Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee Agenda
Monday September 14, 2015
8:00-8:50 AM
Room 107 Lab of Mechanics

Members in attendance: Cameron Campbell (DESIGN), Suzanne Hendrich (CHS), Char Hulsebus (Registrar), Doug Jacobson (Chair, ENGINEERING), Gordie Miller (LAS), Diane Rupp (Registrar), Chuck Schwab (CALS), Cole Staudt (Stud. Gov’t.), Judy Strand (Grad College).

Meeting called to order at 8:03 AM; Gordie Miller agreed to take meeting minutes.

Review of Agenda

Agenda, revised from the one sent out, approved

Approval of Minutes from 5-1-15

GM asked about possible reasons that Chinese Studies Minor was not approved and if the proposers were alerted to the meeting time/place of AAC; DJ indicated they were notified. GM moved to approve minutes; SH seconded – motion carries unanimously.

Items forwarded from ACC: None

Unfinished business:

- GIS Minor
  - Committee still waiting for feedback on consultation with Agronomy.
  - CC and DJ will notify proposer to obtain results of consultation and report back to FSCC.
  - Possible electronic vote by FSCC once feedback is obtained.

New Business:

- HLC (KZ from Registrar led discussion)
  - Curriculum Committees (CC) identified as key stakeholders in the upcoming review and can provide valuable and knowledgeable answers to reviewer questions.
  - Format has changed since 10 years ago. Other than few designated meetings, there will be open forums related to accreditation criteria.
  - Assurance document to be released soon via website; document is strong and data-rich after an internal review.
  - Review emphasizes two criteria: Teaching and Learning. Possible items for discussion may include differentiation of undergraduate and graduate courses,
General Education requirements (ISU has no core requirements, but are decentralized. Nonetheless, there are common outcomes across programs), adequacy of faculty oversight over curriculum.

- Anticipated emphasis on Outcomes Assessment: are course and curricular goals being achieved? How is this evaluated? How extensive will questions probe “research courses”, which may not have fully-developed syllabi?
- Specific schedule is not known; typically Criteria 3 & 4 held as one meeting (Teaching and Learning: 3 = Quality, Resources, and Support; 4 = Evaluation and Improvement); presently identifying groups and individuals who would be helpful for meetings.
- Format? Simple question and answer – no formal agenda during each open forum.
- Difficult to anticipate what the reviewers will ask.
- Federal compliance issues (collection of course syllabi; evaluation of appropriate credits; distance education - compatibility of expectations and workload for on-line vs. face-to-face sections of same course; are students getting what is needed?). When documents released to HLC, panel of 2-3 individuals will review approximately 10 items dealing with federal compliance; this review will begin sooner than Nov 2 visit but at Nov 2, there will be a meeting on compliances;

- Handling of experimental course proposals for jointly administered programs.
  - GM suggested that rather than creating a sequential workflow in Courseleaf, is that a single college be designated for the workflow, but that the other college be alerted to the proposal and receive PDFs for review in parallel.
  - Each college has different ways of dealing with experimental courses, and can vary year to year;
  - Faculty Handbook states that “an experimental offering must be announced by a form submitted to the registrar.”
  - Important to identify who was/were consulted throughout the university by the proposing instructor/department/program.
  - Registrar is willing to provide whatever is needed – a monthly listing, for example.
  - Important for college curriculum committees to be vigilant of issues.
  - No action taken, but agreed that the proposer should check the Workflow (via “Preview Workflow” on submission to see what colleges would be included in the review process.
• A discussion of Internship credit – are there standards in the other colleges?
  - (This discussion occurred as part of HLC discussion above)
  - Do students know the proper expectations regarding credit hours?
  - What distinguishes credit hours for internship? SH – 3 hours / credit hour is the usual expectation. How is that compatible with 400-hour internships offered as 3 credits?
  - If internships are paid, this may partially offset tuition. Can earning academic credit and receiving a salary/stipend occur simultaneously – no ISU rule prohibits both.
  - CC: If internships are required, up to faculty/departments to ensure placement by establishing internship locations.
  - Differences in colleges; what do students think about this? There may be accreditation limits.
  - FSCC Members: Ask Associate Deans in respective colleges – (a) Variation in credit vs. hours expected to be worked; (b) Paid / un-paid internships. These may include Field experiences; Research; internships; Practica. Collect data for next meeting – if available?
  - Student perceptions and expectations: CS will ask.

• Report on any new majors, minors, etc. that might be coming this year.

• Course Pre-requisite Enforcement
  - SH: Heard that Faculty Senate will review enforcement of course pre-requisites; wondered about role of FSCC. AAC discussed the issue.
  - Concern about the differences between actual pre-requisites and recommendations that assist with course management. How do faculty view pre-requisites?

Old Business / updates:

Meeting ended at 8:56 AM.

Minutes, respectfully submitted, 14-Sept-2015

[Signature]

Gordie Miller (LASCC)