

MEMORANDUM

July 8, 1996

TO: Gary Russi, Chair
University Senate Steering Committee and
University President

FROM: James R. Ozinga, ^{old}Chair
University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction (UCUI)

RE: Annual Report on Activities 1995-1996

On behalf of the 1995-96 UCUI I offer the attached report on the committee's activities during the preceding academic year. The length of the report attests to the hours of work accomplished by the UCUI during the year. I am happy to have been a part of it.

Two ladies deserve special mention as having contributed a great deal to whatever success the UCUI had this past year: Jennifer Gilroy, Assistant Registrar for Records, and Priscilla Hildum, Assistant to VPAA and Catalog Editor.

cc: Eric Follo, Chair, UCUI, 1996-97
UCUI members 1995-1996
New UCUI members 1996-1997
Anandi P. Sahu, Chair, UCUI, 1994-95
Chairs, Committees on Instruction
Lawrence Bartalucci, Registrar
Priscilla Hildum, Catalog Editor
✓ Joel Russell, Chair SPRC 1995-96
Jim McKay, Chair, Senate Budget Review Committee
Chair, General Education Committee
George Dahlgren, Dean of Graduate Study
All Heads of Academic Advising Units
President, Student Congress 1995-96
Lois Roelse, UCUI Secretary

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE INSTRUCTION 1995-1996

The University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction met 15 times during the academic year just past. Normally meetings took place every other week and each meeting lasted two hours. The traditional meeting time of Thursday morning from 10-12 was changed for the Winter semester to accommodate Nursing's inability to make the Thursday time. A similar problem caused the time of meeting to shift again for the 1996-97 year to Friday mornings from 10-12. Meetings were held in the spacious SBA Conference Room on the fourth floor of Varner Hall. Gratitude is expressed to the School of Business Administration for the use of this room.

The meetings this past year were also blessed with a very able recording secretary, Lois Roelse, on the Registrar's staff at the beginning of the year. Lois Roelse began developing a database to facilitate the archiving of the UCUI minutes. Space was also provided for filing UCUI minutes in 101 ODH (Office of the Registrar). Since Lois Roelse will not be able to continue next year, it is hoped that another competent person will be freed for the few hours per week this task entails. Proper minutes are vital. Accurate minutes in a central location is also important.

The members of the UCUI during 1995-1996 were James R. Ozinga (Chair), Margaret Christensen (Nursing-Fall 1995), Addington Coppin (SBA-Fall 1995), Carol Crum (Advising-Academic Services, General Studies), Eric Follo (SEHS), Jennifer Gilroy (Registrar Records), Fatma Mili (SECS), Jack Nachman (VPAA-Winter 1996), Ann Pogany (Library), Sherryl Schultz (SHS), Miron Stano (SBA-Winter 1996), Kate Vincent (Nursing-Winter 1996), and Helen Woodman (Academic Skills Center).

A. Petitions of Exception

The main goal was to standardize petitions of exception sufficiently so that a problem was handled consistently from unit to unit. Three steps were taken to accomplish this task.

a. Guidelines to petitions of exception that were developed during the 1994-1995 UCUI year were distributed to committees on instruction (See Appendix A). Of particular interest to UCUI were courses that form a part of the university wide undergraduate graduation requirements. The guidelines were meant as suggestions, not laws. In many instances the UCUI asked the COI to send the problem cases to the UCUI so that the University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction could understand why students have

difficulties with university requirements. By working together with the COIs it was hoped that the whole process could be improved. The UCUI expressed a willingness through the Guidelines to act as a COI for the entire university so as to handle difficult petitions pertaining to these courses. One COI took advantage of our offer and used us as a court of appeal.

Included with the Guidelines were recommendations that were designed to stimulate conversations on these topics between COIs and the UCUI. This intercommunication did not occur. COIs evidently did not feel the need.

b. The annual report on petition activity made by the UCUI and by the Registrar's office were brought into line. The 1994-1995 report (Appendix B) is roughly similar to that prepared in the Registrar's office except for the dates of the survey. The only thing left to do is to make the UCUI reporting dates fit those used by the Registrar: July 1 to June 30th.

c. A UCUI subcommittee was formed in the Fall 1995 to develop a standardized Petition of Exception form that incorporated positive aspects of forms now in use. The new form was developed, sent out to COIs for review, comments were incorporated, and the revised form was approved for use by the UCUI. COIs have been encouraged to use the new form for all Petitions of Exception.

B. Decennial Review of all Academic Units

The University Senate instructed the UCUI to accomplish full internal reviews of all academic units every decade along with interim reviews every five years. To achieve this goal the UCUI needed a review instrument and a schedule of reviews. The 1994-1995 UCUI developed a review instrument modelled after one used by the Graduate Office and another used by the College of Arts and Sciences. The purpose of the Program Review is to identify strengths and weaknesses with the intention of building on the strengths and minimizing the weaknesses. By 1995-1996 the UCUI was ready to test the instrument and review a unit.

John Tower, Interim Dean of SBA, agreed to conduct the first review in the School of Business Administration, using the UCUI instrument. In cooperation with the other Deans, a schedule of reviews was established.

The agreement with the School of Education and Human Services was made with Associate Dean James Clatworthy by telephone conversation. Some misunderstanding must have occurred, because shortly thereafter Dean Mary Otto began to resist the idea of an internal review, perhaps because SEHS was undergoing an extensive external review in 1995-1996 and did not wish to repeat the process. The issue is currently resolved in that SEHS will meet the new deadlines provided by the UCUI and the new UCUI Chair will ease SEHS into the review process. The schedule of reviews is therefore as complete as

any future planning can be and is as follows:

UNIT	DECENNIAL REVIEW	INTERIM REVIEW UPDATE
SBA	1995-1996	2000-2001
SEHS	1996-1997	2001-2002
SHS	1997-1998	2002-2003
SECS	1998-1999	2003-2004
CAS	1999-2000	2004-2005
CAS	2000-2001	2005-2006
SoN	2001-2002	2006-2007

A partial SBA review was received and studied but could not be considered the full review because of missing data. The request that these data be supplied and that typos be corrected was met with courtesy and cooperation, however, by July 8th the review was still not in UCUI hands. Because of these delays, the 1996-1997 UCUI will have to evaluate the SBA review in the fall of 1996 and at the same time review UCUI's instrument for usefulness and efficiency. A report on the SBA review will therefore be made by Professor Follo, the new chair of the UCUI.

Dean George Dahlgren of the Graduate School was informed of the undergraduate review schedule because of his willingness to coordinate reviews of graduate programs.

The final UCUI meeting of the year recommended that a separate Undergraduate Review Committee (URC) be appointed by the Senate or by the UCUI for terms of several years starting from Fall 1997 and charged with evaluating these reviews when they come in. The chair of the committee should be a member of the UCUI, and a second member of the committee should be knowledgeable member of the unit being reviewed, either faculty or a key administrative person such as Katie Kazarian in SBA. The due dates of reports should be made April 1st of each year, so that the Undergraduate Review Committee would have all summer and fall to do their work, reporting to the UCUI by December 1st. Reports from the UCUI to the unit involved, to Senate Steering, to Senate Planning, and Budget Review would occur early in the new year.

The above schedule should facilitate the review process and make timely responses more likely.

C. The charge to UCUI from the University Senate

The setting up of the decennial review process along with several other UCUI activities during 1995-1996 generated questions about what exactly had been the charge from the Senate Steering Committee. A brief discussion revealed that some UCUI members knew of no charge whatsoever, others had received a version of an outdated charge that still had Shelly Appleton in the VPAA office, while newer ones had a fairly

succinct charge provided them. We took the latest copy of the charge, adapted it, and sent it to the Steering Committee for approval. After members of the Steering Committee interviewed the Chair of the UCUI, the Steering Committee accepted the full charge with revisions as provided in Appendix C.

This then became the charge on which the UCUI operated and intends to operate in the future. The charge empowers the UCUI to act as a COI for the entire University in maintaining and safeguarding the undergraduate program of instruction.

D. Foreign language credits from non-accredited military institutions

This issue was brought to the UCUI by the Registrar's office because of the increasing number of students who have requested language credits based on intensive language study in the military. These military courses are normally 32 weeks in length. Oakland does not award credit for courses taken at non-accredited institutions even though the Department of Modern Languages does evaluate each student's proficiency through competency exams. Thus the student does receive credit in a way, by being allowed to enroll in a higher level of the language course. Jennifer Gilroy approached the UCUI for its recommendation on this policy, and the UCUI decided to let the current policy stand. This means that no academic credit is actually given the student for language work done in a non-accredited institution. Students who feel strongly about the issue can petition. If the CAS COI will forward the petition to the UCUI, it will be handled at that level.

E. Ethnic Diversity.

For clarity this section of the report is separated into six categories:

- 1) deciding on petitions of exception dealing with ethnic diversity questions;
- 2) approving course for ethnic diversity;
- 3) monitoring of courses already granted ethnic diversity status;
- 4) developing a reasonable definition of ethnic diversity and guidelines for future use;
- 5) determining when the approval (disapproval) of a course became effective; and
- 6) developing ethnic diversity workshops for both full and part-time faculty and advisors

1) Petitions of exception normally requested satisfaction of the ethnic diversity requirement by means of a course (often transfer) that had not previously been approved. Sometimes syllabi were submitted with the petition, if not it was requested before the decision was made. What was then revealed was a course taken earlier that bore no relationship to ethnic diversity in the United States. These were easy--the petitions were denied. A second category was an agreement that the course in question fit our ethnic diversity expectations and the petition was approved and a note made to add that course to the list of previously approved courses if the UCUI believed that they would see the course again. A third category was the case where the course in question had a dubious

course again. A third category was the case where the course in question had a dubious relationship to ethnic diversity, but the student was graduating and would be seriously disadvantaged by our denial of the petition, or the student's advisor had misdirected the student into thinking ethnic diversity was satisfied. Not wishing to grant ethnic diversity status to the dubious course, the UCUI in these few instances voted to waive the ethnic diversity requirement for that particular student. These policies were felt to be fair to all students, compassionate to the individual, yet consistent with our desire to maintain high standards for university-wide graduation requirements.

2) Generally faculty, sometimes through their department chairs, will ask the UCUI to grant ethnic diversity status to their courses. A syllabus and other material descriptive of the course is provided, and the UCUI makes its decision and communicates this decision to the petitioner, to the registrar, and to the catalog editor. Courses from the outside, i.e., from area community colleges or four year schools were usually considered on request from the Registrar's office. A subcommittee may be chosen in 1996-1997 to focus on this category. The decision is made after some discussion and the results communicated to the Registrar's office who communicates with the school requesting the status for its own courses.

3) Midway through the academic year it became obvious to the UCUI that courses previously approved for ethnic diversity status needed to be checked to see that they were still performing the promised functions. An instrument of monitoring was developed, using the General Education Committee's form as a guide. Specifically, instructors were requested to provide syllabi, and answer specific questions about their particular course. A deadline for response was provided and a subcommittee appointed to deal with the anticipated responses and to recommend action to the UCUI with reference to a specific course.

Approximately 50% of the ethnic diversity course instructors responded. Those not responding have been given a new deadline of December 1, 1996. If no action occurs prior to that date the UCUI will remove those courses from the list of approved courses provided by the *Schedule of Classes* and the *Catalog*. Those responding indicated some confusion about what constituted ethnic diversity.

A few courses (about six) were disapproved, i.e., informed that their ethnic diversity status was removed. Two of those disapproved were in SBA's Management department (MKT 404 and ORG 434). An appeal was made by Ken York and Liz Barclay that indicated a willingness to reshape the courses to fit the UCUI ethnic diversity expectation. On the strength of this, the UCUI decided to transfer MKT 404 and ORG 434 from the removed list to the conditional list which expires December 1st to provide time for Management faculty to make necessary changes in the courses.

The majority of those responding, however, were teaching ethnic diversity as per expectation. But even with these people there was some confusion about ethnic diversity and

the UCUI's expectations in order to have the course qualify for that status. Perhaps this confusion was partly due to the fact that this was the first time that any monitoring had been done, but some confusion was due to misunderstandings or changed understandings over time about ethnic diversity. Some departments and units were teaching a sort of cultural diversity as ethnic diversity. In another, a unit on workers tested positive for HIV virus was considered evidence of ethnic diversity in the course.

4) The UCUI had, throughout the year, tried to answer Professor Follo's request for specificity in re ethnic diversity, and the monitoring process brought home to us that the entire university community was operating without a definition of ethnic diversity and had no guidelines. To remedy this weakness, the UCUI defined ethnic diversity and provided guidelines for departments to meet the ethnic diversity requirement. This was communicated to all Deans and to all department heads whose courses have ethnic diversity status. When future monitoring occurs, these definitions will help people to adjust their ethnic diversity courses or to request that they be dropped from the list. We made sure to note that the requirement dealt with *ethnic* not *cultural* diversity, and that the phrase does *not* refer to diversities of either gender or class.

The UCUI defined the "ethnic" in ethnic diversity to mean African-American, Arab-Americans, Asian-American, Mexican-American, Native American, and less prominent groups who might be regionally significant. The UCUI defined "diversity" in ethnic diversity to mean the differences and interrelationships among groups.

The UCUI envisioned the goal of ethnic diversity as enhancing student awareness and understanding of interrelationships among people.

The UCUI established the following guidelines for judging a class offering as meeting the ethnic diversity requirement.

- a. At least 20% of the course must be devoted to ethnic diversity.
- b. Understanding ethnic diversity must be stated as a goal on the course syllabus.
- c. The geographical area of coverage is to be the United States.
- d. The study of a single group is acceptable provided that its relationship to other groups is emphasized.

5) The timing issue, when a new approval (or disapproval) became effective grew more complex than anticipated. It seemed simple at first: approve a course for ethnic diversity and state quite firmly that the effective date was the next fall semester, or, to put it another way, when it appeared in the new catalog. This worked for a few months but then the UCUI was informed that a few advisors had inadvertently told a few students that

SOC 100, recently approved for ethnic diversity, was possessed of that status in Fall 95 when the effective date was Fall 96. What to do? Make an exception because of an advisors' mistake? Hold the line? The UCUI, one is proud to note, determined to hold the line and did so despite several impressive appeals to our better nature. All this collapsed in hilarious laughter when Jennifer Gilroy informed the UCUI that through a computer error, SOC 100 had been retroactively granted ethnic diversity status for Fall 95. When the dust settled, the UCUI determined that the proper approval (disapproval) effective date would be the publication of the next *Schedule of Classes*. The effective dates become then February 14 for the Spring-Summer, February 28th for the Fall semester, and October 13th for the Winter semester.

6) The issue of ethnic diversity workshops came up as a part of the UCUI attempt to define ethnic diversity. A sense of the confusion among the faculty, a sense of the difficulties of monitoring a course taught only by part-timers who are now far away and cannot be questioned and who left no syllabi behind contributed to the sense that a wider awareness of ethnic diversity would be beneficial to the university. There was little time to do more than explore the idea within the UCUI and with the chair of the Senate Human Relations Committee who was a UCUI guest in the Fall 95 semester.

It is anticipated that in the academic year 1996-1997 a beginning will be made in this area either by the UCUI alone or in cooperation with a few other committees. The idea at the moment is flexible. Implementation could be a few workshops in the morning or afternoon, a few workshops with lunch provided, or a gigantic workshop with massive faculty participation on or off campus. Obviously some of these implementation ideas require funding, others do not. Small might be best, at least in the beginning.

F. Mathematics 011 and 012

The current policy of Math 011 and 012, grades that count in the GPA but credits that do not count toward graduation, was reviewed by the UCUI. Math 011 and 012 are skills development classes designed to aid incoming students with weak math backgrounds; and are thought to be of such low levels as to be unworthy of university credit. So credit is given but those credits are not counted toward graduation. The grades are thought of as necessary spurs, as hunger is said to be the spur of labor, and if the grades didn't count, i.e., were not a part of the student's gpa then, it is alleged by the Math department, the student would not work.

An odd historical note occurred in this discussion when it was discovered that the 1991-92 UCUI had discussed this same issue five years ago and had made a recommendation that no one seems to have seen. According to the UCUI minutes of November 7, 1991, the UCUI recommended to the Senate that grades for these courses be eliminated. While the new policy was being implemented, the UCUI also desired that

"...the Office of Academic Services and General Studies should exclude grades received in these courses when determining whether students are eligible for academic probation or dismissal. That the Office of Financial Aid, the Office of Admissions and Scholarships and other University offices exclude such grades, as far as permitted by law, in determining students' eligibility to obtain or renew financial aids. scholarships, and eligibility to participate in student activities, reside in restricted residence halls, etc. And that academic departments and programs requiring minimum grade point averages for admission to major standing consider the possibility of excluding grades received in such courses when making admissions determinations."

There was no report of any action. Linda Hildebrand could find no indication that the recommendation had reached the Senate in 1991-1992. This frustration was compounded by Jennifer Gilroy's report that regrettably the ISIS (Student Information System) was unable to count accurately the number of students who completed MATH 011 and 012 in the past five years since 1991. Thus determining the number of students possibly disadvantaged by low grades that depress their GPAs or those possibly benefiting from the supposed increase in self-discipline that the presence of grades provides was impossible.

The UCUI asked Professor Jerry Grossman from the Mathematical Sciences Department to express the Math department's view on proposed changes in grading policy for these two courses. He emphasized the need to keep the grades real so as to provide motivation for the student to do well. However, the anomaly of the grades affecting financial aid and academic status but not graduation continued to bother the UCUI. Jennifer Gilroy reported that many colleges report 2 GPAs and 2 credit counts. She felt that an internal and external dual counting might be a good idea, but that with the current system it was not possible. It may be with the new system.

After discussion, the UCUI firmly sided with the declarations made five years before by the 1991 UCUI: if credits do not count, neither should grades. Several ways of accomplishing this goal are recommended:

- 1) A dual reporting system (2GPAs, 2 credit counts), although the effect of a dual report system on federally and NCAA mandated requirements would need review;
- 2) A Pass/Fail grade for Math 011, 012 could be initiated;
- 3) Maintain current system but student services would subtract 011/012 grades from GPA
- 4) Student friendly policies:
 - a) Count credit in financial aid but not in academic standing
 - b) Assign grade but do not count it in GPA
 - c) Institute a no grade-no credit paradigm for 011/012

G. German "abitur" and International Baccalaureate Degrees.

This issue was brought before the UCUI by the Registrar's office and refers to a degree granted to German students on examinations taken after high school's final year. This is similar to the Canadian "13th year" where exams are taken after the 13th year of high school. Current Oakland University policy has been to grant to a student who holds an "abitur" a total of 28 credits or the first year of college. Using those 28 credits, 6 of the 8 general education requirements can be met. The Records office asked for UCUI's recommendation on dealing with the requests for transfer from students who have been granted the "abitur," specifically how to integrate the credits into the OU programs.

A subcommittee of the UCUI was appointed to review the "abitur" and International Baccalaureate. The recommendation of this subcommittee was passed without opposition by the full UCUI and was transmitted to department heads and chief advisors. It reads as follows:

Course Syllabi, Descriptions, examinations, and examination scoring information shall be furnished to each department or program where transfer of credit is requested and each department/program where transfer of credit is requested will determine if credit may be awarded for a particular course in the program and the department/program will establish the criteria for awarding the credit.

H. The distribution of the UCUI Minutes.

The distribution was slightly changed. A decision was made to add college/school deans and heads of academic advising for each college/school and to remove college/school associate deans from the list.

I. A report on recipients of CLEP credits.

A five year report on recipients of CLEP credits was requested by the University Senate Steering Committee, referring directly to a Senate approved motion to lower Oakland acceptance levels for CLEP credits. The feeling expressed was that the acceptance threshold was too high; even with the lowering of entrance levels Oakland would remain in the top 20% of schools granting CLEP credits. The 1989 Senate motion carried with it the directive that the UCUI review the composition of recipients 5 years after implementation of the new entrance levels, presumably to see whether students (or Oakland) were adversely affected by the change. A 1975-1985 survey of CLEP recipients compiled by Beth Millwood, previous Assistant Registrar for Records, was compared with data from 1985-1995 prepared by Jennifer Gilroy, the current Assistant Registrar for Records. Going back twenty years plus leaps over several changes, however, and the result may be that this report compares toads and frogs. With that caveat, the data suggest strongly that no negative impact has occurred as a result of lowering the scores. The tables that support that conclusion are found in Appendix D.

The lowering of CLEP scores necessary to gain Oakland credits some years ago did not create any sort of negative consequence. The total number of students getting CLEP credit is down from 151 to 59 in a comparable period, gender changes may only reflect increasing ♀ enrollment, and the GPAs of students were improved in the 1985-95 period although that may be partly grade inflation. In 1985-95, for example, 83% of the students had grades of 3.0 or better compared to 66% during 1975-85. No matter how one looks at the data it appears that the lowering of the necessary CLEP score to gain academic credit has not disadvantaged Oakland in the slightest.

J. Nomenclature in the Undergraduate Catalog.

The Steering Committee contacted the UCUI through the Senate Secretary requesting a recommendation regarding different nomenclatures in the catalog used to describe majors, minors, concentrations, and specializations for undergraduates. An earlier UCUI decision had attempted to handle the matter by creating definitions for majors, minors, concentrations, and specializations. The hope was that the various units of the University would begin using them, but such a tame response was not to be. Indeed, when the UCUI requested information from Deans, no one could discover that *any* response had been made--as though the earlier UCUI decision had fallen into a vacuum or was written in disappearing ink.

So the UCUI determined to begin *de novo*. The definitions were discussed in various Committees on Instruction and representations were made to the University community about the value of language consistency throughout the catalog. The definitions decided on were as follows:

MAJOR: A student's primary field of study or subject area.

SPECIALIZATION: A group of related courses taken in conjunction with a student's major, or a grouping of courses within a major.

MINOR: A student's secondary field of study or subject area.

CONCENTRATION: A group of interrelated courses with an interdisciplinary focus.

Initially some problems were expected with SEHS, but these were worked out with Associate Dean Jim Clatworthy. Problems of coordination with the Graduate Catalog were worked out with Dean George Dahlgren whose Graduate Council adopted the UCUI definitions. The UCUI therefore recommended that these definitions be placed in the Catalog in some prominent position.

Further inconsistencies alleged to exist in the undergraduate catalog are to be handled by the UCUI as follows. Assistant Registrar for Records, Jennifer Gilroy, has agreed to make a running list of such catalog problems and to bring them once a year to the UCUI in October. This procedure may need adaptation, but the point was to regularly look at the problem so as to

correct small inconsistencies when knowledge of them arises. The possibility of Priscilla Hildum being a regular member of the UCUI would facilitate both discussions of problems and implementations of any decisions.

K. Length of terms on the UCUI.

The Senate Secretary, Linda Hildebrand, contacted the UCUI with reference to member's terms of service. The Senate had requested that the UCUI terms be changed to 3 year staggered terms. A. Coppin, F. Mili, E. Follo and K. Vincent were currently serving the first year of a three year term. A. Pogany, S. Schultz, and J. Ozinga were serving the second year of a two year term. A. Pogany volunteered to serve a third year to make the staggering come out right when J. Ozinga and S. Schultz leave and are replaced by two new members.

L. Untaught courses in the catalog.

The issue of old, untaught courses still on the books was discussed from the perspective of whether or not the UCUI should recommend that courses untaught for six years should be dropped from the undergraduate catalog. The reason for this discussion was the desire to make the catalog as accurate as possible so that students could plan effectively. The UCUI agreed that the undergraduate catalog is a binding document between the university and the student and to have courses that have not been and will likely not be offered in the future is misrepresentation. It was determined, however, that 6 years is too short a time period considering the cyclical nature of enrollments. Discussion on this issue can be scheduled in the 1996-97 UCUI where the question might be directed to department chairs for faculty discussion, to the Registrar to ponder the impact of enrollment patterns, to Priscilla Hildum to ascertain the amount of difficulty in monitoring and implementing whatever the UCUI determined to be the best policy, and to Dean Dahlgren to see whether graduate catalog coordination is desirable.

M. The UCUI role in undergraduate catalog change.

All this activity naturally led to a discussion of the UCUI's role in undergraduate catalog changes. *Where* in the process of change did the UCUI fit? Did the UCUI intend to have a role in *every* change, functioning as some sort of filter for the entire change process? In the past proposed changes in the undergraduate catalog did not go through the UCUI. President Russi requested the UCUI to consider what its role might be in reviewing changes for the catalog. The UCUI decided that it wanted to be involved in important changes but did not have a grasp on "important" at that time and therefore requested involvement in *all* changes for a time so as to access that understanding. This ambitious solution quickly evaporated as common sense prevailed and a UCUI subcommittee determined that it wished to be involved in proposed changes in the undergraduate catalog only when the change impacted on University wide requirements or when the change impacted on the traditional academic purview of another unit, that is, on courses offered by a unit outside the scope of the COI requesting the change. These changes of broad significance would be caught by a new form initiated by the Subcommittee

titled "Submission Form for Undergraduate Catalog Changes Having Impact Outside the Unit Requesting the Change." The suggested form was sent to the General Education Committee for comment and they responded very positively. The concept of a deadline date for submission to the UCUI (December 1st) was approved by the Senate Steering Committee. This form was sent to the Advising community for use and is replicated in Appendix E.

N. Midterm Grades.

Carole Crum brought the subject of midterm grades to the UCUI's attention. Evaluations on students for General Studies, Academic Skills Center, Athletics, and AOP are sent to faculty in order to monitor student's progress during the semester, presumably with the goal of correcting problems while they are amendable. Some faculty have commented on the alleged duplication of effort in evaluating the same student for several different offices, and it has been suggested to Ms. Crum that midterm grades assigned to *all* students before the withdrawal deadline might be a solution. Ms. Crum also stated that greater control over funding might eventually require midterm grades to monitor students. The UCUI discussed the advantages and disadvantages of midterm grades and concluded that there were more disadvantages; the chief being the unreliability of the midterm grade in terms of reflecting the final grade. This sense of the issue was communicated to the Steering Committee.

O. Course Duplication.

This problem is a very delicate one, perhaps exacerbated by the quality of Oakland's faculty. For example, many of the faculty are widely trained and although teaching in a single department have interests and competencies that go well beyond that department. Examples are not hard to imagine: an anthropologist offering a course on the nature of the soul, a historian lecturing on Aristotle's *Ethics*, a political scientist presenting a paper on brain biochemistry at an international conference. This is a happy problem of talent, but it is also a problem of boundaries; if someone complains that Ozinga's Western Political Thought is the same as Bricker's Political Philosophy who decides who or what department teaches the course?

This general discussion would probably have remained at the abstract level but Professor F. Mili brought up two issues involving the SECS and the SBA as well as Math in the CAS. The UCUI's involvement was late (and less effective because of that lateness), but interesting issues were exposed and a manner of treatment was set in motion for others to follow later.

The first issue involved CSE 125 and a new course MIS 200 offered by the SBA. The MIS course was identical to the CSE 125 section which it replaced, in large part because the CSE 125 section was already being taught by MIS personnel to MIS students in the SBA program. The resulting struggle had the appearance of a credit war, but the intriguing underlay was the question: does SBA have the right to construct an "new" course identical to one already being offered? If each unit in the university taught its own computer course (and many do) why have a computing division in SECS? Would not Mathematics in the CAS be in a similar spot should each unit do its own teaching of math? And so forth.

This issue was a no win project from the start. The issue had been sent to the Deans' Council where the issue of duplication was recognized but not allowed to interfere with SBA's desire to offer MIS 200. President Russi (at that point Interim President) also approved MIS 200 and it was placed in the Fall 1996 *Schedule of Courses*.

Does the UCUI have jurisdiction (rather than the Deans' Council) over these sorts of issues? The Deans's Council is not the UCUI. Such issues appear to fall directly into the Senate charge to the UCUI and had the decisions regarding catalog changes been in place earlier, the UCUI would have been involved and will be in the future. Because the timing was so close, the UCUI requested the SBA to resubmit its request for MIS 200 to the UCUI in fall 1996. The MIS 200 issue is thus not yet exhausted in part because proper procedures were not followed and in part because SECS is still irritated.

The second issue involved a superficial duplication of courses, but it was not so much a credit struggle as it was a struggle over the content of a course. ME 476/576 was proposed as an experimental design course needed for accreditation of Mechanical Engineering. Its focus was the Tagucchi method of experimental design, and it was to be taught by a part-timer who wrote a book on the Tagucchi method. This course had been taught as a special topics course in ME and had drawn only 7 or so students.

The proposal to make this course a regular offering ignited opposition from CAS's mathematics department. The allegation was made that ME 476-576 was a duplication of STA 323, 503, and MTS 638; to focus on the Tagucchi method was a mistake; and that the qualifications of the proposed part-time instructor and his book were questionable.

To deal with this zero-sum game the UCUI invited representatives from CAS's Mathematical Sciences and from CECS's Mechanical Engineering as well as other interested people to discuss with the full UCUI membership the nature of the problem and potential solutions. Present were Jim McKay and Rob Kushler from Math, William McCauley from CAS, Liz Barclay from VPAA, George Dahlgren from the Graduate Council, Rajet Roy the part-time instructor and book author mentioned as the instructor for the ME 476-576 course, Joe Hovanesian from ME, and Cathy Rowley from the Registrar's office.

The issue became quite clear as the discussion went on. The SECS assembly had approved the introduction of these courses in order to fulfil the criteria for accreditation in the "manufacturing option" for mechanical engineering members. It had been offered before as a Special Topics course. The office of VPAA had approved the new courses. The Mathematics Department (CAS) objected on the duplication issue, and on the quality of instruction issue. SECS contended that there was little duplication and that the quality of instruction was something SECS should handle.

Initially the UCUI recommended that representatives from Math and ME get together to work out some kind of compromise, but this did not live up to expectations. The two positions were a bit too ideological for compromise. The UCUI therefore recommended that ME 476-576

with a change of title and a new course description be permitted despite the objections of CAS's Mathematics department. The change of title and new description would remove the duplication issue and the quality of the course as well as the entire SECS was, in the UCUI's view, best left to the SECS, at least until such time as the SECS underwent its decennial review.

The experience of the UCUI during 1995-1996 was rich, rewarding, and time-consuming. It was a year not easily forgotten.

APPENDIX A

**UCUI GUIDELINES FOR COMMITTEES ON INSTRUCTION
(to be updated every Winter Semester)**

I. UNIVERSITY-WIDE UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE REQUIREMENTS**A. GENERAL EDUCATION**

Petitions regarding general education requirements fall under the jurisdiction of the University Committee on General Education. Current policy is that all Gen Ed petitions must be decided by the General Education Committee except for very obvious ones such as 31 rather than 32 credits from 8 courses. Questions should be directed to Mike Smith in Linguistics, the current GE chair.

B. WRITING PROFICIENCY

Petitions to waive the writing proficiency requirement fall under the jurisdiction of the COI of the School or College of the student's major. Petitions must be supported by an advisor.

C. ETHNIC DIVERSITY

Petitions regarding any aspect of the Ethnic Diversity requirement should be forwarded to UCUI for action.

D. APPLICATION FOR DEGREE

No petition is necessary. Students who have missed the deadline should be referred to the Academic Records Office.

E. RESIDENCE REQUIREMENT

1. Petitions to **waive the requirement of a minimum of 32 credits at Oakland University** should be denied by the COI. UCUI believes this to be a generous minimum credit requirement. In exceptional circumstances, a petition supported by the advisor should be forwarded to UCUI for action.

2. Petitions to **waive the requirement that the last 8 credits be taken in residence at Oakland University** may be heard by the COI of the School or College of the student's major program. Generally, this requirement may be waived when a student cannot get the necessary courses at OU in a time compatible with the student's work schedule or when circumstances require that the student leave the geographic area. The statements of the student and the advisor should clarify the circumstances for the COI's review.

F. MINIMUM GRADE POINT AVERAGE

Petitions to **graduate with a cumulative GPA < 2.0** should be denied by the COI. In exceptional circumstances, a petition supported by the advisor should be forwarded to UCUI for action.

G. UPPER LEVEL CREDIT REQUIREMENT

Petitions to **graduate with fewer than 32 credits at the 300 or above** should be denied by the COI. In exceptional circumstances, a petition supported by the advisor should be forwarded to UCUI for action.

H. CATALOG USED TO MEET DEGREE REQUIREMENTS

Petitions to **graduate using requirements from an expired catalog (more than 6 years old)**:

UCUI endorses Senate legislation regarding the life of a catalog as six years. Therefore, a petition of exception regarding this requirement should be denied by the COI. Under exceptional circumstances a petition supported by the advisor should be forwarded to UCUI for action.

I. TRANSFER CREDITS

1. 62-credit limit:

The most recent Senate legislation states that one-half of the minimum requirements for graduation can be taken **anytime** at a community college. However, after one-half the minimum number has been reached **NO MORE CREDITS** from a two year school will count toward graduation.

2. Credit disallowed from non-accredited institutions:

This policy is not petitionable. Students with questions about non-accredited institutions should be referred to the Assistant Registrar for Records.

3. 2 + 2 and non-Michigan community colleges:

The General Studies Program, coordinating with the Assistant Registrar for Records, may respond to such petitions as they see fit.

J. REPEAT COURSE POLICY

Petitions of exception regarding repeating courses should be heard by the COI of the School or College of the student's major program. UCUI recommends that such a petition should not be granted without support from the advisor. The COI is reminded that previous enrollments with grades of W, WN, or WS must not be included when counting the number of enrollments in a course.

K. 16 CREDIT LIMIT ON 050-099 COURSES

Petitions to **exceed the 16 credit limit on 050-099 courses** should be denied by the COI. Under exceptional circumstances a petition supported by an advisor should be forwarded to UCUI for action.

L. USE OF MATH 011-012 CREDITS TOWARD THE MINIMUM CREDIT REQUIREMENT

Petitions in this category should be denied by the COI. Under exceptional circumstances a petition supported by an advisor should be forwarded to UCUI for action.

M. GRADUATE WITH LESS THAN THE MINIMUM CREDITS for an undergraduate degree.

Petitions in this category should be denied by the COI. In exceptional circumstances a petition supported by the advisor should be forwarded to UCUI for action.

II. PROGRAM-SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS fall under the jurisdiction of the COI of the School or College of the student's program.

III. REGISTRATION MATTERS:

Petitions are not appropriate for the following:

- A. Late Add/Drop**
- B. Late-Late Add**
- C. Late Registration**
- D. Late Withdrawal**

Students requesting exceptions in these areas should be referred to the Associate Registrar.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The **questionnaire** to COIs from UCUI and the **categories** used by either the Registrar or the COIs should match. The university-wide categories (omitting the credit from non-accredited schools category) should be standardized so that all petition reporting activity follows the same categories. Since information on Gen Ed petitions handled by the University Committee on General Education needs to be shared with UCUI so as to provide a complete record of petition activity in a given year, UCUI shall send an abbreviated questionnaire to UCGE.

Categories

- a. General education--32 credit minimum
- b. General education--non-equivalent transfer satisfaction
- c. General education--substitute course not on list
- d. General education--satisfaction of an area with less than 3 credits
- e. Writing proficiency
- f. Over 62 credits from community colleges
- g. Minimum of 32 credits at Oakland
- h. Last 8 credits at OU
- i. 32 credits at 300+ level
- j. All transfer credit problems
- k. Ethnic diversity
- l. Minimum number of credits required for a degree
- m. Repeat course policy
- n. Use of catalog more than 6 years old
- o. Graduate with GPA < 2.0
- p. 16 credit limit on 050 - 099 courses
- q. 2 + 2 and articulation policies
- r. Program specific issues: approved/disapproved
- s. Excess credits in a semester
- t. Petitioners' percentage of all enrolled undergraduates this unit

2. All petitions should warn:

"THE DECISION ON THIS PETITION MAY NOT APPLY IF YOU CHANGE MAJORS."

3. The senior check-off in the Academic Records Office that frequently uncovers problems that lead to petitions needs to be triggered earlier to avoid decisions made in haste to accommodate a student's plans to work, to move, or to go on to graduate school. There is slippage at this point. Therefore, we recommend that all students apply to graduate in the month of September of the year preceding the year of their graduation.

4. Petition forms should be standardized for the entire university.

5. The annual report on petitions sent by the Assistant Registrar for Records to the VPAA should also be sent to UCUI.

6. Members of professional advising staffs should sit on relevant COIs ex officio and non voting.

7. UCUI should provide feedback to COIs after the COI reports on petitions during the past year.

8. The Registrar or COI chairs should be encouraged to call in UCUI for consultation on "hot" petition issues or any other delicate issue regarding undergraduate instruction.

APPENDIX B

ANNUAL PETITION ACTIVITY REPORT SUMMARY

August 15, 1994 to August 15, 1995

REC'D APPROVED

General Education	37	29	Trans. Cr./classes not offered in evenings
Writing Proficiency	1	1	1976 CLEP/3.6 GPA
Over half total cr from two year schs	1	1	CAS none given
Min 32 cr Oakland	0	0	---
Last 8 cr Oakland	23	23	Geography; corp. course
32 cr 300+ level	8	7	Advising errors
All trans. credit problems	37	32	Cr after 62 cr. mainly
Ethnic Diversity	2	2	Trans Cr. [SN & SEHS]
Min cr reqd degree	31	29	Trans. cr., financial
Repeat course policy	43	38	Family problems, illness
Use catalog over 6 yr	7	5	Health problems
Grad. with GPA < 2.0	0	0	---
16 cr limit 050-099	0	0	---
2+2 & artic. policies	4	4	Nrs. Assoc; 4 yr. Assoc.
Prog. Specific issues	144	106	None given
Late Adds	54	53	Work conflict, Dept. drop, paperwork mixups
Excess cr in semester	1	1	None given [SECS]
Other issues	17	17	Use M011 012 to graduate, readmit, late withdraw, grade changes
Total all 1994-1995	410	348	

Percentage of petitions approved by COIs:

BGS 92%	SECS 70%
SHS 94%	SBA 89%
SEHS 100%	CAS 96%
SN 90%	ALL 85%

APPENDIX C

**CHARGE TO THE
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE INSTRUCTION**

1. To recommend to the University Senate academic policies and procedures concerning undergraduate education and, when necessary, seek advice from other appropriate bodies concerning the impact of these policies and procedures;
2. To evaluate and monitor petitions of exception regarding university-wide undergraduate academic requirements except for university-wide general education requirements;
3. To prepare an annual report on all petitions of exception to be shared with the Office of Academic Affairs, the Registrar, individual committees on instruction, and the Senate Planning Review Committee;
4. To make recommendations to the University Senate regarding proposed and existing undergraduate programs, including recommendations for program modification, suspension, or discontinuance;
5. To advise the Senate Planning Review Committee concerning proposed new undergraduate programs and to maintain regular communication with SPRC through the exchange of minutes;
6. To cooperate with the General Education Committee in overseeing undergraduate instruction throughout the University and to maintain regular communication with that committee through the exchange of minutes;
7. To schedule and monitor decennial reviews of all undergraduate programs in a timely fashion and to report findings to the Senate Planning Review Committee and the University Senate;
8. To evaluate ongoing and proposed undergraduate programs for their consistency with University academic policies and mission, to monitor catalog copy to ensure compliance with all such policies, and to monitor all catalog changes impacting outside of the Committee on Instruction making the change;
9. To implement, approve/disapprove courses for, and monitor the effectiveness of the University-wide ethnic diversity requirement;
10. To advise the Senate on all matters that body may refer to it concerning undergraduate instruction and the general requirements within which the specifics of the undergraduate degree programs function.

APPENDIX D

Table 1
The Number of CLEP Credits Awarded to How Many Students

Credits	Students 1975-1985	Students 1985-1995
1-5	14	13
6-10	53	37
11-15	40	8
16-20	17	0
21-25	12	0
26+	15	1

Table 2
Gender of CLEP Credit Recipients

Gender	1975-1985	1985-1995
Female	73	37
Male	78	22

Table 3
GPA in Oakland University Courses for CLEP Recipients

GPA	1975-1985	1985-1995
1.9 and below	7	2
2.0 - 2.49	13	3
2.5 - 2.99	31	4
3.0 - 3.49	54	21
3.5 - 4.0	46	28
Withdrew 1st Term		1

Table 4
Departments in which CLEP Students Majored

MAJOR	1975-1985	1985-1995	MAJOR	1975-1985	1985-1995
General Studies	9	6	Political Sci	6	0
Management	11	0	Psychology	10	1
Pre-Management	6	1	Sociology	1	0
Finance	1	0	Anthropology	3	0
General Music	1	0	Sociology/Anthropology	1	0
School of Engineering	4	0	Public Administration	1	1
Computer Information Science	5	1	Sec. Educ. English	1	0
Electrical Engineering	1	1	Sec. Educ. French	1	0
Mechanical Engineering	1	0	Pre-Human Resource Dev	3	0
Systems and Industrial	1	0	Manpower Development	4	0
Pre Med-Tech	1	0	HRD-Youth Adult Serv.	3	0
Medical Technology	2	0	Human Resource Develop.	0	1
Pre-physical Therapy	1	1	Elementary Education	3	2
Physical Therapy	1	0	Elem. Educ. Hist/Soc Sc	1	0
Pre-Nursing	1	1	Undecided Sci & Math	1	5
Nursing	2	2	Undecided Social Sci	9	1
Nursing-Specialist	2	1	Undecided Nursing	0	1
Pre-Medical Lab. Sciences	0	1	Pre-Business Administr.	0	4
Medical Lab. Sciences	1	0	Health Sciences	0	3
Undergrad undesignated	2	1	Spanish	0	1
Art History	2	0	Indust. Health/Safety	0	1
Classical Languages	1	0	Undecided Engin/CS	0	1
English	5	3	Engineering Chemistry	0	1
History	6	1	German	0	1
Music	1	0	Engineering/CS Cand.	0	1
Philosophy	2	1	Modern Languages	0	1
Linguistics	3	0	Pre-BGS	0	1
Speech Communication	3	0	Environmental Health	0	1
Chemistry	4	0	Mgt Information Systems	0	1
Biology	11	0	French	0	1
Mathematics	1	2			
Physics	1	0			
Journalism	2	0			
Communication Arts	6	3			
Communication	0	1			
Independent major	2	0			

UNDERGRADUATE CATALOG CHANGES HAVING IMPACT OUTSIDE THE UNIT REQUESTING THE CHANGE

Committee on Instruction Requesting the Change

Deadline for submission: December 1st

Current Language in Catalog Year _____ Page(s) _____

New Language Requested for Catalog Year

Reason for Change:

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

**The following approval is required
if the change affects University Wide General Education Requirements**

Signature for the University General Education Committee

Date _____

**The following approval is required
if this change affects University Wide Graduation Requirements
or the traditional purview of a department outside the
jurisdiction of the Committee on Instruction**

Signature for University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction

Date _____