

Academic Assembly

April 9, 2012

2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 130

MINUTES

Present: Dave Arnesen, Brenda Broussard, Mary Rose Bumpus, Carol Wolfe Clay, Isiaah Crawford, Karen Feldt, Paul Fontana, Terry Foster, Sonora Jha, William Kangas, Kristi Lee, Michael Matriotti, Sean McDowell, Rob Rutherford, Mary Sepulveda, Chris Stipe, Jeremy Stringer, John Weaver, Katie Wieliczekiewicz (ASSU).

Excused: Charles Lawrence, Jacquelyn Miller, Jason Wirth.

Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes.

- I. Review of 3-26-12 Minutes
 - A. Add item IV.D. 6: Adding an Ombusperson office would have a positive effect on campus culture.
 - B. Change typo to Seton Hall.
 - C. Approved with changes.
- II. Philosophy Program Review (*Guests: Burt Hopkins, David Powers*)
 - A. Department serves all undergraduate students through the Core.
 - B. Concerns that were raised in the memo came directly from the external review.
 - C. One point of clarification to memo. There is a concern stated about faculty voting by proxy via email.
 1. Department bylaws state that faculty can vote via email if they are excused away. Has not been difficult to have meetings.
 2. Was a concern stated by external reviewer, but can be removed if the department does not view it as an issue.
 - D. Correction: on the first page, there are 13 full time [add] “tenured and tenure-track” faculty.
 - E. Salary for class is moving up quite a bit with market equity work.
 - F. There is the issue of very limited office space.
 1. Overcrowding, especially during finals.
 2. Space in Broadway is problematic for space and safety. Moving to the Rianna building this summer, which will be an improvement.
 3. Space is a university-wide issue that is being handled systematically. ASAP prioritized science building, but a second academic space is also on the list.
 - G. The 10 contract faculty are all on renewable one-year contracts.
 1. Doing three-year reviews for these faculty, including two recent peer reviews.
 2. Facing challenges within the new Core. The sections of Module 1 staffed by philosophy will impact contracts.
 3. In A&S, 60% tenured and tenure-track lines is a standing priority across departments.
- III. Discussion of Philosophy Program Review

- A. Recommendation 5 should more specifically address salary and office space.
 - B. Delete the “voting by proxy” phrase from Recommendation 6.
 - C. Market equity study included contract professors to bring them up to competitive salaries.
 - D. Full time contract faculty do not attend department meetings and do not get to vote. Perhaps address this as a Concern and then make a Recommendation to include full time faculty who are not tenured/tenure-track in department meetings.
 - 1. Explore different models of departmental meeting participation for Faculty Handbook development. Add to future agenda.
 - 2. Participation in faculty governance can be viewed as a kind of service, but departmental discussions are not service.
 - E. Memo approved with edits discussed.
- IV.** Vote on LMS Recommendation
- A. Recommendation was unanimously endorsed by Deans’ Council.
 - B. AcA vote – unanimously approved.
 - C. The FTC/ATC will present the proposal to the President and E-team.
 - D. Continued discretion about the preference list.
- V.** Announcements
- A. Two AcA appointments still need to be made.
 - 1. Graduate SEP
 - 2. Accreditation Committee
 - B. People need to start thinking about AcA officers and subcommittee appointments for next year.
 - 1. AcA will receive the master list of necessary appointments by next meeting.
 - 2. The goal is for subcommittees to be fully staffed by fall so there is no delay.
 - 3. President and Vice President of AcA are rewarding positions to learn about the university, attend Board of Trustee meetings, and meet with the Provost monthly.
 - 4. Vice President is also chair of Faculty Handbook Revision Committee and Program Review Committee.
- VI.** Core Updates (*Guest: Jeff Philpott*)
- A. Faculty members are designing new Core courses.
 - 1. The CCC (Core Curriculum Committee) is vetting the courses through ad-hoc subcommittees.
 - 2. On track to having all first year courses in place by June 30.
 - B. Departments will know in early summer how many sections they will be offering under the new Core in Fall 13 so that they can proceed with budget planning.
 - C. The Transfer Core is very close to completion.
 - 1. Do no harm principle.
 - 2. Overall goal is to meet learning objectives, with formal documents forthcoming.
 - D. Between Spring 13 registration and Fall 13 preregistration, SU will switch to new Core registration.
 - E. Ongoing administrative issues: cross-listing, SUOnline, registration, etc.
 - F. Category Proposal

1. New Core has requirement that Module I and Module III courses must be in different disciplines.
 - a. This requirement has caused significant difficulties with the software capabilities currently in place.
 - b. UCIC is enforcing as approved. Not the charge of the committee to modify language.
2. Rather than relying on specific disciplines, proposal to develop four broad categories for sorting purposes only.
 - a. Category name is to ensure the breadth of the initial sort. Not an attempt to define or advertise courses.
 - b. Simplifies program evaluation. Allows enforcement through the prerequisite system as opposed to the program requirement system. Doesn't have to influence the degree audit system.
 - c. Way to meet requirement for diversity, but do it in a way that is manageable for the systems that we have (SUOnline, Datatel, Registrar's office).
3. Don't want faculty members to design courses to fit into categories.
 - a. Develop the course they want to teach without reference to category.
 - b. Then the sorting committee (CCC) will put them into categories.
 - c. For future courses, faculty can request a certain category.
- G. From student perspective, students need the simplicity to be able to understand the new Core and the transition. Very beneficial for student planning and advisors, especially when presented as a prerequisite.
- H. There are issues with using a content descriptor to describe categories. AcA would like to follow up to look at specific language to see if it might be tweaked to make the language easier to work with.
 1. AcA cannot modify language without slowing down the process.
 2. If we open up any aspect of what was vetted and approved by the Board of Trustees, it could have serious negative implications for the timeline of the new Core.
 3. Suggestion to move forward with this experiment, which will be assessed as it is implemented. Changes can be made if we run into serious problems.