

**Academic Assembly**  
May 8, 2017  
2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 130

**MINUTES**

Present: Sarah Bee, Rick Block, Pat Buchsel, Brooke Coleman, Kate Koppelman, Chuck Lawrence, Emily Lieb, Viviane Lopuch, Agnieszka Miguel, David Neel, Erik Olsen, Tracey Pepper, John Strait, Charles Tung, Ashli Tyre, Tina Zamora

*Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes*

- I. Review of 4-24-17 Minutes
  - A. Approved with no oppositions and one abstention
- II. Review of Policies
  - A. Incomplete Grades 97-03
    - 1. Form will be created to match new policy, current form is too minimal
    - 2. Incomplete grades not being used properly, policy revision clarifies process
    - 3. Automatic grade conversion happens at four weeks
    - 4. Discussion
      - a. Seems to add another paperwork load to faculty, need to figure out how faculty can submit electronically (maybe a pdf form on SU Online?)
      - b. Chuck will inquire about having more of an online process for the new Incomplete policy
      - c. Concern with Nursing students who cannot complete their hours in clinical placement – policy is still subject to PEP for these individual situations
      - d. Concern with lack of communication between instructor and student
    - 5. Motion to approve revisions
      - a. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions
  - B. Repeated Courses 77-02
    - 1. Removing grades we don't have anymore
    - 2. Change from C- to C to retake course
    - 3. Faculty have been advising students to fail on purpose in order to retake the course for a better grade
    - 4. Discussion
      - a. All grades remain on the record, but the second grade is the one that is counted to the GPA
      - b. College/school can always have a policy that is more strict, but not less strict
      - c. In III.3., need to align either two times or three times allowed to take the same course (change to two times for graduate and three times for undergraduate)
    - 5. Motion to approve with the condition to change the language for alignment in final paragraph
      - a. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions
- III. MRC Task Force Report (*Bob Dullea*)
  - A. Report delivered to Provost on March 31, meeting with stakeholders in the college and across the university
  - B. Discussion

1. Recommendation for faculty need a terminal degree may be a tension with the goal of transdisciplinary that is the mission of the college
  2. Social sciences and humanities, ongoing tension – can MRC courses be cross-listed with PoliSci, Sociology, these ways of thinking? If we are sharply looking at the curriculum, maybe take the opportunity to radically revise and allow cross-listing
  3. In a time of budget crisis, need to consider how this impacts the university financially
  4. Could accomplish most of the major recommendations by rolling MRC into A&S, retain value of unique curriculum
  5. Recommendation to grant percentage of tenure track lines to align with the rest of the university
    - a. Major shift in scholarship expectation, will be an ongoing process
    - b. Will existing faculty have to compete for their positions – concern since these faculty have been doing tenure track responsibilities for years
  6. Recruitment needs to be supported by MarCom and Enrollment Services
  7. Some equivalencies with Core seem way off – needs to be an ongoing discussion with the Core office if this curriculum work moves forward
  8. Would like to see more curriculum description, report only contains titles
    - a. Would provide these if get the green light to move forward
    - b. Full curriculum proposals would come to PRC/AcA
    - c. Clarify language that equivalencies are to Core outcomes
  9. Need to make sure we are thinking strategically about possibilities (Are we thinking big enough? What could this be? What market niche could this fill?)
- C. Faculty Grievances
1. Need to institute a mandatory investigation process with a dissatisfaction minority threshold of 40%
  2. Current individual grievance process is not acceptable in these situations, should not depend on a single faculty member starting the process in the face of retaliation
- D. Provost response
1. Provost is still speaking with stakeholders and no decisions have been made
  2. Response is forthcoming, will be complex
  3. Need to determine enrollment capacity of program (analysis of how big cohort programs have to be in order to be sustainable in the long term)

#### IV. Student Evaluations

- A. Overview
1. Proposal to establish a committee of the careful and just use of data
  2. The current state of research on student evaluations is that they reflect all of the racist, sexist, ablest, ageist issues that are seen in society at large
  3. Call for immediate moratorium on using these in raises or tenure consideration
- B. Discussion
1. Do not want to dismiss evaluations completely, if there are issues in the classroom, these are often the first place it shows up
  2. Currently required by HR, etc. for extreme cases when it is required as a legal document
  3. Would like to improve and deemphasize evaluations
  4. Used differently for non-tenure track and tenure track faculty – those who teach in the Core (mostly NTT) usually receive more negative evaluations due to being in the Core
  5. Evaluations do not give anything useful to the instructor, who are then asked to reflect on them and how they have improved teaching, with no follow up
  6. We don't do enough peer evaluation

7. If we shifted other responsibilities and incentivized peer evaluations, could develop peer mentor relationships that would be much more meaningful
  8. Need to have the ability to customize the measurement tool – add in questions specific to the Core, etc.
  9. Would not look good to tell students their evaluations don't matter
  10. Evaluations that encourage custom narrative responses are helpful
  11. The inclination to teach to the student evaluation is problematic, can discourage creativity and passion
  12. Administrator evaluation has moved in the direction of formative, perhaps student evaluations should move in this direction as well
- V.** Living Wage/Economic Justice
- A. Follow up to last week's discussion of the A&S faculty and staff quality of life survey
  - B. Would like to benchmark salaries compared to market
  - C. How should SU address this for the future of the institution, stay competitive in the market, and not lose applicants to competitors because we can't offer cost of living?
  - D. If we don't address the social justice issue, risk the university only focused on retention of tenure track faculty
  - E. Need to do another equity adjustment study
  - F. Need to connect benefits discussion to salary discussion