

Academic Assembly
December 3, 2018
2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 130

MINUTES

Present: Felipe Anaya, Sarah Bee, Pat Buchsel, Terri Clark, Mark Cohan, Marc Cohen, Cayla Duckworth, Ben Howe, Naomi Hume, Nalini Iyer, Kate Koppelman, Kathleen La Voy, Shane P. Martin, Agnieszka Miguel, Ben Miller, Russ Powell, Frank Shih, Greg Silverman, AJ Stewart, Colette Taylor, Mark Taylor, Kirsten Thompson

Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes

- I. Review of 11-19-18 Minutes
 - A. 12 approve, 0 oppose, 5 abstain
- II. Provost Update
 - A. Goal to help university leadership focus on AcA as the elected voice of the faculty
 - B. Gender Equity Committee related to athletic programs and Title IX compliance
 1. Request for two faculty members' participation will come to AcA
 - C. Dean of the Library proposing a limited term task force on the increasing cost of textbooks
 1. Will examine alternatives such as textbook reserves, open sharing, previous editions
 2. Co-chaired by Dean of the Library and a faculty member
 3. Request for faculty representatives and a faculty co-chair will come to AcA
- III. Online Course Pilot/Future Process Proposal
 - A. PRC has reviewed and forwarded two motions
 1. Motion 1 to approve the pilot of two courses each (Core Module III and College of Arts and Sciences), one in WQ19 and one in SQ19
 2. Motion 2 to endorse the Provost to convene a task force to examine the long term questions and concerns surrounding online courses
 - B. Discussion
 1. Assessment
 - a. Need to resolve the report-back process of the assessment of the pilot program
 - b. Should be assessing online education with the expertise and guidance of CDLI
 - c. Assessing the design of a course is very different than the assessment of achievement of learning outcomes once it is rolled out
 - d. CDLI has had historical issues with the undergraduate, graduate, and doctoral pedagogy being different
 - e. Plans in place to assess the pragmatic piece of the pilot program – will survey target population, faculty members of the pilot courses
 - f. Also building a tool to assess the learning outcome achievement of students in the Core courses – tricky due to courses being different in title and content, but the same in learning outcomes
 2. General online concerns
 - a. Many Core courses are taught by NTT faculty and others concerned about job security, concern with being forced to teach online courses and not having the front end lead time necessary to develop online courses
 - b. Sense among faculty that graduate education is not supported as well as undergraduate when it comes to online

- c. Unclear what data supports the assertion that going online will boost enrollments
 - d. Marketing piece is very important for online – will this be supported institutionally?
 - e. Evaluation structure will have to change when moving to online pedagogy so that it does not affect APR process unfairly
3. Driving issues for Core and A&S pilot
 - a. Transfer students have a hard time graduating on time, especially with the scheduling issues surrounding in person courses and summer term – online would be very helpful for these students
 - b. Not replacing other approaches, this pilot is an addition to existing tools to support student success
 - c. The limited scope of the pilot is to immediately answer the needs of Nursing students in clinicals that are often on adjacent days and don't match with our block teaching schedules
 - d. Classes will only have a maximum of half nursing students to maintain diversity of students in different majors
 4. Positives to online
 - a. Beneficial to students who work, commute, have families, internships, etc.
 - b. Flexibility of online can attract students on the fence about attending
 - c. Anecdotally, feedback for online courses is comparable to face to face
 - d. Students should graduate with experience of how to be an online learner, in a thoughtful and mediated way
 - e. Helpful for students with accessibility issues
 5. Course caps
 - a. CDLI recommends a cap of 25 for online courses, we must be emphatic with these course caps
 - b. The 30 cap in the pilot proposal is to stay comparable to in person courses in the Core Module II and III
 - c. Core Executive Committee is keeping course caps in their discussion of a long term policy in the Core for online learning
 - d. Raises the question of what Module III is in the Core – the structure of the Core is a part of this issue in a larger sense
 6. Larger questions for task force to consider
 - a. How will faculty be evenly compensated across the university when moving to online?
 - b. Need to think about the roll out and training processes, and the effect on faculty of all ranks
 - c. Variability within colleges is comparable to the variability across the university, must be taken into consideration
- C. Vote
1. Motion 1: Approve two related proposals from the Core and CAS to conduct pilot studies of changes in instructional delivery method from face-to-face to online of two courses each
 - a. 18 approve, 0 oppose, 0 abstain
 2. Approve and support the development of a Task Force to study the implications and plan strategically for any significant scale-up of online learning at SU
 - a. 18 approve, 0 oppose, 0 abstain
- IV. Sociology Program Review
- A. Motion to approve PRC memo

1. Well written, challenges are clearly outlined
 2. Recommendations were in alignment with the program review
- B. Discussion
1. Process was delayed in part due to the external reviewer, so in many ways the program has moved beyond some of the recommendations
 2. Planning with Career Services to do the appropriate professional development work
 3. Definitely need another faculty line, problematized by having a colleague move back into the department from administration
 4. Strengthening community engagement is a methodological priority and would be an area of hiring
 5. Have not yet developed 1000 level courses recommended by Dean, ongoing work
- C. Vote to suspend one week voting rule
- a. 15 approve, 0 oppose, 0 abstain
- D. Vote to approve PRC memo
- a. 14 approve, 0 oppose, 1 abstain
- V. University Rank and Tenure Committee Appointment Confirmations
- A. Process
1. URTC alternates between candidates who are appointed by the President (and Provost), or Academic Assembly appointments
 2. Upon termination of Presidential appointment, successor is appointed by AcA
 3. Upon termination of AcA appointment, successor is appointed by President
 4. Also includes two at large appointments
 5. URTC chair invited Deans to submit candidates to AcA
 - a. Albers process included a faculty vote
 - b. CSE process came directly from the Dean
- B. Discussion
1. One of the most important university committees
 2. Process differences between colleges is problematic, should include faculty input
 3. Related to the ongoing AcA college handbook/minimum governance discussion
 4. Need to be clear on the terms of office for each of these positions – should be listed on the website
 5. Usually at large is not reserved to a particular part of the institution
 6. Need to appropriately look at the entire committee structure, any and all academic committees should be under the purview of the AcA, with a clear charge and membership
 7. The timing of this vote is rushed and feels like AcA is backed against a wall with not enough time to appropriately consider and ask questions
 8. Some faculty were not considered for nomination based upon tenure status, which can be a diversity issue
- C. Motion to confirm ASB candidate Dave Arnesen
1. Vote: 17 approve, 0 oppose, 0 abstain
- D. Discussion of CSE candidate
1. Term of office should be four years
 2. Term of office for all committee members is unclear
 3. Status as position as college representative or at large is not clear
 4. If this term is indeed at large, this nomination does not meet the process
 5. Delay vote until we clarify the position
 6. Could propose to appoint for this year with a goal to revise the process

- 7. Nominations should not arrive to AcA so late, with no time to discuss
 - E. Motion to table a final vote on appointment until we have clarification on the nature of the appointment
 - 1. Vote: 15 approve, 0 oppose, 1 abstain
 - F. AcA will discuss the Committee on Committees next quarter
- VI.** School/College Level Governance
- A. A motion on minimum college governance expectation was put forth last year and tabled
 - B. AcA leadership will work with the Provost's office to consider a reset of this motion, taking into account the AcA discussion from last year