

University Committee on Academic Policy
Minutes of the Meeting
September 3, 1998

Present: B. Ames, J. Chartkoff, D. Lantagne, B. Litman, F. Lindahl, G. Mead,
D. Pysarchik, J. Wald

Others: B. Steidle, (Assistant Provost)

Minutes prepared by: B. Ames

1. The meeting was called to order at 10:20 a.m. by F. Lindahl.
2. The minutes of April 30, 1998 were approved.
3. The following slate of officers was unanimously accepted:

Chair: Joseph Chartkoff

Vice Chair: Barbara Ames

Secretary: to be rotated among committee members

2nd Rep to Academic Council: Jeanne Wald

Rep to Military Education Advisory Committee: Doug Lantagne

4. Comments from the Assistant Provost:

- A. B. Steidle indicated that there are nearly 6800 freshmen, and that quality, as measured by GPA, ACT scores and AP credits, is improving. In response to a question, she noted that the last review done for UCAP indicated that the percentage of students coming to the university with high school foreign language continues to increase, having risen from 61% in 1989 to about 83% currently.
- B. The issue of calendar coordination for semester-length overseas study programs will be addressed by adjusting semester dates for those programs that do not coincide with the MSU calendar in order to eliminate incompletes resulting from the differentiations.
- C. The UCAP 1997-98 Annual Report was distributed. Items for consideration during the 1998-99 academic year include:
 1. SIRS form policy
 2. Graduation with honors

3. First year student projects and programs

4. College of Business: revised criteria for program admission at the junior year, including use of criteria beyond GPA

5. Questions/comments from committee members included:

a. B. Ames asked if institutional policies are being developed to guide the acceptance of transfer credit from Web courses. B. Steidle indicated that the decisions will continue to reside in the departments. A related issue, however, is the residency requirement.

b. D. Pysarchik asked for clarification as to whether some issues might come to UCAP for discussion and feedback, while other issues come for formal approval through the academic governance system. B. Steidle agreed that this is appropriate.

6. F. Lindahl was thanked for his efforts as chair during the 1997-98 year.

7. Meeting adjourned 11:20 a.m.

UCAP9.3.98

University Committee on Academic Policy
Minutes of the Meeting
October 1, 1998

Present: J. Chartkoff, R. Fisher, C. Gibbons, F. Jacobs, D. Lantagne, F. Lindahl,
B. Litman, J. Patterson, J. Rodman (for D. Pysarchik), M. Stefaniak, J. Sticklen,
J. Wald, M. Wendorf, D. Woodard, I. Woodward

Others: B. Steidle (Assistant Provost), A. Barber, Eli Broad College of Business

Minutes prepared by: D. Lantagne

1. The meeting was called to order at 10:18 a.m. by J. Chartkoff.
2. The agenda was approved with changes. The presentation of proposed changes for admission requirements to the Eli Broad College of Business was moved to follow the opening comments from the committee chairperson and the Assistant Provost.
3. The minutes of September 3, 1998 were approved.
4. Comments from the Committee Chairperson:

J. Chartkoff asked J. Wald to summarize for the committee some of the issues that were discussed in Academic Council that she attended for the chair. She informed the committee that President McPherson outlined ideas and issues that would be discussed with the Board of Trustees. These included discussion about the University's emphasis on undergraduate education, graduate education, community diversity, research direction and outreach issues.

5. Comments from the Assistant Provost:

A. B. Steidle commented that President McPherson was setting out discussion points for the University agenda over the next few years in his meeting with the Academic Council. These would be further major points that need to be addressed under the Guiding Principles already set forth by the President. There needs to be a discussion on the priority of undergraduate education with the intent of developing implementation points and a strategy of where to position undergraduate education in the future. The issue raised in Council surrounding graduate education is how to continue to develop our strengths within a constrained universe of resources.

B. There was also some discussion about the role of Athletic Council during the meeting of the Academic Council. There is a continuing exchange on explaining why members of the Athletic Council receive free tickets to sports events. There is a concern regarding conflict of interest, but this must be balanced by a need by the members of the Athletic Council to understand the expectations placed on our student-athletes.

- C. B. Steidle then outlined items that UCAP will be addressing in the coming year. These included the idea of requiring students to arrive with laptop computers for the 2001 fall semester, continuing discussion of the SIRS project that was conducted last year and the issue of making public a new set of questions appended to SIRS forms.

6. Presentation by A. Barber, Assistant Dean, Eli Broad College of Business on revised Admission Requirements

- A. A. Barber gave a brief history of the reason for being a limited enrollment college, the method determining admission to the college currently in place and the suggested revisions to the admission policy. The college wishes to manage the numbers more directly by establishing one GPA level as a floor for consideration for entry to the college. Anyone meeting that floor would be considered competitively for entry using other criteria such as overall GPA, GPA within core courses and diversity issues. The latter is defined to include residency, ethnic diversity and international diversity
- B. B. Steidle summarized history of past problems with enrollment numbers in some colleges and the attempt by affected colleges to find new approaches to balance the problem of demand for access against resource availability within the affected colleges and the University.
- C. Numerous questions were raised by committee members regarding the implementation details of the new admission policy. Some of the issues, a number of which related to internal management of the process, discussed were:
- a) Overall GPA would become the dominant factor determining entry to the college. This was a concern of several members who expressed reservations that the college would be able to equitably evaluate the records of students beyond the GPA. There were some suggestions that the college consider an application form or other mechanism that would provide the evaluators with a broader array of information on the applicants. A. Barber was concerned that time would be a major factor in trying to implement an application form but would discuss it with the faculty.
 - b) The published floor GPA would not truly represent the GPA level actually needed for admission. Several members were concerned that the floor GPA only becomes a published number that does not convey the actual requirements required to gain entry to the college. Some students may view the floor GPA as a guarantee of admission to the college and not as the minimum required for consideration. The college needs to make efforts beyond the college catalog to inform students of the competitive nature of the admission process to the college. A. Barber indicated communication would be ongoing to the students beyond that contained in the University Catalog.
 - c) How would the college gather or use student background information to help in the admission of students to the college? This was a recurring theme in the discussions. Given the compressed nature of the time in which decisions are completed for admission to the college, how could the college assure that students with diverse backgrounds but slightly lower GPA would be fairly and equitably evaluated for admission? A. Barber indicated on a number of occasions that the college was still

- working on the details of the plan, but assured members of the committee that factors other than GPA would be considered and would be important items in the evaluation procedure.
- d) The process used for student selection needs to be clear to the students. In addition, a clear set of alternatives within business should be provided to those students that are denied entry when appropriate.
 - e) A number of comments regarding the difficulty of enrolling non-business majors into core business courses were raised, as were the concerns that the service courses offered by the College do not serve the needs of all non-business majors. A. Barber indicated that discussions were on-going on how to deal with this issue.
 - f) The issue of how the new admission requirements would affect additional degree programs with the College of Business was raised. A. Barber indicated that this is an issue that still needs to be reviewed.
 - g) A question as to what level of enrollment was being targeted for the college. B. Steidle informed the group that this is a negotiated number between the Provost and the college.
 - h) A straw vote showed majority support for the new admission requirements. The committee's sense of support will be forwarded to the Provost.
 - i) Continuing discussion occurred during and after the straw vote with the majority of discussion concerned with insuring clarity of understanding for students and the consequences of unintended student sorting that might occur under the new guidelines. A. Barber indicated the college would continue to work on the issues that were raised by UCAP to insure that the admission requirements are applied fairly.

7. Residency Requirement Definition

- A. B. Steidle provided a history of the residency issue to the committee. The increase in opportunities to take overseas studies courses, summer classes, off-campus classes taught by MSU faculty or off-campus classes sanctioned by MSU was compromised by the fact that they were outside the definition applied to the University's residency requirement. This disadvantaged some students for such considerations as Board of Trustees awards and graduation with honor or high honor. A joint subcommittee of UCAP and UGC was established to consider the matter and to make recommendations to the committees. The report of the joint subcommittee of UCAP and UGC was distributed to the committee for consideration of sections of the report dealing with recommendations regarding Baccalaureate degrees and a proposed new definition of residency.
- B. The committee questioned the consistency between the wording of the statement regarding Baccalaureate degrees in regards to the statement that MSU was "primarily a residential undergraduate institution" and the proposed redefinition. There was also some discussion on the use of the phrase "in a classroom setting". B. Steidle agreed that the

wording was not phrased correctly and would bring some revised wording to the committee for further consideration.

- C. The definition of residency was accepted in principle but there were concerns with the continued use of the term residency given the wide-ranging definition that followed. The question was whether to use another term to describe the wide range of acceptable formats that a student can use to expand their MSU experience while reserving the use of the term "resident" for those taking classes on campus.
- D. There was also discussion by the committee in regards to the definition of the virtual university and its relationship to those both on- and off-campus. There was a general agreement that a student's use of technology on- or off-campus in the pursuit of their degree at MSU should never be penalized.

8. Academic Recognition of Non-Traditional Students

To be discussed at the next meeting.

9. Information Item: Electronic and Phone Availability of Grade Reports

- A. L. Smith reported voice response technology, touch tone phone access and Internet access will be increasingly used to provide students with their grade reports. The goal over time may be to reduce or eliminate the need to mail grade reports. Some of these accessibility measures are also in response to the American with Disabilities Act.

10. Meeting was adjourned 11:59 a.m.

University Committee on Academic Policy
Minutes
October 15, 1998

Present: B. Ames, J. Chartkoff, C. Gibbons, F. Jacobs, B. Litman, L. Martin, D. Pysarchik, M. Stefaniak, J. Sticklen, M. Wendorf, J. Wald, D. Woodard, I. Woodward

Others: B. Steidle, Don Straney, Francisco Villarruel, Jeff Edmonds

Minutes prepared by Fred Jacobs

1. Agenda and minutes were approved.
2. B. Ames said that she could attend the November meeting of the Executive Committee of Academic Council since J. Charkoff has a class conflict. Chartkoff will investigate the appropriateness of having an alternate.
3. B. Steidle proposed that the main agenda item for the next meeting be the Laptop Computer Proposal and that the subsequent meeting address the promotion of undergraduate education, in the context of President McPherson's emerging "Promises".
4. The Committee reviewed the memorandum entitled Recommendations Regarding Residency Policy, as revised by B. Steidle to accommodate the Committee's October 1 comments. Items 2.a., 3, and 4 of the previous version had been changed. There was some concern about whether it was prudent to allow students to use technologically-mediated courses to satisfy the residency requirement. The consensus of Committee members was that these types of courses were primarily designed to enhance the learning experience for students that are on campus. The Committee supported the revised version. A copy will be forwarded to the University Graduate Council, which is also reviewing the document.
5. The Committee discussed a letter from a part-time student asking consideration of some form of academic recognition for part-time students analagous to the Dean's List. Related issues discussed were separate student categories for Dean's List-type of recognition, a decrease in the number of credits needed to get on the Dean's List, the effect of changing current Dean's List criteria, other recognition options for "non-traditional" students, the number of students that would be affected by a change, and benchmarking with peer institutions. A subcommittee was appointed to explore options and make recommendations to the Committee in approximately one month. The subcommittee members are B. Ames and J. Wald.
6. There was discussion of a recent pilot study of several SIRS-type questions administered in a classroom by F. Villarruel and other issues associated with making results accessible to students. Another pilot at the end of Fall semester, with much larger numbers, is being planned. Related issues discussed were the possible inclusion of instructor and course global questions on a future pilot study, the examination of correlation of the global questions with current questions, the method for making results accessible, the potential benefits for faculty, and other uses of results. In general, the Committee supports the concept and encourages continued pilot testing, but recognizes that full implementation requires more study and analysis. Faculty members of the Committee were invited to participate and/or to solicit participation in their academic units.

The meeting adjourned at noon.

University Committee on Academic Policy

Minutes

October 29, 1998

Present: B. Ames, J. Chartkoff, P. Edwards, C. Gibbons, F. Jacobs, D. Lantagne,
L. Martin, J. Patterson, D. Pysarchik, P. Sinder, J. Sticklen, M. Stefaniak,
J. Wald, M. Wendorf, I. Woodward

Others: P. Hunt (Provost's Office), A. Paulukonis (ICTC), J. Siegel (NCC – School of
Criminal Justice), B. Steidle (Assistant Provost), M. Sullivan (School of
Music and CCSAC)

Minutes prepared by: J. Wald

1. The meeting was called to order at 10:18 A.M. by J. Chartkoff.
2. The agenda was approved.
3. The minutes were approved with correction by B. Ames regarding her attendance of Academic Council meetings.
4. J. Chartkoff and B. Steidle passed on comments in order to devote time to the main issue: The Student Laptop Proposal.
5. **Presentation by P. Hunt (Provost's Office), A. Paulukonis (ICTC), J. Siegel (NCC - School of Criminal Justice), and M. Sullivan (School of Music and CCSAC)**
 - A. After introducing his colleagues, P. Hunt began the presentation regarding the Student Laptop Proposal by providing some historical context. Discussion regarding computer requirements for all students has been ongoing for several years. The increased access, availability of funds for technology, advances in technology in combination with lower cost of laptop computers all led to the current document advising adoption of a computer requirement for entering freshmen in 2001. The 12 main points of the Proposal are summarized in one of the submitted documents.
 - B. J. Siegel briefly described his role as a faculty member and member of the Network Communications Committee. MSU has been aggressively networking classrooms and dormitory rooms. In fact, soon MSU will have the largest number of rooms wired of any university in the country. While problems exist such as the consequences of large numbers of people simultaneously using the network, his committee remains optimistic regarding solutions. The Committee also recognized the need to develop programs to prepare faculty. The Committee was unanimous regarding the advisability of proceeding and the judgment of a successful outcome. As evidence of

the importance and ubiquity of technology in our students' future, J. Siegel pointed out current uses of technology such as in police cars and innovative criminal justice use. After investigation of other universities, it seems that MSU may be a leader in this area. Among concerns raised were the costs to students. Here it is hoped that financial aid will be at least a partial solution.

- C. A. Paulukonis indicated the function of the Instructional Computing and Technology Committee includes approving software for lab use. She pointed out that individual laptops enable students to use software more easily since labs may have limited hours, may be crowded, or may be in inconvenient locations. Sometimes small classes need a specific piece of software which then might be located in just one lab. In this case, there is obviously very limited access. If students had their own laptop computers, this would not pose a problem. Additionally, after leaving MSU the students take the laptop with them affording to the student access to this material in the future. While laptops provide all these advantages, the current labs still would have a function and would be maintained. For example, some software may only run on one type of machine.
- D. M. Sullivan focused on the advantages of portability of laptop computers, the individual's choice of type as long as it met certain minimal requirements for capability and the versatility for different class situations. Some current problems that need addressing now include networking of dormitories, access to the Internet across campus, equity of access including off campus housing, faculty preparation, financial aid, maintenance questions (availability of loaners, quick response time, etc.). By starting now MSU increases the likelihood of being in a reasonable position to make excellent use of the computers three years hence. MSU would be in a leadership position and would increase substantially the quality of its education.
- E. P. Hunt discussed the Provost's comment on social equity and referred to NTIA tables (submitted document) regarding use of computers in homes according to socio-economic factors. He indicated that more recent data from other sources suggests the percentages are up to about 50% currently. The data shows there are differences according to income, race, single parent homes, etc. By making computers a requirement, MSU then is able to include the cost in financial aid calculations and thus resolve a possible conflict with MSU's land grant philosophy. Counsel's opinion is that this requirement would not have an adverse effect on the tuition tax credit. Another question that arose was whether the federal government would accept this as financial aid. Florida State seems to have "broken the trail" with this.
- F. Next P. Hunt invited an item by item discussion of the 12 points of the proposal.
- G. #1: UCAP Committee members raised questions concerning adequate availability and usability of printers and access for off-campus students. P. Hunt commented that we are upgrading now and have been doing so consistently. There is planning regarding future needs. In addition concern was expressed regarding the already slow response time during certain periods of the day. A. Paulukonis responded that the slowness was due to nationwide use rather than local use. There was a question regarding possible vandalism by students. Currently this is not a problem.
- H. #2: Issues raised included whether there would be battery back-ups in case of power failure; how would the lack of adequate desktop space in many lecture rooms be

addressed; what happens when the equipment becomes obsolete; how much of the costs for the upgrading of classrooms, etc. will be passed on to the student. P. Hunt responded to these concerns by saying that CCSAC has considered these problems, and that funds are set aside to deal with some of these contingencies.

- I. At this point P. Hunt suggested that it might be more profitable to first address whether we should support the proposal and then deal with the specifics of implementation. One key issue of the proposal is the allowing individual choice of platform. This is different from other universities. An individual graduate program may be permitted to specify one platform, but because many undergraduates change majors a few times, CCSAC decided against requirement of special types of computer for particular undergraduate majors. The question was raised as to whether the faculty would be charged with a certain percentage usage of computer in courses in order to justify the requirement. There is no intention of requiring faculty to incorporate computers in courses, however accrediting bodies probably will review this usage anyway. (Music was just reviewed in this regard by an accrediting agency.)
- J. An overwhelming majority of CCSAC, ICTC, NCC committee members were in favor of laptop computers as opposed to desktop computer.
- K. Gender issues were raised - there is evidence that boys and girls use technology differently. Will there be programs to deal with this? P. Hunt responded that other groups such as the Women's Resource Center would be asked to submit proposals in their APPR regarding these issues.
- L. Concerns about whether there would be funds available for those graduate students not currently on aid were voiced. Hunt indicated that, for both graduate and undergraduate students on the margin of financial aid, the requirement might move them into the eligibility category. The Provost is aware of the impact of the additional cost on the financial aid packaging.
- M. UCAP's role was clarified. UCAP's role falls under the category of consultation, which involves discussing the issue placed before the committee and acting to inform the decision of the administrator who has authority to make the decision. P. Hunt was asked to attend the next meeting in order to assist UCAP's further discussion. The Committee will then have the opportunity to discuss the matter as a committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:05

UCAP10.29.98.doc

**University Committee on Academic Policy
Minutes
November 12, 1998**

Present: B. Ames, J. Chartkoff, P. Edwards, C. Gibbons, F. Jacobs, D. Lantagne,
B. Litman, L. Martin, J. Patterson, D. Pysarchik, J. Sticklen, M. Stefaniak,
J. Wald, I. Woodward

Others: P. Hunt (Provost's Office), B. Steidle (Assistant Provost),
M. Sullivan (School of Music and CCSAC), Gail Reigle (College of Osteopathic
Medicine), James Rechtein, Acting Chairperson, Department of Anatomy

Minutes prepared by: J. Sticklen

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:20 a.m. by Chairperson Chartkoff.

2. Agenda Approval

The agenda was amended by moving Item 5 (Student Laptop Proposal) forward in the agenda, including a resolution passed by ASMSU regarding the Student Laptop Proposal. The agenda was approved as amended.

3. Minutes Approval

The minutes of the last UCAP meeting were approved with minor amendments.

4. Chairperson Comments

Chairperson Chartkoff noted in his comments that ASMSU at its most recent meeting had passed a motion expressing opposition to the Student Laptop Proposal in its current form. He then turned the floor over to Mr. Stefaniak for presentation to UCAP of the motion passed by ASMSU. Mr. Stefaniak read the motion to UCAP. Moderate questions from other UCAP members ensued – in particular trying to determine the kernel of the ASMSU objections to the Student Laptop Proposal. Crux issues seemed to be centered on economic concerns.

5. Assistant Provost Comments

Assistant Provost Steidle had no comments.

6. Effect of Anatomy Department Dissolution on Undergraduate Courses

UCAP then went on to discuss an issue of continued availability of undergraduate anatomy courses, consideration of which related to the reorganization of the Anatomy Department and reassignment of faculty members to different academic departments. Assistant Provost Steidle reminded UCAP members of the role which UCAP plays in this type of discussion: UCAP is charged with reviewing the situation with particular attention to how the instructional role formerly played by the departmental faculty will be carried out in the future. By its practices, UCAP pays particular attention to evidence of thorough consultation with affected units and groups.

Dr. Rechtein of the Anatomy Department indicated that the current Anatomy Department courses of direct concern are Anatomy 316 and 480. The plan calls for ANT 316 to be offered annually by the Radiology Department. The handling of ANT 480, a dissection course related to the cadaveric needs of the medical schools, is dependent on the College of Human Medicine, and there is an equivalent commitment to offering this course.

Discussion was opened to UCAP members. Mr. Stefaniak inquired as to how the faculty and staff would be affected by the proposed administrative reorganization. Dr. Rechtein indicated that this issue was not fully worked out yet. Dr. Steidle reminded UCAP members that the reorganization issue and personnel issues flowing from this proposed reorganization are not UCAP issues – rather that UCAP's scope is limited to examination of the effects of the reorganization on the instructional program.

Dr. Chartkoff inquired about the clientele of the courses. Dr. Rechtein replied that the major areas affected are nursing and pre-med.

Dr. Lantagne asked for clarification as to what UCAP was to vote on regarding the issue under discussion. Dr. Steidle reiterated that the primary role of UCAP was advisory on this issue, and that the scope of the advice should be limited to effects on the instructional program.

Dr. Jacobs inquired about the impact on students. Dr. Rechtein replied that, in relation to the current Anatomy 316, students may in fact see a positive effect. Radiology (the unit to take over 316) is aggressive in terms of the introduction of innovation into the teaching program, and tends to have ample resources to fund such innovation.

Dr. Ames inquired if other models had been investigated. She further cautioned that changes in large enrollment service courses can sometimes have unforeseen ramifications.

Dr. Chartkoff expressed similar concerns regarding 480 although the enrollment is less than 316. He went on to suggest that handling the transition of 316 seems well thought out, except possibly the issue of how potential student demand for 316 will be covered. Dr. Rechtein indicated that this is an active area of discussion with the relevant Deans. One proposal to achieve multiple annual offerings of ANT 316 would involve having the course provided by the College of Natural Science. Dr. Steidle added that, historically, when student need overran available space, additional seats had been made available through increased section size.

Dr. Pysarchik noted that from the record of interactions it seemed as though Nursing was not directly involved in consultations regarding the suggested disposition of Anatomy and the impact on the 316

course. Dr. Steidle indicated that Nursing was informed, but not directly involved in the formal negotiation/discussion regarding departmental structure and faculty reassignment.

After further consideration, UCAP consensus was that issues related to impact on the Anatomy 316 course flowing from the administrative reorganization proposed had been adequately discussed and addressed. The chairperson further expressed the sense of the group as encouraging the deans involved to consider more frequent offerings in order to advantage the students. In response to a question from Dr. Kerr, Dr. Steidle noted that the scope of UCAP on this issue centered on determination of whether adequate discussions between affected units had taken place rather than on the nature of those reactions, and that since UCAP after thorough examination had determined that such discussion had taken place as shown in the documentation presented, that the UCAP role in the matter was fulfilled.

7. Consideration of Student Laptop Proposal

UCAP members then went on to reopen discussion regarding the Student Laptop Computer Proposal which has been put forward by Provost Simon's Office, and by CCSAC. Dr. Hunt and Dr. Sullivan (Chair of CCSAC) joined UCAP members for this discussion.

Dr. Hunt first yielded the floor to Mr. Stefaniak for discussion of the ASMSU position against the Student Laptop Proposal. Mr. Stefaniak indicated that the crux of the objection raised by ASMSU seemed to be focused on financial concerns, and in particular, on eligibility of students for obtaining student loans for laptop purchase. Mr. Stefaniak also noted that the process by which the ASMSU motion against the Student Laptop Proposal was passed was somewhat rushed. UCAP members then went on to ask Mr. Stefaniak questions to help clarify student concerns on the issue. Several UCAP members expressed some concerns over the process that yielded the ASMSU expressed position against the laptop proposal.

Dr. Hunt then resumed his discussion of major facets of the Student Laptop Proposal. (Summarized in material given to UCAP at an earlier meeting.)

Dr. Hunt noted that data gathering has progressed to assess the problems of damage, theft, and maintenance of laptops that might be expected. Data has been accumulated from the SUPER program and from the loaner program operated in the Computer Center. The data suggest that damage, theft, and maintenance issues are not significant problems. This data was factored in by CCSAC and by Dr. Hunt's office in developing the current laptop proposal.

Dr. Hunt then moved to the issue of faculty computing environment. The issue here is that if faculty are to leverage the new educational options offered if the laptop proposal is adopted, then the faculty computing environment must be continuously upgraded. Dr. Hunt noted that teaching/learning environment funds (TLE) are currently divided by the factors ... 65% to units, and 45% directly for faculty upgrades. Between the current date and the rollout date for the laptop requirement, there would be three more installments of TLE funds made available for faculty computing environment upgrades: February 99, February 00, and February 01.

Dr. Jacobs inquired as to the level of support in terms of faculty computer upgrades. Dr. Hunt replied that the Administration is committed to providing faculty members a computing environment

as least as powerful as the laptop units students will have. He further noted that varying units at MSU undertake upgrades in different fashion with the TLE funding provided. Dr. Chartkoff asked if faculty needs would not really center on laptop units (as opposed to desktop units). Dr. Hunt replied that he thought that was a reasonable general view, but that (again) different needs in units or individuals might dictate upgrades to computer types other than laptops. Dr. Pysarchik inquired if the upgrade policy would extend to GTAs. Dr. Hunt replied that it would if the GTA were the instructor of record.

Turning to his Item 4, Dr. Hunt went on to discuss faculty training programs, and their importance. He indicated that there were three current initiatives to address training needs.

1. live faculty training sessions/short courses,
2. CBT on line modules, and
3. free training for students which in the current semester were held on Saturday mornings. (Over 400 students have participated during fall semester.)

Dr. Steidle added that Computer Science and Engineering 101 should also be counted as a large factor in developing student computer literacy. Enrollment in CSE 101 is currently at 1800 students per term during the regular academic year.

Dr. Pysarchik inquired if the short courses for faculty included customized training. Dr. Hunt replied in the affirmative; tracks include (a) general, (b) electronic publishing, and (c) CGI scripting (for advanced web development). Dr. Hunt further indicated that funding for faculty training is available, but that no serious requests for draws on this funding have been made.

Dr. Patterson asked a general question that went to a crux issue: Will faculty be ready to take advantage of the new opportunities if the Student Laptop Proposal is adopted? Dr. Hunt replied that the concern of the Administration is not over the number or percentage of faculty who are involved at this point, but rather with the actions which are being taken by some faculty members who are “pressing the envelope.” The point he expressed was that if there are many examples of what can be done, then other faculty will see these examples and over time adopt available methods/techniques to their own teaching situation.

Dr. Hunt then moved on to his Issue #5 which covered financial aid, and cost of the Student Laptop Proposal from a student perspective. Dr. Hunt emphasized that the projected cost of the machine type at rollout would be approximately \$1000. Currently a percentage of incoming students come to MSU with laptops or desktops. But those not financially able do not. In effect, computer technology introduction if not handled correctly could have the effect of further stratifying student outcome abilities. To make computing universally available student aid packages are needed, but to enable this, the Student Laptop Proposal needs to be a requirement of matriculation at MSU, not an option. A good deal of the thinking leading up to the Student Laptop Proposal flows from this one point.

Dr. Hunt shared with UCAP members an anecdote. Recently he attended a professional meeting in North Carolina. The hotel he stayed in had data ports in each room; his colleagues each brought with them their laptops. At the bottom line, the type of ubiquitous mobile computing present at this meeting will be the norm of the professional world our graduates will face.

Mr. Woodward inquired if there had been discussion of University sponsored rentals of laptops that students could make use of. Dr. Hunt replied that it had been discussed but that a very large impediment is that the University cannot be perceived to be in competition with local corporate entities. The issue is still open, but must be treated very carefully.

Dr. Sullivan inquired if any method of pooling (analogous to car pooling) had been considered to allow multiple students to use one portable. Dr. Hunt replied that such pooling will be allowed under the current proposal, but that no formal support infrastructure for setting up pooling relationships between students was anticipated.

Dr. Hunt then went on to indicate that there are three families of computers that are present: Mac/Apple, PCs/PC Clones, and Unix machines. The University will take no stand on which of these three families a student should choose. Requirements will not be based on platform, but rather on functional capabilities.

Dr. Jacobs inquired of student UCAP members why some students have expressed opposition to the Student Laptop Proposal. Mr. Woodward replied that there were two issues: (a) financial and (b) the perceived lack of any value-added capability for the educational process. Mr. Sullivan of CCSAC added that most professors he has asked in his college do not think there is any value-added. However, they were only beginning to become aware of the potential. But further, that financial concerns are really the overriding issue.

Dr. Chartkoff made an analogy to hand calculators. Today in most high school technical classes, and in many math classes at MSU, hand calculators are assumed, and are the responsibility of students. The original family of calculators had been very expensive, yet their equivalents and improved versions are available now for as little as \$40.

Dr. Sticklen suggested that if the Student Laptop Proposal is adopted, three key areas must be addressed: (a) financial ramifications on students and units, (b) technical implementation issues, and (c) pedagogical issues related to providing a value-added educational experience for students by leveraging the laptop capabilities. He further suggested that issues (a) and (b) seemed to be the major foci of the laptop proposal, but that issue (c) is to some extent being left unaddressed. Faculty training in how to develop web pages (for example) is only at the nuts and bolts level. Higher level issues centered on developing awareness for methods/techniques of using the new capabilities have to be addressed for faculty to be fully empowered to leverage the new capabilities. A revision of the current proposal would benefit from specific identification of these three general areas inherent in the proposal.

Dr. Sullivan inquired as to who the perceived leading institutions are in the introduction of computing technology into university learning environments. Dr. Hunt indicated that Dartmouth would be considered a very early leader. After discussion, Dr. Sullivan summarized by saying that if the MSU Student Laptop Proposal is adopted, we would be thrust into a position at the forefront, but that other institutions have already broken early ground.

Dr. Hunt summarized by suggesting three core issues prompting the Student Laptop Proposal:

1. the world currently demands, and increasingly will demand, computer literacy and a mindset to take advantage of it,
2. the introduction of pervasive computing will allow new pedagogical opportunities, and
3. computing is becoming ubiquitous.

8. Adjourn

Time having expired, Chairperson Chartkoff adjourned UCAP at 12:05. The next UCAP meeting will be on Thursday, December 3. At that meeting, Dr. Hunt will continue his discussion of the Student Laptop Proposal.

UCAP11.12.98.doc

**University Committee on Academic Policy
Minutes
December 3, 1998**

Present: B. Ames, J. Chartkoff, R. Fisher, C. Gibbons, F. Jacobs, D. Lantagne,
F. Lindahl, B. Litman, D. Pysarchik, M. Stefaniak, J. Sticklen, J. Wald, M. Wendorf,
I. Woodward

Others: P. Hunt (Provost's Office), B. Steidle (Assistant Provost),
M. Sullivan (School of Music and CCSAC)

Minutes prepared by: D. Pysarchik

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:20 a.m. by Chairperson Chartkoff.

2. Agenda Approval

The agenda was amended by moving Item 6 (ASMSU Bill No. 7-30: Bill to request Timely Grade Point Distribution) forward in the agenda.

3. Minutes Approval

The minutes of the November 12, 1998 meeting were approved.

4. Chairperson Comments

Chairperson Chartkoff had no comments.

5. Assistant Provost Comments

Assistant Provost Steidle noted that December 11 is the graduate commencement ceremony and December 12 is the undergraduate commencement. She announced a new practice to invite faculty mentors/major professors to hood their PhD students in the ceremony.

The spring semester will begin on Monday, January 11, 1999, which is a deviation from the Wednesday spring semester opening dates of the past several years.

6. Consideration of ASMSU Bill 7-30 (To Request Timely Grade Point Distribution)

The reason for this proposal stems from the pressure students feel to make decisions about dropping classes before having adequate academic performance assessment in some of their classes. This does

not allow time for students to adequately assess their academic standing in a class before it is too late to drop.

Assistant Provost Steidle asked for clarification as to the intention of the bill. ASMSU wanted the bill (7-30) to be a requirement and not simply a recommendation: that is, to require faculty to have a specified portion of a student's grade available to the student by the drop deadline and a greater portion available by midterm.

If a faculty requirement, B. Steidle indicated that the ASMSU bill (7-30) would require an amendment to the Academic Freedom Report (AFR) which is a Board approved document. The proposed bill (7-30) would need to pass through all of the formal approval steps including the Board of Trustees.

If this practice was "desired", the bill (7-30) would not need approval all the way up the line. It was then suggested that the bill be taken back by ASMSU and considered in light by the AFR Report (Section 2.2.3 Role of Faculty).

M. Stefaniak reminded UCAP that in some courses there are only two exams per semester, and the first exam occurs after the drop date.

J. Sticklen proposed two alternatives. The first was to present the bill (7-30) as a suggested practice. Alternately, he suggested that ASMSU might want to propose that the drop date be moved to later in the semester.

Ian Woodward indicated that the proposed requirements in the Bill (7-30) would not be amenable for Independent Study courses or courses that were graded solely on attendance.

B. Litman indicated that students are sending the message to faculty members that they want quicker feedback. Therefore, students might consider informally and politely requesting earlier evaluation and feedback from faculty members. Litman noted there are some courses with limited enrollment, where late drops would operate to the disadvantage of students who needed the class but had not been able to access it. There needs to be an effective way to ensure that students do not disadvantage others by dropping after adds are closed.

M. Stefaniak indicated that there needed to be a holistic assessment to move away from the "one paper and one exam" format.

R. Fisher noted that in some instances students improve their performance at the end of the semester. She noted this improvement was after forty percent of the grade was recorded. Fisher cautioned that an early assessment may be a false indicator of the student's potential achievement.

F. Lindahl indicated the Bill (7-30) runs counter to the learning curve in that it presumes that not a lot of learning occurs at the end of the course or that there is not an important cumulative impact.

M. Stefaniak will resuscitate the discussion in ASMSU and bring back the results of that discussion.

Chairperson Chartkoff suggested there be a functional balance between when students need to drop and when students receive course performance information. Chartkoff inquired as to the nature of the appropriate information needed by students to make decisions to drop courses.

C. Gibbons noted that clinical practice is graded on the accumulation of learning. She expressed concern that the intentions of the proposed bill do not reflect a student's learning in such a course.

M. Stefaniak noted a mismatch between homework and exam content in some courses.

R. Fisher indicated that this may be a different problem, not necessarily likely to be solved by the proposed solution. She noted that faculty members have a responsibility to clearly state course expectations and how performance will be measured.

F. Jacobs suggested that, based upon the discussion of the Bill, there was not a great deal of support from UCAP. He suggested that a mechanistic approach to the issue does not solve the problem: discussions with faculty would be a better approach.

7. Consideration of Student Laptop Proposal

B. Steidle reviewed with UCAP where the discussion of this issue terminated at the previous meeting. Paul Hunt resumed the discussion with item number eight on the 9-14-98 Summary Document. Hunt noted that an acceptable functional definition of what a student needed was to be able to access the WEB and E-Mail, but there would not be a mandated platform. Most MSU students will be exposed to two or three platforms (UNIX, MAC, Windows, etc.) GTA training will need to take multiple platforms into account (if multiple platforms are needed).

Some colleges and programs may make specific platform decisions for particular purposes.

UCAP members then went on to discuss issue 9, Timing of Acquisition (9-14-98 Summary Document). There is not a mandatory rule that a student must purchase a laptop; students must have access to a laptop computer.

M. Stefaniak noted that MSU should not require laptops merely to stay ahead of other schools. There should be a legitimate academic reason. He inquired as to how students would know what software would be supported by MSU in the future? He indicated that hardware/software support decisions will be made by MSU long before the policy starts in 2001. Therefore, it would be important to notify high school students in advance.

UCAP members went on to discuss issue number 10 regarding graduate students (9-14-98 Summary Document). De facto graduate computer requirements already exist in certain MSU programs. Since graduate students needs are different throughout the university, a "one size fits all" solution is not appropriate for graduate student requirements.

For GTA's and RA's on projects, who will pay for the computers? P. Hunt responded by stating all graduate students will need to buy a computer; however, if a computer is required, the cost may be covered by a grant, etc., depending on local policy. A computer could be part of a recruitment package for a graduate student.

UCAP proceeded to discuss issue number 11, assistive or accommodating technologies. P. Hunt recognized that people with disabilities need to be accommodated. A portion of the 10.4 million technology funding is currently being used to address this issue and will continue to be in the future.

Item number 12, On- and Off-campus Net-working, was next discussed.

Married student housing, university non-residence housing and off campus housing all need to be linked and on par with residence halls. A quarter of a million dollars will be spent for dial in lines in 1999 and so there is considerable internal pressure to facilitate better cable/data links. Landlords can be encouraged to provide cable/data links. The Computer Store may be able to provide discounts for network connectivity just as they sell computers and software.

P. Hunt Reviewed the advantages of having laptops for students:

- (a) Laptops will make possible a better learning environment around the University. Students can use info technology wherever they are.
- (b) Laptops will allow students maximum advantage of the computing systems at MSU.
- (c) Since many CD ROMS are bundled with textbooks, students will need the computer to play the CD in class (especially for simulation).
- (d) There could be active learning software access in real time in classrooms.
- (e) The library and INTERNET could be brought into the classroom.
- (f) In today's world, employers have expectations for mobile technology, e.g. in hotels, on airplanes. They will expect no less of our students, in terms of ability to function in this environment.

Note: CCSC stated that the requirement will be a mobile computer with WEB access, not a laptop, specifically.

B. Litman asked P. Hunt if faculty were going to be "urged" to incorporate technology into their instruction. Hunt repeated his earlier comments and F. Jacobs summarized them as "not urging" but "enabling".

J. Chartkoff said we will discuss our advice for the Provost's Office on the laptop issue at our next meeting (January 14). B. Steidle commented that since the Graduate Council will not begin discussions until December 7, we should be able to conclude the discussion in a timely manner.

J. Sticklen inquired about whether we could consider the whole proposal or just the undergraduate part. Steidle indicated that the entire proposal is before the committee. J. Chartkoff said we'd be collecting our observations on each of the categories at the next meeting.

8. Adjourn

Time having expired, Chairperson Chartkoff adjourned the meeting at 12:06.

UCAP12.3.98.doc

University Committee on Academic Policy
Minutes
January 14, 1999

Present: B. Ames, J. Chartkoff, R. Fisher, C. Gibbons, F. Jacobs, B. Litman, L. Martin, C. McHugh, J. Rodman (for D. Pysarchik), P. Sinder, M. Stefaniak, J. Sticklen, J. Wald

Others: B. Steidle

Minutes respectfully submitted by C. Gibbons

1. The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Chartkoff.
2. Agenda and December 3, 1998 minutes were approved.
3. Assistant Provost Steidle noted that the recommendations regarding restructuring of the department of Anatomy and redesigning of the residency definition were forwarded to the Provost. Steidle distributed handouts about general and work environment faculty issues, which will be a topic on a future agenda, and on Martin Luther King events.
4. **Student Laptop Proposal:** UCAP members made the following remarks.
From extensive discussion within the College of Engineering, J. Sticklen reported that faculty held mixed viewpoints on the laptop proposal: one department formally voted down the proposal; another is, on balance, favorably disposed but took no formal vote. Conversations centered on: 1) type of computer e.g.; desktop vs. laptop; 2) amount of educational value to be derived from uniform access; 3) feasibility; and 4) logistics. J. Sticklen recommended the university may want to consider wireless technology.

J. Wald indicated that the Natural Sciences were generally opposed to the proposal for similar reasons. However, she added concerns of fragility and security of the laptops and cost: in particular, cost to the departments (e.g. for TA's, graduate students) for the laptops. For review, J. Wald distributed comments from students and faculty, and an article from Atlantic Monthly. Many College of Natural Science faculty expressed the opinion that the university should have considered earlier, direct consultation with faculty about the proposal.

L. Martin, from an experiential point of view, voiced concerns about student skill levels, software compatibilities, classroom hookups, costs – questioning whether or not the benefits would outweigh the demands. Based on her present experience, she noted that the time consumed in getting students to the right sources was not well spent.

R. Fisher suggested that if the laptop proposal were to be adopted, departments may want to consider the creation of technology consortia to offset cost and share support.

B. Ames stated that while the College of Human Ecology recognized that laptops may enhance computer and professional skills, the faculty echoed that physical infrastructure and technological support are/may become problematic issues.

For similar reasons, C. McHugh reported he was opposed to the proposal.

F. Jacobs indicated that the college advocated innovative teaching-learning strategies. However, the Undergraduate Programs Committee of the College of Business expressed reservations about the laptop proposal. He suggested that the university consider alternative strategies, e.g., the development of more numerous select laptop classrooms and the use of digital projectors.

B. Litman urged the university to consider the balance between the benefits and costs. He questioned whether there is compelling evidence to show that the laptop will significantly improve instruction and will be the best use of classroom time. He too, was very concerned about training time for both students and faculty.

M. Stefaniak, speaking for undergraduate students represented by ASMSU, indicated that the laptop would be a burden to students because of cost, security, transportability, and software issues. He proposed the committee investigate the results of the current (rumored) pilot study or plan another pilot – paying close attention to sample selection techniques.

J. Rodman suggested that the university check the demand for laptop computer classrooms in individual departments and colleges.

J. Chartkoff proceeded to spearhead a discussion about the purpose of re-configuring the classroom. He expressed the view that the current proposal may be a solution in search of a problem, and wondered whether the solution fit the problem. He suggested, for example, that if the problem were computer competency, then the solution may be to offer computer classes – not computer enhanced classrooms.

Chartkoff, in sum, concluded that UCAP did not seem to endorse the laptop proposal and reviewed UCAP's options. The committee members concurred for the reasons discussed in numerous meetings. The consensus was that faculty and students were not generally in favor of the proposal as stated. It was agreed that: B. Steidle informally relay UCAP's discussion to the Provost; that a UCAP subcommittee draft a report and recommendation, and present it to the group for consideration at the next meeting. M. Stefaniak, C. McHugh, J. Sticklen, and J. Wald volunteered for the subcommittee. They agreed to bring the draft to the next meeting.

5. Due to time constraints, discussion of the MSU promise was postponed until the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned.

University Committee on Academic Policy
Minutes
January 28, 1999

Present: J. Chartkoff, C. Gibbons, F. Jacobs, F. Lindahl, J. Patterson, D. Pysarchik, M. Stefaniak, J. Sticklen, J. Wald, M. Wendorf, I. Woodward

Others: P. Dickson (College of Education, Dept. of Counseling Educational Psychology and Special Education), M. Hesse (Assistant Provost, for B. Steidle)

Minutes submitted by J. Patterson

1. The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Chartkoff at 10:15 a.m.
2. The agenda for the meeting was approved.
3. The minutes from the January 14, 1999 meeting were approved, with the following 3 amendments to the draft of the minutes distributed to committee members prior to today's meeting:
 - 1) Under Item 4 (Student Laptop Proposal), in the last line of the first paragraph, the word "pursue" was changed to "consider."
 - 2) In the last sentence of the second paragraph under Item 4, the phrase "J. Wald noted..." was changed to "The College of Natural Science faculty expressed the opinion that..."
 - 3) In the second paragraph on page 2 (comments from F. Jacobs), in the second sentence, "Student Advisory..." was changed to "Undergraduate Programs..."
4. Chairperson Chartkoff recommended that we begin with Item 4 on today's agenda (Student Laptop Proposal: Committee Discussion) and then proceed to Item 6 (MSU Promise).
5. **Student Laptop Proposal: Committee Discussion**

J. Sticklen began the discussion by summarizing the report of the Subcommittee on the Student Laptop Proposal (members: C. McHugh, J. Sticklen, M. Stefaniak, J. Wald). A draft report, entitled "Advice on the Student Laptop Proposal," from the subcommittee was distributed to UCAP members via email prior to today's meeting, and paper copies were available at the meeting. Sticklen briefly discussed the 7 points of concern in the draft report. The concerns were listed in order of relative importance according to subcommittee members. The subcommittee's recommendation to UCAP was to NOT endorse the Student Laptop Proposal in its current form. The original proposal was drafted by Dr. Paul Hunt following his consultation with faculty, staff, and students on the Instructional Technology Computing Committee (ICTC), and the Network Communications Committee (NCC) of the Communications and Computing Systems Advisory Committee (CCSAC). The UCAP subcommittee recommended referring the original proposal back to the original committee(s), "with requests to reformulate the proposal to (i) include more detail in all regards, (ii) include much stronger faculty input, especially on curricular and pedagogical issues, (iii) include much stronger student input, especially on financial issues affecting students, (iv) include multiple pilot studies, (v) include consideration of alternative models for campus-

universal computation, in particular models focused on desk top computing rather than mobile computing.”

P. Dickson discussed an informal pilot study he conducted during Fall Semester 1998 regarding student use of laptop computers. He distributed a 6-page handout explaining the study to UCAP members at the meeting. The details of the study are included in the handout. Basically, students in two of Dickson’s classes were given laptop computers for use during the semester. The computers were provided on a voluntary basis (i.e., if a student wanted a computer, he/she was given one), and participating students were surveyed at the end of the semester regarding the computer’s usefulness. Dickson pointed out that, at least in the field of education and undoubtedly in many other fields, student need computer skills in order to obtain jobs. While results of his study seemed to promote the use of computers by students, Dickson repeatedly emphasized the informal nature of his research, and advocated the need for more formal pilot studies.

J. Chartkoff mentioned that Northern Michigan University also is considering a laptop proposal. NMU is considering purchasing the laptops and distributing them to entering students. Students’ fees would be increased in order to cover the purchase of the computers. Computers would be upgraded and repaired or replaced every 2 years, so that the machines and software would not become obsolete. Students, however, would not take the computers with them upon graduation. Chartkoff said that MSU should consider alternatives to the current laptop proposal as well.

P. Dickson wondered if it would be more expensive in the long run for MSU to equip more classrooms and laboratories with desktop computers (i.e., providing more places for students to use computers), despite the technological needs and more wide-ranging accessibility that would go along with a requirement for all students to have their own laptops. He also expressed the opinion that students learn computer technology best by exploring on their own (i.e., “self-teaching”), rather than by having the technology “given” to them in the form of desktop computers and selected software.

J. Chartkoff asked if Dickson’s findings altered the “tenor” of UCAP’s recommendation to the Provost regarding the laptop proposal.

J. Sticklen noted that one of the main points of Dickson’s study seems to be that students taught themselves how to use the computer. Maybe an important objective of a laptop requirement is encouraging usage beyond the classroom. Initially, we may have been thinking only in terms of the in-classroom usage of computers (i.e., computer-assisted instruction). Encouraging learning and the development of computer skills outside the classroom may be a more important objective.

F. Jacobs said that even if we were to take a more broad view of how students become computer-literate, this may not alter UCAP’s recommendation regarding the proposed REQUIREMENT for laptops.

C. Gibbons said that she recently received a survey from the University regarding the use of technology in the classroom. She wondered if all faculty received this survey, and stated data from such a survey should be gathered by those putting forward the student laptop proposal, and should be shared with all University faculty so that they may make an informed opinion on the proposal. Gibbons also suggested that UCAP should be more positive in its recommendation to the Provost--i.e., the committee endorses the idea that students should become more computer-literate while at the University--rather than being negative about the proposal in its current form.

F. Jacobs had several suggested changes for the report of the UCAP Subcommittee on the Student Laptop Proposal. On page 2, the first line under “UCAP Concerns” states that “UCAP members expressed concerns...” Jacobs suggested that the statement be changed to indicate the UCAP members’ views reflect the views of many of their colleagues. Under “1. Concerns about Unsubstantiated Effects on Instructional Mission,” the second paragraph may more properly belong in the “UCAP Recommendations” section at the end of the report. Jacobs felt that Concern #2, “Concerns about Faculty Involvement in Defining the Proposal,” should be strengthened; faculty should be made more aware of the laptop proposal university-wide to spark conversation and discussion. Under “3. Economic Concerns,” Jacobs felt that there needs to be more detailed cost analysis data, especially regarding the infrastructure costs to the University if a laptop requirement were put into place. The last sentence under “4. Concerns about Lack of Training for Faculty and Students” should be moved to the “UCAP Recommendations” section. Jacobs felt that Concern #6, “Concerns about Detailed Planning Strategies,” may be the #1 Concern; the laptop proposal needs more detail regarding technical and pedagogical implementation. Jacobs said that Concern #7, “Concerns about Student Recruitment,” was not discussed or considered strongly by UCAP members, and may not be a significant concern. Under “UCAP Recommendations” on page 4 of the report, Jacobs recommended changing “does not” to “cannot” in the first paragraph. In summary, Jacobs recommended a more widespread distribution of information and data related to the Student Laptop Proposal to University faculty, exploration of other alternatives to achieving “computer literacy” among students, and the wiring of more classrooms for computer usage before plunging ahead with a laptop requirement.

M. Wendorf reiterated the need for more detail in the laptop proposal, and the need for more faculty input.

M. Stefaniak wondered if concern #2 in the subcommittee’s report should be strengthened to the point of advocating more faculty involvement in ALL decisions with University-wide impact.

J. Chartkoff summarized by stating that the central issue is whether UCAP should endorse a requirement for student competency in computer technology. If so, then we must consider whether a laptop REQUIREMENT is the means by which to achieve this competency. Is ACCESS to computers enough, or is having one’s own computer better? Should all students be required to take an introductory computer course? We must consider all alternatives, and weigh the positives and negatives of each.

D. Pysarchik suggested that the University survey other universities and colleges which have computer requirements in place already. Are these schools accomplishing the objective of making their students computer-literate?

J. Sticklen agreed that CCSAC should gather data on computer requirement programs at other universities. He also reiterated the need for detailed data from sound pilot studies to justify the huge undertaking and cost of a student laptop requirement.

F. Lindahl said that there are probably many faculty with strong opinions on the laptop proposal, and their opinions are needed to strengthen the proposal.

P. Dickson said earlier that he felt the Northern Michigan University program, where students use computers provided by the school, has the disadvantage of students not leaving the university with a computer of their own. M. Wendorf suggested that perhaps this was a good thing, rather than a bad thing. A program where students own, carry, and use only one computer would not encourage “technological versatility”; students would be competent on only their machine.

J. Chartkoff pointed out that, with computer technology changing so rapidly, a student's laptop potentially would be obsolete if he/she were to have it through all undergraduate years.

J. Wald reiterated that UCAP's most important recommendation to CCSAC is to gather more information before putting forth the Student Laptop Proposal. If information has already been gathered, then that information must be shared with all University faculty.

F. Jacobs wondered if there needs to be a proposal for a student computer requirement at all. The "marketplace", which more and more demands computer skills of its workers, may dictate the course of events. If students want a good job upon graduation from the University, they will do what's in their best interests and will seek computer literacy. The University may not need to have a requirement for student-owned computers.

M. Stefaniak questioned whether students would become computer-literate "in time" to get a job, if the University had no program to promote the development of computer skills.

D. Pysarchik said that the laptop proposal has a "public relations" air to it; Michigan State University wants to show that it is "out front" in promoting computer literacy among its students.

M. Stefaniak said that he strongly disagrees with a proposal that has any "public relations" slant to it.

J. Wald sees no problem with the University having a requirement for computer literacy among its students, but we must ask whether a requirement for a laptop computer is the best way to achieve this.

J. Chartkoff advised the subcommittee to make the suggested changes in the draft of its report. Chartkoff said that he will meet personally with Paul Hunt to discuss UCAP's recommendations and concerns.

There was a motion by M. Stefaniak to accept the Subcommittee on the Student Laptop Proposal's report "as amended," and the motion was seconded. Discussion indicated, however, that UCAP should probably see the suggested changes in writing before voting to accept an amended report. J. Sticklen made a motion to table the motion to accept the subcommittee's report, and his motion passed.

6. **MSU Promise**

Robin Pline will make additional copies of the materials which were initially distributed at the November 12, 1998 meeting, and will redistribute the information to UCAP members. Also included in the information package will be the text of President McPherson's "State of the University" address, which is scheduled to be given on February 9. UCAP's next meeting is February 11.

7. **Selection of MEAC representative**

UCAP should have a representative at the MEAC meeting to be held on February 8, 1999. J. Chartkoff will speak with B. Steidle about who would be the most appropriate representative.

The meeting was adjourned at 12 noon. The discussion of Agenda items number 6 & 7 (MSU Promise & Faculty Work-Environment Issues) was postponed until the February 11 meeting.

University Committee on Academic Policy
Minutes
February 11, 1999

Present: B. Ames, J. Chartkoff, R. Fisher, C. Gibbons, F. Jacobs, C. McHugh,
J. Rodman (for Pysarchik), M. Stefaniak, J. Sticklen, J. Wald, I. Woodward

Others: B. Steidle (Assistant Provost)

Minutes submitted by M. Stefaniak

Chartkoff called the meeting to order at 10:15 for the consideration of information items as there was no quorum.

1. **Approval of Agenda:** The Agenda was approved by consent.
2. **Approval of Minutes:** The Minutes for the January 28 meeting were approved by consent.
3. **Comments from Chair:** Chartkoff distributed memos regarding his discussion with Dr. Paul Hunt concerning UCAP's opinion on the Student Laptop Proposal to assure that Dr. Hunt's arguments had not gotten lost in the discussion. Chartkoff summarized Hunt's comments as a reiteration of statements he had made in prior UCAP meetings, particularly with regard to how computing at the current time is important, with emphasis on mobile computing.
4. Chartkoff reported that M. Wendorff resigned his position.

At this time, a quorum was attained and the committee moved to consider action items.

5. **Student Laptop Proposal Committee Discussion:** Chartkoff reminded the committee that UCAP's role was to recommend a course of action to the Provost. A question was asked about the options available to the Provost after recommendations were forwarded. Chartkoff then alluded to the relevance of the Wireless Networks article (from the Chronicle of Higher Education).

Chartkoff then recommended discussion on the agenda item end no later than 11:00 a.m.

Several minor corrections to the draft recommendations were made. These were primarily grammatical in nature.

Jacobs asked what changes had been made since the previous revision. Wald outlined the changes, remarking that the changes were mostly reordering and grammatical in nature.

Sticklen moved to amend the document by adding a sentence to the end of the document which read “UCAP requests the opportunity to provide advice on revisions of the Student Laptop Proposal that may result from these recommendations.” The amendment was approved by consent. McHugh then approved adoption of the recommendations; Stefaniak seconded.

Wald inquired as to the confidentiality of the document. Steidle answered saying the Provost should be given the opportunity to see the proposal before it is made public.

With no further discussion, Chartkoff called for a voice vote on approval of the document entitled “*Advice on Student Laptop Proposal.*” The vote to adopt was unanimously approved.

6. **Approval of MEAC representative:** Steidle mentioned that although the regular meeting had already taken place, another meeting may be called before the end of the semester. Chartkoff then asked for volunteers. Gibbons volunteered. Gibbons was appointed UCAP’s MEAC representative.
7. **MSU Promise:** Steidle defined the role of UCAP on this matter. UCAP may offer advice on the suggestions offered in the Promise. She recalled that the chairperson had expressed an interest in having the committee consider what might constitute a first-rate undergraduate education.

Chartkoff then outlined the document, emphasizing the enhancement of the undergraduate learning experience and making MSU a global institution. Chartkoff then listed the implications in making these goals possible: namely possible changes in resource allocation, degree requirements, faculty and staff promotion. Chartkoff then requested feedback and general input on the document.

McHugh wanted to know the difference between the MSU promise and the *Guiding Principles*. Steidle answered saying the *Guiding Principles* was the umbrella document, while the MSU Promise incorporated specific implementation points as a way of fulfilling the Principles.

Fisher commented on the emphasis on Undergraduate education and expressed concerns on graduate colleges and the apparent omission of the medical students. She explained how medical schools (human and osteopathic medicine) were not included as graduate or undergraduate colleges. Fisher remarked that those colleges should be labeled undergraduate colleges and some attention should be paid to their constituencies.

Sticklen voiced his concern that faculty may interpret the Promise as promoting undergraduate education at the expense of graduate education. Sticklen then asserted that the goal was understood but did not wish to see programs cut.

Ames echoed Sticklen, and wanted implementation/funding issues represented better. Ames then remarked that discussion was needed on how the University must change to implement these proposals.

Sticklen then commented on how the Promise was an institutional change. Emphasis would have to be placed on how to change, and how structure would be rewarded.

Chartkoff suggested faculty awards should be multiplied, there should be increased significance for University instruction tied to annual salary increases. A redefinition of merit would be necessary.

Fisher expressed concern that placing emphasis on MSU's stronger programs would lead to the abandonment of weaker programs.

Rodman disagreed with the notion that graduate education was being underrepresented.

Chartkoff outlined both comparative strengths and gaps at MSU by comparison with other programs in the State of Michigan. MSU faculty is considerably stronger and more stable. Other institutions conduct considerably less research than MSU; 45% of classes may be taught by non-regular faculty; tenure for the many faculty in community colleges has been eliminated. On the other hand, MSU lacks a center for faculty development for teaching and learning (University of Michigan, E. Tennessee State, Ferris State University all have such centers.) Chartkoff then said that discussion would continue at a later meeting.

Business was suspended at 11:30 p.m. due to lack of quorum.

UCAP2.11.99.doc

University Committee on Academic Policy
Minutes
February 25, 1999

Present: J. Chartkoff, R. Fisher, C. Gibbons, F. Jacobs, B. Litman, D. Pysarchik,
J. Sticklen, J. Wald

Others: B. Steidle (Assistant Provost), D. Gift

Minutes constructed by B. Litman and B. Steidle, with review by J. Chartkoff.

Chartkoff called the meeting to order at 10:25 for the consideration of information items as there was no quorum.

1. **Agenda:** The Agenda was unchanged, with agreement that there would be no actions taken.
2. **Approval of Minutes:** The Minutes for the February 11 meeting were held for approval at a later time.
3. **Comments from Chair:** Chartkoff noted that the ASMSU bill regarding changing the drop date for classes needed to be put in the context of several related policies and the practices of peer institutions. He asked Steidle to comment on these policies. She responded that changes in drop dates had implications for repeat policies, limits on repeat credits, and the manner of calculating grades taken for repeat courses. She also noted the impact on the value of the credentials with relation to external agencies and institutions. Any further discussion was deferred until such time as a quorum including student members, was present.

Chartkoff noted that UCAP would reserve time in the next meeting for a visit by the Provost, who might wish to discuss the laptop proposal with the committee.

4. **MSU Promise:** Chartkoff posed the question as to what parts of the Promise had policy implications that UCAP should address. The basic commitments in the Promise clearly have budgetary implications. In addition, there are implications for changes in faculty evaluation procedures related to the goals of active learning in the classroom. What additional steps need to be taken to assist in the evaluation of teaching: should there be a formal Center for Teaching and Learning; should there be better documentation of teaching quality through videotaping, etc.; is there a need for more systematic programming related to matters of teaching and learning.

In response to a position attributed to Lee Shulman, to the effect that teaching is not valued as highly as it should be because it is not evaluated as thoroughly as is research, Litman noted that much of the evaluation of research was bean counting rather than

quality-based evaluations. Thorough evaluation was very time-consuming here, and would be at least equally so in regard to teaching. Further, he noted that minimal raise pools made the effort less worthwhile. Faculty members noted instances of various activities which were very difficult and/or time-consuming and which reaped little recognition in the evaluation process: e.g., international activities, collaborative research. It was further noted that any evaluation process needed to be rooted in acceptance of multiple models of good teaching. Departments were acknowledged to be the critical layers in the evaluation and in the decision-making. Members were encouraged to identify other policy considerations for the next meeting.

5. The group turned to discussion of the **Faculty Worklife** concerns, to identify which of these had policy implications. A discussion on changes in the numbers of Friday classes ensued (without data at hand). It became clearer in the discussion that such concerns were rooted in a number of other conceptions: the lack of a serious attitude toward learning by students (i.e. weekends beginning on Thursdays); the difficulties of producing good attendance on Fridays. On the other side of the ledger, participants acknowledged a number of changes in worklife patterns and in students that made Fridays less attractive as class days (while being useful for getting disparate groups together.) It appears that the perception of what is happening and the message conveyed by changes may be more significant than the reality.

The group expressed an interest in coming back to issues of academic support, especially in the context of recent rises in enrollment.

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

UCAP2.25.99.doc

University Committee on Academic Policy
Minutes
March 18, 1999

Present: B. Ames, J. Chartkoff, R. Fisher, C. Gibbons, F. Lindahl, B. Litman,
C. McHugh, D. Pysarchik, P. Sinder, M. Stefaniak, J. Sticklen, J. Wald,
I. Woodward, R. Zimmerman

Others: B. Steidle (Assistant Provost), L. Simon (Provost)

Minutes submitted by P. Sinder

Chartkoff called the meeting to order at 10:30 am.

1. **Agenda:** The Agenda for the meeting was approved.
2. **Approval of Minutes:** The Minutes from the meetings of February 11 and February 25 were approved.
3. **Comments from the Chairperson:** a) Due to the fact that a quorum was not present at the 2/25 UCAP meeting, and that no student representatives were present, no formal action on ASMSU bill 7-62 was taken. However, there was a discussion of the student sponsored bill (7-62) to extend the deadline to drop a class without a grade reported. b) There are two other issues currently under consideration by UCAP – the MSU Promise, and Faculty Work Environment Issues – and it may be a challenge to effectively handle them by the end of the semester.
4. **Comments from Assistant Provost Steidle:** Data was presented relative to the weekday distribution of MSU undergraduate courses. It is a fact that there have only been minor changes in the percentage of courses offered at the 100-200 levels on Friday over the past 15 years. 300-400 level courses experienced more of a change on Fridays, dropping from 13.7% of all courses to 8.8% over this 15 year period, but this should still be viewed as minor. Concludes that some change has occurred, but that changes in instructional methods as well as the semester conversion process may have contributed largely to this.
5. **Faculty Work Environment:** Committee discussion of the Faculty Work Environment issue was tabled until a later date.
6. **ASMSU Proposed Bill 7-62:** Chair Chartkoff began a discussion of the next item, the ASMSU Proposal to *Extend Deadline to Drop a Course Without a Grade Reported* (Bill 7-62). He stated that there were three possible options for the Bill; 1) endorse it as written, 2) reject it and recommend to Executive Committee of Academic Council that it not be forwarded to council for action, 3) reject it but provide suggestions for improvement.

Discussion of the Proposed Bill 7-62 ensued, with questions and clarifications of the original motive for the proposal, as well as policy for this matter at other Big Ten universities. The proposed bill would allow for a student to drop a course without a reported grade through the final day of classes before finals week. Steidle provided input on the current related MSU policy for repeating courses, which currently allows for 20 repeat credits when a grade below 2.0 is recorded. Both old and replacement grades appear on transcripts, but only the repeat grade is used in computing a student's GPA. She noted that there were trade-offs on aspects of this and the withdrawal policy that should be considered. If students are permitted to drop without record until the last week of the term, it makes little sense to have a liberal repeat policy whereby grades can be substituted for a prior low grade.

MOTION: made by B. Litman, second C. McHugh

That the official MSU deadline to Drop a Course Without a Grade Reported be changed from halfway through the semester to a date two-thirds of the way through the semester.

Discussion of this motion continued, with other policy questions, suggestions for naming a specific week of the semester rather than a percentage derived date, possible impact this proposal would have on the current MSU repeat policy, possible manner in which this might devalue the MSU diploma, advantages to students who could make a more informed decision about a course after midsemester exams, potential impact on a student's financial aid, and the fact that currently a withdrawal from a course does not get computed in the 20 credit repeat policy.

Steidle mentioned that the MSU Tuition Guarantee has limited what can be done with course offerings, and suggested that changes in enrollment demand linked to such a change could trigger a possible surcharge for repeat enrollments in courses, as is done at several other universities. Lindahl believes that drops will increase substantially with a new extended date policy, and that midsemester grades will become the central reason for dropping a course. Sticklen agreed, and added that students with scholarship support or from an affluent background may gain an advantage with this new proposed policy.

Chartkoff elected to table discussion of this item and motion until the April 1 meeting, in deference to the Provost's arrival to discuss the computer proposal.

7. **Student Laptop Proposal:** Chartkoff introduced Provost Lou Anna Simon, and gave her the floor to provide response to the recent UCAP recommendation on the Student Laptop Computer Proposal.

Provost Simon noted that the original proposal came from CCSAC, an established representative group; that they were looking to the future regarding potential computer use, and were acting from a position of knowledge. She believes that the initial role of this advisory committee has been lost. Her view is that more students are coming to MSU with technology backgrounds, and that this will continue to escalate. She believes

that disadvantaged students do not have access to technology, which greatly impacts their ability to succeed at MSU. She mentioned the impact of financial aid on this proposal, the fact that residence halls will be wired by 2001, and the fact that the incoming class in 2001 will be graduating in the sesquicentennial year for MSU (2005). She believes this much advance notice will allow individuals to orchestrate a computer purchase at the right time for their situation and needs. While the proposal for laptops came from CCSAC, her view is broader regarding computer needs. She believes that all students at MSU need a computer of their own, whatever the type, and not just computer lab access. She mentioned that she does not want to wait on this issue.

Provost Simon then entertained questions regarding the laptop computer proposal. She believes that the original proposal recognized differing needs of students, and could be flexible in its utilization. Issues of hardware/software requirements were discussed, along with software expense and access. Sticklen and Chartkoff both commented on the lack of detail and clarity in the original laptop computer proposal. Simon suggested that the MSU computer labs must remain as cutting edge as possible, and provide access to all students. Gibbons stated that the prior discussions in UCAP were related to the evidence contained in the laptop proposal, and that little information was presented on the impact of the proposal on students. Simon mentioned that computer skills are needed more and more for students to obtain job placement and job success. She also believes that students who own computers have a big advantage in academic success over those who must use the labs. Lindahl believes that the comments from the Provost are quite different in scope from the laptop proposal, and agreed that a more general thrust for this issue is needed and desirable.

Simon closed by indicating that she has not rendered her decision yet, and is waiting to incorporate information from a number of sources. She acknowledged that there is a wide range of computer knowledge and equipment across the MSU campus. She believes there will always be a generational issue at MSU. Simon believes that students benefit from the capacity to learn in a variety of settings. She welcomes further advice from UCAP in order to move ahead on this proposal as she creates her recommendation in the near future.

Provost Simon departed the meeting at 12:05 pm.

8. The meeting adjourned at 12:08 pm.

UCAP3.18.99.doc

University Committee on Academic Policy
Minutes
April 1, 1999

Present: B. Ames, J. Chartkoff, F. Jacobs, F. Lindahl, B. Litman, L. Martin, J. Patterson, D. Pysarchik, P. Sinder, M. Stefanick, J. Sticklen, J. Wald, I. Woodward

Others: B. Steidle (Assistant Provost)

Minutes prepared by Fred Jacobs

1. The agenda was approved.
2. The minutes of the March 18, 1999 meeting will be reviewed at the next meeting.
3. Joe Chartkoff and Paul Hunt were interviewed, individually, for a video dealing with the student laptop proposal that was ultimately sent to CNN. He presented UCAP's position on the proposal.
4. There was significant discussion on the riots of Saturday, March 26. Earlier in the week, Chartkoff sent a memo to President McPherson requesting that he begin the process of trying to identify student attitudes that might, at least partially, explain the events of the evening. Chartkoff recommended an ethnographical study that would help the University better understand larger and continuing issues that might be present. Jon Sticklen summarized a number of E-Mails he received from engineering faculty. In those E-Mails and among UCAP members, there was agreement about a number of things:
 - There is much anger in the MSU community directed primarily at those actively involved in the riots.
 - There was a strong feeling that passive involvement is almost as harmful as active involvement and should be discouraged by some lesser form of penalty than those accruing to the major perpetrators.
 - Prevention will require a significant STUDENT response.
 - It is important to have arrangements with all other Michigan colleges and universities to prevent involvement by non-MSU students.
 - There is much anger among MSU students directed at East Lansing city government and police and the MSU administration.
 - Prevention will require that student attitudes be identified and that root causes be corrected; however, there should not be significant delays in taking action against known violators of law.
 - The Board of Trustees has not taken a strong enough stance against the behavior of students at previous, similar events.

A motion was made to send a memo to Provost Simon suggesting that she encourage faculty to discuss the events of the weekend in their classes. In particular, she should suggest that faculty announce related activities and events, discourage students from attending such

events, and try to find out why students think these things are happening. The motion passed unanimously.

In addition, UCAP encourages the Provost's Office to fund a full-page information add in the *State News* that would allow student groups to announce the activities they are undertaking to express their opposition to the riots and to "repay" East Lansing and MSU. Ian and Mike will set this up. Steidle indicated they could proceed and the support would be forthcoming.

5. Having deferred comment at the beginning of the meeting, Steidle announced that the first All-University Undergraduate Research and Creative Activities Forum will be held on Saturday, April 10. Almost 60 undergraduates will give oral or poster presentations on projects with which they have been involved over the past year. Faculty judges will evaluate the work and prizes will be awarded. We would like to support and commend these student and faculty efforts.
6. There was discussion of the motion that was made at the March 18 meeting to change the latest time a student can withdraw from a class (with a W grade) from one-half of the way through the semester to two-thirds of the way through the semester. The motion was tabled until the next meeting.
7. Meeting was adjourned.

UCAP4.1.99.doc

University Committee on Academic Policy
Minutes
April 15, 1999

Present: B. Ames, J. Chartkoff, F. Jacobs, F. Lindahl, C. McHugh, J. Rodman (for D. Pysarchik), M. Stefaniak, J. Sticklen, J. Wald, R. Zimmerman.

Others: B. Steidle (Assistant Provost), B. Cambrey, N. Graham

Minutes submitted by B. Ames

Announcements prior to achieving quorum:

a. A new slate of officers will be presented for election on 4-29-99. B. Ames will chair a nominating committee composed of Litman, Sinder, Bennet, and Pysarchik, outgoing committee members.

b. MSU representatives will be attending a technology conference at Wake Forest University in May. J. Chartkoff has been invited as chair of UCAP, and other UCAP members discussed the possibility of attending in the event he is unavailable.

1. **Agenda:** With the arrival of numbers constituting a quorum, the Agenda was approved.

2. **Approval of minutes:** The minutes for March 18 and April 1 were approved.

3. **Comments from chair:** no comments.

4. **Comments from Assistant Provost Steidle:** A very successful undergraduate student research conference was held April 10. There were 56 presenters.

5. **Nominating committee:** announced above.

6. **ASMSU Proposal to Extend Deadline to Drop Without a Grade Reported:** Motion to change to 2/3 semester had been tabled. Moved to re-introduce. Questions/comments included relevance of repeat policy to this issue, transcript reporting, effect on perceived quality of MSU diploma, appropriateness of policy for courses with significant group or final projects.

C. McHugh and R. Zimmerman stressed that original intent was to lower withdrawals as a result of students having more accurate information as to their status in the course. Sometimes, the perceived difficulty of the material and actual test results do not correlate.

It was also pointed out that within the Big Ten, Penn State is more liberal than MSU, but others have earlier deadlines.

Motion failed, with 4 in favor, 4 opposed, 1 abstention.

7. Integrative Studies in General Science: Change in Lab Structure: Bill Cambray, Director of ISGS, presented a brief overview. The request was to: a) change credits for ISBL and ISPL laboratories from one to two credits, adding a one hour recitation, b) combine the ISB 202L and 204L labs into one lab with a new number separate from lecture sections, c) make ISB 202 or 204 a co- or pre-requisite for the combined lab.

Context: MSU currently has 30 credits for integrative studies. This is low for similar institutions. The added credit would be taken from the 3 credits originally assigned to the transcollegiate course, which has never been initiated.

Motion approved unanimously.

8. James Madison College--DCL/MSU 3+3 Program Proposal: N. Graham, Acting Dean, presented the proposal for an exception to the University Policy of the credits earned at Michigan State toward the undergraduate graduation requirements. Specifically, JMC requested that the first year of the DCL/MSU program (29 credits) count as the final credits of the 120 required for a BA in JMC.

It was noted that this program is seen as very limited; permitting up to five students per year, it will help DCL become better integrated with the MSU community, and it will be implemented without major changes to the college curriculum or the philosophy of JMC. The program will be evaluated after a 4 year trial.

Motion to endorse the proposal passed unanimously.

9. Agenda items 9, 10 and 11 were not addressed due to time constraints.

10. Discussion following the defeat of the ASMSU proposal to extend drop deadline was briefly resumed. It was suggested that a resolution might come from UCAP recommending that faculty provide feedback prior to the drop date of the middle of the semester, consistent with the goals and structure of the course. Due to time constraints, this issue will be addressed at the April 29 meeting after resolution language is refined.

11. Meeting adjourned 12:15 p.m.

University Committee on Academic Policy
Minutes
April 29, 1999

Present: B. Ames, H. Bossen, J. Chartkoff, R. Fisher, C. Gibbons, D. Imig, F. Jacobs, L. Martin, C. McHugh, J. Patterson, J. Radma, J. Sticklen, M. Stefaniak, J. Wald, W. Wilkinson, R. Zimmerman

Others: B. Steidle

Minutes prepared by: J. Wald

1. The meeting was called to order at 10:23 a.m. by J. Chartkoff.
2. The agenda and minutes were approved.
3. J. Chartkoff will be going to the International Center for Computer Enhanced Learning (ICCEL) Laptop Conference at Wake Forest University.
4. Jon Sticklen and Jeanne Wald were elected as co-chairs for 1999-2000.
5. There was extensive discussion on SIRS and the proposed new public student evaluation forms.

D) New public student evaluation forms:

Work on a public student evaluation form began in the Spring '97. In Spring '98 there was a small pilot study (7 faculty members), and a larger pilot study (40 faculty members) was conducted in the Fall '98. Analysis of the results is available, but some felt it was incomplete and not as informative as it could have been regarding whether the questions were effective. It was suggested that the percent of students responding be added to the report.

The students constructed questions based on what they felt students wanted to know. Much discussion followed on the questions and how they were framed. In an earlier discussion, some UCAP members had suggested that only two global questions were really necessary. The Fall 1998 pilot included the six original questions and the two global questions. Steidle observed that the responses to the two global questions were not as informative as the others. Others believed that the set of questions would not, in fact, tell the students what they wanted to know since instruction can change substantially from year to year (depending on feedback and other factors). In fact, they felt as though the evaluations might encumber courses from changing in a positive direction due to a possible class predisposition based on previous negative evaluations. Others questioned

the wisdom of adding another evaluation form to be filled out. They felt students already did not take seriously the evaluation forms they were doing.

II) Current SIRS:

The Business College has gone to 2 forms; Social Science has several forms. In general individual colleges and departments often have different approaches to which forms they use.

Ninety percent of the departments use SIRS (or their teaching evaluations) as the sole criteria for evaluation of teaching. Several question whether the teaching evaluations do an adequate job of evaluating teaching. There is evidence both for and against the conclusion that students factor in what they have learned from a course when evaluating the instructor.

III) Discussion on both:

The purpose of the public evaluation forms was simply to get useful information, as defined by the students, to the students. The purposes of the current evaluation forms include feedback to the individual faculty member and evaluation of the faculty member's teaching. As with other factors involved in promotion and annual evaluation of faculty, there is a policy of confidentiality. Rather than changing the current policy and combining these purposes in order to come up with a single evaluation form, the option of developing a second evaluation form, the results of which would be public, was selected.

Of the CIC institutions, currently 3 have no public evaluations available, 5 have an optional public evaluation form and 4 have some form of public evaluation.

If UCAP votes for the motion to approve the public evaluations, the next step would be for the policy statement to go to Academic Council.

IV) C. McHugh moved to vote on the motion and M. Stefaniak seconded it. R. Zimmerman moved to table the proposal and B. Ames seconded that motion. The motion to table carried.

6. UCAP continued discussion on a resolution regarding providing feedback to students before the course drop deadline:

It was moved that UCAP officially recommend the following resolution be presented to Faculty Council and to Academic Council at the opening meetings of the 1999-2000 academic year:

While UCAP recognizes that graduate and undergraduate evaluation must be consistent with the goals and structure of individual courses, UCAP strongly encourages faculty to provide significant feedback to students regarding progress in the course prior to the drop date in the middle of the semester.

There were 2 abstentions and the motion passed.

7. The final item discussed was the laptop recommendation to the Provost.

J Sticklen moved that UCAP approve the following recommendation. C. McHugh seconded.

UCAP strongly supports the concept of universal access to current technology and universal competency in computing at MSU.

1) UCAP urges the Communications and Computing Systems Advisory Committee (CCSAC) to revise the proposal with due regard to comments in the UCAP report and to announce broadly to the university community proposed refinements of the student laptop proposal. In addition, UCAP urges CCSAC both to encourage and to allow full and open feedback on the proposal from the university community.

2) Because of the broad impact of the implementation of the student laptop proposal, UCAP requests that future refinements of the proposal be brought back to UCAP for comment before implementation of the plan.

The motion passed.

8. The Faculty Work-Life Issues were tabled. Bob Banks and his committee are getting a report ready.

9. The meeting was adjourned at 12:13 p.m.

UCAP4.29.99.doc