Members:  
Kathy Brook, Chair, Interim Dean  
Liz Ellis, Interim Asst Dean for Academics; Steve Elias, Interim Asst Dean for Research; Asst Dean for Development and Public Relations;  
Kevin Melendrez, Dept Head, ACCT/IS; Rick Adkisson, Dept Head, ECON/IB/ESTAT; Ken Martin Interim Dept Head, FIN; Steve Elias, Dept Head, MGT; Pat Gavin, Dept Head, MKTG; Chris Erickson, Faculty Council Representative; Janet Green, School of HRTM.

Absent: J. Green

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Description and Follow Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Review of Minutes of October 9 – K. Brook | Kevin Melendrez reported that we are close to having the assistant dean/development officer position posted with HR. We will post it for the 14 day minimum with the possibility of extending the deadline after that. Search committee members will be able to access the applications online.  

- Assistant dean search  
- Behavioral lab  
- Federal Reserve Event  
- BRR projects  
- Distinguished Alum Reception  
- AACSB Salary Survey  
- Tuition Waivers  
- Regents Professors |
| 2. Research – Steve Elias | Steve Elias reported on a recent CADRe (Council of Associate Deans for Research) meeting attended by the provost. One of the topics discussed by the provost was start-up funds and his desire that start-up funding (mostly in the sciences and engineering) not be front-loaded but spread over a number of years. The provost also indicated that he supports differentiated course loads (including within departments). He described three year agreements with faculty members with deliverables as a model for future research.  

- AACSB Salary Survey  
- Tuition Waivers  
- Regents Professors |
Kathy was asked for her perspective on the ability of department heads to make adjustments in course loads within their departments. She indicated that is the prerogative of department heads but that the dean should be kept informed.

The provost also conveyed to associate deans for research that colleges should not be asking him for money since vacant lines have been left in the colleges. Salary savings should be used first before asking him for money.

Another topic of discussion was the new method of covering ICT costs with a per capita charge. Some of the colleges have found this mechanism to be particularly burdensome.

2. Development and PR
   No report.

3. Academic and Other Issues – Liz Ellis
   - Assessment and Curriculum

Liz Ellis distributed a copy of AACSB standard 9 and described in detail the work that she has been doing with three college committees: AoL, Undergraduate and Graduate. She particularly referenced the Guidance for Documentation in standard 9 that calls for documentation of where the MBA and BBA programs cover the content which AACSB expects to see in these programs. To address this, the Graduate and Undergraduate Committees are looking at what we cover now and what we are not covering. The Undergraduate Committee has divided the core courses among the committee members with the committee members collecting information through meetings with department heads and instructors. The Graduate Committee, on the other hand, is looking at our peer and aspirational institutions (from the AACSB review) to see what their MBA programs look like.

For the MBA, critical thinking will be reassessed this fall (out of cycle) because of a problem with the assessment instrument last year. In addition, this fall there will be assessment of globalization (the recently adopted goal) and ethics. A new learning objective for the MBA focusing on decision-making under uncertainty will be recommended.

For the BBA, diversity and ethics will be assessed this fall and a new learning objective will address business knowledge in a number of functional areas, with assessment cycling through the components, rather than trying to assess all components at once.

Discussion of changes in learning objectives raised the question of why the learning objectives are taken to convocation for approval rather than empowering the committees to make these changes. Taking these items to convocation is a source of inefficiency. The conclusion of the discussion was that the committees should share information about the changes they make in the learning objectives and that these would only require a vote if faculty members ask that these items be placed on the agenda for convocation or some other general faculty meeting.

The need to improve on the process of encouraging discussion of curriculum and other matters was addressed with recommendations that department heads assist in drawing issues to the attention of their departments.

Liz is working on a new assessment page on the web.
4. Updates – K. Brook

- Online programs

Kathy reported on her monthly meeting with the provost and on the meeting of the Academic Deans Council earlier in the week. At both meetings the provost conveyed his desire that each of the colleges place a high quality graduate program (probably a master’s program) completely online – so that students need not set foot on the campus. His goal is to implement such programs for fall 2014 with the goal of expanding enrollments. He anticipates that these programs would be funded through a revenue sharing arrangement with much of the tuition flowing to the colleges.

The provost has specifically referenced the MBA program in this discussion and Kathy has determined that all of the MBA courses except BA 502 have been offered online at one time or another. One possibility would be to propose an online cohort program where students would take two specified courses per semester (in the same way as students at Sandia). If we wanted to, we could create a specialization for the online program (such as an entrepreneurial emphasis) or use an existing specialization. The funding would allow us to teach classes in load while hiring adjuncts to cover other courses.

This discussion will be continued next week.

Another topic for more extended conversation is the implementation of the performance standards approved at the faculty meeting on October 11. Kathy provided some data from Nate Whitten describing the number of current upper division business students who do not meet the standard of the 2.5 GPA for lower division business courses. She also noted that the provost has initiated a discussion of higher admissions standards (based on high school GPA. (From Nate’s report, the group of students with high school GPA below 2.75 does not correlate very well with the students who performed at less than 2.5 on the lower division courses.)

With the fractional grading system, a C+ average is 2.3, so the proposal that was adopted amounts to a high C+ or a low B- average on the lower division business courses.

To smooth the transition to this standard, the College needs to explore the technical issues of monitoring students who do not meet the standard at the point when they would otherwise be eligible to move to upper division. We also need to consider how we might support students in meeting the standard. It is hoped that when incoming students are made aware of the standard, they will adjust their own performance accordingly.

This will be a topic for further discussion in the near future.

5. Other

Action/follow-up items are in bold.