

Academic Assembly

January 11, 2016

2:05 – 3:35pm

MINUTES

Present: Sarah Bee, Rick Block, Pat Buchsel, Terri Clark, Arun Iyer, Kate Koppelman, Charles Lawrence, Viviane Lopuch, Margit McGuire, Carrie Miller, David Neel, Michael Ng, Erik Olsen, Katherine Raichle, Rob Rutherford, Frank Shih, Heath Spencer, John Strait, Dan Washburn

Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes

- I. Review 11-30-15 Minutes
 - A. Approved with no oppositions and one abstention
- II. University Honors Program Revision Proposal (*Sean McDowell and David Powers*)
 - A. Overview
 1. Goals of revision
 - a. Update the existing rigorous undergraduate program (first two years, students taken in place of the Core)
 - b. Integrate the University and Core Honors tracks together
 - c. Create a third “track” spread over three years to provide flexibility for the scheduling and program requirement constraints of students in Engineering, Nursing, and some Albers programs
 2. PRC had general concerns with scheduling, especially for those students in the programs listed above, and so PRC requested implementation updates in one and two years
 - B. Discussion with program representatives
 1. Honors program agrees with recommendations in regard to scheduling – for program to work well, must communicate and coordinate closely with credit-intensive majors
 2. Suggestion from program to modify implementation updates to include third and fourth years for more robust data
 3. Suggestion for program to contact Rich LeBlanc about how ERP could be implemented in the rollout of program
 4. Tracks are already diverse, will change somewhat with this revision but also try to make sure that each cohort has a sense of integration and identity
 - C. AcA Discussion
 1. Discussion
 - a. Concern with lack of communication between University Honors and the Core in regard to integrating Core Honors into program revision – concern that we are expanding the number of students who do not take the Core (larger question of whether Honors students are effectively integrated into the student body and treated exclusively)
 - b. Question about Western focus of Honors curriculum is an ongoing discussion within University Honors and amongst students – disconnect of language describing program and what is actually taught
 - c. Worried about diversity of student population and diversity of curriculum (focus on “great books”)
 2. Helpful to present motions to modify, approve, or reject instead of abstract discussion
 3. Motion to shift the dates of review to the third and fourth years of implementation

- a. More timely updates were requested due to the historical issues with accommodating schedules of students in the credit-intensive majors
 - b. Withdrawal of motion
 - 4. Proposed edit to memo, add to third bullet point, *“Further, the PRC recommends that the Spring 2017 review include a report from Honors faculty addressing both the diversity of the University Honors cohort as well as the academic diversity of the program—including an analysis of how effectively the program and its curriculum critiques Eurocentrism.”*
 - 5. Motion to close debate
 - a. 12 approve, 5 oppose – debate closed
 - 6. Motion to approve memo with above edit
 - a. 13 approve, 4 oppose – edited memo approved
- III. Faculty Appointments
 - A. University Academic Policy Committee needs a co-chair and faculty members
 - 1. Significant workload
 - 2. Margit McGuire will volunteer as co-chair
 - 3. Position is interim until Faculty Senate committee model is in place
 - B. University Sponsored Academic Program curriculum committee needs a chair
 - 1. Not a major workload
 - 2. Rob Rutherford will volunteer
 - C. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions
- IV. Executive Session