

Academic Assembly
March 26, 2012
2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 130
MINUTES

Present: David Arnesen, Brenda Broussard, Mary Rose Bumpus, Karen Feldt, Paul Fontana, Terry Foster, Sonora Jha, Tina Johnson, William Kangas, Chuck Lawrence, Kristi Lee, Michael Matriotti, Sean McDowell, Jacquelyn Miller, Mary Sepulveda, Frank Shih, Chris Stipe, Jeremy Stringer, John Weaver, Jason Wirth.

Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes.

- I. Introduction of substitutes Mary Sepulveda (Library) and Frank Shih (Science & Engineering).
- II. Minutes from 3-12-12 approved.
- III. FY13 Budget Update
 - A. Pursuit of academic excellence continues to be the priority at the university.
 - B. Academic Affairs budget highlights.
 1. Promotion of curriculum development.
 2. Expansion of summer programming.
 3. Core pilot coursework starting in Fall 2012, with full implementation in Fall 2013.
 4. Increase in the number of tenure track faculty lines.
 5. CETL and ORSSP funding.
 6. Funding for undergraduate strategic action plan with a retention emphasis.
 7. Development of graduate programming to ensure leadership and a stronger voice for graduate students.
 8. Global Engagement strategic plan funding, including the Nicaragua program.
 9. Implementation of the first University Center of Excellence.
 10. Funding for new LMS.
 11. Faculty market equity funding.
 - C. Over the last 6 years, the Academic Affairs budget has grown 92%.
 - D. Enrollment goal is 7900 for AY2012-13 (stable with this year's number).
- IV. Ombudsperson Discussion (*Guests: Jerry Huffman, Ted Fortier*)
 - A. Mary Peterson will not be a guest as scheduled. John Strait asked Ted Fortier to join the meeting, as Ted put forth the original proposal.
 - B. Purpose of discussion is to determine how the ombudsperson position will fit into the university structure, taking into account all of the changes in policy addressing personnel issues [at the university, school/college, and staff (HR) levels]. Over the last several years, there have been changes made to:
 1. School/college guidelines.
 2. University policies.
 3. HR and Faculty Services.
 4. Faculty handbook processes.
 5. Policies related to Title IX.
 6. Course overload policies.
 7. Training available through HR and CETL for supervisory issues.
 8. Leadership within some schools/colleges.
 - C. Justification for the continued need for an Ombudsperson.

1. Issues that faculty, staff, and students don't feel comfortable addressing within the new structure(s), such as interpersonal difficulties, departmental issues, and other vague situations that the new policies don't necessarily address.
 2. Importance to students.
 - a. The normal chain could lack confidentiality.
 - b. Safe space to discuss, even if claim is incorrect or has no merit.
 - c. Avoid retaliation.
 3. Importance to faculty.
 - a. Navigate policy territory and advise on how to proceed.
 - b. The more detailed the policies become, the greater the need for someone who is an expert to clarify how to proceed.
 - c. Difference between written policy and stated policy.
 - d. Diffuse situations early on before they reach the legal level.
- D. Ted Fortier researched the position at other institutions.
1. All colleagues at Georgetown, DePaul, Marquette, and Seton Hall see their role as one that doesn't replace the university's standard practices but only enhances them.
 2. Advocacy for everyone in the university at all levels.
 3. Develop ongoing methods of collecting impartial data.
 4. Average salary is \$66,000 for full time.
 5. None needed a legal retainer.
 6. The addition of an Ombudsperson office would have a positive effect on the campus culture.
- E. Ethics Hotline (whistle-blower) was implemented a few years ago.
1. Legally responsible to respond ethically.
 2. Required to thoroughly pursue investigation.
 3. Conclusion was that the ethics hotline did not satisfy what an ombudsperson position would, because it lacked confidentiality.
- F. Implementing the position.
1. Clear standards and practices put forth by international ombudsperson association, including diplomacy, mediation, coherence, and communication of policy. These will be heavily relied on for the position formation.
 2. Include Jake Diaz, VP of Student Development, to discuss the issue of making this position available to students. Some universities split the position: faculty/staff and students.
 3. Previously proposed a 3 year contract, which will have to be developed.
 4. Could report to Provost (problematic if conflict of interest). Could report to Mission & Ministry or Executive Vice President. President is focusing externally, so that would not be a good fit.
 5. Development of measurable outcomes will be challenging. Perhaps fewer grievances, faculty retention numbers, a method for annual or semiannual reports.
- V. Graduate Learning Outcomes Revision Draft
- A. Committee members vetted the revised outcomes with faculty at their respective schools/colleges with general approval. All feedback was considered.
 - B. The draft was approved by Deans' Council.
 - C. Written so that students can reach achievement of outcomes without additional Graduate Core or other university programming. Supplemented by each program or school/college.
 - D. Concern that the word mastery in outcome 1 is gendered?
 1. Sonora Jha will check with the Women Studies program director.
 - E. Motion to approve, subject to the update on usage of non-sexist language.

- F. The draft was approved by vote.
- VI. LMS Recommendation (*Guests: Randy Horton, Chuck Porter, Rich LeBlanc*)
 - A. After an 18 month needs analysis process, the FTC/ATC has developed a short list of four Learning Management Systems, with recommendations.
 - 1. Desire2Learn (D2L)
 - 2. Instructure
 - 3. Blackboard "Learn"
 - 4. moodlerooms (was just bought by Blackboard)
 - B. Needs analysis included:
 - 1. Faculty survey
 - 2. Angel Use Analysis
 - 3. Stakeholder Meetings
 - 4. Industry Trends
 - 5. Peer Institutions
 - C. Usability and Performance, Support, and Functionality were the main faculty priorities. Additional features that were important to SU: Architecture and Technical, Budget, Business, Security and Legal.
 - D. Evaluation activities:
 - 1. Faculty Usability Tests
 - 2. Vendor Demos
 - 3. Student Usability Tests
 - 4. Online Sandbox Demos
 - E. Results:
 - 1. Faculty Usability Test was best with Instructure, followed by D2L.
 - 2. Student Usability Test was best with Instructure, followed by either D2L or moodlerooms, lower endorsements for Blackboard.
 - 3. For functionality, Instructure and D2L both rate highly, while Blackboard and moodlerooms were lower.
 - F. Recommendation
 - 1. First Choice Recommendation: Instructure
 - a. Many features above and beyond.
 - b. Gradebook and dropbox functions.
 - c. Video feedback on assignment attached to assignment.
 - d. Online video chat.
 - e. Cloud-hosted, so less downtime.
 - 2. Alternative Recommendation: Desire2 Learn.
 - 3. Deferred judgment on Blackboard.
 - 4. Ruled out moodlerooms.
 - G. Moving Forward
 - 1. Chuck Porter is overseeing the budget and costs, technical, architecture, and legal issues.
 - 2. The goal is to have a decision made by July 1.
 - 3. Pilot courses beginning in Spring 2013, and then bring the full Core online when it is implemented in Fall 2013.
 - 4. AcA will discuss the recommendations and vote on 4-9-12.
 - 5. There will be two open forums for faculty with Q&A around recommendations.