

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE
CURRICULUM AND ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

CAAC 2012-2013
Steven Lamb, Chair
February 11, 2013
MINUTES #14

Members Present: J. Decker, S. Kiger, R. Guell, S. Lamb, R. McGiverin, D. Malooley, R. Peters, G. Zhang

Student members:

Ex-officio: L. Brown, D. Collins, R. English, K. Harris, L. Maule, B. McLaren, Y. Peterson, S. Powers

Executive Committee Liaison: T. Sawyer

Absent: S. Frey: Excused

Guests: J. Conant, M. Schafer, B. Welsh, A. Badar, M. Shahhosseini, M. Dechausay, J. McMullen, S. Robinson

S. Lamb called the meeting to order at 11:03 AM.

1. A motion to approve the Minutes of Meeting #13 (2-4-13), was made. Following discussion on one point, a motion to table until next meeting to allow a revision was made and passed, 6-0-0, (Guell/Peters).
2. A motion to approve the proposal from the College of Technology for a **NEW** degree program: Bachelor of Applied Science, BAS, with multiple concentrations was made and passed, 6-0-0, (Peters/Guell). *Forward to Senate Executive Committee for action.*
3. A motion to approve the proposal from Applied Health Sciences for a **NEW** degree program: Bachelor of Applied Science, BAS was made and passed, 6-0-0, (Peters/Kiger). *Forward to Senate Executive Committee for action.*
4. J. McMullen discussed the recommendation from the University Athletic Committee to modify ISU transfer policies. It was emphasized that this was not an athletic student proposal, rather it was one with far reaching effects. Only 30 of 500 transfer students were athletes. As NCAA restrictions are much more stringent than ISU's this is presented as a systemic problem. If this proposal is granted, graduation rates will increase, economic aspects of students having to retake courses, and the obvious extension of time before they can graduate are all burdens that can be reduced. M. Dechausay provided a list of peer institutions and their policies on transfer. Most accept C- and D grades as long as the CGPA is above certain levels. J. Conant suggested the Athletic Committee believes the proposal is

worth discussion at the curricular level of campus as it has an impact on the entire university. It was questioned if the Registrar can integrate this into the system and link it to CGPA and the answer was yes. As grades are not considered in the block transfers already being done, it is logical that this policy could be incorporated in the same manner. Of course, major courses and prerequisites are the primary ones of concern. How this would affect programs such as the BAS proposals just passed, it was explained that those accepted a block transfer from AAS degree holders. Again, it would be those courses that were either major requirements or prerequisite requirements that would cause a student to have to take additional courses at ISU. Inspection of the University Handbook directed that this proposal should actually go through the SAC as grading falls under their primary authority. Chair Lamb will forward it to SAC for consideration.

5. B. Welsh presented the proposal from Aviation Technology, COT, for revision of the Professional Aviation Flight Technology program.
6. A motion to suspend the rules and allow immediate voting on proposals was made and passed, 8-0-0, (Guell/Kiger).
7. A motion to approve the proposal from Aviation Technology, COT, for revision of the Professional Aviation Flight Technology program was made and passed, 8-0-0, (Guell/Kiger). *Publish as approved in Academic Notes.*
8. S. Lamb and S. Robinson presented the proposal from AFIRM, SCOB, for revision of the Finance major with a single Concentration creating a new Financial Planning Concentration. The CFP Board has very specific requirements for the topics and each must be verified. Two new courses were required to fulfill these requirements. It was noted that there should be an F4 due to elimination of the Money and Banking course. This proposal created an additional Concentration with the original one remaining intact. There was also discussion on the counting of Math 115. The proposal will be amended and further discussed at the next meeting.
9. A. Badar and M. Shahhosseini presented the proposal from AETM, COT, for revision of the Mechanical Engineering Technology major. It is in response to the 120 Credit Rule.
10. A motion to approve the proposal from AETM, COT, for revision of the Mechanical Engineering Technology major was made and passed, 7-0-0, (Guell/Decker). *Publish as approved in Academic Notes.*
11. A. Badar and M. Shahhosseini presented the proposal from AETM, COT, for revision of the Civil Engineering Technology major. It is in response to the 120 Credit Rule.
12. A motion to approve the proposal from AETM, COT, for revision of the Civil Engineering Technology major was made and passed, 7-0-0, (Guell/Kiger). *Publish as approved in Academic Notes.*

13. D. Malooley presented the proposal from ECET, COT, for revision of the Automation and Control Engineering major. It is in response to the 120 Credit Rule.
14. A motion to approve the proposal from ECET, COT, for revision of the Automation and Control Engineering major was made and passed, 7-0-0, (Guell/Kiger). *Publish as approved in Academic Notes.*
15. L. Brown presented the proposal from ART for revision of the Art History Concentration of the BA/BS Art major.
16. A motion to approve the proposal from ART for revision of the Art History Concentration of the BA/BS Art major was made and passed, 7-0-0, (Guell/Kiger). *Publish as approved in Academic Notes.*
17. D. Malooley presented the proposal from Interdisciplinary Programs, for revision of the International Studies Minor. It allows students to take a different foreign language in addition to the foreign language already taken rather than the current requirement of a single language. It allows greater student flexibility in their program.
18. A motion to approve the proposal from Interdisciplinary Programs, for revision of the International Studies Minor was made and passed, 7-0-0, (Guell/Decker). *Publish as approved in Academic Notes.*
19. A motion to approve the proposal from Interdisciplinary Programs, for **elimination** of the International Business Concentration was made and passed, 7-0-0, (Guell/Kiger). *Publish as approved in Academic Notes*
20. S. Powers discussed the proposal from Social Studies Education, for revision of the Social Studies Education Major. It is in response to the revised State requirements. Due diligence was done. There was a question of needed F4s from affected areas. The TEC approved as well as the Social Studies Advisory Committee. The 120 Credit Rule has been satisfied.
21. A motion to approve the proposal from Social Studies Education, for revision of the Social Studies Education Major was made and passed, 7-0-0, (Lamb/Peters). *Publish as approved in Academic Notes*
22. Discussion was initiated on the University College Proposal. Following discussion on the governing body, it was determined that since the FSC was a body with a selection process under the auspices of CAAC, it was the logical body to select.
23. A motion that CAAC recommends that the FSC act as the governing body for the UC with that enhanced responsibility was made and passed, 7-0-0, (Lamb/McGiverin).
24. Further discussion on the UC centered on the responsibilities and relationship of Department Chairpersons and the Dean of the University College in the scheduling of courses. Should the chair have the authority? Should the respective Deans be able to intercede? Should the

UC Dean have direct authority? It was determined that a recommended language was needed. R. Guell will create a first draft. There was additional discussion on the AVP and UC Dean positions. Housing should be in Student Affairs. An Assistant Dean would be a more appropriate co-worker with the UC Dean than an AVP. There was also discussion on the formation of a Coordinating Council, different from the governing body, with responsibility for implementation, transitional programs, coordination with ORR, calculations of GPAs, etc.

25. S. Lamb addressed the Baccalaureate Task Force Recommendation. CAAC Members are asked to review and carefully consider the proposal for the next meeting. This could potentially require many program changes.

26. The Committee adjourned at 12:47 PM

Respectfully Submitted
David J. Malooley, Secretary