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Minutes of Student Academic Policies Committee
January 5, 2001
4:00 pm in KU 311

Senators Present: Bartley, DeConinck, Doyle, Eimermacher, Galioto, Gould, Ilg, Lechleiter, McKenna, Skill

Guest: Walker

Chair of SAPC

George Doyle was selected as chair of the SAPC

Meeting Times

The SAPC will meet on Mondays at 3:00 pm. George Doyle will determine the meeting room.

Issues

1. Alternate Grading System: I – 00 – 16

A letter to be sent to the faculty, which ask for their input concerning a possible change in the grading scheme used at UD, was reviewed. The purpose of the letter is to alert them to the likelihood that the Academic Senate will vote on adding + and – grades to the present grading of A, B, C, D, F. It also asks them to indicate their preference.

Some discussion as to the reasons given for the proposed change ensued, specifically why + and – grades would be fairer. The issue of fairness to the students would surely be dependent on whether the student was near the low end of the grade (a B- rather than a B for example) or near the high end of the grade (a B+ rather than a B). One of the strongest arguments for + and – grades is that students are likely to study more to get the B+ rather than slack off and receive a B-. The bottom line is that many faculty members believe that a finer gradation would give them more flexibility and be more indicative of the student’s performance. It should be noted that a number of faculty are not in favor of + and – grades because they believe it is not possible to make finer gradations.
It was asked if the + and – grades would reduce grade inflation. The answer to that is not known, but it no doubt will reduce the number of students graduating in the 3.7 to 4.0 range, because those students will likely receive A-’s instead of A’s in some courses.

2. Student Senators Academic Senate/SGA Academic Senators 1 – 00 --24

It has been suggested that undergraduate students elected to SGA as academic senators be the same students elected to serve as senators on the Academic Senate. The arrangement would give closer ties between the SGA and the Academic Senate.

There are at least two problems to overcome to fulfill this suggestion. First, SGA academic senators are elected two from each unit (a total of eight), whereas the Academic Senate elects one from each school and three from the college (a total of six). The Academic Senate’s student senator distribution is more in line with the number of students in the schools and college, and is not likely to be changed. SGA is presently looking into changing their constitution to match the Academic Senate’s Constitution of number of student academic senators.

The second problem is that SGA senators are elected in the spring and serve for the next school year. All academic senators are elected in the fall and serve for the calendar year. One important reason that academic senators begin serving in January is to allow the ECAS to become familiar with the ELC during the winter semester, so that they can have a greater impact on the budget issues that are decided in the fall.

It was suggested that we review the Academic Senate’s Constitution for a means of allowing student senators to be elected in the spring and start serving in the fall. If that is not possible, we need to submit a constitutional amendment to the Academic Senate, and to the whole faculty, to change the student election schedule.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be at 3:00 pm on Monday, January 22, 2001 in KU.