

Wright State University

CORE Scholar

Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Policy Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Policy
Committee Minutes Committee

2-16-2004

Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Policy Committee Minutes, February 16, 2004

Follow this and additional works at: https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/archives_ucapc_minutes



Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

Repository Citation

(2004). Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Policy Committee Minutes, February 16, 2004. .
https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/archives_ucapc_minutes/67

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Policy Committee at CORE Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Policy Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of CORE Scholar. For more information, please contact library-corescholar@wright.edu.

Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Policy Committee

Minutes of February 16, 2004 Meeting

Present: Jeanne Fraker, David Green, Charles Larkowski, Joe Law, Henry Limouze, Karen Kimber (for Jan Maxwell), KT Mechlin, Richard Mercer, Sharmila Mukhpadhyay, Ryan Newman, Doug Nord, Tony Ortiz, Susan Praeger, Tom Sav.

Approved Minutes of January 12, 2004

UCAPC Subcommittee Reports

Writing Across the Curriculum Committee: Joe Law, WAC Chair, reported that the committee discussed via email the project to permanently designate courses as WI and is working with the Registrar's Office to complete the task.

University General Education Committee: Henry Limouze, UGEC Chair, reported on the activities of the committee at its January 15 and January 29 meetings. The minutes are available as follows:

[UGEC Minutes, January 15, 2004](#)

[UGEC Minutes, January 29, 2004](#)

Course Inventory and Modification Requests

CECS:

Approved Modifications: ME 199, ME 488

CEHS:

Approved Modification: EDT 280 -- it was noted that the course modification to be effective Fall 2004 implies program changes for at least four programs in the CEHS and that while the Curriculum Processes and Procedures require such to be submitted simultaneously, the committee approved the request with the understanding that the required program changes would be submitted in time for UCAPC and Faculty Senate action this academic year.

COBA:

Approved Modifications: ACC 206, ACC 307, ACC 323, ACC 326

COLA:

Approved Inventory: SOC 210

COSM:

Approved Modifications: MTH 243, MTH 244

Program Changes

COBA:

Approved: B.S.B. Accountancy. The proposal is available as follows:

[**B.S.B. Accountancy**](#)

Approved: B.S.B. Finance. The proposal is available as follows:

[**B.S.B. Finance**](#)

COLA:

Approved: B.A. Anthropology. The proposal is available as follows:

[**B.A. Anthropology**](#)

New Programs

COLA:

Approved: Certificate of Completion Leap Intensive English Program available as follows:

[**Certificate of Completion: Leap Intensive English Program**](#)

Academic Policy

Fresh Start Program Policy: In addition to the committee consideration of changing the policy from multiple to a one-time Fresh Start, KT Mechlin, Chair of the Petitions Committee, reported that the her committee is considering other possible change recommendations that will be submitted for the next UCAPC meeting. The current policy is as follows:

[**Fresh Start Program Policy**](#)

Course Drop Date Policy:

The committee reviewed the recommendations of changes to the Course Drop Date Policy as drafted by the Petitions Committee and forwarded to UCAPC by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. The committee praised the Petitions Committee for its diligent work in researching the issue and presenting an excellent report. The Petitions Committee recommendation is as follows:

[**Course Drop Date Recommendation: Petitions Committee**](#)

After much discussion and reports of committee members as to the feedback from their colleges, it was decided to make a substitute proposal to the Faculty Senate. The committee's substitute recommendation is based on the objective to move all undergraduate students to a single drop date under the constraint that the drop date meet the 60% minimum deadline for students receiving financial aid. Hence, the committee recommends in substitute to "Recommendation item (2)" contained in the above that:

"The drop date for all students shall be the same and at the end of the seventh week (ending on Saturday) of the quarter. Since summer has three terms (A, B and C) the breakdown would be the middle (Wednesday) of the the fourth week for each of the summer A and B, and the end of the seventh week for summer C."

Spring Quarter Meeting Schedule

The committee set its Spring Quarter meetings for April 12 and May 17. All proposals from colleges **must be received** with the original plus 19 copies by March 31, 12:00 noon for the April 12 UCAPC meeting and by May 5, 12:00 noon for the May 17 UCAPC meeting. Submissions received after the May 5 deadline will be considered by the UCAPC next academic year at the the September or October 2004 meeting. ***The UCAPC cannot make exceptions to the established deadlines.***

IMPORTANT NOTE: Any curriculum or academic policy proposals that must go before the Faculty Senate for approval this academic year must be submitted to the UCAPC by the March 31 deadline because IF approved by the UCAPC, the Faculty Senate will consider it as New Business at it May 3 meeting and act on it as Old Business at its June 7 meeting.

University General Education Committee
Meeting of January 15, 2004

Present: Carl Brun (CoLA), Susan Carrafiello (Honors), Valerie Doll (CEHS), Jeanne Fraker (UVC), David Green (Student), Lillie Howard (Provost), Daniel Ketcha (CoSM), Joe Law (WAC), Evan Osborne (RSCoB), David Reynolds (CECS), Henry Limouze (CoLA, Chair); also present, Charles Long, Adult and Transfer Services

1. Minutes from November 10 were approved.
2. A copy of the General Education Program packet was distributed.
3. Charles Long addressed the committee about the problem of designing articulation agreements with state community colleges that will allow students to transfer credit into our General Education program. He brought along three such agreements. The committee discussed the issues and approved the following statement:

Wright State's general education program will accept courses (like Sinclair's PHL 205 or 206), which will count toward a college's transfer module, but which are not normally accepted to meet an area requirement, only if their purpose is to satisfy a deficiency in the number of credit hours.

This statement is in keeping with the "Note" appended to the Guidelines for Implementation of WSU's General Education Transfer Policy passed by the Faculty Senate on April 7, 2003 and included in the GE program packet. Both of them clearly require that the area distribution requirements be satisfied by courses listed as "Approved Transfer Module Courses" in the Guidelines.

4. The committee received the proposed new college component course in Engineering and Computer Sciences, ISE 210. Committee members will review this proposal and discuss the course at the next meeting.
5. The committee discussed the situation developing in Areas 3 and 6, where lead faculty may not be available to develop a draft assessment plan. Provost Howard and the committee chair will meet with Area 3 department chairs and with Associate Deans to discuss possible strategies for plan development for these areas.
6. The next committee meeting will be Thursday, January 29 at 4:00 p.m. in a room to be announced.

The committee adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Attachment: Description of General Ed. articulation agreement issue

University General Education Committee
Meeting of January 29, 2004

Present: Carl Brun (CoLA), Susan Carrafiello (Honors), Jeanne Fraker (UVC), David Green (Student), Lillie Howard (Provost), Daniel Ketcha (CoSM), Joe Law (WAC), Evan Osborne (RSCoB), David Reynolds (CECS), Henry Limouze (CoLA, Chair); also present, Ed Rutter

1. Minutes from January 15 were approved.
2. The committee considered the proposed new Area 6 (college component) course in Engineering and Computer Sciences, ISE 210. The proposal needs to spell out GE objectives in greater detail and to relate those objectives to the course description, course goals, and course schedule more specifically. Since the course is writing intensive, the proposal and syllabus need to define more clearly how writing will be integrated. The course needs to clarify how the skills it will teach relate to the purposes of GE. Finally, the proposal must state who will teach the course and must give a contact person. David Reynolds and other CECS faculty will work with Joe Law to find language that better integrates writing into the course schedule. Henry Limouze will be available as a resource to help with GE objectives.
3. Ed Rutter discussed GE staffing patterns. Ed distributed a spreadsheet showing that nearly 27% of GE sections (core courses only) were taught by faculty at the professorial rank, while instructors and lecturers teach nearly 41% of sections. While this means that over 2/3 of GE sections are taught by full-time faculty, it appears that professorial faculty are responsible for fewer sections than they had taught in the past. Lillie Howard raised the question of how the university might revive faculty interest in and commitment to teaching general education. The committee discussed various faculty attitudes toward GE classes; some view it as a punishment, others as a rewarding opportunity to teach their field. No decision was taken on whether to conduct a survey of faculty attitudes—the problem needs to be more clearly defined first. Ed Rutter will break down the data area by area. Lillie Howard will find a similar survey of staffing patterns done some years ago. The committee will examine data further.
4. Lillie Howard discussed the latest OBR review of GE courses submitted for the transfer module. Seven GE core courses have been turned down, including all Area one courses along with courses in RST, SOC and SW. Other courses that were turned down include several preprofessional courses in the sciences and GE substitution courses in various departments. Dr. Howard and the deans are examining the data now, and the deans will decide which courses they wish to resubmit.
5. The chair distributed all assessment plans received before today's meeting. They include a plan for the Area 1 writing courses and a plan for each of the three Education courses in Area 6.

The committee adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

RAJ SOIN COLLEGE OF BUSINESS
Department of Accountancy
B.S. in Business
Accountancy Major

Current Program		Proposed Program	
	Hours		Hours
I. General Education	48	I. General Education	48
Required Substitutions:		No change	
Area One: Mathematics (counted in Section II) 4 hrs Area Three: Economics (counted in Section II) 4 hrs Area Six: College Component: EC 290 or FIN205 4 hrs			
II Business Core Requirements	79	II. Business Core Requirements	79
MTH 129, 228 (substitution for GE, MTH 145)	8	No change	8
EC 204, 205 (substitution for GE Area Three, EC 200)	8	No change	8
Other Business Required Core Courses (see College of Business Core Requirements)	63	No change	63
III Accountancy Major Requirements	44		40
ACC 206 – Accounting Systems	4	Delete ACC 206	
ACC 307 – Intermediate Accounting I	4	ACC 307 – Intermediate Accounting I	4
ACC 308 – Intermediate Accounting II	4	ACC 308 – Intermediate Accounting II	4
ACC 309 – Advanced Accounting	4	ACC 309 – Advanced Accounting	4
ACC 323 – Management Accounting	4	ACC 323 – Management Accounting	4
ACC 326 – Accounting Systems Design	4	ACC 326 – Accounting Systems Design	4
ACC 343 – Federal Income Tax I	4	ACC 343 – Federal Income Tax I	4
ACC 423 – Auditing	4	ACC 423 Auditing	4
ACC 424 – Advanced Mgt. Accounting	4	ACC 424 – Advanced Mgt. Accounting	4
ACC 444 – Federal Income Tax II	4	ACC 444 – Federal Income Tax II	4
FIN 311 – Financial Management II	4	FIN 311 – Financial Management II	4
V Business Electives	12	Business Electives (Change: Add one elective)	16
VI. Non-Business Electives	8	VI. Non-Business Electives	8
Total	187	Total	187

RAJ SOIN COLLEGE OF BUSINESS
Department of Finance and Financial Services
B.S. in Business
Finance Major

Current Program		Proposed Program	
	Hours		Hours
I. General Education	48	I. General Education	48
Required Substitutions: Area One: Mathematics (counted in Section II) 4 hrs Area Three: Economics (counted in Section II) 4 hrs Area Six: College Component: EC 290 or FIN205 4 hrs		No change	
II Business Core Requirements	79	II. Business Core Requirements	79
MTH 129, 228 (substitution for GE, MTH 145)	8	No change	
EC 204, 205 (substitution for GE Area Three, EC 200)	8	No change	
Other Business Required Core Courses (see College of Business Core Requirements)	63	No change	
III Finance Major Requirements	28		24
ACC 206 – Accounting Systems 4 ACC 307 – Intermediate Accounting I 4 ACC 308 – Intermediate Accounting II 4 FIN 311 – Financial Management II 4 FIN 401 – Investing in Securities 4 FIN 419 – Financial Planning & Analysis 4 FIN 490 – International Financial Mgt. 4		Delete ACC 206 ACC 307 – Intermediate Accounting I 4 ACC 308 – Intermediate Accounting II 4 FIN 311 – Financial Management II 4 FIN 401 – Investing in Securities 4 FIN 419 – Financial Planning & Analysis 4 FIN 490 – International Financial Mgt. 4	
IV Finance Electives	12	Finance Electives (Change: Add one elective)	16
V Business Electives	12	Business Electives	12
VI. Non-Business Electives	8	VI. Non-Business Electives	8
Total	187	Total	187

To: Sharon Nelson
College of Liberal Arts
From: Bob Riordan
Chair, Sociology/Anthropology
Date: 30 December 2003
Subj: Anthropology Program Requirements

Attached please find the revised Anthropology program requirements. These changes reflect the 56 credit hours for general education, 56 credit hours for departmental requirements, 12 credit hours for related requirements, 24-32 credit hours for foreign language and research methods requirements, and 36-44 credit hours for electives requirements.

The B.A. program in Anthropology is revised from 54 credit hours (as approved) to 56 credit hours. This change reflects ATH 241 and ATH 242 being converted to four credit hours rather than the previous three credit hours each. This then requires that the electives be revised from 38-46 to 36-44 hours to reflect these two credits.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at X2667.
Thank you for your assistance.

Degree Requirements

General Education 56 hrs.

Department Requirements

ATH 241 Introduction to Physical Anthropology 4 hrs.

ATH 242 Introduction to Archaeology 4 hrs.

ATH 448 Development of Ethnological Thought
Or 4 hrs.

ATH 468 Seminar in Archaeological Theory

Cultural Electives 12 hrs.

Archaeology Electives 12 hrs.

Physical Electives 8 hrs.

Open Anthropology Electives 12 hrs.

Total 56 hrs.

Related Requirements 12 hrs.

Selected from economics, geography, history,
political science, psychology, sociology, and
certain courses from biological sciences,
geographical sciences, and communication

Foreign Language and Research Methods Requirements 24-32 hrs.

Open Electives 36-44 hrs.

Total 192 hrs.

Date: November 20, 2003

To: Dr. Sharon Nelson, Associate Dean, College of Liberal Arts

From: Henry Limouze, Chair, English

Subject: TOEFL Substitution proposal

Every undergraduate from overseas whose native language is not English must take the TOEFL (the Test of English as a Foreign Language) to gain admission to universities in the United States. Wright State has a TOEFL score requirement of 500 for most undergraduate programs. This requirement is low, but it is intended to certify some English proficiency.

There are two problems with this situation. First, TOEFL does not do a very good job of certifying that students actually have the skills in reading, understanding, writing, speaking, listening, and comprehending English they need to have in order to succeed in a university classroom. The first three skills (reading, understanding and writing) are somewhat assessed by TOEFL, which at least now contains a writing component. The last three skills are not assessed at all. Yet English speaking and listening abilities are as important to a student as are reading and writing abilities.

The second problem with TOEFL is that as an internationally administered standardized test, it generates enormous test-anxiety among students around the world who must jump through this one particular hoop in order to gain entrance to a U.S. university, one of the most coveted educational opportunities available today. Those who know the international student community know well the dread of TOEFL among international students. This has of course spawned the usual profitable test-preparation industry. Unfortunately, it has also spawned widespread allegations and/or suspicions of cheating in parts of the world where the secure administration of this test cannot be relied upon.

The bottom line is that international students will “do anything” to avoid having to take TOEFL, and that TOEFL is not the best indicator of student ability anyway.

We propose to provide a certificate to the university guaranteeing that any student successfully completing our highest-level LEAP courses in intensive English (the “Bridge program” that the proposal refers to) possesses skills in English reading, writing, speaking, listening, and so on, skills more than sufficient to be able to succeed in the college classroom. When students complete this Bridge program, which also includes a course in the student’s prospective major subject (thus enabling us to insure that students’ skills are sufficient to permit them to succeed in their majors), they will be certified as having English skills equal to those required by TOEFL, and the TOEFL requirement will be waived.

The benefits this program will provide are at least two. First, this new policy will help increase enrollment in our intensive English program at a time when intensive programs around the country are suffering from decreased enrollments because of new visa restrictions and immigration rules. Second, this new policy will help attract international students to various excellent programs at Wright State University. We suspect that few or none of these students will be interested in majoring in English, but many of them will want to explore majors in business, the sciences, engineering, social sciences, computer science, mathematics, and the arts. Permitting these students to substitute completion of our LEAP Bridge program for the required TOEFL score will open the university up to further internationalization of its student body, one of the goals our university has articulated for years.

The WSU School of Graduate Studies has already approved a substitution similar to the one we are proposing here. Programs like it are already in place at a number of other universities (the University of Findlay, for example). Note that we are not asking that the TOEFL requirement be removed; we are simply requesting that the requirement be waived for students who successfully complete a demanding program in intensive English. And note also that we do not ask the university to take our LEAP Certification of English Proficiency on faith. Students will not be able to complete the Bridge Program until they demonstrate their ability in English by passing a course in their prospective major department. We will work with students and with departments to select appropriate courses and to determine an appropriate minimum grade level.

We have discussed this proposal with the Vice President for Curriculum and Instruction, Lillie Howard. She supports it. We would hope that the CoLA Curriculum Committee could approve and forward this proposal to UCAPC. Approval there would be followed by consideration and approval by the Faculty Senate. Thank you.

February 18, 2004

RECOGNITION OF THE CERTIFICATE OF COMPLETION
FROM
THE LEAP INTENSIVE ENGLISH PROGRAM

PETITION

We are petitioning to have the certificate of completion from the LEAP Intensive English Program recognized as an alternative to the TOEFL requirement for undergraduate admission. Currently, all international students applying to Wright State University from overseas must submit a TOEFL score of 500 (173 Computer Based).

Successful completion of the LEAP program will require that a student meet all the requirements of LEAP's most advanced level, the bridge level. The completion of the course in the bridge level certifies that a student has achieved proficiency in English speaking, writing, and academic study skill well beyond what is certified by the TOEFL.

DESCRIPTION OF THE BRIDGE LEVEL

The bridge level has the most advanced language instruction in the LEAP program. There are two fundamental components to the Bridge Level:

- 1) An advanced level in LEAP that addresses academic language and study skills needed for college admissions.
- 2) A certificate of completion from LEAP that can be used in place of the TOEFL for Wright State Admission. For any student not enrolled in LEAP, the TOEFL will still be used when applying for admission

The bridge level will include a combination of 1) ESL service courses, 2) a new LEAP study skills course, and 3) a course in the student's future major or a course recommended by the student's future department or program.

Bridge Level Program of Study (16 contact hours a week)

1) Speaking

* English 110 (4 contact hours)

2) Writing

* English 111 or English 112 (4 contact hours)

3) LEAP

* Study Skills (4 contact hours)

4) Course in or recommended by prospective major (4 contact hours)

LEAP CERTIFICATION PROPOSAL, Page 2

Benefits

Recruiting

- Students will be assigned an academic advisor who will help them apply to Wright State University.
- Classes would be small. On average the ESL service classes enroll 12 students a quarter and the LEAP classes enroll 8 a quarter.
- Students can apply for IHOP on campus housing and live with a native English speaking student.
- Students will gain university experience by taking approved academic classes and have the opportunity to meet faculty in their future majors. Students will no longer have to take the extra step of applying and passing the TOEFL for admission to Wright State. A certificate of completion from the *Bridge Level* will constitute validation of college-level proficiency in English. The certificate will indicate undergraduate or graduate proficiency levels.

Cost and Administration

- Existing instructors and classes will be used for the majority of the classes.
- The new LEAP study skills course will be taught by a part-time instructor or LEAP faculty member.
- The ESL classes (English 110 and 112) already have university-recognized exams with faculty participation and oversight. English 110 uses a modified OPT as an exit exam and English 112 requires an in-class essay. The 110 exit exam and the 112 essay are evaluated by university faculty members.

Chris Hall, Interim Director
LEAP Intensive English Program

DATE: November 3, 2003
FROM: Student Petitions Committee (Chair, KT Mechlin)
TO: Executive Committee
SUBJECT: Proposed change in drop date

CURRENTLY: There are currently three deadlines for drop dates for students.

- (1) All students can drop a class without any notation of signing up for it on their transcripts, before the end of the third week of class.
- (2) Upper classmen can drop a class with a grade of "W", before the end of the fifth week of class
- (3) Freshmen can drop a class with a grade of "W", before the end of the eighth week of class.

PROBLEMS: The Petitions Committee believes that there are a number problems associated with our existing multiple drop deadline policy, which include the following:

- (1) Transfer students find our current policy confusing and excessively strict, especially when compared to institutions they have transferred from. In fact, our policy is much more restrictive than all the other universities in Ohio. This puts WSU at a competitive disadvantage especially when trying to retain students who feel they have been hurt by our policy.
- (2) Upperclassmen who have received financial aid are afraid to drop classes for fear of losing financial aid. Students receiving federal financial aid who completely withdraw before 60% of the term has passed are subject to the federally mandated Return of Title IV Funds calculation. When these students withdraw, the institution must return a portion of the federal aid (grants and loans) which had been awarded to pay the students' fees. If the withdrawal occurs after the university's refund period has ended, the student is then indebted to the university for the amount of aid the university has returned to the federal student aid programs. The amount of aid that has to be returned is a pro-rated amount based upon the student's institutional charges, amount of federal aid awards, and the percentage of term in which the student was enrolled. The university then has the burden of collecting that money back from the student, which may or may not be successful. While the student will not be allowed to register for classes again until that debt is paid off, getting that money back will be very difficult if they drop out of school. Obviously, this policy hurts the poorest students the most, the ones who have to borrow not only tuition, but also living expenses. Note: freshmen are not affected by this requirement since Friday of the 8th week occurs after 60% of the quarter.
- (3) Students are often confused as to which drop date applies to them. Delays in posting of transfer credits, military credits, AP credits, etc. may cause a student's status to change midway through the quarter, and hence which drop date policy applies to them.
- (4) Students above the freshmen level sometimes do not have significant course feedback before the exiting 5th week drop deadline. Thus, they do not have enough time and information to evaluate whether or not they will be able to successfully pass the class.

RECOMMENDATION: To address the above problems, the Student Petitions Committee recommends:

- (1) There shall be one common drop date for all students to drop with a grade of "W"
- (2) The drop date for all students shall be the same as the current drop date for freshmen, which is the end of the eighth week of the quarter. Since summer has three terms (A, B and C) the breakdown would be the end of the fourth week for each of the summer terms A and B, and the end of the eighth week for summer C.

Summary of Withdrawal dates			
Quarter Schools			Approx
Wright State	AllButFresh.		5 weeks
	Freshman		8 weeks
U.Cincinnati			8 weeks
Ohio State	Selective		5 weeks
	FullDrop		10 weeks
Ohio Univ.	Selective		5 weeks
	FullDrop		10 weeks
Shawnee State			6 weeks
	Emergency		10 weeks
Semester Schools			
U.Akron			12 weeks
Cleveland State			12 weeks
Youngstown State			11 weeks
Kent State			11 weeks
Central State			8 weeks
Miami Univ.			6 weeks
			16 weeks
Bowling Green			9 weeks
U.Toledo			8 weeks
	NoAttend or		10 weeks
Case Western			12 weeks
U.Dayton			11 plus
Xavier U.			13 plus
Wilmington			8 weeks
Wittenberg			12 weeks