Academic Assembly
January 28, 2019
2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 130

MINUTES

Present: Felipe Anaya, Pat Buchsel, Terri Clark, Mark Cohan, Marc Cohen, Miles Coleman, Clara Cordova, Cayla Duckworth, Charlotte Garden, Ben Howe, Naomi Hume, Nalini Iyer, Kate Koppelman, Kathleen La Voy, Shane P. Martin, Ben Miller, Michael Ng, Frank Shih, Greg Silverman, AJ Stewart, Colette Taylor, Mark Taylor, Kirsten Thompson

Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes

I. Review 1-14-19 Minutes
   A. 13 approve, 0 oppose, 2 abstain

II. Provost Update
   A. Brief Frame of Dean Evaluation
      1. Previous process was piloted and needed improvement
      2. New external consultant is Rose Drummond with Sea Change Partners
      3. Working on a new tool, developed with the inspiration of Santa Clara’s model and including AcA subcommittee feedback
      4. Goal for this to be a continuous improvement process

III. Dean Evaluation (Michelle Clements, Natasha Martin)
   A. Timeline
      1. Originally planned to launch assessment next month, now has been pushed to April/May to give more time for faculty input
      2. Pilot assessment of Cabinet members will take place at the same time
      3. VP for Diversity and Inclusion offers an important perspective to the process
   B. Discussion
      1. In addition of micro-managerial, also need to ask question on big-picture issues (e.g., vision for college)
      2. Level of accountability
         a. Look at leadership impact with stakeholders, both on and off campus
         b. Does not include finite goals such as enrollment and retention of students, although these goals are considered in the performance review done by the Provost
         c. Opportunity with new consultant and instrument to put more focus and discipline into the process and regularize dean evaluation – more systematic, greater clarity and transparency
      3. New instrument
         a. More in line with what we are seeking, will resonate more with constituents, uses terms we are familiar with
         b. Concern with how faculty and staff would fill this out who do not have much (or any) interaction with their dean
         c. Survey, interviews, and key stakeholder feedback will all be incorporated
      4. Reappointment of deans
         a. SU currently lacks a consistent way to evaluate deans for reappointment, has not been done consistently in the past
         b. We need to decide the appropriate cycle (perhaps five years?)
c. Goal to align with faculty handbook dean evaluation cycle (currently three years)

5. Equity
   a. Inequities may be hidden in the evaluation process for deans and other leaders
   b. Would like this to be perceived with credibility within a larger system
   c. How to fine tune instrument to remove hidden bias

IV. Program Review Committee Motions

A. Suspension of four STM programs (Valerie Lesniak, Mark Markuly)
   • Graduate Studies Certificate in Diaconal Ministry-Episcopal
   • Graduate Studies Certificate in Diaconal Ministry: United Methodist
   • MA in Transforming Spirituality
   • MA in Transforming Spirituality/Studies in Spirituality Specialization
   1. Discussion
      a. In the process of re-visioning theological education broadly, beginning with suspensions of the lowest enrolled programs
      b. Website hits were naturally attracted to Spirituality degrees, but then interest shifts to other Masters programs such as Transformational Leadership
      c. New diaconal certification process in churches happened after our certificates came online, do not want to compete with them
      d. Accrediting board for STM is moving toward broader degrees with less specific focus
   2. Motion to waive the seven day motion-to-vote requirement
      a. 18 approve, 0 oppose, 0 abstain
   3. Motion to accept PRC memo recommendation to suspend four programs
      a. 18 approve, 0 oppose, 0 abstain

B. Suspension of Sport Sustainability Leadership Certificate and Master Sport Business Leadership program revision (Maylon Hanold, Madhu Rao)
   1. Discussion
      a. Suggestion to build in a report-back process in the recommendation
      b. In the proposal form for the SSL certificate suspension, impact is noted as minor, but then seems to list several impacts
         i. Was developed as an add-on online with an international student focus
         ii. Designed to be marketed separately, alone, or internationally
         iii. Impact of suspension is increasing the number of electives integrated into the full MSBL program
      c. The certificate is not growing, no more than a few people interested in any given year, enrollment numbers include total students enrolled (not just new) so did not increase as it appears
   2. Vote to approve PRC memo recommendation to suspend certificate and revise program
      a. 17 approve, 0 oppose, 0 abstain

C. New Mechanical Engineering Minor (Mike Quinn, Teodora Shuman)
   1. Discussion
      a. 16 of the 30 credits are cross-listed courses
      b. Will work with program and credit requirements for students in other engineering programs
   2. Vote to approve PRC memo recommendation to approve new minor program
      a. 17 approve, 0 oppose, 0 abstain

D. Restructuring of the Undergraduate Computer Engineering Bachelors programs (Agnieszka Miguel, Mike Quinn)
   • New BS in Computer Engineering
• Termination of the Electrical Engineering Specialization in Computer Engineering
• Revision of the BS in Electrical Engineering

1. Discussion
   a. Far greater capacity in the Electrical and Computer Engineering (ECEGR) program than in Computer Science programs
   b. New major is popular for students who want to blend the hardware of Electrical Engineering and the software of Computer Science, although it does still maintain a hardware focus
   c. Additional equipment expenses – data position devices, computer board, robots, AWS for machine learning have all been worked out within the college
   d. Courses
      i. Can take 3000, but it is a 1 credit class
      ii. Can work with Math or Physics to develop, or go back to 3 credit class

2. Vote on PRC memo to revise current program, approve new program, and terminate specialization
   a. 18 approve, 0 oppose, 0 abstain

E. Two New Criminal Justice Degrees
• New MA in Criminal Justice 4+1 (David Powers, Matt Hickman)
• New BA in Criminal Justice and JD Law 3+3 (also with Annette Clark)

1. Discussion
   a. Strengths
      i. These help make us more affordable and boost recruitment
      ii. Some students may decide to remain in the longer programs and not do the fast track
      iii. Several other Jesuit universities that have 3+3 law degrees, tend to offer it more broadly to other majors
      iv. Law School would certainly be interested in broadening this to other departments, Criminal Justice was the first one to come forward
      v. There are mostly elective credits that are cut out in the “fourth year” – students still take history, humanities, etc.
      vi. There is a fairly new comparable program in Albers (Business to Law 3+3) that is small (2-3 students per year)
      vii. For law school, a good expansion of the pipeline – first year of law school takes the place of the last year of undergraduate

   b. Concerns
      i. Major philosophical question of whether or not advanced students should be able to effectively “skip” a final year of undergraduate education in these combination degrees
      ii. Unknown how financial aid would be affected
      iii. Lack of explanation or strategy for why other humanities majors weren’t considered for this “fast track”
      iv. Matteo Ricci (MRI) degree is effectively a three year BA currently with the fast track from high school credits, concern that this was not considered
      v. With the current financial situation of the university, we need to ask more financial questions about the viability of these kind of combo programs
      vi. Concern with GPA being the only judge of high achieving students before they even get here
vii. Hope that equity issues around using GPA as the only indication of student talent have been addressed

viii. Concern with students who transfer in or don’t know what they want to do first being left behind and not able to join this cost-saving program

2. AcA Discussion
   a. Suggest to put this on hold for further discussion
   b. Concern with internal competition, especially MRI
   c. What would be the effect on departments who offer many electives for the “fourth year” of CJ?
   d. Unclear if these proposals went to a body of chairs and program directors (Executive Committee in A&S) to be considered as part of the college’s strategy

3. Motion: The question of these two degree proposals shall be referred back to the Executive Committee of the College of Arts and Sciences with a request for a written response to AcA on the following:
   • Impact on Matteo Ricci Institute,
   • Equity concerns regarding criteria for admittance,
   • Effect on double majors and minors,
   • Concerns raised in Program Review Committee memos.

   a. Vote on motion
      i. 16 approve, 0 oppose, 0 abstain

V. Faculty Handbook
   A. Deferred to next meeting

VI. Motion on UAC Charter
   A. Deferred to next meeting

VII. Voting Results
   1. MPS Review - Dylan Helliwell, 17 affirmed out of 18 ballots
   2. Academic Technology & Online Education Task Force - Kirsten Thompson 87, Erica Martin 61, Lyn Gualtieri 61, Ben Kim 58, Dylan Medina 44, Andy Kim 34 (Kirsten has AcA’s support to serve as its faculty co-chair)
   3. Textbook Access & Affordability Initiative - Juan Reyes 55, Mark Siegenthaler 43, Greg Mason 35, Rebecca Peltz 35 (Juan has AcA’s support to serve as its faculty co-chair)