

Freshman English Policy Committee Meeting

February 3, 1977

Parlin 8B, 11:00-12:00

Members present: Kinneavy, Trimble, Saldivar, Creel, Henry, Haney,  
Ruszkiewicz, Wainwright, Cameron

Agenda: (starred items deferred)

- \* Approval of minutes
  - Standing committee reports
  - Course proposals
  - Special committee reports
- \* Apprentice program
- Grade inflation
- \* E 308 Syllabus

1. Ramon Saldivar reviewed course proposals which the committee had approved in past semesters, noting that a number of them had been reapproved without having been evaluated. He suggested that the FEPC should establish guidelines for scheduling and for carrying out such evaluations. Among the possibilities mentioned were: requesting student evaluations of each variant section; getting response to the student evaluations from each teacher; getting self-evaluations from each teacher. Saldivar requested that his committee be charged with drawing up a series of guidelines to follow in such matters, subject to the approval of the committee; the committee encouraged the Course Evaluation Committee to draft the guidelines.

2. Since the new AT/ST program description had been circulated within the committee for approval earlier in the semester, and since there was no pressing need for us to discuss apprentices at this point, actual discussion of the Apprentice Program was postponed until such discussion is needed. (This item has been placed in the minutes to document the distribution of the FEPC statement in late January.)

3. The committee functioned for the remainder of the hour as a committee-of-the-whole to discuss the two versions of a Grading Policy statement for all Freshman courses. John Trimble had, during the last week of January, circulated an initial statement and subsequent revisions of it among the members of the committee. At the meeting, Jana Wainwright distributed still a further revision of the statement which differed somewhat in focus and tone from the previous statement, while still retaining a large part of the data included in it. The committee carefully compared the two versions and outlined still a further version which is to be drafted by Lynn Henry and Jim Creel for presentation at the next meeting.