Resolution F11

TO: President John E. Van de Watering
FROM: The Faculty Senate
Meeting on 2/22/88 (Date)

RE: I. Formal Resolution (Act of Determination)
II. Recommendation (Urging the fitness of)
III. Other (Notice, Request, Report, etc.)

SUBJECT: Grade Requirements for Communication Skills and Quantitative Skills

Signed: Date Sent: 2/24/88

(For the Senate)

TO: The Faculty Senate
FROM: President John E. Van de Watering

RE: I. Decision and Action Taken on Formal Resolution
   a. Accepted. Effective Date
   b. Deferred for discussion with the Faculty Senate on
   c. Unacceptable for the reasons contained in the attached explanation.

II, III. a. Received and acknowledged
   b. Comment:

DISTRIBUTION: Vice Presidents: [Signature]

Others:
Distribution Date: [Signature]

[President of the College]

Date Received by the Senate: [Signature]
GRADE REQUIREMENTS FOR COMMUNICATIONS SKILLS AND QUANTITATIVE SKILLS

Be it hereby resolved that the Communication Skills and Quantitative Skills requirements of the College be revised to include the following provisions:

1. Students who do not pass a lower division Communication Skills or Quantitative Skills course with a grade of D or better after taking the course twice at Brockport will be dismissed from the college, regardless of their successful completion of other courses. If extraordinary circumstances exist, a student may be granted a one semester extension following a review by the Coordinator either of Communication Skills or of Quantitative Skills, as appropriate, and a recommendation acceptable to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

2. Students must have earned grades of C or better in all Brockport and transfer courses applied to satisfy the Communication Skills requirements, except as provided in paragraph 3. below.

3. Students with Associate of Arts, Associate of Sciences, or Associate of Applied Sciences degrees shall continue to be able to satisfy the cognitive skills and breadth component requirements as stated on pp. 54-55 of the 1987-1989 undergraduate catalog of the college, the provisions of paragraphs 1. and 2. above notwithstanding.
TO: John E. Van de Watering  
President

FROM: Robert D. Marcus  
Vice President for  
Academic Affairs

DATE: March 2, 1988

RE: Faculty Senate Resolution #11 “Grade Requirements for Communication Skills and Quantitative Skills”

I recommend that Resolution #11 be accepted only in part. After consultation with the deans and with Academic Advisement, I recommend that parts 2 and 3 of the resolution be accepted. This would raise the passing grade for COM 102 and 101 to a C for all students except those who transfer in with associate degrees. This will allow students to repeat D’s in Communication Skills courses without jeopardizing their financial aid. Data provided by Paul Curran suggests how frequently this would be good advice: in three recent semesters 61 percent of students who received D grades are gone with an additional 20 percent on probation.

Item 1 is a problem. First of all the legislation is imperfect in that it passes a resolution that has a kicker in supplementary material that is not in front of you. The kicker is on page 3 of the enclosed analysis by Paul Curran. We are planning, according to this, but not stating that we will force students to register for Communication Skills again after receiving D’s or F’s. Otherwise, the legislation is very misadvised in that it will lead students who have gone badly in Communication Skills to avoid taking the course again until they are seniors to ensure that they are not automatically dismissed. If the Senate wishes to purge student preregistrations and force re-enrollment in prescribed courses, then they had better put that in the resolution. I don’t think the Senate really wants to do that and I am certain that I do not want them to. The Registrar’s office informs me “there is no precedent for either administratively registering students or purging the entire registration for non-compliance.” We would be establishing such precedent for the very small number of students affected by this resolution.
In summary, I recommend that you approve sections 2 and 3 to take effect Fall 1988 (or as soon as we can appropriately inform our feeder schools) and that you send section 1 back to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for reconsideration and specifically for discussion of whether the Senate in fact intends to incorporate the enforcement policy contained in Curran’s accompanying February 22, 1988 report.
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xc: Deans
    Roger Weir