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Academic Standards Committee
Draft Minutes November 9, 2006

Attendance: Peter McNamara, Chris Call, Stephanie Hamblin, Kathryn Turner, Roland Squire, Scot Allgood, Ed Reeve, Michelle Lundberg, Bryan Bornholdt

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Scot Allgood at 3 p.m. in FL 113.

1. Approval of minutes of October 12, 2006. It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes. The minutes were adopted.

2. Discussion of Academic Renewal Policy and Guidelines. Roland Squire, representing the Registrar’s Office, handed out this policy and led the discussion. He reminded us that the Academic Renewal Policy is to help the student. Discussion by him and others included: Should this policy be an all or nothing policy, where students may pick and choose which grades to keep. The practice in the past has been all or nothing: remove all transfer classes that are D+, D, or F. Sometimes it is in the best interest of the student to keep a few low grades because they represent GE requirements that the student does not want to retake because it would extend the time for their graduation. If this policy is to help the student, we should allow them to pick and choose.

It was moved, seconded and adopted by the committee that this policy should be kept as written, but revise the practice. When a student meets with the advisor (usually the transfer advisor), he should be informed about this policy, and with the assistance of the advisor, make an informed decision.

3. Bryan Bornholdt presented information concerning the next agenda item: Math Placement Test. The Math Department is experiencing difficulty in placing students in the appropriate math class when they do not place in Math 1050. Most of them take Math 1010, when Math 0900 would be more appropriate. For example, 116 out of 1200 students were misplaced in Math 1010. They should have started with Math 0900. Many students enrolled in Math 1010 take the class over and over. They probably should have taken Math 0900 first. The Math Department is looking at using ACT or SAT scores to act as a trigger for a Math Placement Test. The Math Placement Test could be included as part of SOAR. Accuplacer is one of the computer math placement tests that is under consideration. A fee will be involved to take the Math Placement Test. With automatic results, the student taking the test early enough, may still enroll for the appropriate math class during the upcoming semester.

The Academic Standards Committee asked Bryan to prepare a proposal in official policy language, and email it to committee members prior to the meeting, December 7, 2006 at 1:30, so it can be passed on to the next committee and receive University approval in the spring.

4. The next agenda item was regarding Syllabi. With feedback from the PRPC committee it has been determined that there is no policy or code regarding the content or availability
of syllabi at our University. The committee discussed whether we want to consider a
syllabi policy or leave it as it is. Is there a model from another university with a general
policy that we could look at? There is a possibility of linking the online catalog to the
course syllabus. Committee members were encouraged to continue gathering
information and report at the January meeting. Steve Hanks in the Provost’s office will
be contacted to see if he will see what policies our sister institutions use across the state.

5. The committee reviewed code for relating to Academic Standards Committee
Membership, which states that this committee shall consist of four faculty members and
one student appointed from the Educational Policies Committee. Other committee
members can be appointed as needed. Past practice has been that all colleges, Registrar,
and Advising Center all have representation. It was moved and passed that membership
code is adequate but that the current practice of representation be retained. This includes
getting recommendation from the deans for those additional appointed members.

6. It was moved and seconded that the agenda be opened to add an item to today’s agenda.
Motion passed.

7. Roland Squire passed out information regarding the Suspension Appeal Process. The
committee members were asked to study the information and be prepared to discuss it at
the January meeting. The concern: in the past, there has been no formal appeal process.

8. The meeting was adjourned at 4 p.m.

9. Next meeting December 7, 2006 at 1:30. This will be a short meeting to decide on the
Math Placement Test.