

**Academic Standards Council Meeting  
Meeting of September 27, 2011  
Cheng Library, Room 107 (Reference Conference Room)**

**Present:** J. Bliss, C. Burns, K. Demsey, D. Falk-Romaine, R. Kearney, R. Laud, S. Mankiw, H. Maratouk, P. Noonan, N. Trelisky

**Absent:** N. Zeller

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 pm.

- 1) **Agenda** - The Council approved agenda for September 27, 2011
- 2) **Election of Chair/Co-Chairs** – Bliss and Maratouk agreed to serve as Co-Chairs for the year and were elected by acclamation. Kearney will continue as secretary.
- 3) **Review of Council Charges** - Senate Vice-Chair Falk-Romaine reviewed the Council's additional charges for the year:
  - a. Follow through on work begun during 2010-2011 with the Administration regarding ongoing review of effectiveness of academic policy matters – Kearney indicated that work on this charge was begun last year. The proposed approach was to review the academic policies listed in the undergraduate catalog, identify the campus offices responsible for administering them, and establish communication with these offices to agree upon a means of assessing the effectiveness of each policy.
  - b. Follow up with the Provost's Office regarding the Academic Integrity Policy (AIP) approved in 2008 and begin to develop strategies to implement the policy – The policy is currently pending attorney review in Trenton. When it is returned it will go to the Administration and the Board of Trustees for approval and will go into effect when it is published in the catalog. Kearney indicated that the Council's work on “implementation” is mostly confined to the issue of communicating the new policy to the faculty. Laud agreed to inquire with the Provost's Office regarding the current status of the AIP and report back to the Council.
  - c. Study of ‘exceptions’ to the curriculum and recommend a standard policy – Falk-Romaine explained the importance of this issue. At the present time advisors have an option to substitute certain courses to fulfill both GE and major requirements, but these may be overused, and there may also be an issue with advisor failure to use “advisor notes” to provide background and context if students change advisors and/or majors.
  - d. Continue discussion and develop recommendations for academic standards and basic guidelines for online courses – Kearney and Maratouk have been responsible for this charge, and more should be done to bring this charge to completion this year.
  - e. Assess academic efficacy of concentrated courses offered during Winter and 3 or 4 week summer sessions. Involve Patrick Noonan and other relevant members of the campus

community. - Falk-Romaine indicated that an assessment (report) of summer session is scheduled to be released in the near future. There is also a question pending as to whether WPUNJ's summer session fees should be discounted so as to compete with other area institutions that have implemented a discount policy. It was noted, however, that College of Education students cannot take certification courses elsewhere. Trelinsky also noted that students should not take courses at a community college (even if the lower fees are attractive) after they've completed 70 credits of work toward a bachelor's degree.

- f. Review of Incomplete Grade Policy, addressing inequity of time students have to complete requirements from semester to semester – Kearney indicated that this charge has already been dispatched by the Council. He will check his records to find the resolution.
  - g. Continue discussion about number of credits needed for Latin Honors – Kearney indicated that this charge has also been dispatched by the Council, with a resolution for a policy change approved by the Senate last year. He will check the Senate minutes to confirm this.
- 4) **Registrar Advice on Resolution Pertaining to Transfer Credit Applicable to Majors** – Last year the Council completed work on a resolution recommending a change in policy on the maximum number of transfer credits applicable to a major. The current policy indicates a specific credit value (15 credits) for the maximum figure and appears to be oriented toward 30-credit majors, disregarding the differences in total credit requirements for several other majors; some of these are substantially higher. The Council therefore recommended the maximum number of transfer credits applicable to a major be designated as a ratio (“...no more than half the credits in a major...”) rather than as a specific number. This resolution was presented in the first Senate meeting of fall 2011, but it failed to go to a vote and was instead sent back to the Council.

Trelisky and Noonan shared some of their views on the issue. They indicated that there is not a consensus interpretation of the number of credits in a major in cases of departments where certain courses are defined as “co-requisites” in relation to the major. In these instances, the view of most Departments is that “co-requisite” courses are not part of a major and fall outside the total number of courses required for a major. In the Registrar's view, however, “co-requisite” courses are counted as part of the total credit required for a major. Owing to these differences in interpretation, a change in policy such as proposed in the Council's resolution would result in differing assessments of transfer credit eligibility. Trelisky and Noonan also cautioned against any policy change that might result in an increasing number of community college credits being applied to the upper-division course requirements for bachelor's degrees. The Council will examine this issue further.

- 5) **Balance of Fall Meetings** – The Council agreed to the following dates for the remainder of its meetings for the fall semester:

\* October 26, Atrium 111, 3:30 pm

\* November 15, Hunziker Wing (Room TBA), 2:00 pm

\* December 14, Valley Road Building (Room TBA), 3:30 pm

The meeting adjourned at approximately 3:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard Kearney