

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

MINUTES

Present: Sarah Bee, Pat Buchsel, Terri Clark, Carlos de Mello e Souza, Bob Dullea, Theresa Earenfight, Chris Granatino, Mike Huggins, Charles Lawrence, Emily Lieb, Viviane Lopuch, Agnieszka Miguel, David Neel, Michael Ng, Tracey Pepper, Trung Pham SJ, Colette Taylor, Charles Tung, Ashli Tyre

Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes

- I. Review of 10-31-16 Minutes
 - A. Approved with no oppositions and three abstentions
- II. University Assessment Committee (*David Carrithers, Bob Duniway, Jeff Philpott, Sophia Sansone, Tim Wilson*)
 - A. Overview
 - 1. UAC is a subcommittee of AcA
 - 2. Presentation of assessment results from 2013-14 and 2014-15, challenges, and proposal
 - 3. ULOs 2 and 3 were assessed by the UAC
 - B. Assessment of ULO 2
 - 1. Assessment based on the annual assessment reports provided by academic programs across the university
 - 2. Programs are required to assess all of the learning objectives at least once each over a five year period
 - 3. UAC compiles the results of those assessments on a yearly basis
 - C. Assessment of ULO 3
 - 1. Used assessment reports from academic programs, and data from Student Development and Campus Ministry
 - 2. Report on the attempted assessment
 - 3. Challenges
 - a. Voluntary participation in co-curricular activities
 - b. How to integrate the use of program level assessment data from annual reports with standardized data collected through student surveys
 - D. Proposal to AcA
 - 1. UAC will review challenges and questions and develop recommendations and options to address them
 - 2. Recommendations of possible solutions and options will be presented to AcA for consideration later this year
 - E. AcA representatives should go back to their college/school and programs/departments to let them know about what is happening with UAC and assessment, and then bring forward challenges, concerns, successes, etc. to UAC
 - F. Discussion
 - 1. First time that UAC has assessed ULOs broadly across the university, issue is arising that many of the ULOs cannot be addressed only via departmental assessment – will be an ongoing conversation
 - 2. Difficult to assess co-curricular programming widely due to the boutique nature of many programs

3. The more spiritual, social justice outcomes can be addressed from areas of the Core, but cannot be covered fully
 4. Some areas of the undergraduate education are not covered by Core (transfer students, MRC students, Honors students)
 5. UAC needs time to frame some of these issues and present possible ways forward
 6. Difference between education and formation, some of these ULOs try to articulate both
- III. Student Code of Conduct (*Michele Murray*)**
- A. Proposed revisions to Demonstrations Policy, in Code of Student Conduct
 1. Code of Conduct is statement of university's community standards
 - a. Reflects Jesuit Catholic identity
 - b. Personal accountability
 - c. Respect for common good
 - d. Regard for safety and well-being
 - e. Maintain atmosphere conducive to study, work, and live together
 2. Annual review minimally with input from students, faculty, staff
 - a. Led by Dean of Students
 - b. Involves local experts and also broad representation from campus
 - B. Demonstrations Policy (section 4.8)
 1. Protects right to free expression
 2. Outlines university's responsibility to indicate time, place, and manner
 3. Upholds three principles: protect health and safety, maintain regular business and operations, respect property
 - C. Rationale for Updates
 1. Locate pertinent policies in one place
 2. Increase clarity and eliminate ambiguity
 3. Align with procedures language
 4. Be consistent with other Jesuit institutions
 - D. Discussion
 1. The 48 hour requirement to notify of the demonstration and the designated location both seem like bureaucratic control mechanisms
 2. The space between the library and student center is the one most commonly used by students already
 3. Most campuses do have a designated protest space
 4. Conversation with SGSU showed that the policy revision group is more ad hoc than it should be, recommend AcA requests more representatives on that group
 5. Language has a few statements of what students can do and many more sentences of what they cannot do, may want to focus on more positive language
 6. In extenuating circumstances, such as the MRC protest this past spring, the students should not face disciplinary measures for protest
 7. Faculty need to be included and notified about how this happens and is going to play out – Dean of Students should be part of the regular group formation
- IV. Administrator Evaluation Update (*Kathleen La Voy*)**
- A. Following the work started last year, a new, smaller committee was formed
 - B. Work is consistent with the Faculty Handbook requirement of administrator evaluation every three years
 - C. Three shared truths: Jesuit community, academic community, place of employment
 - D. Proposed timeline
 1. Develop and articulate goals and decide on instrument this quarter

2. Seek feedback in winter quarter
 3. Pilot with Arts and Sciences, Nursing, Education in the spring
 4. Use return data to roll out fully next year
- E. Discussion
1. Assessment should provide a venue to hear feedback from faculty and staff, work should be understood as part of a larger feedback process, clarity on formative versus summative assessment
 2. Still discussing where the results will go and how they will be used
 3. Currently the process will focus on Dean evaluation, but may expand in the future to include other administrators
- V. Committee on Bullying
- A. The work on the subcommittee ended in confusion, focus shifted from faculty to students
 - B. There are many systems in place to handle collegiality issues, so the purpose of the committee was unclear
 - C. Grievance committee does not currently work well, this might be an area to improve instead
 - D. Pat will contact the committee and bring a report with recommendations of how to move forward to AcA