

Academic Policies Committee  
Minutes  
Thursday, November 17, 2011  
ECC 207 (Presidential Conference Room)  
Meeting: APC 2011/2012: 04 (corrected 12/8/2011)

Convened 3:15 PM

Attending Sami Ansari, Patricia Buchanan (Chair), Jeanne Corcoran, Brewer Doran, James Fallon, Ellen Golub, Amie Goodwin (Recorder), Brad Hubeny, Sanjay Jain, Scott James, Martin Krugman, Pamela Leong, Krishna Mallick, Vickie Morrison, Ken Reker, Gwen Scottgale, Steven Silvern

Guest Mary-Jo Grenfell

I Chair's Report

The APC will meet on December 8 to review proposed academic calendar and other subcommittee reports.

At APC11/12:02 the committee chose to return the proposal 12:018 Changes to Walkaway Policy to Enrollment Management . Informally, Patricia has learned that ACC might be requesting that APC take action on the proposal, but no official word has come through governance to APC.

With the committee's indulgence, the chair changed the order of the agenda in order bring New Business up earlier.

II Approval of the Minutes of APC 2011/2012:03, October 27, 2011

*Motion* To accept the minutes of APC 2011/2012:03  
Made by Sanjay Jain  
Seconded by Krishna Mallick

*Vote* For: (9), Against: (0), Abstentions: (1) Motion passed

III New Business

A. Revision to Admission to Music Major (12:075 )

*Motion* To accept the Revision to Admission to Music Major (12:075 )  
Made by Vickie Morrison  
Seconded by Ellen Golub

*Discussion* The Chair introduced Music Chair Mary-Jo Grenfell to speak on behalf of the proposal and give the committee some background on the issue. The proposal seeks to clarify the difference between "Approved Music Majors" and "Provisional Music Majors."

## Original Language:

“Music applicants will be rated as approved, provisional, or not approved. Approved applicants, pending successful admission to the University, are eligible to become music majors. Those who are deemed provisional will be encouraged to enroll in first-year Music Major courses, and may take applied lessons at their own expense. Provisional applicants will be required to complete a successful second audition during the next semester. Applicants who are not approved may take applied lessons at their own expense, and may take a second audition in the next semester if they so choose.”

## Proposed Change:

“Music applicants will be rated as approved, provisional, or not approved. Pending successful admission to the University, approved applicants are eligible to become music majors. Those who are deemed provisional are eligible to become music majors and will be required to complete a successful second audition during the second semester of study. Applicants who are not approved may take applied lessons at their own expense, and may take a second audition in the next semester if they so choose.”

*Vote* On the proposal  
For: (15), Against: (0), Abstentions: (1) Motion passed

IV SubCommittee Reports

*Motion:* Academic Integrity (see attached report)  
The subcommittee recommends that the Academic Integrity Policy be thoroughly reviewed by the entire Academic Policies Committee in order to rework the policy. Specific items that need to be addressed include procedural issues and clarifications of items in the document.

Made by Brad Hubeny  
Seconded by Scott James

*Vote* For: (16), Against: (0), Abstentions: (0) Motion passed

Composition Exemption

Brewer Doran reported that the subcommittee has found discrepancies between Acalog and the English Department web site with respect to the policies on exemptions for composition. Alex Peary and Nancy Schultz will work to bring these into alignment.

Foreign Language Requirement (see attached report):

The subcommittee’s report suggests several revisions. The decision to submit these changes formally through governance will lie with the Foreign Languages Department. The revisions include a change in procedure to limit the Foreign Language substitution to students with documented language learning disorders. Doing so would assign responsibility for the decision to Disability Services rather than a faculty committee. If Foreign Language wished to continue

allowing students to apply who do not have a documented language-based learning disorder, the subcommittee recommended creating a standardized form and adding the chairperson of the student's major department to the signatories.

*Motion  
Vote*

The committee noted several corrections to be made: (1) Scott James' name is reversed; delete the words "Office of" before "Disabilities Services" wherever it appears.

To send the recommendations, as corrected, to the Department Chair of Foreign Language.

Made by Patricia Buchanan

Seconded by Vickie Morrison

For: (16), Against: (0), Abstentions: (0) Motion passed

*Honors and Deans List*

Amie Goodwin and Gwen Scottgale will file a report for the 12/8 meeting.

*Course Information Policy (see report):*

Gwen Scottgale reported The current policy is adequate and was updated in AY2010/2011.

Several faculty members asked if the policy should be written to allow posting of an electronic version of the syllabus without requiring hard copy handouts.

Recommendation: Retain the policy as worded in the current online catalog with an update of a name, making a global change from "Office for Students with Disabilities" to "Disability Services".

The committee had a lively discussion about whether there needs to be clarification with respect to the language concerning how written syllabi are distributed. A concern was raised that the language infers only hard-copy paper format is acceptable. Patricia Buchanan proposed that the existing language did not need to be changed.

Global name changes in all cases where office name changed. Faculty need to be using current course information policy.

*Academic Writing Standards (see report):*

On behalf of the subcommittee Pamela Leong filed two general recommendations by the subcommittee on academic writing standards.

1. Consideration of all suggestions and revisions from Section 3 of the subcommittee's report (*Findings regarding faculty perceptions of the Academic Writing Standards*)
2. Greater efforts to alert faculty about the policy.

*Deferral*

Patricia proposed that the further consideration of the subcommittee's recommendations be deferred until the English department has hired a writing specialist. Gwen suggested that going forward, faculty who teach writing-intensive courses also be consulted. Scott proposed that this topic will also be addressed through examination and revision to the Core.

The recommendation of the Academic Writing Standards subcommittee is hereby deferred.

Transfer Credit

Scott reported that revisions will be submitted to All-College. Changes include more “welcoming” language, overall clean-up of the policy and clarification with respect to credit by examination and credit for military transcripts.

Art Admissions

Jim Fallon reported that Arts + Design will be submitting proposed changes on admission to Art + Design to All-College.

Music Admissions

The required change is addressed in 12:075 which was covered under New Business in this meeting.

Internal Program Review

Marty Krugman reported that the policy was reviewed two years ago. He will contact the Provost to seek advice with respect to the impact of the recent Academic Planning process on the 5-year cycle that the policy includes.

Patricia thanked the committee for their hard work and dedication to the policy review under way .

V                      Adjournment  
*Motion*              To adjourn  
                            Made by Brewer Doran  
                            Seconded by Sami Ansari  
*Vote*                      On the motion  
                            In favor (16 ) Against (0 ) Abstaining (0 )    Motion passed unanimously

Adjourned              4:15 PM

*Next meeting*              December 8, 2011, 3:15

Respectfully Submitted,  
Amie Marks Goodwin

**Report on the Academic Integrity Policy**  
**Subcommittee to Review Academic Integrity Policy**  
Brad Hubeny (co-chair), Vickie Morrison, (co-chair),  
Sami Ansari, Pamela Leong, Ken Reker, Steven Silvern  
8 November 2011

**Recommendation:** We recommend that the Academic Integrity Policy be thoroughly reviewed by the entire Academic Policies Committee in order to rework the policy. Specific items that need to be addressed include procedural issues and clarifications of items in the document.

**Summary of Findings:** There are a limited amount of data available with which to evaluate the effectiveness of this policy. According to institutional data provided by Neal Fogg, a total of 55 students were formally charged with academic dishonesty between 2005-11. No pattern or trend is apparent, however (from 2005-11 the number of formal charges are: 2, 5, 14, 16, 0, 0 [1 was “not formally charged”], and 18).

Additional information was gained by examining data from the 2011 NEASC self study (data provided by Neal DeChillo), most of which was collected from a faculty survey (n=184). The vast majority of faculty reported that they were familiar with the Academic Integrity Policy (94%). When asked of instances of plagiarism and cheating during the fall 2009 semester, 57.1% reported that they did not experience any such instance. One to two instances were reported by 28.6% of faculty, and only 8.2% reported more than two instances of dishonesty. Six percent of faculty responded “not applicable” to this question. The rate of reporting academic dishonesty instances is interesting. Only 6.8% of instances were reported, while 31.6% were not reported. An overwhelming 61.6% of faculty felt that the reporting of such instances was not applicable.

A number of procedural issues were identified with the current policy. Michelle Sweeney has provided a list of problems that have arisen from the enforcement of the current policy (see attached). We recommend evaluating these suggestions and incorporating them into the proposed revised policy.

Members of the sub-committee have made additional suggestions to the wording of the existing policy. These recommendations are attached.

The sub-committee is in the process of collecting additional data from faculty (through a Survey Monkey survey) and the Provost. We believe that the additional data will shed light on other aspects of the policy that may need revision.

## Subcommittee on Foreign Language Requirement

### Final report

November 5, 2011

#### Sub-Committee Members:

Patricia Buchanan (English Department),

Scott James (Enrollment Management)

Vanessa Ruget (Political Science)-

Deleted: James

A subcommittee of the Academic Policies Committee was charged with reviewing the foreign language requirement at SSU during the fall of 2011. This policy, which is copied below, was most recently changed in 2007 and 2005.

Members of the subcommittee -- Patricia Buchanan, James Scott and Vanessa Ruget-- had conversations with three departmental chairs: Elizabeth Blood (Foreign Languages), Nancy Schultz (English Department) and Christopher Mauriello (Chair, History Department). Alix Gordon from the Registrar's Office was also consulted.

In addition, the subcommittee researched the foreign language requirements of a dozen universities, including Boston University, the University of Massachusetts- Dartmouth, and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Based on this research, the subcommittee suggests several revisions. The decision to submit these changes formally through governance will lie with the Department of Foreign Languages:

- 1) To align SSU with other institutions, we suggest the following revision to the rules for the foreign language substitution (see below section called "Exceptional satisfaction through foreign culture course substitution"). In particular, we propose that course substitution be granted only to students with a documented language-based learning disorder;
- 2) To streamline the petition process, we suggest that the recommendation for "language-based learning disorders" as a basis for course substitution be issued by Disability Services, using a standard form that would then be signed by the chair of Foreign Languages, the chairperson of the student's major department, and the student's academic advisor;

Deleted: the Office of

Such a change would obviate the need for the Foreign Language Waiver Committee. However, if the Department of Foreign Languages wished to keep the option available to grant

substitutions for students who demonstrate difficulty learning a foreign language, but who do not have a documented language-based learning disability, then we suggest the following:

- 3) The “Review Committee” for substitutions--now consisting of the Chairperson of the Foreign Languages Department (or delegate), as a nonvoting member, and three faculty members appointed by the MSCA/MTA/NEA--should also include a representative from the Disability Services as non-voting member;
- 4) Create a standardized form with clearly marked places for required signatures;
- 5) Add a line for the signature of the chairperson of the student’s major department.

Deleted: Office of

## From catalog as of Fall 2011

### L. Foreign Language Requirement (0-12 credits, depending on placement)

#### Who needs to satisfy the Foreign Language Requirement?

All students in Bachelor of Arts programs (except for B.A. Art Majors with concentrations in Art Education, Graphic Design, Interactive Multimedia, Painting, Photography, Printmaking or 3-D Studio and B.A. History Majors with a concentration in Applied History).

#### What is the Foreign Language Requirement?

This requirement consists of demonstrating an advanced intermediate level proficiency or higher in a foreign language or American Sign Language.

#### How is the Foreign Language Requirement satisfied?

##### 1. Satisfaction by college-level language courses

This required language proficiency is typically demonstrated by successfully completing the advanced intermediate level course (4th semester, 202 or equivalent). Thus, students take a maximum of four language courses (two elementary and two intermediate) in order to complete the requirement-but often take fewer if they have studied the language previously. The actual number of courses that needs to be taken depends on the level at which a student places (see the Foreign Languages Department section in this catalog for information on language placement). Two or more years of high-school language courses, for example, may allow a student to place higher than 101 or 102 course in the sequence. The Department’s faculty can advise students on appropriate placement. There is a placement test for Spanish currently available. Students may also show the required proficiency by passing a 300 or 400 level language course conducted in the target language. Students may also transfer these foreign language or American Sign Language courses from other accredited institutions of higher learning.

##### 2. Satisfaction of the requirement by examination

The requirement may also be satisfied fully or partially by examination, according to the guidelines below. For information on taking these tests, inquire at the Foreign Languages Department (available at the department's site: [salemstate.edu/languages](http://salemstate.edu/languages)).

- a. By achieving a sufficiently high score on the College Board's **College-Level Examination Program (CLEP)** Test for a foreign language (currently available for French, German and Spanish). These scores are recommended by the College Board [collegeboard.com/clep](http://collegeboard.com/clep) and carry 6 credits (for 201 and 202).
  - French: 62
  - German: 63
  - Spanish: 66

A minimum score of 50 in either one of these languages exempts a student from the elementary level (101-102) and carries 3 college credits (for 102).

- b. By achieving a sufficiently high score on the College Board's **Advanced Placement (AP)** Test for a foreign language (currently available for French, German and Spanish):
  - A score of 5 results in automatic satisfaction of the language requirement; and carries 9 credits (for 201, 202 and the Advanced Grammar course of the particular language)
  - A score of 4 results in automatic satisfaction of the language requirement; and carries 6 credits (for 201 and 202)
  - A score of 3 will exempt students from the 201 level and carries 3 credits (for 201). The student still needs to take the advanced intermediate course (202 or equivalent)
    - c. By achieving a sufficiently high score on the College Board's SAT subject test:
  - A score of 700 or above results in automatic satisfaction of the language requirement (it carries no credits)
  - Students with scores between 400 and 699 may skip the 101, 102 and 201 levels (no credits are awarded). See [Foreign Languages](#) section of this catalog for details.
- d. In the case of **American Sign Language**, in order to satisfy the foreign language requirement students have to either:
  - Complete a four-semester college sequence in a certified ASL program
  - Pass the Intermediate level of a nationally recognized ASL proficiency test, such as the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview (SCPI).

### 3. Exceptional satisfaction through foreign culture course substitution

Students who have demonstrated extreme difficulty learning a foreign language at the elementary (101-102) level, whether or not they have a documented language-based learning disability, may petition in writing to the Chairperson of the Foreign Languages Department to satisfy the Foreign Language Requirement by successfully completing the foreign culture twocourse sequence (203-204), taught in English, in the same language area (Spanish or French, the only available sequences), instead of taking the 201-202 intermediate language sequence.

For students beginning as Freshmen in a Bachelor of Arts degree program, substitution petitions must be submitted by the end of the first semester of the sophomore year. For students transferring from a non-Bachelor of Arts curriculum into a Bachelor of Arts degree program, substitution petitions must be submitted by the end of the second full semester in the new program. For students transferring to Salem State University from another college, substitution petitions must be submitted by the end of the first full semester at Salem State (or by the end of the first semester of the sophomore year, whichever is later).

The following procedures for administering such petitions are in effect:

1. The student must have an interview with, and obtain written recommendations for the course substitution from, the following individuals or offices:
  - The elementary language instructor, who must attest to the existence of a serious attempt to learn that language and succeed in the class
    - The student's academic advisor
    - The Academic Advising Center
  - The Office for Students with Disabilities, if the student knows that he/she has, or suspects that he/she might have, a language-based learning disability.

2. The student must submit a request for substitution in writing to the Chairperson of the Foreign Languages Department, accompanied by a copy of the student's complete college transcript (and high school transcript if appropriate), and the above-mentioned recommendations.
3. The petition transcripts, examination results, and written recommendations will be evaluated by a Review Committee consisting of the Chairperson of the Foreign Languages Department (or delegate), as a nonvoting member, and three faculty members appointed by the MSCA/MTA/NEA (Salem Chapter). The recommendations of this Review Committee will be forwarded to the Vice President, Academic Affairs, for final action.
  4.
    - a. Students who have a documented language-based learning disability must have registered for at least one semester of a foreign language at Salem State University. If their substitution petition is approved while they are enrolled in an elementary language course they do not need to complete that course. These students will be subject to the standard University policies regarding course withdrawal (e.g., a grade of "W" can be granted only up to the withdrawal deadline of a semester). Previous grades for foreign language courses will not be included in the student's cumulative average. However, the granting of a substitution will not result in the elimination or modification of any grades on the student's transcript, nor will it reduce the total number of credit hours required for graduation.
    - b. Students who do not have a documented languagebased learning disability, but whose petition is accepted by the Review Committee, must complete the elementary level sequence before starting the substitution of the intermediate sequence (201-202) with the culture sequence (203-204).

#### **Foreign Language Requirement for International and Multilingual Students**

Any student whose is proficient in a language other than English may satisfy the Bachelor of Arts Foreign Language Requirement by both:

- A. demonstrating proficiency in English either through satisfactory performance on a proficiency examination administered by the English Department or by the completion of six semester hours in courses offered by the English Department, with grades of C or better, **AND**
  - B. one of the following three options:
    1. Demonstrating proficiency in the native language either by graduation from a secondary school where instruction was commonly in the native language, **OR**
    2. By the attainment of a score equivalent to advanced intermediate level (202) on the CLEP exam (see above), **OR**
    3. By obtaining a passing score in the 12 point foreign language test from New York University's School of Continuing and Professional Studies, available for 50 languages (see the [Foreign Languages Department](#) for more information).

Upon completion of (A) and (B) the student will be exempted from the Foreign Language requirement. Only the CLEP examination carries credit, exactly how much credit is specified above.

## Subcommittee on Course Information Policy Report and Recommendation

Subcommittee Members: Sanjay Jain, Gwen Scottgale  
met on Oct. 19, 2011 and also contacted academic Deans and some faculty members for input.

The current policy is adequate and has already been updated in the past few academic years. Several faculty members asked if the policy should be written to allow posting of an electronic version of the syllabus without requiring hard copy handouts.

**Recommendation:** Retain the policy as worded in the current online catalog with an update of a name, changing “Office for Students with Disabilities” to “Disability Services”. Discuss with the whole committee if a change is needed regarding how syllabi are distributed.

from online SSU Catalog 2011-2012:

### Course Information Policy

Prior to the end of the second week of the semester, the instructor will distribute to each student in each course and section a written and dated course syllabus, which must contain at least the following information:

1. The course name and number, section number, semester, instructor’s name, office location, office hours, email address and telephone extension.
2. Official course description.
3. Course goals and learning objectives.
4. The course requirements for assessment such as papers, projects, and examinations (with due dates if possible). These assessments should be clearly tied to the course learning objectives listed in number 3 above.
5. The instructor’s attendance policy for the course (e.g. no attendance taken, number of absences allowed, any penalty for extensive absence, etc.).
6. A list of texts for the course, indicating which are required and which are optional.
7. A statement on whether or not a final examination will be given and, if given, whether it is required or optional.
8. The method by which the student’s final grade in the course will be determined.
9. The instructor’s policy on work handed in late, makeup examinations, and the like.
10. Any special rules, regulations, or procedures of the course.
11. A statement indicating that each student is responsible for completing all course requirements and for keeping up with all that goes on in the course (whether or not the student is present).
12. The statement “Salem State University is committed to providing equal access to the educational experience for all students in compliance with Section 504 of The Rehabilitation Act and The Americans with Disabilities Act and to providing all reasonable academic accommodations, aids and adjustments. Any student who has a documented disability requiring an accommodation, aid or adjustment should speak with the instructor immediately. Students with Disabilities who have not previously done so should provide documentation to and schedule an appointment with the Office for Students with Disabilities and obtain appropriate services.
13. In the event of a university declared critical emergency, Salem State University reserves the right to alter this course plan. Students should refer to salemstate.edu for further information and updates. The course attendance policy stays in effect until there is a university declared critical emergency. In the event of an emergency, please refer to the alternative educational plans for this course located at/in [faculty member determines this]. Students should review the plans and gather all required materials before an emergency is declared.”

Instructors who develop course requirements as the semester goes along will so indicate on the syllabus. Once requirements have been established, students will receive a written and dated copy of them and of the method by which the final grade will be computed. This statement will be distributed prior to the end of the twelfth week of the semester.

If in the professional judgment of the instructor it is necessary to modify course requirements during the semester, students will be given a written and dated copy of the modifications. Such modifications will be consistent with the nature and purpose of the course.

A student who believes that the Course Information Policy has not been followed should bring the matter first to the instructor; second, if necessary, to the Department Chairperson; third, to the School Dean; thereafter, to the Vice President, Academic Affairs; and, ultimately, to the President.

Formatted: Left: 1", Right: 1", Different first page header

**A REVIEW OF SALEM STATE UNIVERSITY'S ACADEMIC WRITING STANDARDS**  
**Report of the Academic Writing Standards Sub-Committee**

**Presented to the Academic Policies Committee**

**November 8, 2011**

**Sub-Committee Members:**

Pamela Leong  
Vanessa Ruget

**REPORT CONTENT:**

1. ACADEMIC WRITING STANDARDS AT SALEM STATE UNIVERSITY: THE OFFICIAL POLICY
2. ASSESSING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SALEM STATE UNIVERSITY'S POLICY ON ACADEMIC WRITING STANDARDS
3. FINDINGS REGARDING FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF THE ACADEMIC WRITING STANDARDS
4. RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this report is to share what the sub-committee on academic writing standards has learned from a review of Salem State's academic writing standards' policies and practices.

## **1. ACADEMIC WRITING STANDARDS AT SALEM STATE UNIVERSITY: THE OFFICIAL POLICY**

The policy for academic writing standards is as follows:

### **ACADEMIC WRITING STANDARDS**

The college policy on academic writing standards applies to all course work.

Expository writing assignments may receive a grade of "C" or higher only if the form and content are appropriate for the purpose of the assignment and for the intended audience. Characteristics of expository writing include the following:

1. A clear thesis
2. Adequate support for the thesis
3. Clear and coherent overall structure
4. Varied sentence structure and expression
5. Standard usage, punctuation, and spelling
6. Accurate documentation when necessary

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

These standards may be amended by the instructor to meet the specialized writing requirements of various disciplines.

Students in all disciplines are encouraged to visit the Writing Center (MH 223) which provides individualized assistance in writing.

## **2. ASSESSING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SALEM STATE UNIVERSITY'S POLICY ON ACADEMIC WRITING STANDARDS**

### **METHODOLOGY:**

We collected our data through surveys conducted over email in October 2011. Three questions were posed:

1. Are you aware of Salem State's official policy for academic writing standards?
2. Is the policy consistent with your writing standards/expectations for your students?
3. Are there any revisions (changes, additions, etc.) you would make to the policy?

We included the official policy on academic writing standards within the survey.

### ***Sampling***

In our sampling design, we were careful to include all colleges at Salem State. That includes the College of Arts and Sciences, the Bertolon School of Business, and the College of Health and Human Services.

From the College of Arts and Sciences, we randomly selected five disciplines, drawing from a list of all disciplines within this college. The following departments from the College of Arts and Sciences were selected for inclusion in this survey: political science, theater and speech communications, foreign language, geological sciences, and philosophy. All tenured and tenure-track faculty from these departments were included in the survey, for a total of 41 faculty represented in the College of Arts and Sciences (6 in political science, 15 in theater and speech, 5 in philosophy, 7 in geology, and 8 in foreign languages).

From the Bertolon School of Business and the College of Health and Human Services, six tenured and tenure-track faculty from each of the following disciplines that represented the major schools were randomly selected: business, education, social work, criminal justice, and nursing. Two faculty were represented from each department of the School of Business (accounting and finance, management, and marketing and decision science), and six faculty each from education, social work, criminal justice, and nursing, for a total of 30 faculty from the School of Business and the College of Health and Human Services.<sup>1</sup>

A total of 71 faculty at Salem State were surveyed, with 24 responding, yielding a response rate of 33.8%.

Apart from the survey, the subcommittee also contacted several members of the English Department, as well as the coordinators of the Writing Center, asking for their input and insight on the current writing standards.

Formatted: Font color: Auto  
Deleted: few  
Deleted: from

### 3. FINDINGS REGARDING FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF THE ACADEMIC WRITING STANDARDS

#### 1. Are you aware of Salem State's official policy for academic writing standards?

Eleven faculty (15.5%) were aware of Salem State's official policy for academic writing standards.

At least four faculty who were aware of the policy mentioned that they either include it on their course syllabus or else distribute it to their students.

#### 2. Is the policy consistent with your writing standards/expectations for your students?

Only four (5.6%) faculty indicated that the current academic writing standards are *not* consistent with their own standards or expectations.

At least two faculty, while noting consistency with their expectations, noted poor writing ability among students whose second language is English. One faculty mentioned that, in spite of classes, screening, and assistance from the Writing Center, the ESL students continue to struggle in terms of academic writing.

#### 3. Are there any revisions (changes, additions, etc.) you would make to the policy?

A number of faculty provided constructive suggestions that could be considered by the committee. Recommendations and suggestions include the following:

<sup>1</sup> In a few cases, faculty who did not teach upper-division classes (at least 300-level courses) were eliminated from the sample. Replacement faculty were randomly selected for inclusion in the sample.

**a. Regarding the list of characteristics of “expository writing”**

**Item # 1 (“a clear thesis”)**

- i. Add: “consistent”
- ii. At least two people suggested adding the words “original” or “innovative” to emphasize the idea of academic writing as critical/independent thinking.

**Item #4 (“Varied sentence structure and expression”)**

- i. One faculty recommended a focus on “good word choice”—notably, “Specific, accurate, and varied vocabulary used throughout.”

**Item #5 (“Standard usage, punctuation, and spelling”)**

- i. Add “grammar.”
- ii. For item 5, it would be helpful to clarify what “standard usage” represents.

**Item # 6 (“accurate documentation when necessary”)**

- i. Add: “quality and diversity of sources.”
- ii. Could be cross-referenced with the policy on academic integrity.
- iii. One faculty noted that she has “more specific requirements for references.” This suggests that the current policy could be clearer in terms of both the details and examples used to illustrate what counts as “accurate documentation.”

**Last sentence in the policy:**

- i. “Research librarians” could be added as another potential source of individualized assistance.
- ii. The Writing Center reference in the last sentence could be hyperlinked.

**b. Regarding the overall policy:**

- i. Should we clarify whether a student needs to perform appropriately in each of the 6 standards to receive a grade of C?
- ii. We could clarify: “adequate support for thesis” and “accurate documentation.”
- iii. One faculty suggested a remedial writing course for students who cannot pass a certain standard.
- iv. One faculty wrote, “We find these standards to be problematic: they’re too generic and not context-specific. Writing standards need to be discipline and/or context-specific. We would also want the standards to address critical reading and Reading-Across-the-

Curriculum.” The faculty also noted the importance of faculty across disciplines developing “clear, context-specific rubrics.”

In addition to the survey, we have been in contact with several faculty from the English Department, including the department chair and at least one composition instructor. It is our understanding that the composition instructors in the English Department are also reviewing the academic writing standards separately.

Formatted: Font color: Auto

When asked for their input, one English Department faculty wrote:

We find these standards to be problematic: they're too generic and not context-specific. Writing standards need to be discipline and/or context-specific. We would also want the standards to address critical reading and Reading-Across-the-Curriculum. Lastly, we would want to help faculty from across the disciplines develop clear, context-specific rubrics.

Formatted: Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font color: Auto

We also contacted the Writing Center coordinators. Jan Lindholm indicated that the Writing Center does not itself promote any standards, because staff members offer individualized assistance on specific assignments, following the written directions provided on the assignment prompt.

Deleted: the

Formatted: Font color: Auto

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"

Deleted: coordinators from

Deleted: the assistance the Writing Center

Deleted: provides

Deleted: is individualized; staff members assist students with

Deleted: by

Deleted: of the

Deleted: instructors' syllabi.

Formatted: Font color: Auto

Deleted: of the assignment. ¶

#### 4. RECOMMENDATIONS

There are two general recommendations by the sub-committee on academic writing standards. First, we recommend a consideration of all suggestions and revisions from Section 3 above. Second, our survey reveals that few faculty at Salem State are aware of the official policy on academic writing standards. This sub-committee therefore recommends greater efforts to alert faculty about the policy.

To: Academic Policies Committee  
From: Mary-Jo Grenfell, Chairperson, Music Department  
Re: Proposal to change Music Audition Procedure Language  
Date: November 1, 2011

Dear Committee Members:

The Music Department proposes to change the following paragraph:

“Music applicants will be rated as approved, provisional, or not approved. Approved applicants, pending successful admission to the University, are eligible to become music majors. Those who are deemed provisional will be encouraged to enroll in first-year Music Major courses, **and may take applied lessons at their own expense.** Provisional applicants will be required to complete a successful second audition during the next semester. Applicants who are not approved may take applied lessons at their own expense, and may take a second audition in the next semester if they so choose.”

The proposed re-wording would be:

“Music applicants will be rated as approved, provisional, or not approved. **Pending successful admission to the University, approved applicants are eligible to become music majors. Those who are deemed provisional are eligible to become music majors and will be required to complete a successful second audition during the second semester of study.** Applicants who are not approved may take applied lessons at their own expense, and may take a second audition in the next semester if they so choose.”

Justifications for this change are:

- The University does not make a distinction between “Approved Music Majors” and “Provisional Music Majors.” Provisional status is a departmental distinction and allows faculty to monitor student progress through the first year of study and provides important information for advising each student properly.
- All Music Majors take applied lessons through the department and are not assessed additional fees.
- In order for the Provisional Music Major to adequately prepare for the second audition, it is crucial that they study applied music as this, along with their first two semesters of academic study are weighted equally in the re-audition process.

Please find the original audition procedure language attached for your reference.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this change.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mary-Jo Grenfell, Music Department Chairperson

## **Admission Policy/Procedures for Music Major**

All prospective music majors must audition to be considered for entrance into the B.A. music degree program. An in-person audition is strongly recommended, and will be recorded by the Music Department. Any alternative audition arrangement will be the exception, and must first be approved by the Music Department Chairperson. The alternative audition will require a DVD of solo music performance and an application letter that details the applicant's music background and experience: this will be followed up by a telephone interview with a Music Department faculty member.

The requirements of the audition are as follows:

The applicant will perform two musical selections of contrasting style that display technical proficiency and musicality.

The applicant will be asked to perform scales and sightread.

The applicant will be required to complete a music theory placement exam.

A brief personal interview will be conducted.

All applicants will receive written notification of their rating. A successful audition will demonstrate the applicant's capacity for college music study. A successful audition does not guarantee admission to Salem State University: the University's admission requirements must be satisfied.

Music applicants will be rated as approved, provisional, or not approved. Approved applicants, pending successful admission to the University, are eligible to become music majors. Those who are deemed provisional will be encouraged to enroll in first-year Music Major courses, and may take applied lessons at their own expense. Provisional applicants will be required to complete a successful second audition during the next semester. Applicants who are not approved may take applied lessons at their own expense, and may take a second audition in the next semester if they so choose.

Applicants to the program may audition up to two times. Provisional and not approved applicants may take a second audition in the next semester. A final decision on acceptance or not is made at that second audition. This entire audition process will apply to all new students, external transfers, and internal transfers.

At the beginning of each academic year, the Music Department will announce and publicize the schedule of audition dates with print and digital access. There will be a minimum of two audition dates per Fall and Spring semesters. Some circumstances may require external transfer students to make special arrangements for an audition date and time, and this will be scheduled with the Music Department Chairperson on a case-by-case basis.

Applicants will be encouraged to reserve an audition time at least two weeks prior to their desired audition date. Applicants will call the Music Department Office 978.542.6296 to schedule an audition appointment.