

**Academic Assembly**  
June 8, 2015  
2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 130

**MINUTES**

Present: David Arnesen, Sarah Bee, Pat Buchsel, Terri Clark, Brooke Coleman, Isiaah Crawford, Lynn Deeken, Bill Ehmann, Trish Henley, Arun Iyer, Kate Koppelman, Chuck Lawrence, Margit McGuire, David Neel, Michael Ng, Erik Olsen, Katherine Raichle, Roshanak Roshandel, Rob Rutherford, Heath Spencer, John Strait, Dan Washburn

*Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes*

- I. Review of 6-1-15 Minutes
  - A. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions
- II. Review of AcA Annual Report Draft
  - A. AcA can send minor edits to Rob Rutherford
  - B. Motion to approve for distribution to all faculty via Academic Assembly email and posted to Canvas
- III. Election of AcA Officers AY2015-16
  - A. Terri Clark nominated for Vice President and Chair of PRC
    1. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions
  - B. For the past few years, there was a second AcA Vice President, who served as Chair of FHRC
    1. Worth considering the possibility of ongoing revision
    2. Need to keep separate from PRC leadership
    3. AcA will decide on this position and nominate in the fall
  - C. President
    1. Summer duties
      - a. President's Summit
      - b. Guide for Faculty Ombudsperson
      - c. Academic Affairs committee of the Board of Trustees and full Board of Trustees
    1. David Neel nominated pending further discussion
      - a. Approved with no oppositions and one abstention
- IV. Appointment to Budget Advisory Committee
  - A. Sarah Bee nominated
    1. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions
- V. Appointment to Board of Trustees Student Development Committee
  - A. No major issues anticipated, but not fully known at this point
  - B. Former AcA appointee did not attend any meetings because confidentiality contract was being edited
  - C. Kate Koppelman nominated
    1. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions
- VI. Proposed Revision to Finals Week Schedule (*Michelle DuBois*)
  - A. Current Final Exam Schedule
    1. Implemented in 2011
    2. Exams are restricted to a four day schedule
    3. Day of exam is a day when that class is taught

4. If curriculum is focused on certain days of the week, good chance that student will have to take two or three finals on the same day
  5. Results in final exam schedules that are unnecessarily dense
  6. Numerous issues with students with disabilities seeking accommodation
- B. Proposed New Final Exam Schedule
1. Redistributes finals schedule to make peak finals time for most used class blocks
  2. Accommodates disabilities extended testing blocks
  3. Later blocks (primarily graduate classes) are retained
  4. Endorsed by Council of Deans and SGSU
  5. Motion to approve proposal as written
    - a. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions
- VII.** Program Review Committee
- A. Proposed Revision to MSF
1. Program was not revised for a long time
  2. No major concerns with proposed changes
  3. Discussion
    - a. Dropping two ECON classes and dropping two prerequisites
    - b. Is this an academic issue? How can we determine the academic impact? In many graduate programs, prerequisites are used for scheduling purposes
    - c. Albers is encouraging students to be able to take certificates, this allows that flexibility in schedule
    - d. Finance faculty is possibly interested in looking into online/hybrid modality
  4. Motion to approve – approved with no oppositions or abstentions
- B. Program Reviews
1. Psychology (graduate)
    - a. Issues with licensure, program is increasing credit hours to meet these new requirements including internship requirement
    - b. Additional burden on the person coordinating internships, more supervision, but spaced over time
    - c. Motion to endorse PRC memo as written
      - i. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions
  2. Liberal Studies
    - a. Name of program was not serving students well, have now changed to new name (Interdisciplinary Liberal Studies)
    - b. Addressed all of the issues raised in their previous review and “closed the loop”
    - c. Edit: Change the word “demand” to “request” in Recommendations
    - d. Motion to endorse PRC memo with above edit
      - i. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions
  3. Physics (*David Boness*)
    - a. Department plays an important role as a service department in S&E, teaching across the college and also in the Core
    - b. Program faculty have been successful in obtaining outside funding for student and faculty research
    - c. Concerns: lab space, assessment, consistency with breadth versus depth of courses when taught by different professors
    - d. Discussion of how these concerns are being addressed
      - i. Intro courses do a set series of chapters, the breadth/depth is only an issue in upper level courses

- ii. Department meetings to try to standardize, there is some disagreement amongst faculty but ongoing
- iii. Number of majors has gone up and down, but is more than standard when compared to peer institutions
- iv. For assessment, currently using an introductory physics course exam at the beginning and end of the course
- v. Additional funding this year from the Provost's Office and Dean assisted with development of more lab stations
- e. Motion to endorse PRC memo as written
  - i. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions
- 4. Software Engineering (graduate)
  - a. Challenges
    - i. Enrollment numbers dropped markedly during recession, including traditional base of graduate students employed by local software and other tech companies that have removed tuition benefit
    - ii. Numbers rebounding in the last year
    - iii. Program is well-designed but small
    - iv. Measurable assessment of program outcomes is a major concern – no regular assessment program in place
  - b. Recommendations
    - i. Challenging to hire TT faculty due to competitive market (tech jobs)
    - ii. Strong recommendation to design assessment process and ensure measurement mechanisms within three years
    - iii. Program also needs space and dedicated marketing resources
  - c. Motion to endorse PRC memo as written
    - i. Approved with no oppositions and one abstention
- 5. Cultural Anthropology (*Rob Efird, Ted Fortier, Harriet Phinney, David Powers*)
  - a. Overview
    - i. Faculty serve a large number of Core courses
    - ii. Strengths including relationship to mission
  - b. Concerns
    - i. Self-study issues – data was clear but the analysis of data was missing to identify actual needs of program
    - ii. Enrollment trends show major decline
  - c. Statement from program
    - i. Calls into question how PRC assesses programs, but also its role within the university and proper purview in terms of recommendations
    - ii. Major time lag between time review is submitted and the time it goes to PRC and AcA
    - iii. In PRC meeting, the program representatives updated and provided context for data, but did not find that context or most recent enrollment data reflected in the updated PRC memo
    - iv. Enrollment is up 20 percent since report was submitted, currently at 26 majors
    - v. Arts and Sciences approved program assessment and PRC did not, seems to be an institutional disconnect

- vi. Diversity of opinions in department, view this as a strength and not a weakness, strongly disagree with PRC statement “disruptive environment trickle down to the students”
- d. Requires significant discussion, will not be resolved today
  - i. Contentious quality of PRC memo should be explored, especially in relationship to “understand” in Bloom’s taxonomy
  - ii. Academic Assembly members can review the full program review materials over summer by request
  - iii. Motion to table discussion until fall quarter approved with no oppositions or abstentions

**VIII. Managed Print Services (*Chuck Porter*)**

- A. Estimates of cost saving
  - 1. Many of the previous costs were covered by the college/school and not the department
  - 2. To date, have billed departments just over \$60k for MPS over March, April and May (approximately 1 million pages)
  - 3. Copiers NW has also provided 2 million pages to correct issues caused by their services
  - 4. Price per page is on track with estimates
  - 5. Anecdotal evidence that people are sometimes not printing when they see the cost
- B. Issues
  - 1. Restocking
  - 2. No copy counter
  - 3. Color copy is expensive
  - 4. Printer says out of paper when not
  - 5. Feeder trays not working
  - 6. Sent multiple documents and they didn’t print, just erased
  - 7. Department costs have now tripled or even more, very difficult in this budget climate
    - a. Not an intentional move for the university to save costs by outsourcing to departments
    - b. Will be addressed over time as these issues come out
  - 8. The implementation on Macs has been troublesome
- C. Motion to request that the university leave old printers in faculty offices (by individual request) with no support from the university for printing supplies or service/maintenance
  - 1. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions