

Faculty Senate/All University Committee Report (2015-2016)

Committee:	Academic Affairs	Prepared By:	Prentice Chandler	Date: 9.28.15
-------------------	------------------	---------------------	-------------------	----------------------

Committee Members at the Meeting:	<p>Present: Stacey Hummeldorf, Carol Wheeler-Strother, Stephanie King, Prentice Chandler</p> <p>Absent: Chia-Chi Ho, Ratee Apana, Deborah Page</p>
--	--

Topics Discussed: provide a brief description of each	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Course Evaluation Committee, Rich Miller: The committee received an update from Rich Miller on the Course Evaluation Committee’s progress. 2. DSST Testing, John McNay: The committee heard from faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences, and their concerns over DSST testing. 3. Prior Assessment of Learning Portfolio Update, Maureen Schomaker (for Rebecca Leugers): The committee heard from an update from Schomaker. Initially the committee thought they were ready to have AAC endorse this document so that this could move on to Faculty Senate. 4. “Materials” additions, Andrew Naab: The committee heard from Naab, UG student government president about adding language about “Counseling and Psychological Services” and “Title IX” to course materials.
Action Items: List item and attach supporting document if action requires such background	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Course Evaluation Committee: It was noted that there is no universal process or form for doing student teaching evaluations. The AAUP did not see any issues with revising our university-wide processes. The purpose of these evaluations would be to help faculty improve their teaching. Request was made for AAC endorsement to move forward with a pilot phase in the spring 2016 semester with summer semester TBA. 2. DSST Testing: These are tests that students can complete/pass to receive credit for college level coursework. McNay and Campos’ concerns were that these tests were created without input from content area professors, issues over curricular control (since faculty ‘control the curriculum’), and who makes the decision over what courses can be tested out of. 3. PLA: Now however there is concern that the OBR may make more changes and it is not felt prudent to put out a document only to have to change it right away. So what was brought was just info sharing and updates will be given when they are available.

Describe action needed on items above (discussion and input, vote, etc):	By Whom:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Course Evaluation Committee: Unanimous in favor of moving it forward for Faculty Senate vote 2. DSST: Group would like more information on this topic 3. PLA: None. Waiting for final draft 4. Materials addition: Unanimous in favor of moving this forward for Faculty Senate vote 	<p>___ By Faculty Senate</p> <p>___ By Cabinet</p> <p>___ Others (List-)</p>
<p>Next Meeting: 11/2/15, 3:00-4:00, TC 401</p>	

When complete, save your report with the committee name and report date as the file name. Please send the file to Tracy Herrmann (tracy.herrmann@uc.edu) and Christie Joslin (Christie.Joslin@uc.edu). Thank you!