Minutes of the Undergraduate Council Monday, March 5, 2001 #5

April Summitt, chair; Delmer Davis, secretary; Samuel Chuah, Paula Dronen, Patricia Mutch, Malcolm Russell, Brad Sheppard, Lynelle Weldon, Patrick Williams **MEMBERS PRESENTS**

Charlotte Coy, Gary Williams, Susan Zork

NON-VOTING
MEMBERS PRESENT

Lynelle Weldon

PRAYER

Because not enough voting members attended to form a quorum, no formal votes were a part of this meeting.

LACK OF QUORUM FOR MEETING

Committee members reviewed the minutes of Feb. 4, 2001, and noted that two non-voting members needed to be added to those minutes (Erling Snorrason and Gary Williams).

MINUTES REVIEWED

The chair explained that the motion "to table" at the end of the Feb. 4, 2001, meeting had not been appropriate according to accepted parliamentary procedure. Therefore, she will consider a motion to amend at the next meeting when a quorum is present. PROCEDURAL APPROACH FOR THE NEXT MEETING

Samual Chuah, chair of the Academic Policies Subcommittee, has requested more clarification regarding how to refine the "Admission" document. Committee members indicated that GPA issues continue to be important concerns. Also, further bench-marking needs to occur. CLARIFICATION FOR THE ACADEMIC POLICIES SUBCOMMITTEE

Paula Dronen raised questions about the 8th line on p. 13 of the "Grading" document. She expressed concern about advisors having the responsibility to warn students who are failing a program. Should not this section be reviewed further in relationship to possible changes in the advising relationship, given web registration? The committee urged that legal counsel be sought regarding the wording of the sections that make advisors responsible for such warnings.

ADVISORS'
RESPONSIBILITY FOR
WARNING STUDENTS
WHO ARE FAILING
QUESTIONED

Malcolm Russell requested that in the future policy documents be distributed to the committee prior to meetings at which they are first considerd.

TIMELY DISTRIBUTION OF POLICY DOCUMENTS The members considered a letter from Ray Davis, principal at Great Lakes Academy, regarding ACT scores among seniors at his institution. The letter indicated comfort with the proposed changes in the admission process (see the document on "Admission), but encouraged the committee to consider ways to process potential students who do not test well but who have clear academic abilities. The letter led to considerable discussion of how best to evaluate potential students. Are ACT (and SAT) scores along with two college-prep math courses enough? Should GPA continue to be a factor?

LETTER FROM RAY DAVIS CONSIDERED

The committee encouraged the chair to request that Pat Mutch ask Jerry Thayer and the Center for Statistical Services to do a study of ACT (and SAT) scores vs. secondary GPA levels as predictors of academic success at Andrews University. The committee also requested that further bench-marking against non-SDA institutions be conducted in relationship to GPAs vs. test scores for admission.

STATISTICAL STUDY
OF ADMISSION TEST
SCORES VS.
SECONDARY GPA
LEVELS AS
PREDICTORS OF
ACADEMIC SUCCESS

The members next considered the problem of regular reviews of academic programs. The Subcommittee on Program Review and Development of the Undergraduate Council has not been active for over one year. This year's chair of this subcommittee, Paula Dronen, has been in touch with Linda Thorman, the chair of the similar subcommittee at the graduate level. There had been some efforts prior to this past year to coordinate program review policy between the Graduate Council and the Undergraduate Council. Linda Thorman, Dean of the School of Graduate Studies, will be chairing joint sessions of the two council subcommittees in order to try to work out a coordinated and simplified policy for regular program review. The chair pointed out that two programs must be reviewed in the interim, however: the BS in Computer Science and the BBA in Information Systems (as voted last year).

DISCUSSION OF PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES

Malcolm Russell has requested that the Honors Council not be the committee assigned the responsibility of reviewing the appropriate GPA level for *cum laude* designation because in the past the Honors Council has not handled such issues and the group is extremely busy at this time preparing for the implementation of the new Honors WHAT GROUP SHOULD CONSIDER THE GPA LEVELS FOR GRADUATION WITH HONORS (CUM LAUDE, ETC.)

curriculum. Such a review could be assigned to the Academic Policies Subcommittee. The Undergraduate Council will consider such assignment at a future meeting.
April Summitt, chair

Delmer Davis, secretary