

Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Council
Minutes
April 1, 2010
8:00 to 8:50 a.m.
Lab of Mechanics

- 1) Meeting was called to order by Chair Suzanne Hendrich.
- 2) Those members in attendance were: Robert Martin, (CALC); Dave Holger (EVPP); Jordan Smellie (GSM); Michael Clough (CHS-CI); Brad Dell (LAS); Suzanne Hendrich (Chair); Sanjeev Argawal (Business); April Katz (Art & Design); and Jim Thompson (FSCC).
- 3) Moved and seconded to approve the March 25th meeting minutes. The motion passed with 6 For, 0 Against and 1 Abstention.
- 4) Jim Thompson discussed proposed new curricula.
 - A) The Bachelor's of Engineering Technology will not likely be resolved this Spring Semester.
 - B) The Bachelor's of Industrial Design has been approved by the College of Business and the College of Engineering. We need a letter confirming these approvals from each college. Documentation of some kind is needed. Thompson will try to get these letters this Spring.
- 5) Academic Standards & Admissions – No official report submitted.
 - A) Dean David Holger wanted the Council to be aware of the increasing number of international Memoranda of Agreement in the area of the curriculum (2 years in home country and 2 years at ISU). The Executive V.P. needs to approve and report that ISU admissions standards are being met.
 - B) Dean Holger also reported on the issue of when the admissions office verifies qualifications for admission. Applicants need to tell us where they are now when making application. The high school transcript will be the confirming documentation. When they enforce the qualification requirements will be different, not the qualification requirement.
- 6) Executive Board
 - A) Approval of 10.8 to go to the Senate. Taking out the piece on departments and colleges. The focus is on the program.
 - B) A revised section of 2.7.4 was handed out. Discussion focused on this reorganization planning chart. Approval of the reorganization planning chart may be open to new discussions (new ground) given the present situation in the university. Merger procedures were discussed.

The question was asked “Do we need a policy on “Schools”? Discussions are going on regarding the formation of “schools.”

The question is “Who votes on department mergers?” What will be debated from 2.7.4 will be who approves discontinuances and mergers.

Do we really need a chart? The problem with the “chart” is it is not always clear on the specifics. Charts give a snapshot but what is really needed is a statement on the specifics.

The Council decided not to do anything further with the chart; use language in the faculty handbook.

Hendrich suggested that we accept what is in 2.7 as being clear enough to explain procedures.

- 7) Jordan Smellie (GSB) met with the Council to discuss student evaluations of faculty teaching performance. A summary of comments are included here.
 - a) Students feel, in general, that evaluation of faculty teaching performance is not transparent.
 - b) Hendrich said faculty, in general, are not comfortable making student evaluations public.
 - c) Evaluation of student outcomes from a course may be more appropriate and manageable.
 - d) There is an effort being pursued to have volunteer departments to have students complete an assessment questionnaire regarding learning outcomes of courses.
 - e) The new assessment will focus on students’ perceptions of their learning rather than their perceptions of the “teacher’s performance”.
 - f) Information could be shared on the syllabus the next time the course is taught indicating the changes made as the result of the students’ input about their learning.

The GSB leaders will continue to inform the AA Council regarding updates on these ideas and procedures.

- 8) There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:15 a.m.

Respectfully submitted

Robert Martin