

REPORT OF  
FACULTY SENATE STEERING COMMITTEE

Section A. - Nominations.

At the May 1, 1984 Faculty Senate meeting a recommendation to create the University Committee on Academic Responsibility was approved.

The Steering Committee presents the following nominations:

Three-Year Term

Charles H. Randall  
School of Law

Robert M. Rood  
Government and International Studies Department

Two-Year Term

Harry K. McMillan  
College of Engineering

Sarah Wise  
College of Applied Professional Sciences

One-Year Term

Duane L. Rohlfing  
Biology Department

*For information only:*

THE EVALUATION OF THE PROVISIONAL YEAR

The Provisional Year Program calls for the Faculty Senate Steering Committee to conduct an evaluation of the Program during its third year and to submit appropriate recommendations to the Faculty Senate based upon that evaluation. It seems desirable to establish at the outset the basis for the evaluation. By formulating now the criteria for evaluation, we have a better idea of what information to acquire and what records to maintain. This will provide only the material for the evaluation; the actual judgment will be made by the Steering Committee and Faculty Senate at the time, 1986-87.

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING THE PROVISIONAL YEAR PROGRAM

1. Success in enrolling students in the Provisional Year.

How many students applied for the P.Y.? How many were accepted and on what basis? How does the record of those accepted compare with the record of the average freshman admitted for that year? Were there students who were accepted but did not enroll? Why?

2. Success in retaining students for the entire year.

If students dropped out before the end of the year, how many dropped out, at what point in the course of the year, and for what reasons? Where did these students go?

3. Success in completing the Provisional Year with a minimum of 2.0 g.p.a.

How many of the students admitted initially completed the year with the required 2.0 g.p.a. minimum? What was the actual g.p.r. distribution? What did the students do who completed the year but without the required 2.0 g.p.a.?

4. Success in securing admission to the colleges of U.S.C., the branches, other institutions.

How many students completing the P.Y. with the required minimum 2.0 g.p.a. were admitted to the colleges of U.S.C. and to which colleges? Were any of these conditional admissions, and if so, what were the conditions? How many students were rejected for admission and why? How many went to U.S.C. branches or to other institutions? Why did they go elsewhere?

5. Success in maintaining satisfactory progress toward a baccalaureate degree.

How many of the P.Y. students admitted into the colleges of U.S.C. are making satisfactory progress toward a degree as defined by the rules of that college? What percent of the P.Y. students is not making satisfactory progress toward a degree and how does this compare with the percent for other students in the college? Have students dropped out of the colleges, and if so, at what stage in their academic careers and for what reasons? How does this compare with the retention rate for other students in the college? Instead of dropping out, did the P.Y. students transfer elsewhere and why? Have any of the P.Y. students been suspended for academic or other reasons? What is the g.p.r. of the P.Y. students? How does the suspension rate and g.p.r. compare with that of other students in the college?

DATA NEEDED FOR EVALUATING THE PROVISIONAL YEAR PROGRAM

Data to be provided the Faculty Senate Steering Committee for the purpose of evaluating the Provisional Year Program. The information is to be sent to the Faculty Senate Office at the end of each semester for the academic years 1984-85, 1985-86 and 1986-87 to the extent possible.

1. By the Chairman of the Admissions Committee or the Director of Admissions:

The number of students applying for admission to the P.Y. program.

The number of students admitted to the P.Y. Program.

The names and student ID numbers of all admitted to the P.Y.

The predicted g.p.r. of those admitted.

The evidence of "future academic growth and performance" which influenced the decision to admit.

Comparison with the scores and records of the regular admittees for that year.

Any information as to why students admitted to the P.Y. did not enroll.

2. By the Registrar:

The transcripts (or summary data) of all students enrolled in the P.Y. for that particular year separated to show the students completing the year with a minimum 2.0 g.p.a., students completing the year with less than a 2.0, and students who have withdrawn from the Program.

3. By the Faculty of the Provisional Year Program:

Any information as to why students withdrew from the P.Y. before the end of the year and what happened to these students.

The guidance given the students who did not secure admission to a baccalaureate program at U.S.C. and what happened to these students.

Any information as to why students admitted into a baccalaureate program at U.S.C. did not enroll.

4. By the Deans of the Colleges at U.S.C.:

The number of P.Y. students denied admission and the reasons for rejection.

The number of P.Y. students admitted and the conditions of admission if there were any.

A list of the P.Y. courses accepted, <sup>by the faculties</sup> as applicable toward a degree. A list of those not accepted and the reasons.

The number of P.Y. students making satisfactory progress toward a degree.

The transcripts of the P.Y. students not making satisfactory progress toward a degree and indications as to the deficiency.

The g.p.r. of each P.Y. student and how this compares with other students in the college.

The transcripts of P.Y. students who have dropped out of the college and any information as to why they have done so. How the withdrawal rate compares with that of other students in the college?