

Academic Affairs Council
Minutes
February 8, 2011

In Attendance:

Lee Burras – Academic Standards and Admissions
Robert A. Martin – College of Agriculture and Life Sciences
Dave Holger – EUPP
Ann Marie VanderZanden– FSCC
Greg Luecke – ME
Paul Anderson – Design
Michael Clough – CHS
Suzanne Hendrich – Chair
Brad Dell - LAS

1. Approval of minutes.
 - a. Burras moved to make a minor change in the minutes. (The change is reflected in the updated minutes.)
 - b. Anderson moved to approve, Martin seconded. Minutes were approved (with correction) unanimously.

2. FSCC Report
 - a. The FSCC met on Jan. 20.
 - b. The FSCC is waiting for an update from Kinesiology about changes in minors. Hendrich questioned whether it needed to be brought to the AAC. VanderZanden indicated that at least one of them is a name change, and Holger and Hendrich said that then it would need to come to our committee.
 - c. VanderZanden said that the FSCC would be looking at clarifying the language in the handbook about what the process should be used to change the name of a minor.
 - d. VanderZanden reported that a number of changes will be coming from the College of Design at the next meeting.
 - e. Much of the rest of the discussions in the meetings have been about the catalogue.

3. Academic Standards and Admissions
 - a. No report. They have not met.
 - b. Hendrich asked a questions about the Merchandising Minor. It indicates that a cumulative GPA of 2.0 needs to be maintained to obtain this certificate. Hendrich questions why this needs to be stated since the university requires a 2.0 to graduate. Burras said that part of the reason for this was so that someone with a BA from another school or who already has a BA from ISU can come to ISU and get this without getting another BA. Burras said he will bring these questions to the Academic Standards and Admissions committee.

4. Hendrich introduced the proposed revision to Section 10.8.1
 - a. Luecke questioned the impetus for this change. Hendrich said that the current policy allows a program proposal to be vetoed and denied if it does not get the consent of other relevant programs from across the University. The proposed revision would allow the proposal to move forward to subsequent committees with the written objections to the proposal attached to it. Hendrich said that this was more consistent with other aspects of the program approval process. Holger supports the proposed change because then both sides are forwarded and allowed to speak their case. Holger suggested adding another sentence that states this even more clearly. Hendrich said that she would make the proposed change to the revision language and forward it to the AAC so it can be reviewed before the next meeting.
 - b. A discussion ensued about how this revised change might have affected the BET proposal. Holger indicated that he FSEB ruled that the BET proposal could not go forward because “consent” was not granted. The proposed revision of 10.8.1 would likely have meant that the BET proposal could have been sent forward to the Senate with objections attached to the proposal.

5. Hendrich has proposed reconciling the process of approving a minor between the documents on the FSCC website and the Provost website.
 - a. Hendrich presented a document which combines and clarifies the language in the two documents.
 - b. The substantive change is that it must be stated that the approval process is only necessary for a minor that does not have the same name as an existing major.
 - c. Holger suggested the language about the approval of graduate minors should be consistent with the process outlined in the table in 10.8.
 - d. Holger suggested that approval guidelines be listed in only one place with a link to the other. He said he would discuss this with the Provost’s office and report back to the AAC.
 - e. Hendrich asked that we look to see if the language for approval of majors, programs, and certificates is the same in all locations.
 - f. VanderZanden asked that we clarify the policy of how to approve the renaming of minors. Hendrich said that she would bring this up to the Executive board.

6. Holger handed out an example of a Bachelor of Applied Science degree from the University of Nebraska – Lincoln for us to peruse. Holger’s intent is for the AAC to consider the possibility of degrees other than the BA or BS, so that we are prepared if any colleges decide to propose a new degree.

