

Minutes of a Meeting of the Undergraduate Council
Wednesday, January 13, 1999
#4

Harold Lang, Chair; Linda Closser, Secretary; Tom Chittick, Paul Denton, Delmer Davis, Richard Orrison, Michel Pichot, Bill Richardson, Douglas Singh.

VOTING MEMBERS
PRESENT

Keith Clouten, Charlotte Coy, Emilio Garcia-Marenko, Najeeb Nakhle, Gary Williams, Susan Zork.

NON-VOTING
MEMBERS PRESENT

Michel Pichot

PRAYER

VOTE: Approved

MINUTES

Harold Lang explained that the members of the Academic Policies Sub-Committee began their discussion of the Admission Categories section of the Undergraduate Policies Manual three years ago. Certain research directed toward decisions concerning this section was never completed, so the committee only submitted revisions for the Regular Admission Status for Bulletin copy. Now the Sub-Committee is discussing the remaining categories. Harold discussed the categories with David Penner, the new Vice-President for Strategic Initiatives and Enrollment Services, and their conclusions are reflected on the back side of this meeting's AGENDA.

ADMISSION
CATEGORIES

The concept of an Admissions Committee would be to deal with exceptions to the admission categories usually decided by Charlotte Coy, from Undergraduate Admissions, on a case by case basis. Even though a committee would be more time-consuming, the decisions about admitting students in special circumstances would be more consistent. These exceptions are on the increase—i.e., most Home School students lack verifiable documentation. Emilio Garcia-Marenko suggested the Council assign someone to suggest the terms of reference: how the committee would function, who would be members, and whether or not the committee could recommend policy changes removed from the Academic Policies Sub-Committee; and bring a report back to the Council for approval. Admission then becomes a collegiate and a cooperative process, one that adds authority to admission decisions.

ADMISSION
COMMITTEE

A **STRAW VOTE** was taken to approve the formation of an Admission Committee.

The committee will probably include the two assistant school deans who deal primarily with probation students, Don May from CAS and Gerry Coy from COT, Char Coy from Undergraduate Admissions, a

faculty representative, and an administrator as chair.

Andrews is the only Seventh-day Adventist school without an admission committee.


The discussion of process for approval of revised programs was postponed.


Jack Stout gave his presentation on a method for evaluating the cost effectiveness of programs. He is chair of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC). He explained that often the SPC is asked to evaluate new programs in light of their service to students, their academic quality, their fit into mission, but is informed by their financial impact. This becomes difficult when looking at undergraduate programs which are made up of a percentage of major courses and general education/service courses. The information generated by the study is from the College of Arts and Sciences only. Major courses are by far more expensive to the university, costing approximately \$.76 for each dollar of tuition generated, whereas general education/services courses cost only \$.23 to deliver. Therefore, the educational costs of the CAS and the wider university is very dependent on the profits resulting from GE/service courses (*see accompanying spreadsheet and graphs*). This can reflect very negatively on professional programs whose students often take their first two years of general course work at another school and transfer here for their professional courses.

He concluded by explaining that we need to recognize "the crucial role that GE/service credits play in the financial effectiveness of the undergraduate programs offered, incentives should be created that reward departments and colleges/schools for keeping the numbers of course options offered for programs/majors as near as possible to the minimum necessary for delivering good quality majors and/or programs. Comparisons between departments or college/schools should consider separately the efficiency of GE/service credits and the cost/income ratios resulting from offering majors or programs. Developing collective strategies that maintain both high quality undergraduate majors and programs and maximize financial efficiency is in the best interests of our students, constituents and our own financial survival."

SEMESTER SYSTEM CONVERSION

EVALUATING THE COST EFFECTIVENESS OF PROGRAMS


Harold Lang, Chair


Linda Closser, Secretary

ADMISSION CATEGORIES

Regular Admission	
Purpose	Regular admission which all students must achieve in order to earn a degree
Criteria	Meet the general admission standards published in the bulletin
Decision made by	Decision made by admissions officer based on published standards
Provisional Admission	
Purpose	Provisional admission for students who appear to meet the general admission standards but have not yet submitted all of the documentation
Criteria	Appear to meet the general admission standards published in the bulletin
Decision made by	Decision made by admissions officer based on published standards
Time limit	Not to exceed one term
Probationary Admission	
Purpose	Probationary admission for students who do not meet the general admission standards but who show evidence that they can be succeed college classes
Criteria	Based on standards approved by the Undergraduate Council and applied by the Admissions