analyze the root cause of the increase. Did we admit more talented students? This is not the case—students graduating in 1996-97 were somewhat lower in entry credentials than those in subsequent years. There is not a simple answer to date. One possibility relates to the transition period (91-92), in which there was a large increase in numbers of students graduating—desiring to get out before transition. It is believed that people taking longer to graduate tend to have lower GPAs. It is possible that the 96-97 group of graduates took a shorter length of time to earn their degree, and thus represented the students from that class with higher ability levels. It is also possible that more transfer students are graduating with honor. The uncertainties suggest the need to explore further before UCAP proposes any change in policy.

Hoerr wondered if this could be due to grade inflation? UCAP's study of this a couple of years ago found that grade inflation is not really an issue. Mean grades have remained relatively stable over time.

Lucas noted that some colleges are increasing a lot compared to others. Steidle explained that some shift in the caliber of the students from one field to another might affect that. We will have more information later. The committee agreed that a change in the system at this time should not be recommended.

7. Steidle distributed the fall semester report on the distribution of course grades by teaching college and by student's college. This is available on the WEB under the Registrar's Office/Enrollment Data pages. UCAP members were encouraged to share the information with their departments and colleges so that they will view these and take stock of the helpful information. Along with the Grading Practices Analysis, these reports have been made available to the Assistant/Associate Deans of the colleges. The Grading Practices Analysis report includes the mean grades for each course and section as compared to mean grades earned by the students in those courses/sections in their other courses.
8. The meeting was adjourned at 11:33 a.m.

UCAP2.5.98.doc

University Committee on Academic Policy
Minutes of the Meeting
March 5, 1998

Present: Folke Lindahl (chair), Rachel Fisher, Sharon Hoerr, Kristina Juntunen, Sheryl Kill, Judy Kolkman, Jan Krehbiel, Peter Lappan, Dawn Pysarchik, Rachel Schiffman, Cy Stewart

Others: Barbara Steidle (Assistant Provost)

1. The meeting was called to order at 10:20 a.m.
2. Minutes for UCAP meetings on 2/5/98 and 2/22/98 were approved without additions or amendments.
3. The chairperson suggested that all committee members share the grade distribution data with all relevant faculty and administrative personnel in their various departments and colleges. It was requested that comments on this data be requested and that this data be communicated to Professor Lindahl.
4. The Book Fair at the MSU Bookstore was announced. It will include displays of new books that may be of interest to the faculty. This may provide faculty with a means by which to gain enhanced understanding and appreciation of the bookstore's services.
5. The University Policy committee responded favorably to the proposal for the celebration of Martin Luther King, Jr.'s birthday. The decision was that classes be canceled on the Martin Luther King, Jr. holiday. Student representatives were clear on their desire not to simply have a day off but, rather, to have the opportunity to celebrate Dr. King's contributions to our society; hence, the opening of the semester was advanced to the Monday preceding the originally scheduled Wednesday. Reasons for the continuation of the Monday origin of classes were presented by Dr. Steidle. A motion to this effect was presented and passed. The change will begin with the 98-99 academic year.
6. The discussion regarding students' desire to have SIRS information published and how this might be done is proceeding according to the scenario projected by the Provost at Academic Council. Several layers of discussion have been initiated (a) with student representatives; (b) with groups of faculty; and (c) with a mixture of students and faculty. The purpose of these discussions is to identify exactly what information students want; what information is most useful to faculty; and how to strike balances between the non-complementary purposes of the SIRS forms (i.e., formative and summative), and how to reconcile differences in student and faculty positions. If a small set of 5-6 questions can be defined in a timely manner, academic departments will be invited to participate in a pilot project to test the questions and ascertain whether they provide the information students are seeking. Students seem to be interested in data regarding course objectives, teaching styles, the conduct of

classes, grading procedures, and general satisfaction with the course and with the instructor. In addition, there is broad and increasing support for mid-term evaluations that would lead to course changes, as necessary.

7. A number of commercial note-taking organizations do not follow university policy regarding their activities. University policy requires that when notes are taken for profit (i.e., to be sold to students), or are to be commercialized, the student must be enrolled in the section and, in addition, must have the instructor's permission. Discussion reflected on the violation of copyright, the problems of incorrect representation of class materials, and interference with the student-instructor relationship. Numerous legal complications on freedom of access and information were discussed. It was agreed that UCAP should prepare a statement that might be used by instructors who are concerned with protecting their lecture/classroom materials. Such a statement could be included on the class syllabus.

8. The meeting was adjourned at 11:10 a.m.

UCAP3.5.98.doc

University Committee on Academic Policy
Minutes of the Meeting
April 2, 1998

Present: Folke Lindahl (chair), Adam Herringa, Sharon Hoerr, Sheryl Kill, Judy Kolkman, Peter Lappan, Jim Lucas, Rachel Schiffman, Cy Stewart

Others: Barbara Steidle (Assistant Provost), Associate Dean James Rainey

1. The meeting was called to order at 10:25 a.m.
2. Minutes for the UCAP meeting of March 5, 1998 were approved without amendment.
3. The chairperson requested, and received, permission to re-order the agenda to accommodate the arrival of guests who were to speak to relevant issues.
4. The Committee reviewed a draft letter regarding a statement on commercialized notetaking intended for distribution to faculty. The impetus had been provided by the appearance of a new Web-based "notetaking service" and by a challenge from a local notetaking service to a statement on notetaking policy by a faculty member in a syllabus. The letter was approved with a minor change in wording.
5. A request from the College of Business to raise the current 2.75 GPA requirement for admission to the accounting major to a 3.0 was placed before the committee for consideration. Some preliminary information was reviewed on the institutional posture on enrollment limitations and the nature and number of such limitations. Programs with approved enrollment limitations may be permitted to set special requirements for entrance to the major. Such requests are reviewed by UCAP, acting in its advisory mode. Associate Dean Rainey addressed the reasons for the proposed change and responded to a number of questions about the College's rationale and on the College's practice of raising the GPA floor to maintain control of the number of admits.

Following Dean Rainey's departure, there was a lengthy discussion of the motion to change the GPA threshold for admission to the accounting major. Members raised questions about the nature and coherence of the rationale presented; the real impacts on students; the impact upon other business programs of treating admissions to Accounting even more differentially; the advisability of applying a GPA floor as an arbitrary cut-off for admission; patterns of placement of accounting majors; and whether the institution should be driven to such changes based on the preferences of a limited set of external businesses. The proposal was unanimously rejected, without prejudice to the College's ability to propose an alternative mechanism.

6. UCAP then turned to the review of possible "public questions" that might be added to the SIRS form. Jeremy Dershow (guest) and Adam Herringa briefly described the process the

student sub-committee had used to define its selections. Without any prior information as to the result of the student poll, UCAP members ranked items from a list of 20. Among the items that rated most highly, 4 of the choices were identical to the student list:

1. Instructor stimulates students to think critically about course content.
2. Lectures and other in-class activities contributed to students' understanding.
3. Student competence in the discipline increased as a result of this course.
4. The substance of items 15, 19 and 20, dealing with communication between student and instructor. A variation that combines the items will be framed.

There was also agreement on adding a "student effort" – focused item. Other choices differed across the groups, with the student group (non-UCAP) strongly supportive of including "student would take another course from this instructor," while UCAP members favored items on fostering in-depth understandings and activities that contribute to students' understanding.

Drs. Steidle and Straney will meet again with the students to try to arrive at a final list. The plan is to pilot these questions with a set of faculty volunteers this semester. An analysis will then be done to determine whether the questions measure what they are intended to measure. There were some concerns expressed about the validity of these or any of the SIRS questions and as to how the information will be presented.

The meeting was adjourned at noon.

UCAP4.2.98.doc

University Committee on Academic Policy
Minutes of the Meeting
April 30, 1998

Present: Folke Lindahl (chair), Jenifer Banks, Rachel Fisher, Adam Herringa, Sharon Hoerr, Kristina Juntunen, Sheryl Kill, Jan Krehbiel, Peter Lappan, Jim Lucas, Dawn Pysarchik, Rachel Schiffman

Others: Barbara Steidle (Assistant Provost), Associate Dean James Rainey, Kevin Loudon

1. The meeting was called to order at 10:20 a.m.
2. Minutes for the UCAP meeting of April 2, 1998 were approved without amendment.
3. The chair thanked the Committee for their work over the year.
4. Assistant Provost Steidle provided Committee members with an edited copy of the questions that were devised for use in the pilot project to evaluate some questions for possible public dissemination. She also provided a copy of the *State News* article on the subject plus the letter of clarification sent to the *State News* by Don Straney and Steidle.
5. Associate Dean James Rainey and Kevin Loudon re-introduced the proposal by the College of Business to raise the GPA requirement for admission to accounting to 3.0. To underscore the College's policy of adjusting the criteria in order to maintain appropriate levels of admission, Dean Rainey recounted for the Committee the 1992 discussion with UCAP that resulted in lowering the threshold for admission in non-accounting programs to 2.5; for accounting, the threshold was maintained at 2.75. He indicated his and the College's belief that, as a limited enrollment program, the College had the option of changing the entry level requirements to maintain stability, with the expectation that they would inform UCAP of the changes. He further indicated that the College had made certain staffing decisions for next year on the assumption of approval. Responding to commentary in the April 2 minutes, Rainey indicated that the Engineering approach to enrollment limitation was not fool-proof and that the Assistant Dean of Engineering was consistently faced with explaining rejections that affected students with higher-than-minimal GPAs. He noted that the service load borne by Business parallels the lab space limitation issues in Engineering.

Committee members raised a number of questions. These included: the level of the service role of the College; patterns of new hires and staffing; the number of students who would be affected by the change; the options available to students who were on the margin (i.e., 2.95); the impact on diversity; the liability involved if the College set a strict standard and then departed from it to serve special purposes; the extent to which students applied to the program, as opposed to the College; and why—given the continued requests for changes in the standards—it was not better to establish a basic threshold and limit numbers according to a richer, more varied set of criteria. Dean Rainey and Kevin Loudon responded to the

questions raised. Loudon expressed the opinion that the entry threshold would not be much more of a barrier and that students could improve their chances for admission by working harder. Dean Rainey noted that a College-wide limitation was under study and suggested that UCAP consider authorizing the 3.0 level entry GPA for a year, with the expectation that he would return in the fall with an over-all plan.

In the discussion that followed, Committee members debated seriously the proposition of a one-year approval. They concluded that a roll-back after that period was unlikely and that the College would continue to face limitation issues that were not solved by the periodic changes in GPA level. Members supported the use of multiple measures, and argued that GPA alone was an insufficient measure for an area like Business, that required varied skills beyond academic competency. Rachel Schiffman moved to oppose the request; the motion was seconded by Jennifer Banks and received unanimous support. The group recommended (a) that the College devise a set of criteria that included, but went beyond, GPA; (b) that the criteria include some focus on “people” skills; (c) that, consistent with the land grant mission, the College place a premium on diversity in its student body; (d) that the College apply the criteria with reference to selecting the number of students which constituted the limitation target.

6. Nomination of officers, 1998-1999: Because the roster of members was incomplete, nomination of a slate of officers was postponed. The chairperson will consult with members over the next two weeks. Elections will be held at the opening meeting of 1998-1999.
7. Residency: The Committee received a draft status report from the residency sub-committee. The topic will be carried over to next year’s committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

UCAP4.30.98.doc