# An Evaluation of the Academic Standards Committee

by
Jim Connell, D.V.M.\*

During the 1975-76 academic year the Academic Standards Committee, the so called "Admissions Committee" for the College of Veterinary Medicine, had a student member. In all, ten senior students selected by the Dean served on the committee on a rotating basis. This plan allowed a cross-section of the senior class to participate, yet demanded a minimal amount of time away from their clinic duties. The student member is a non-voting member of the committee but participates to the fullest extent in all the activities of the committee.

Since I was selected to serve as one of the students on the committee, I feel an obligation to pass on my impressions of the committee. The greatest task before the Academic Standards Committee is that of interviewing and evaluating applications to the College of Veterinary Medicine. There seems to be great concern about this particular activity among veterinary students and faculty, not to mention the applicants. I have found in the past year that relatively little correct information about the selection of new students is in circulation. Most of the "general knowledge" is based on little or no fact.

The Academic Standards Committee is made up of five rotating faculty members and the non-voting student member, all appointed by the Dean. Each member has the task of forming an opinion of each candidate based on various subjective and objective information. Once the individual opinions are formed, the committee votes on each particular applicant to admit or deny. It is not possible to state how each

\*Dr. Connell is a 1976 graduate from Iowa State University College of Veterinary Medicine. He is currently practicing in Lodi, Wisconsin.

committee member weighs the information available to form his opinion, but one can state what is available. The interview is scored in various categories but it remains highly subjective. To remove as much bias as possible all the interviews are completed before any of the applicant files are reviewed. Thus the committee knows only the applicant's name at the time of the interview. The applicant's file contains his application and transcripts as well as the interview sheets. Grades are available in two forms: the all-university grade point and the basic science group average. At the time of final evaluation, the committee has an alphabetical list of the applicants and their interview scores, both grade points, a graph of all-university grade points, and comments abstracted from the interview sheets. The files are available at this time and are usually reviewed in depth by the committee as they vote on each individual applicant.

Although the student member has no vote he does have input into the committee. He may be an active participant in the interview process and may comment freely on the particular applicant's interview.

The greatest student input however came after the selection process was completed. Their observations and recommendations, reported to the Dean, were broken down into three groups: those for the committee, those for the selection procedure and those for the Dean.

For the committee, the students suggested membership on a five year rotation with the senior faculty member being chairman. They suggested that there be more than one committee member appointed to review files with unsuccessful applicants and that the committee members

be relieved of clinic and academic responsibilities when the committee was scheduled to meet. Continuation of the student member was highly recommended.

Suggestions for the selection procedure itself revolved around trying to reduce the number of interviews granted by raising the minimum grade point and moving the application deadline up. Any other sort of pre-screening that could be uniformly and fairly applied to reduce the number of interviews granted would pave the way for more positive interviews. It was also suggested to give the applicant a chance to "sell" himself during the interview. One of the strongest recommendations made was to be sure that all applicants were informed of their right to review their files with a member of the committee.

The students urged the Dean to contact other Colleges of Veterinary Medicine to see how our admissions process stacked up against theirs and to see if there were any ideas that could be exchanged. The Dean was also urged to publicize as much of the general information about the most recently accepted class as possible.

In a meeting between the students and the Dean all these points were discussed and well taken by the Dean. Both the students and the Dean agreed that the major problem of the Academic Standards Committee was the unwieldy number of interviews handled. They also agreed that if there was a way to fairly reduce the number of interviews granted that it could only help to get a better evaluation of each student interviewed. No one really felt that he had the best answer to the pre-screening problem.

It is clear to me that the Academic Standards Committee is the single most important committee within the College of Veterinary Medicine. It is the Dean's Committee, therefore all decisions concerning the structure and routine of the committee are up to the Dean. The positive student input will add to the Dean's data base from which he will make his decisions about future committees.

After observing and participating with the committee and following the admissions procedure to the end I feel that this system works, but, as with any system, it can be

#### **CLIPPER BLADE SHARPENING**

We GUARANTEE you the best clipper blade sharpening and clipper repairing you ever had. More than 40 years practical factory training.' We now service the largest veterinary colleges, veterinary hospitals, and kennels in the U.S.A. Satisfied customers in 50 states and they recommend us. "They are new when we are through" Cleaned, polished and cut. Oster clippers and blades sold. Avoid C.O.D., enclose \$2.00 for each set of blades. We return prepaid.

### Service Grinding and Supply Co., Inc.

Route 7 Box 750 Hayward, Wisconsin 54843

Issue No. 3, 1976

made to work better. As has been mentioned before, the large number of interviews was a hinderance to the committee. Selecting the applicants for interviews and making better use of the interview time would improve the process greatly. Fresh ideas on any committee are

always needed, thus the suggestion of a five year rotation. There is also a definite need to let the public know more about the mechanics of the committee to avoid rumors and poor advice from prevet advisors.

## **ALUMNI NEWS**



#### Class of 1946

Dr. R. C. Bowie is owner of Bowie Mfg. Inc., a well known manufacturer of Mobile Clinic units. His family consists of his wife, Maxine, and his two sons, Lee, a professor at Temple University in Philadelphia, and Lowell, a chemical engineer. Dr. Bowie has served 23 years as county school board member and director of Area V Junior College. He is also active in Kiwanis Club, the church, Chamber of Commerce, A.V.M.A. and Boy Scouts.

After graduation, Dr. R. E. Cooney served three years as Captain in the U. S. Army Veterinary Corp. From 1949 to 1951 he practiced in Dyersville, Iowa. From 1951 to the present time, he has engaged in a mixed practice in Manchester, Iowa. His family consists of his wife, Kathryn, and their children, Steve, 26, Tom, 24, Jim, 22, Laura, 20, Anjanet, 12, Cathy, 10, and Dan, 7. Dr. Cooney belongs to the E.I.V.A. and the I.S.U. Alumni Association.

Upon graduation, Dr. Arthur M. Collins worked six months in a small animal practice in Oak Park, Illinois. The following six months he spent with U.S.D.A. in poultry inspection. For the next 24 years he was engaged in small animal practice in Cicero, Illinois, which he sold in 1971, and opened a small out-patient clinic in LaGrange Park for two years. Currently he is with the Illinois Department of Agriculture, Animal Welfare Section. He and his wife, Dorothy, have four children.

At the present time, Dr. Harvey Price is engaged in a small animal practice in Ada, Oklahoma. He is also owner and operator of Biscuit Hill Farm, a registered Hereford cattle farm, and does state meat inspection for two local packing plants. He is a member of Oklahoma Veterinary Assn. and A.V.M.A. He has served as Chairman of the Metropolitan Planning and Zoning Commission and of the Pontotoc County Soil Conservation District. He is a former member of the Oklahoma State Board of Veterinary Medical Examiners.

Dr. C. H. Schlauderaff sold his interest in a group practice in 1973. He is currently employed by the Meat Inspection Division of the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture. He and his wife, Betha, have four children; Paul, a Lutheran minister; Betha Nan; Mark; and Kristen.

Dr. A. J. Eckstein is presently engaged in a mixed practice in New Ulm, Minnesota, with his associate Dr. Lois Braun (U of M '74). His family consists of his wife, Harriet, and six children, two of which are I.S.U. graduates. Dr. Eckstein has served as Mayor and President of the City Council. He is currently State Representative and a member of the local Rotary Club.

After graduation, Dr. John B. Herrick joined a private practice for one year. Between 1947 and 1952, he held the following positions consecutively: chief veterinarian for Farmer's Hybrid Hog Co.