

**Academic Assembly**  
October 16, 2017  
2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 130

**MINUTES**

Present: Pat Buchsel, Felipe Castillo, Terri Clark, Mark Cohan, Marc Cohen, Brooke Coleman, Miles Coleman, Carols de Mello e Souza, Allison Gibbons, Arie Greenleaf, Leticia Guardiola-Saenz, Kathleen La Voy, Charles Lawrence, Emily Lieb, Michael Ng, Katie Oliveras, Erik Olsen, Tracey Pepper, Frank Shih, Julianne Slate, Colette Taylor, Kirsten Thompson

*Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes*

- I. Review of Minutes
  - A. Point of order: minutes are not taken during executive session, if we do want to provide summarizing notes we must establish a separate process to do that
  - B. Motion to approve minutes
    - 1. Approved with two oppositions and one abstention
- II. CIO (*Chris Van Liew, Rich LeBlanc*)
  - A. Updates
    - 1. RevSU has taken the majority of ITS time over the past months
    - 2. Other projects have been delayed
    - 3. Student module go-live was this weekend, was successful
    - 4. Aware that there are many issues across campus that need attention
  - B. Opportunities for improvement
    - 1. Forms of communication/interaction must improve
    - 2. Outages or changes to technology environment need to be predictable
    - 3. Working on a multi-year rolling plan for projects, new for ITS
    - 4. Password change cycle will be lengthened in the next few months
    - 5. Wifi guest password process improvements
    - 6. Account access permissions to help with onboarding new employees
    - 7. Computer refresh needs earlier planning and updated asset lists
    - 8. Spam filtering, sometimes interferes with emails to and from off-campus addresses, especially problematic with international communication
  - C. Discussion
    - 1. Helpdesk moved over to the Columbia building
      - a. Increase training, communication, interaction with the rest of ITS staff
      - b. Now have to have an appointment to walk in, line is very long – capacity problem related to resources
      - c. Helpdesk staff show more concern with the ticket specifics and marking it resolved than actually fixing the problem – interface is not successful
      - d. Few permanent staff, mostly students
    - 2. Design aspects of ITS systems put too many steps in a process (access to student records, printing, Mac users virtually simulate Windows to access the P and T drives)
    - 3. Understaffed to manage identity management, ITS did purchase a tool to use in conjunction with RevSU but the company went out of business
    - 4. Software for instructors needed

- a. How far along are students, what grades are they getting, who is in trouble?  
Information is not easy to access, takes two to three weeks and involves many people manually processing data
- b. Reports are being developed in InformSU to address this need
- 5. Faculty are an important end user and are not regularly or successfully consulted (the new hiring software in HR, for example)
- 6. Need to standardize admin privileges across users
- 7. Seek out what peer institutions are doing for reporting – GradTracker is one example
- 8. Issue with lab computers used for forms of instruction on specific software
  - a. In the past there was a process to request specific software installed in a classroom in preparation for a class, but that is no longer available
  - b. Need to have a point person for these issues, has prevented student learning
- 9. Improvements coming soon
  - a. Password policies
  - b. Changes related to account creation and management
  - c. Additional resources to finish refresh and plan next year's
  - d. Improve Mac experience
  - e. Improve class in session response time and experience
  - f. Need groups of faculty that can be called upon to provide feedback on prioritization
- D. Faculty Technology Committee
  - 1. Katie Oliveras is the a new AcA representative on FTC
  - 2. Role of the committee is to participate and represent faculty voice in all of the above discussions, policies, and project prioritization
  - 3. FTC is still seeking members from STM and Education

### III. MRC Motion

- A. Amendment, "We support the incorporation of MRC into CAS with the understanding that tenure track positions will be created for MRC faculty."
  - 1. Discussion
    - a. Rationale: have a special obligation to the students and faculty of MRC in light of the poor treatment over the last several years
    - b. Left open ended enough to leave the details to the administration
    - c. Don't want to start singling out particular types of faculty and positions, just leaving it general
    - d. This would involve national searches, in line with standard university policy
    - e. Voting against is not against MRC faculty, simply means there are two ideas: incorporation, tenure track positions
    - f. Amendment to amendment: strike the word faculty from the end of the amendment
  - 2. Vote on amendment, with amendment: 12 in favor, 3 abstentions, 2 against (amendment passes)
- B. Main motion as amended, 14 in favor, 3 abstentions, 0 against (motion passes)

### IV. Committee Appointments

- A. Michael Trice nominated to University Rank and Tenure Committee
  - 1. Approved with no oppositions and one abstention
- B. Academic Policy Review Committee
  - 1. Need a nomination from the College of Arts and Sciences for AcA confirmation
  - 2. No tenure/track requirement
  - 3. Would help to have some administrative experience or knowledge

- V.** Report on Dean Evaluation College/School Sessions
  - A. College of Nursing
    - 1. Dean made a presentation to college about feedback from the review
    - 2. 47% faculty response in college
    - 3. Described process, survey scores, interpretation, and spoke to areas of success and improvement
    - 4. Nursing as a profession is used to a dispassionate review of performance and review of outcomes, but even given that, the process was difficult
    - 5. Ended with summary of take-home points with specific goals defined
    - 6. Disparities noted between the feedback the dean received and her perception of her function – spent quality time discussing this, very important to the college to have this discussion
    - 7. Also discussed the instrument itself, the modeling, and improvements on the pilot
  - B. College of Arts and Sciences
    - 1. Dean was open to the feedback
    - 2. Many faculty were critical of the process, particularly that the dean and provost chose who to include on targeted interviews
  - C. College of Education
    - 1. Relatively small number of faculty, four out of 35 (and ten staff)
    - 2. Happened too early in the morning for faculty in a graduate college teaching mostly in afternoon and evening
    - 3. Dean feedback was good, process was generally good but there also was an issue with the dean choosing their own interviews
  - D. Next step, Frank Shih will share some general documents from the process with AcA to begin discussion of pilot process and proposed changes
- VI.** Executive Session