Minutes
Steering Committee
9/29/2006

Meeting convened with Baker, DeNoble, Doran, Saghafi, Salehizadeh, Toole; Ex-officio: Lackritz and Naughton present.

Minutes of the 8/25/2006 SC meeting were reviewed and discussed with the Dean. The Dean recommended that the minutes of the meeting be revised to better reflect the level of SC support for the Global Entrepreneurship MBA (GEMBA) program. It was recommended to eliminate communication of the specific concerns over the GEMBA in favor of a more general statement of concern over aspects of the program.

Jim Lackritz updated the committee on the status of the implementation of the Electronic Course Evaluation system throughout the university. He reminded the SC that this is a university driven system over which the CBA has little control. Tests of the system from three other colleges (Education, HHS, PSFA) revealed no apparent overall differences between the paper and pencil system and the new electronic system. However, there were some individual differences in both directions. Jim had originally been told that faculty would have the option to do paper evaluations in tandem with the electronic version this semester (however, he has since been told that the college will either do all electronic or all paper evaluations). Concern was expressed over the potential that students will wait until they take final exams or received final grades before they complete evaluations. Jim explained that during the regular grading period grades will be blocked from students until they complete their evaluations. After the final grading period, however, all grades must be released. Jim recommended to Javier Gudino, who is in charge of the implementation, that five blank fields be made available in each faculty member’s evaluation form for custom questions. Jim is planning to update the entire faculty on the status of the process.

The establishment of a permanent Assessment Committee was discussed. Such a committee will include representatives from each department and the chair of the Graduate Committee. Potential advantages of the permanent committee include (1) the formalization of a process already in place, (2) affirmation to the AACSB and the university of the importance of assessment to the college and (3) optimizing inter-department communication of best practices in each department. The major disadvantage is addition of one more committee in an already crowded committee environment. Jim will draft language to bring to the committee for inclusion of the committee in the college policy file.

There was a general discussion of the effectiveness of the current committee structure in the CBA. Several issues were raised including balancing participation with resources, addressing the perception that active committee participation is not valued or rewarded and junior faculty participation. A major concern is that a lack of perceived importance and incentives is leading to lackluster participation.
Jim reviewed the state of our relationship with the HTM program. There is growing concern over a perception of HTM’s desire to teach core CBA curriculum. There are additional concerns about the academic rigor of courses in HTM. Although HTM practices do not impact the CBA’s accreditation process, potential problems in the HTM program reflect on the CBA. At a more general level, there are doubts regarding the value of the relationship to the CBA. While HTM plays up their partnership with the CBA and uses our credentials to build credibility, there is little reciprocal benefit. It was recommended that the results of the HTM audit be given to department chairs with the objective of putting a discussion of the HTM on all department agendas.