During the past academic year, the Academic Standards and Policies Committee took action on the following issues:

1. **Prepared response to proposed revision of PULs.** At the request of Susanmarie Harrington, the Academic Standards and Policies and Common Core Curriculum committees prepared a written response to the proposed revisions to the PULs (see Appendix 1).

2. **Revised wording for Area III requirement.** The committee agreed to revise the wording on the Area III requirement so that students completing “a double degree, double major, minor or certificate” can count four courses from the second program toward the Area III requirement (added wording is in italics). This recommendation was presented to and unanimously approved by the faculty assembly.

3. **Prepared a policy related to ownership of teaching evaluations.** The committee spent considerable time discussing and writing a policy related to ownership of teaching evaluations. The policy (see Appendix 2) was presented and approved at the April 22, 2005 faculty assembly meeting.

4. **Revised policy to allow International Studies majors to double-count up to 9 hours for double majors.** The committee acted on a request from International Studies to revise policy so that “International Studies majors who are completing a double major or a double degree will be allowed to double count up to three classes for the major requirements, excluding the capstone.” The proposal was presented to and approved by the faculty assembly in April 2005 (see Appendix 3).

During the past academic year, the Academic Standards and Policies Committee discussed the following issues, but the issues were not resolved:

1. **SLA policies related to general electives** Currently students can count 9 hours of course work from any degree-granting university, but the remaining electives must come from courses in SLA, Herron, Journalism, Science, or “an approved list” of courses. This list had not been reviewed for several years. The committee discussed the impact of completely eliminating restrictions on electives, but did not reach any final decisions. This item should remain a high priority for the new Academic Standards and Policy committee.
2. **SLA policy on Administrative Withdrawals.** According to the university’s Administrative Withdrawal Policy, each academic unit is supposed to have procedures for managing administrative withdrawal and notifying students prior to administrative withdrawal. The committee drafted an administrative withdrawal policy (see Appendix 4), but the committee never reached consensus on it. Some of the concerns that still need to be worked out include: the need to formalize the appeal process and ensuring that the policy doesn’t add an extra step for teachers.

During the past academic year, one item was brought to the attention of the Academic Standards and Policies Committee, but the committee did not address it:

1. **Develop a policy outlining liability issues in service learning courses**
Appendix 1

TO: Catherine Souch
FROM: Academic Standards and Policies and Common Core Curriculum Committees
RE: Feedback on proposed revisions to PULs
DATE: December 7, 2004

At the request of Susanmarie Harrington, the Academic Standards and Policies and Common Core Curriculum committees met to discuss the proposed revisions to the PULs. Here is an overview of our responses. I have cut and pasted the proposed revisions into this document, followed by a summary of our responses to each.

Principles of Undergraduate Learning
- Principles of Lifelong Learning (PLLs)
- Principles of Undergraduate and Lifelong Learning (PULLS)
- Principles of Learning (PLs or POLs)

The committee members were in agreement that the label “Principles of Undergraduate Learning” should be retained. The committee members rejected “Principles of Lifelong Learning” because it doesn’t represent what we do at the university, “Principles of Learning” because it is too general, and “Principles of Undergraduate and Lifelong Learning” because it is too cumbersome.

Core Communication and Quantitative Skills
- Core Communication and Quantitative Reasoning Skills

The committee had no problems with this proposed revision.

Core Communication and Quantitative Skills: Definition
- The ability of students to write, read, speak, and listen, perform quantitative analysis, and use information and technology – the foundation skills necessary for all students at IUPUI to succeed.
- The ability of students to write, read, view, visualize, speak and listen, perform quantitative reasoning and analysis, and use information resources and technology – the foundational skills necessary for all IUPUI students to succeed.

The committee had no problems with these proposed revisions. However, we agreed that this PUL should include expectations related to students’ ability to communicate in another language. With that in mind, the committee proposed the following alternative wording: “The ability of students to write, read, view, visualize, speak and listen in more than one language, to perform quantitative reasoning and analysis…” The committee noted that this should be included as a communication skill; it is not just an issue of understanding society and culture.
Written Communication
a) to express ideas and facts to others effectively in a variety of written formats
a) to express ideas, opinions, beliefs, and facts to others effectively in a variety of written and visual formats

The committee raised concerns in two areas related to this proposed revision: 1) Including “opinions” and “beliefs” adds unnecessary and potentially problematic wording. 2) Including “visual formats” as a component of written communication may be problematic. Questions were raised about how “the visual” can be part of “the written”. If the reasoning behind including the phrase “and visual” is to include visual elements of text (i.e., choice of font), that may need to be clarified in the wording. Also, the revised wording implies that all graduates will be expected to be able to produce effective visual messages, which the committee felt was an unrealistic expectation.

Understanding text
b) to comprehend, interpret, and analyze texts
b) to comprehend, interpret, and analyze written and audio texts and visual representations

Questions arose about the definition of “texts” in this PUL. In addition, the revised wording implies that undergraduates would have competencies in comprehending, interpreting and analyzing all of the texts listed (written, audio, and visual). The committee strongly recommends the following alternative wording: “to comprehend, interpret, and analyze a variety of texts, such as written, audio, and visual.”

Oral Communication
c) to communicate orally in one-on-one and group settings
c) to communicate effectively (speak and listen) one-on-one and in small and large group settings, as well as identify factors that facilitate and impede communication

Overall the committee found this proposed revision to be somewhat tedious. We concluded that the last phrase of the proposed revision, “as well as identify factors that facilitate and impede communication” was unnecessary and should be eliminated. In addition, the first phrase of the revision implies that undergraduates should have competencies in all of the communication contexts listed (one-on-one, small groups, large groups). Because the contexts in which competency is required would likely vary from school to school, we recommend the following alternative phrasing: “to speak and listen effectively in a variety of settings.”
Quantitative Reasoning
d) to solve problems that are quantitative in nature,
   d) to perform quantitative functions and analyses

The committee agreed that the original wording is clearer than the proposed revision. Also, the wording of the original seems more consistent with the revised wording of the first PUL (replacing “quantitative skills” with “quantitative reasoning skills”).

Information Resources and Technology
e) to make efficient use of information resources and technology for personal and professional needs.
   e) to make efficient use of information resources and technology for academic, personal, and/or professional needs

The committee agreed that “efficient” should be replaced with “effective.” In addition, we noted that facilitating the use of information technology for “personal” needs should not be the focus of the university. Therefore, we propose the following revision of the revision: “to make effective use of information resources and technology for academic and/or professional needs.”

Integration and Application of Knowledge
Ο This skill is demonstrated by the ability of students to apply knowledge…
Ο This skill is demonstrated by the ability of students to integrate and apply knowledge…
   Ο c) to further the goals of society
   Ο c) to further the goals of society through civic participation OR
   Ο c) to further the goals of society, for example through civic participation OR
   Ο c) to further the goals of society, for example through community participation and/or internships.

The committee concluded that this sub-principle is problematic and should be eliminated for several reasons. First, defining “the goals of society” is complex, perhaps even impossible. Second, assessing this objective is difficult, maybe even something that could only be done years after graduation. If this sub-principle is included, we think it would more appropriately be integrated under the last PUL (Values and Ethics), but the committee expressed reservations about including it even there.

Understanding Society and Culture
Understanding Diverse Societies and Cultures

Overall the committee thought that including the word “diverse” in this label is redundant. “Understanding Societies and Cultures” is a simpler way to communicate the same idea.
b) to analyze and understand the interconnectedness of global and local concerns;
b) to analyze and understand the interconnectedness of global and local concerns through international study or travel  OR
b) to analyze and understand the interconnectedness of global and local concerns, for example through courses in international perspectives or study abroad.

The committee was not convinced that adding the language in either of the proposed revisions enhanced this sub-principle. We found the first alternative to be unacceptable, because it implies that all students would be expected to participate in international study or travel, which is an unrealistic expectation. The wording of the second proposed revision is also problematic, complicating rather than illuminating. Including specific examples of how students might meet this principle shifts the focus away from defining or explaining the principle. Perhaps this additional information would be better located in the explanations that accompany the PULs.

Definition of Values and Ethics
- The ability of students to make judgments with respect to individual conduct, citizenship, and aesthetics.
- The ability of students to make informed and ethical judgments with respect to themselves and others, their families and communities, as well as the world around them and to help foster an environment of mutual respect where each person is important and encouraged to succeed.  OR
- The ability of students to make informed and ethical judgments with respect to themselves and others, their families and communities, as well as the world around them and to help foster an environment of mutual respect.

The committee unanimously agreed that neither of these proposed revisions improves the original. Questions were raised about how “fostering an environment of mutual respect” could be assessed and about the appropriateness of the wording for desired outcomes at the university level. The committee proposed the following revisions: “The ability of students to make informed and ethical judgments with respect to individual and social conduct.” The rationale behind the proposed changes is: 1) “aesthetics” does not fit with “conduct” and should be moved to the “Outcomes of Values and Ethics” section, and 2) “individual and social conduct” subsumes “citizenship.”

Outcomes for Values & Ethics
- A sense of values and ethics is demonstrated by the ability of students (a) to make informed and principled choices regarding conflicting situations in their personal and public lives and to foresee the consequences of these choices; and (b) to recognize the importance of aesthetics in their personal lives and to society.
- A sense of values and ethics is demonstrated by the students’ ability to:
Make informed and principled choices regarding conflicting situations in their personal and public lives and to foresee the consequences of these choices

Explore, understand, and recognize important ethical and aesthetic principles in marginalized and dominant cultures OR

Explore, understand, and recognize important ethical and aesthetic principles in any culture

The committee recommends moving this to the “Understanding Society and Culture” PUL. We preferred the wording of the first alternative over the second. Concerns were raised about the use of the word “marginalized,” and we recommend looking for an alternative, perhaps “minority.”

Maintain a climate of civility and mutual respect regardless of race, ethnicity, national origin, or religion; gender or sexual orientation; disability; or socio-economic, marital or military status OR

Maintain a climate of civility and mutual respect toward people in all situations

The committee found the second alternative here to be unacceptable because a “climate of civility and mutual respect … in all situations” is unrealistic, possible even undesirable. In addition, questions were raised about the measurability of this outcome. Therefore, we propose the following alternative wording: “Articulate the importance of civility and mutual respect in a diverse society.”

Encourage and participate in an honest and open exchange of ideas and opinions

Understand and practice principles promoting health and wellness

Appreciate, respect, and promote stewardship of the environment as a public value

Although the committee unanimously agreed that each of these last three outcomes is laudable, we were not convinced that they should be included in the outcomes expected for all undergraduates at IUPUI. Also, questions were raised about how one would measure or assess these outcomes. We recommend not including them in the PULs. We would, however, like to see outcomes related to the value of “Academic and Professional Integrity” included in this PUL.
Appendix 2

A Proposal Defining Ownership of Teaching Evaluations
Presented by Academic Standards and Policies to Liberal Arts Faculty Assembly
22 April 2005

Motivation: There is some faculty concern over the ownership rights of teaching evaluations. Ownership issues naturally arise when the interests of the department and the faculty are in some conflict. One example is when a faculty member wishes to seek employment opportunities without informing or involving their department’s administration. Evidence of teaching performance could only be provided if the faculty member had full access to his/her evaluations and the authority to disseminate the materials.

Proposed Policy: In light of campus policy that faculty must have access to their teaching evaluations, School of Liberal Arts policy is:
1. Summary statistics of teaching evaluations (such as those produced by the School) must be returned to instructors within two weeks after having been returned to the department. The originals of the evaluation forms must be returned to instructors within one month after having been returned to the department. Departments should be especially vigilant about getting the teaching evaluations to instructors in a timely manner in the spring semester when the data is required for completing FARs. The Dean’s office is requested to consider this time frame when assigning FAR due dates;
2. Departments must retain copies of summary statistics for assistant and associate professors for at least five years in order to be prepared for promotion and tenure reviews;
3. Departments must retain copies of summary statistics for lecturers and other fulltime non-tenure track faculty for at least five years to provide for the possibility of termination disputes and to be prepared for promotion reviews;
4. Retention of copies of evaluations materials for associate faculty not under contract is at the discretion of the department; and,
5. Retention of student written comments (e.g., the evaluation forms themselves or transcripts of the written comments) is also at the discretion of the department.
Appendix 3

A Proposal to Allow for Double-Counting of Major Classes for International Studies Double Majors
Presented to Liberal Arts Faculty Assembly, 22 April 2005

Motivation: The proposed new International Studies major is an interdisciplinary major that draws courses from all existing SLA departments as well as a number of other schools such as SPEA, the Kelley School of Business and the Herron School of Art and Design. The fact that it is an interdisciplinary major raises unique questions or issues for double majors that are not faced by students who double major in existing discipline specific majors. To take one example, a student who double majors in Anthropology and Geography has to fulfill all the requirements for each major but there is no overlap between them. The only impact of double majoring is that 4 courses from the second major can count toward meeting the student’s Area III requirement of 15 credits at the 300-400 level. A student, though, who wishes to double major in Anthropology and International Studies or Geography and International Studies, however, faces a different question in that potentially 6-10 courses from each department can count toward their departmental major and toward their International Studies major. This proposal suggests that student be allowed to “double count” a limited number of courses toward fulfilling the requirements of both majors.

Proposed Policy: “International Studies majors who are completing a double major or a double degree will be allowed to double count up to three classes for the major requirements, excluding the capstone.”
Appendix 4

Proposed School of Liberal Arts Supplement to IUPUI’s Administrative Withdrawal Policy

1. The decision to utilize the Administrative Withdrawal Policy will be made at the departmental level. If a department chooses to use the Administrative Withdrawal Policy for a specific course, it must be used by all sections of a multi-section course. Administrative withdrawal is not a section-level policy.

2. The Administrative Withdrawal Policy must be included in the course syllabus with specific language as to the policy. Students must be informed that administrative withdrawal may have an impact on their Financial Aid awards and/or student visa status.

3. When the Administrative Withdrawal Policy is utilized, the course instructor must take attendance. Students who miss more than 50% of their class meetings of a given section during the first four weeks of the fall or spring semesters may be administratively withdrawn from that course. The course instructor initiates the administrative withdrawal process and has the right to stop the process at any time.

4. The course instructor will use the student’s official IUPUI e-mail address to notify the student that he/she is going to be administratively withdrawn from the course. This notification should include instructions for the student about steps to take if the student believes he/she should not be administratively withdrawn from the class. Typically the student should be instructed to contact the course instructor immediately if he/she does not want to be administratively withdrawn from the class.

5. The student has the right to appeal an instructor’s decision to administratively withdraw a student, first by talking with the department chair and then, if necessary, by appealing to the SLA Dean of Student Affairs.