

Academic Assembly
May 22, 2017
2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 130

MINUTES

Present: Sarah Bee, Rick Block, Pat Buchsel, Brooke Coleman, Leticia Guardiola-Saenz, Mike Huggins, Kate Koppelman, Viviane Lopuch, Agnieszka Miguel, David Neel, Michael Ng, Erik Olsen, Frank Shih, John Strait, Ashli Tyre, Charles Tung, Dan Washburn, Braden Wild, Tina Zamora

Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes

- I. Review of 5-8-17 Minutes
 - A. Add item 2.A.4.b. “Chuck will inquire about having more of an online process for the new Incomplete policy”
 - B. Approved with above edit, with no oppositions and one abstention
- II. Core Assessment Results (*Kate Koppelman and Susan Meyers*)
 - A. Overview
 1. The new Core has been in place for a few years and we are now able to identify patterns via assessment of how it is functioning
 2. Feedback from faculty to Core Assessment Committee
 - a. Much of the Core outcomes language is not assessable – for example, the second global engagement outcome
 - b. May be moving toward revising the Core learning outcomes
 - B. Discussion
 1. Rubrics
 - a. Reflection and reflective-based writing has been the most challenging outcome to assess so far, and it is difficult to find decent rubric models for this
 - b. For the global engagement outcome, do not see a mention of understanding of student’s own impact on global communities on the rubric
 - c. Rubrics are meant to be broad enough to accommodate differences in discipline, etc.
 - d. Intended to articulate what we hope is happening across the courses, without being overly prescriptive
 - e. Tools for faculty to use and augment within an understanding of maintaining general standards
 2. Core Assessment Committee report
 - a. These are qualitative, not quantitative, reports
 - b. After these results are finalized, the Core can begin to give examples of what a good assessable model of each course looks like
 - c. Courses may need to be on a recertification schedule, require a new syllabus
 - d. Concern with uniformity aspects of this exercise, don’t want to be overly prescriptive
 - e. Norming sessions can be valuable for faculty to reflect through examples on how and why they design and grade as they do
 - f. At the point in the Core where we want to know what faculty are actually doing – very complicated structure

- g. Conversations between people from different disciplines teaching the same course lead to breakthrough moments of understanding
- h.
- i.

III. AcA Officer Elections

A. President

- 1. Two nominees: Frank Shih and Margit McGuire
- 2. Frank: goals to have tangible accomplishments and expand the use of Canvas
- 3. Ask both nominees to prepare a written statement for our final meeting in two weeks

B. Vice Presidents

- 1. Hope to have PRC VP continue with Terri
- 2. Perhaps invite whoever isn't elected as President to serve as VP

IV. Review of AcA Priorities

A. Motion: request that Provost end GPA-based student awards and scholarships unless and until unequal grading patterns are addressed in a systematic way (either in adjusting the criteria for the awards/scholarships or by regularizing or statistically-adjusting campus-wide grading patterns.)

B. Motion: Request that the Provost and VP for Institutional Effectiveness jointly create a Committee on Just and Proper Use of Data, staffed with at least three faculty. Said committee can then function to evaluate and improve internal and external institutional uses of data, as well as set up reporting mechanism available to students, staff, and faculty.

1. Discussion

- a. The Law School instituted mandatory grade curve and that has caused some issues – cannot give all good grades even if all students did well
- b. Second to motion, request to constitute the committee
- c. Part of this is to act as a clearing house for examples of the issues and then investigate if necessary
- d. Should also include a student voice – can either include that in writing or suggest it later on to Provost
- e. David will create a straw poll online and then vote at next meeting

C. Part time faculty representatives, perhaps move to two year AcA terms

- 1. Part of having the one year appointment is because part time non-tenure track faculty may not know if they will be here for longer than one year
- 2. Perhaps have an option for a second year
- 3. Continue to think about these options

D. Motion: Academic Assembly requests that the Provost instruct all schools/colleges to review their bylaws and/or handbook . If such bylaws/handbook does not exist, the Dean and faculty of a school shall collaboratively form a bylaws/handbook committee (consisting of at least three members and composed of at least 66% non-administrative faculty members) for the development of such a document, which shall take effect only when approved by 2/3 majority vote of the faculty of that school/college, followed by approval of the AcA and Provost. The deadline for formation of the committee is September 30, 2017. The deadline for submitting a draft to the vote of the faculty of the school/college is April 30, 2018.

E. Motion: AcA requests that the Provost instruct schools/colleges currently without bylaws and without a handbook, that the most recent previous set of bylaws/handbook shall take effect until such a time as new bylaws/handbook can be formed and approved. If no such documents have ever existed, the deadlines outlined above shall be moved forward to: [discretion of Provost].

1. Discussion
 - a. May be called a faculty code, not handbook, in some schools/colleges
 - b. Require handbooks to meet the university handbook standard, can be more strict but not less – also needs to be mentioned explicitly in university faculty handbook
 - c. These school/college handbooks should include processes for shared governance
 - d. David will modify motion language and bring to next meeting
- F. Motion will come forward about Faculty Senate goals for next year
- G. Would like to see a formal response from AcA to the A&S FSS economic reality report
- H. AAOR report was just finished – will discuss at next meeting and overlaps a lot with our priorities
- I. Request for a new salary equity study with an established goal
- J. Motion: Academic Assembly recommends to PRC and Provost that “Maximum Enrollment” [or “Course Cap”] field be added to “New Course Proposal” and “Course Revision” documents. Courses are designed and revised with Learning Outcomes appropriate to certain class sizes. Changes to maximum class size should trigger a new round of review of Learning Outcomes to protect and preserve student learning experience.
 1. This is also covered by the AAOR report
 2. We will discuss at the next meeting
- K. Motion: Though Student Evaluations of Teaching (SET) can provide useful formative information to teachers as practitioners, meta-analyses of students of SET show that such evaluations are racist, sexist, ageist, and ableist. (Reference: FSS analysis from FQ16.) Thus, uncritical inclusion of SET as part of tenure, promotion, and merit-pay processes will pollute those processes with biases against vulnerable populations. Academic Assembly urges the Provost to instruct all schools/colleges to review their procedures to insure that these facts are taken into account during tenure, promotion, and merit-pay processes, and to provide a report back to Academic Assembly on or before December 31, 2017 with updates on this effort.
 1. Perhaps keep numerical data for only instructor, not available to administration
 2. In Core, this is the only access Core Director has on what is happening in Core classes
 3. Discuss at next meeting