Academic Assembly  
March 14, 2016  
2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 130

MINUTES

Present: Patricia Buchsel, Terri Clark, Isiaah Crawford, Lynn Deeken, Carols de Mello e Souza, Bill Ehmann, Leticia Guardiola-Saenz, Arun Iyer, Charles Lawrence, Margit McGuire, Carrie Miller, David Neel, Michael Ng, Trung Pham SJ, Katherine Raichle, Rob Rutherford, John Strait, Dan Washburn

Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes

I. Review 3-7-16 Minutes  
   A. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions

II. Proposed Programs/Revision  
   A. Master of Science in Mechanical Engineering (Mike Quinn, Teodora Shuman)  
      1. Overview  
         a. Leadership focus, including management courses, with broad appeal to diverse engineering workforce  
         b. Flexible program structure with mostly non-sequential courses can fit working professional student’s schedule  
         c. Endorsed by college institutional advisory board  
      2. Discussion  
         a. Students with non-ME undergraduate background will take prerequisites to meet entry requirements for graduate-level ME courses  
         b. Faculty hiring sequence  
            i. Current ME faculty will teach in new program  
            ii. Proposal does include a request for one new tenure track position  
            iii. Dean will support hiring two full time instructors to begin program and reevaluate tenure track line once program is established  
         c. Accreditation body (ABET) does not require more than one degree within a program to be accredited, so the new MSME will not be accredited (standard practice in MS Engineering degrees)  
         d. Strong undergraduate program, good pipeline of students  
      3. AcA Discussion  
         a. Unclear how the non-tenure track line will convert to a tenure track line  
            i. Concern that non-tenure track faculty will contribute to growth of program and then not be hired into tenure track line  
            ii. Previous searches at SU that have a similar situation typically result in a non-tenure track faculty member being hired into the position (not always, but often)  
            iii. Seems to be a common issue when starting new programs, AcA should discuss faculty hiring processes and communication in the future  
         b. Concern from the college curriculum committee that in recent years the promised tenure track growth within new programs does not happen on the timeline approved in the program proposals  
         c. Concern that there is a drift of tenure track faculty to graduate programs, leaving undergraduate faculty heavily non-tenure track
d. Motion to adopt the PRC report – approved with no oppositions or abstentions

B. Master in Public Administration Revision and Certificate in Public Administration (Larry Hubbell)
   1. MPA Revision
      a. Credits increase from 54 to 57, minor adjustment to proportion of core courses and area of emphasis to better align program with accreditation standards, two specializations: government and non-profit
      b. Discussion
         i. Concern with the onsite supervision of capstone project coordinators
         ii. Instead of final paper, more consistent with mission to do a series of group projects (non-profits and government agencies) involving research and literature review – will take more time to plan and support but program is prepared to do so
   2. New Certificate in Public Administration
      a. Four courses, 12 credits
      b. Hybrid model using required core courses in MPA program
      c. Could be an entry portal for students who may be interested in full MPA or other graduate programs
      d. Marketing analysis showed this would be a popular option in local market
      e. No additional resources requested, capacity open in current core courses
      f. Same admissions standards as full MPA degree
   3. Motion to accept PRC report – approved with no abstentions or oppositions

III. Academic Policies (Erin Morgan)
   A. Transfer Credit Policy
      1. Overview of edits
         a. Language – no longer distinguish type of institution, now lower division and upper division credit types
         b. Remove section about returning SU students using SU credit as transfer credit
         c. Add section E3 allowing students to transfer credits back to community or technical college
         d. Modified areas around the Core credits
      2. Discussion
         a. Only applies to undergraduate degree transfer students, graduate section modified very minimally with input from Graduate Education Council
         b. Credit for ESL is not accepted, but we do accept credits from foreign institutions
         c. Does not apply to School of Law
         d. Section 2B5 – prior experiential learning is handled through CDLI
         e. Motion to approve changes to policy – approved with no abstentions or oppositions
   B. Non-Petitionable Policies
      1. Removed two sections in policy that are now covered by Transfer Credit Policy
      2. Motion to approve changes to policy – approved with no abstentions or oppositions

IV. ASAP 2.0 Discussion
   A. Overview
      1. ASAP 1.0 was in place 2009-2014
      2. ASAP 2.0 development was led by Bill Ehmann and Carol Wolfe-Clay (A&S) and a group of 19 faculty, staff, and students to review 1.0 and propose revised/new goals
         a. Five goals, 22 initiatives supporting goals
         b. Endorsed by Academic Affairs subcommittee of Board of Trustees
c. Will eventually want schools/colleges to develop their own documents to align
   d. This executive summary also has a companion process document that lays out
      benchmarks, after process is complete the full set of documents will come to AcA

B. Motion to approve – approved with no oppositions or abstentions

V. Executive Session

VI. Pilot: Administrator Performance Evaluation
   A. Overview
      1. Will apply to Deans and Provost
      2. Hope to implement this spring
      3. Will include University Librarian in the future
   
   B. Process
      1. College or school faculty would form a committee to complete evaluation at that level
      2. Evaluation sheet with limited questions
      3. Confidentiality would be on the same level of University Rank and Tenure Committee