

Committee on Academic Policy

Minutes of Meeting #14, Academic Year 2015-2016

February 1, 2016

Present: L. Brady; L. Capogna; J. Doyle (Chair); F. Egan; M. Elmes; J. Hanlan; A. Heinricher; J. Rulfs

Luke Brady and Frank Egan were introduced as the new student members of CAP.

The minutes of meeting #13 were approved as amended.

J. Doyle distributed a draft memo to the faculty regarding the extension of the current online experiment for student course evaluations. Dean Heinricher pointed out that, for faculty willing to participate in this experiment, an email is sent to students in the courses involved inviting them to submit an online course evaluation. This email is repeated every 48 hours unless there is a response. Instructors are notified by email that the online evaluation has gone out to their students. Some changes to Prof. Doyle's draft memo were suggested. It was moved to extend the pilot program through the end of term D'16. The motion passed. In the course of the discussion, the role of CAO in managing changes to the original survey instrument was discussed. There was some suggestion that the instrument could be tightened up to include only those questions of central importance. Instructors have little, if any, control over the room temperature or physical comfort, for example. It was suggested that both students and faculty should be surveyed to determine which questions yield the most information directly relevant to instruction and potential instructional improvement. It was agreed that Prof. Doyle would have a conversation with the chair of CAO regarding possible revisions to the survey instrument.

Discussion continued from past meetings on the current state of the rationale regarding a definition of an ISP. Dean Heinricher reviewed data gathered from the 20 AITU schools. He noted that most required a significant amount of detail regarding the content and requirements of the independent study as part of the registration process. Of those schools: 13 require faculty signatures and some additional signature (department or program heads, for example) for registration; 4 require only the signature of a faculty member; for 3 schools, the requirement for approval of registration is unclear. It was agreed that Prof. Doyle and Dean Heinricher would continue to work on the rationale.

Respectfully submitted,

James P. Hanlan