

Academic Assembly
April 23, 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, Jan Hartley, Tina Johnson, William Kangas, Chuck Lawrence, Kristi Lee, Michael Matriotti, Sean McDowell, Rob Rutherford, Chris Stipe, John Strait, Jeremy Stringer, John Weaver, Jason Wirth.

Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes.

- I. Minutes from 4-9-12 approved with no corrections.
- II. Appointment to University Accreditation Committee
 - A. Carol Wolfe Clay nominated.
 - B. Nomination approved unanimously.
- III. Undergraduate Strategic Enrollment Plan (*Guests: Dan Dombrowski and Marilyn Crone*)
 - A. SU is a tuition dependent institution (over 90% of revenue from tuition and fees).
 1. In the past, admitted more undergrads to solve financial needs.
 2. Now we have personnel and facility limitations.
 - B. Undergraduate SEP Recommendation: SU grow its freshman population 885 to 975, and transfer population from 450 to 500 over 5 years (modest growth).
 1. Meet the needs of the university as a whole and address the needs of specific groups closely tied into enrollment.
 2. SU can grow in alternative ways such as hybrid and online classes, international, graduate, and continuing education.
 3. Provide a model for the way that future processes take place addressing university wide concerns.
 - C. Underlying decisions (undergraduate residence, Masters' comprehensive) for the recommendation were thoroughly considered.
 1. Additional residence facility underlies this plan.
 - a. Phasing out triple efficiencies (room built for two and used by three).
 - b. Need 400 beds by 5 year timeframe.
 - D. Future Work
 1. Survey on (undergraduate and graduate) student feedback to ticket price, merit and need based awards, marketing, financial aid awards. The results will have implications for pricing, award strategies, etc. for fall 2013.
 2. Position approved for coordination of retention activities using improved technology and connecting across campus to produce usable data.
 3. Improvements in Alumni Relations, Study Abroad, Enrollment, Adult Learners, Transfer Students.
 - E. AcA Discussion of Undergraduate SEP Updates
 1. Non-traditional student category includes veterans.
 2. Goal to increase academic admissions requirements, but at a moderate pace.
 3. Need to better advertise emphasis on academic excellence.
 - a. Brand study in process.
 - b. MarComm will increase emphasis on academic excellence. Stories in SU publications about academic matters, research interest of faculty, etc.

- c. This spring, SU will send out the university's first glossy publication about faculty research and publication.
 - i. Will go to US News and World Reports recipients (Chief Academic Officers).
 - ii. Also use to distribute to visitors and others.

IV. Updated International Travel Safety Policy (*Guest: Victoria Jones*)

- A. Concern that increased time commitments and responsibilities for the faculty directors of study abroad programs may discourage their participation.
 - 1. For faculty, nothing has changed.
 - 2. The change is that the policy now applies to Mission & Ministry, Student Development, and other non-faculty leaders of student groups. Travel safety training is now required of all programs with international travel.
 - 3. Faculty member is only required to provide site-specific training.
- B. How to travel to countries that have a State Department Travel Warning.
 - 1. The policy is to not travel to those countries.
 - 2. To lead a study abroad in those countries, use the appeal process/procedure in place to show students and parents that all of the safety concerns were considered in order to grant an exception to the policy.
 - 3. Standing committee reviews requests, ad-hoc is convened if necessary, and then final decision is made by the provost.
- C. Safety incidents involving alcohol.
 - 1. SU keeps track of all safety incidents. Most are traffic incidents, some involve alcohol; both are covered in safety training.
 - 2. May develop a university policy, but ultimately depends on faculty member.

V. Faculty Titles Discussion

- A. Initial Concerns
 - 1. Concern that the Deans' Council will use the faculty titles document for differentiating workloads for non-tenure track faculty members.
 - 2. Confusion about how the 4/7 rule (specifying that no adjuncts would teach more than four courses per year) fits with the faculty titles document.
- B. Deans' Council Updates
 - 1. Conversations about what is necessary within each school/college (tenured, tenure track, adjunct and part time) to deliver curriculum within that school/college.
 - a. Decision is made at the dean level.
 - b. No mandate from Office of the Provost.
 - 2. Took into consideration that there has been a clear and unequivocal recommendation from AcA for many years to have more courses taught by full time faculty, particularly more tenured and tenure track faculty.
 - 3. Tenured and tenure track faculty who are scholarly active teach 6 out of potentially 7 courses in a given year so that they can pursue scholarly, research, and artistic endeavors.
 - a. There are some circumstances where part time faculty are contributing to academic load and teaching four, five, and six courses. This may obscure the need for more full time non-tenure track and full time tenure track faculty positions.
 - b. The dean of each school/college can establish their own limit on number of courses part time faculty can teach.
- C. Senior versus Regular Full-time Non-tenure Track Instructor or Lecturer
 - 1. New categories are Instructor and Lecturer, can be senior in either.
 - a. The standards and criteria by which someone can have the distinction of senior and the associated benefits are to be determined by the school/college.

- b. General level of equity across colleges and schools should be considered, but flexibility in criteria and standards across college/schools should be allowed.
 - 2. Full time, non-tenure track instructor and lecturer appointments do not include expectation for these faculty members to produce research, scholarship or artistic expression; rather, their contributions should be in the areas of course instruction, advising/mentorship of students, and service to the college/school or university.
 - D. Adjunct Faculty Compensation
 - a. Some members of our community worry about the difference in compensation adjunct faculty receive across the university's schools/colleges. The reality is that certain areas of the academy compensate its members at different rates – law, sciences, health specialties are paid at different rates than social sciences, arts, etc.
 - b. Mercer study showed some people who teach 7 courses a year (by piecing together seven part-time course assignments) earn \$24,000.
 - c. Trying to move away from having faculty cobble together course assignments to make a “full time” position. This will help us see our true full time faculty needs. Part time individuals could then apply for those positions.
 - d. The university's first priority was to address the needs of its full time faculty members, and then move attention to part time faculty. The university does intend to look broadly at part time compensation.
 - e. Delay on policy for another year is a dean level decision.
 - E. Relationship of Faculty Titles Document and 4/7 Rule
 - a. Discussion has occurred in the Deans' Council about an upper limit to the number of courses a part-time faculty member can teach in an academic year.
 - i. The establishment of four courses per year as the maximum number was discussed as a possible standard; however, no university-wide policy was established.
 - ii. Schools/colleges have the flexibility to set their own course load maximum policies for their part-time faculty.
 - b. Some part-time faculty members who teach five to six courses a year like that arrangement, as do some schools/colleges because it may serve the unique instructional needs of their academic programs.
 - i. Exploring the possibility of developing “modified full-time appointments” for these unique individuals and circumstances that would create a framework to compensate them on a percentage basis of a full-time appointment as opposed to compensating them on a per part-time course basis.
 - ii. If implemented, an arrangement of this nature would only be considered in the most exceptional and highly needed circumstances.
- VI. Honors Program Review (*Guests: James Risser and David Powers*)**
- A. Statement from program
 - 1. Mission of program fits well with National Honors Society mission.
 - 2. UHP has convened a committee to begin to review and revise program.
 - 3. Some of the program review was done before the new Core development; there have been significant developments since then.
 - B. Concern about UHP course load versus normal course load.
 - 1. After first term, students take 4 credit courses so that they can take a fourth class for math and lab science.
 - 2. Professors are still responsible for the content of a 5 credit course and students are doing 5 credits worth of work.

3. Revision committee is currently addressing this concern.
- C. Graduates from first graduating class will be returning for a reunion in a few months speaks to the strength of the cohort model.
- D. Separate admissions process is complicated but some students only come if accepted into Honors.
- E. AcA Discussion
 1. Lots of small but significant problems that need to be addressed.
 2. Need to look at additional compensation for instructors.
 3. Nursing and sciences are impossible to do in conjunction with Honors in 4 years.
 - a. This gave rise to Core Honors.
 4. Revisions
 - a. Category mistake in Recommendations: not trying to push Honors to map onto the new Core.
 - b. Need to look at the relationship between Core Honors and University Honors in regards to admissions, etc. in order to clarify the distinction to the public.
 5. Memo is approved with revisions.