Academic Standards Committee Meeting

October 23, 2008

Present: Ken Clark, Martins Linauts, Rob Taylor, Debbie Chee, Seth Weinberger, Drew Shannon, Ted Taranovski, Brad Tomhave, Bill Breitenbach, Chris Kline, Roseann Fish, Wade Hands, Carol Lentz (Academic Advising liaison).

Chair Weinberger called the meeting to order at 9:35am.

Business

Minutes from previous meeting were approved.

Petitions Committee Report: During the period October 9-October 22, there were two late adds approved. The Preview Team also placed a student on warning—did not complete incomplete ENGL 221 so failed. Total petitions since September 5: 37 approved and 4 denied. 18 Registrar Approved; 12 Preview Team Approved; 7 Sub-Committee Approved; 4 Sub-Committee Denied. Leading petition issues: Late Add—23 petitions; Time Conflict—12 petitions.

Self-Assessment: Chair Weinberger reopened discussion by focusing upon #4 of the self-assessment issues regarding the scope/domain of committee responsibilities. Do we have enough to do? Is there anything else we should be doing? One issue raised has to do with overlap between the ASC and the Curriculum Committee. Often, decisions are made in curriculum committee and then sent to Petitions committee. There are some gray areas between the two committees. For example, grade point average requirements is an issue that goes to both committees. In addition, faculty schedules constitute another area where the scope of responsibilities between committees is vague. Breitenbach asked who is dealing with the M-Th, T-F plan. Tomhave answered the Faculty Senate. Taranovski suggested that there should be a provision for joint meetings of committees to resolve jurisdiction issues. Weinberger asked if there are any other issues. No one raised any. He ended discussion by saying that he will finish typing up the results of the self-assessment later.

Honor Code/Pledge: At the end of last year, were just at the process of revising the 4th bullet point under “Language” of the Honor Code Proposal created by Bill Breitenbach and Seth Weinberger. Weinberger initiated the discussion by mentioning the words “voluntarily” and “obligations and consequences.” Carolyn Weisz’s (not present) previous concern with the word “voluntarily” was that students might feel that the parents forced them to come to the university. Chris Kline suggested we change the language to “I am a member of the Puget Sound community…” Taranovski suggested that we eliminate “academic” since this referred to a broader community. Breitenbach suggested we eliminate “free choice” and instead say “…consequences of my membership in this community…” Roseann Fish suggested the word “responsibilities” instead of “obligations.” Discussion continued over specific words such as society vs. community.
Taranovski suggested that we link the Honor Code Proposal to the Academic Integrity policy. Sarah Moore asked for clarity regarding the purpose of the honor code and the implementation of the ritual at matriculation. Taranovski and Wade Hands discussed to what extent we were requiring them to sign off on the Academic Integrity policy. Kline suggested that something there should be both indicative of the opportunity as well as the obligations. Carol Lentz said that there need to be reminders throughout the four years. Debbie Chee said that the students were already taking an Academic Integrity vow at the matriculation ceremony. Weinberger said he would incorporate the changes. Chee agreed to provide more details of the Academic Integrity vow taken at the matriculation ceremony.

**Reading Period:** Weinberger—assisted by Moore and Tomhave—initiated discussion by describing the issue with reading period. The university has a policy of not allowing scheduled activities during reading period days. Therefore, an instructor cannot schedule a review session that requires students to attend. But what happens when, for example, a professor wants to schedule a “non-mandatory” review session and schedule a classroom during reading period? Typically, the administration has said that an instructor can hold office hours in a classroom and can inform the class that, should any student wish to visit, the instructor will be in a particular classroom during particular hours. The problem is that while an instructor can schedule a classroom through the Registrar's Office for the stated purpose of sitting in it, this is a ruse to get around a prohibition on a scheduled class activity. Then there is the issue of faculty scheduling take-home exams during the week after reading period. Fish mentioned faculty assigning work due during reading period. Chee clarified that non-academic activities were also prohibited during reading period. Breitenbach explained that he understood reading period as a time to catch up and where no new material would be introduced. He said that he was fine with review sessions. Taranovski agreed with Breitenbach that this was the intention, but the problem was that many faculty weren’t giving exams anymore. Weinberger brought the conversation back to the question of scheduling rooms. Weinberger said that under Breitenbach’s interpretation the review sessions were fine if they weren’t mandatory. Weinberger closed discussion by saying that this issue needed to be discussed further at a later date (out of time).

Weinberger M/S/P that the meeting be adjourned at 10:30am.

Respectfully submitted,

Dolen Perkins-Valdez
Secretary of the Day