

Academic Assembly
January 9, 2012
2:05-3:35pm, STCN 130

MINUTES

Present: David Arnesen, Brenda Broussard, Mary Rose Bumpus, Carol Wolfe Clay, Isiaah Crawford, Karen Feldt, Paul Fontana, Terry Foster, Sonora Jha, Tina Johnson, William Kangas, Andy Kim, Charles Lawrence, Kristi Lee, Michael Matriotti, Sean McDowell, Jacquelyn Miller, Rob Rutherford, Kristen Shuyler, Chris Stipe, Jeremy Stringer, Eric Sype (for Alanna Welsh), John Weaver, Jason Wirth.

Excused: Alanna Welsh.

Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes.

- I. Review of 11-28-11 Minutes
 - A. Minutes approved with no corrections.
- II. Revision of EDLR Program (*Guests: Sue Schmitt, Tana Hasart, Laurie Stevahn, John Gardiner, Jeremy Stringer, Bob Hughes, Charisse Cowan Pitre, Mary Graham, John Chatten-McNichols, Carol Weaver*)
 - A. Summary of Revision
 1. The program was set for review in 2009, and the College of Education (CoE) decided to revise the program instead. The past 3 years have been dedicated to program revision.
 2. The revision includes a substantial change in the governance. Instead of being run by a single department, the program is now governed across CoE.
 3. The revision also includes significant changes in the curriculum structure, including the development of Concentrations in areas across the university.
 - B. Revision Process and Future Plans
 1. Statement from John Strait: Report does not have as much information as AcA would like to have in the future. The Program Review Committee (PRC) of AcA is currently revising the degree revision process.
 2. While there has not been a university program review of EDLR for quite some time, there have been CoE internal reviews consistent with accreditation requirements.
 3. The academic areas of the program that were most revised were the admissions process, the definition of values and beliefs, the areas of curricular application to include general leadership courses (practical study portions of the program), and the research components.
 4. SU's program is positioned to serve a unique niche of working adults engaged in studies of leadership that will lead them to additional career pathways and prepare them to make changes in their program and community at large. Programs at other institutions in the region are

specifically focused on K-12 education or require a general block of study that working professionals cannot attend.

5. There are currently over 80 prospects seeking admission next year. CoE has draft material to provide them, but no set information.
6. The courses themselves have not all been defined, but it is defined where they fit in terms of sequence and scope, so there is very little overlap unless intentional.

C. Response to PRC memo

1. Clarification: page 1, paragraph 3 states that the program was suspended last year. In fact, it was admission to the program that was suspended, not the program itself. Rosa will make the correction to the memo.
2. There is concern over the Concentrations that are based upon courses in other schools/colleges.
 - a. The Concentrations are determined by the other colleges (Nursing, Albers, etc.) and the curriculum will be developed collaboratively.
 - b. Concentration courses are in the budget, but the budget is not comprehensive yet because the other deans haven't had the time to dialogue with their faculty then develop curriculum for the Concentrations.
3. AcA concern about the carbon footprint of the global engagement component.
 - a. Many creative ways to attend to that objective including local immersion and distance learning.
 - b. A broader issue across university.

III. Discussion of EDLR Program Revision

A. Concerns

1. The revision lacks a significant amount of information, in particular concerns with the previous program, definition of Concentrations and the agreements with other schools/colleges, and course syllabi.
2. There was concern from the PRC that even currently, students struggle with getting into classes that they want. The revision lacks clarity about how the cohort program could move through Concentration courses at other schools/colleges.
3. What were the student concerns that led to this revision?
 - a. Students wanted to have a broader and more academically diverse selection of faculty to guide their dissertations.
 - b. Students also requested clearer research guidance, which was one reason why the program looked to cross-university Concentrations.
4. The AcA has a major concern about approving a doctoral program with the curricula of the last two years not developed.

- a. To develop all of the curricula would have pushed the revision process into spring, which would be too late for marketing to incoming students for fall.
 - b. The new PRC guidelines should require the complete program design.
- 5. No clear sense of how the Concentrations would work
 - a. CoE will identify what the Concentrations will be and the agreements with other schools/colleges will be stipulated. Then students will choose a Concentration from the selection available. Students do not design their own Concentration.
 - b. There is positive feedback from deans of other schools/colleges that the Concentrations component will open the door for faculty across the university to engage in doctoral education.
 - c. The Office of the Provost will do a comprehensive analysis of budget and business plan to ensure that the Concentration component is developed successfully for students and faculty.
- B. The university has no designs for moving forward on any additional doctoral programs. The DNP was driven by external accreditation requirements.
- C. Vote on PRC Memo with one revision.
 - 1. Approved to submit to the Provost.

IV. Announcements

- A. Faculty Salary Data
 - 1. Now available to all faculty online on the University Planning website.
 - 2. Request from AcA for the benchmark document that SU is striving to meet. The Office of the Provost will provide the benchmark document.
 - 3. Library data could be included, but might be too small a group.
- B. Commencement Participation
 - 1. Under the current policy, there is flexibility surrounding commencement participation credit requirements. Students are allowed to walk even when lacking up to an entire quarter worth of credits.
 - 2. Office of the Provost is revising the university-wide policy to clarify commencement participation credit requirements.
 - 3. There is also a plan to make courses more available during summer quarter and intercession and to address study abroad deficiencies.
 - 4. In addition to the policy revision, there is a proposal to develop a winter celebration to allow students who finish their credit requirements in the summer or fall to be recognized without waiting until June.
- C. The faculty lounge usage in the library is still under discussion and will be monitored throughout winter and spring quarters.
- D. The AcA Bylaws document revisions were voted on but were not properly recorded. John Strait and Karen Feldt will work to determine if the draft they have is final or if John needs to reassemble a subcommittee to develop the final version.

- E. Graduate Student Council (GSC) is having an employment event called Employment Confluence on February 13 with private, government and non-profit sector representation. And email announcement will be sent to students and Tina Johnson will send the announcement to Rosa to distribute to ACA.
- V. Meeting adjourned at 3:28pm.