Academic Assembly
April 15, 2019
2:05-3:35pm, STCN 130

<u>MINUTES</u>

Present: Pat Buchsel, Terri Clark, Marc Cohen, Mark Cohan, Miles Coleman, Clara Cordova, Arie Greenleaf, Naomi Hume, Nalini Iyer, Kate Koppelman, Kathleen La Voy, Shane P. Martin, Ben Miller, Michael Ng, Mo Sin, Frank Shih, Gregory Silverman, AJ Stewart, Colette Taylor, Mark Taylor, Kirsten Thompson

Minutes taken by Nicole Moses

I. Review 4-1-19 Minutes
    A. 11 approve, 0 oppose, 2 abstain
II. Provost Update
    A. Budget
        1. Prioritize academics in general, i.e. student engagement, faculty and staff development, enrollment
        2. Historical process of reductions and cuts in numerous areas due to lack of efficiencies in budget management – clear need for a process change to holistic planning process taking into account all areas and divisions of the university
        3. Discussion
            a. Concern about inequitable budget reporting structure in schools/colleges (for example, market study survey was only sent to full professors in CSE, which is highest paid, white, male population)
            b. An alternative would be for the market study to be led centrally, by the Provost's Office
            c. Enrollment budget increases include support for online programs (two in Albers and one in Law), advising and student support, and more sections in potential growth areas such as Nursing
    B. Provost's Awards for Faculty
        1. Announcement today that these awards have been placed on hiatus this year, in order to improve the process and criteria moving forward
        2. Currently recognizing teaching and scholarship, will add service to award list
        3. Also looking to add a convocation event for presentations on awarded research
    C. Population of Committees
        1. Develop Committee on Committees, to clarify issues and membership of faculty committees
        2. Review process for population of Rank and Tenure Committee on hold, due to confusion and lack of clarity
        3. Committee on Committees will provide guidance so that URTC can be fully populated by the time their cycle begins November 1
    D. Center for Community Engagement led an excellent event on Community Engaged Teaching, which highlighted the many and important ways this is currently taking place and ideas for the future
III. Bylaws Revision
    A. Comments

1. Revision process was driven by requests and concerns of committee members. First step was to compile list of concerns and requests from members, whether minor or major
2. Bylaws created to be a better reference document for committee members and faculty to have as a resource and capture processes
3. Important to see framework of document and then make edits to content

B. Table of Contents
   1. Outlining the different sections and where items are located in document
   2. Typical table of contents
   3. No major changes

C. Part 2. Purpose
   1. More detailed statement of purpose of bylaws and AcA
   2. No changes

D. Part 3. Authority
   1. Added grant of authority due to comments stating there was lack of authority in original document
   2. Looked to papers and policies of AAUP to see what best practices and policies are
   3. AcA has authority over academic matters
   4. AcA may delegate decision to Deans and Department Chairs, or to subcommittees
   5. Created four points of authority
      a. 3.1 Primary Authority sets our core authority of AcA, anchor of academic program, grounds authority of academic review, process excludes processes about finances, primary responsibility over academic matters
      b. 3.2 Presumption of Deference is generalization of current practice by which the Provost disagrees with AcA, they must respond to assembly in writing
      c. 3.4 Appointment Authority sole authority to appoint faculty members, if faculty is requested for committee or taskforce must come through ACA
   6. Discussion
      a. Authority creates possible red flag for Deans, Department Chairs, or other faculty
      b. In regard to the authority to appoint faculty members, section is missing: Search for President and Provost

E. Part 4. Membership
   1. Language is primarily the same
   2. Added section 4.7 which explains the duties of AcA member
   3. Discussion/Comments
      a. Make explicit categories of different members and involvement
      b. Term for regular member is four years but what about instructors who have two year contracts? Makes it difficult to pitch AcA to adjunct faculty
      c. Suggested that Staff Council member join AcA as an ex-officio member
      d. Create document to flag items for more in-depth discussion on Canvas
      e. Depending how college/school faculty population decreases or increases, colleges/schools may lose or gain a seat
      f. One seat should represent 30 faculty
      g. AcA census will remain at 1 year
      h. Longer terms may contribute to the stability of AcA

F. Part 5. Officers
   1. Discussion/Comments
      a. Must be member of AcA for at least one year before member can run for officer positions

    b. Responsibility of President and Vice President to handle administrative tasks and the running of AcA

    c. Each standing committee needs to submit a yearly report to AcA

    d. Meeting responsibility for AcA executive members, bigger workloads for members might result in difficulty recruiting

    e. How does the work get done between AcA and standing committees?

    f. AcA decides if AcA members can serve on standing committees

  G. Next Steps

    1. Add bylaws review (continued) to next meeting agenda

IV. CAS MRI Seat

  A. Matteo Ricci sees no rationale on having a seat for the remaining year, since they are now a part of CAS

  B. Motion AcA30a: to keep original MRI seat and term length

    1. 0 approve, 17 oppose, 0 abstain

  C. Motion AcA30b: MRI terminates seat at the of 2018-19

    1. 17 approve, 0 oppose, 0 abstain

V. Online Education Taskforce (*Rick Fehrenbacher, Jeff Philpott, Kirsten Thompson*)

  A. Discussion

    1. Divided into subgroups for students and faculty

    2. Survey sent to faculty, questions taken from national survey, data from survey will be available even though low response rate

    3. Have conversation on which schools and departments have accessibility to this information, where does online education make the most sense?

    4. National question reflects that students are taking online and on campus classes, not always exclusively one or the other modality

    5. Stipends for people who are creating these courses are inconsistent across campus

    6. Suggestion to update current online classes for students with accessibility issues rather than creating completely new courses

    7. Issues with attrition rate for online courses need to be addressed in development

    8. Issues with data on student evaluations

      a. Unknown which classes are being compared

      b. Evaluations have been shown to be biased

  B. Taskforce is creating list of questions and concerns, and will bring back an updated report to AcA