

Academic Assembly
April 25, 2016
2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 130

MINUTES

Present: Jeffrey Anderson, Sarah Bee, Rick Block, Patricia Buchsel, Terri Clark, Isiaah Crawford, Bill Ehmann, Charlotte Garden, Mike Huggins, Arun Iyer, Bruce Koch, Katherine Koppelman, Charles Lawrence, Viviane Lopuch, Margit McGuire, David Neel, Michael Ng, Erik Olsen, Katherine Raichle, Rob Rutherford, Frank Shih, Heath Spencer, John Strait, Dan Washburn

Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes

- I. Minutes
 - A. Add item II.B.6. – “There was additional discussion of the purpose of administrator evaluation in terms of accountability and in relationship to AcA’s role in evaluating academic quality”
 - B. Edited minutes approved no oppositions or abstentions
- II. New Course Proposal: USAP 1100 Introduction to Seattle U
 - A. Overview
 - 1. USAP curriculum committee (similar to a school/college curriculum committee, with representative faculty from schools/colleges) reviewed and approved proposal
 - 2. Course will fill a gap for freshmen students who are not receiving basic college skills, mostly those in Arts and Sciences and non-engineering programs in Science and Engineering
 - 3. Will not be required for those whose school/college provides a similar orientation course (Albers, Nursing, engineering programs)
 - 4. Includes academic content (reading, writing, critical analysis skills) based on learning community focus, and Ignation pedagogy
 - 5. The pilot will include four course sections in the fall and then be assessed and, if successful, rolled out more broadly
 - 6. The course will eventually be available to transfer students, but not during the pilot
 - 7. Goal to elevate retention of freshman-to-sophomore students, part of larger retention strategy
 - B. Discussion
 - 1. Resilience training elements of the course can be very beneficial
 - 2. Learning communities are a structure that already has faculty working with students based on own research interests – this course is a way to separate out from housing and residence life
 - 3. Program Review Committee chose to waive review of the course at a university level, with one vote against the decision
 - 4. Concern with awarding academic credit for the course, especially content starting in week four on proposed syllabus
 - 5. Learning outcomes seem too similar to the University Core outcomes
 - 6. If carefully assessed, this experimental pilot of four sections with 24 students each will provide rich feedback on the academic component
 - 7. The two credit course allows the student to take with either 15 or 10 other credits, and maintain full time status

8. The syllabus is written to be intentionally broad to accommodate many different teachers and styles, to leave the academic side up to their discretion
 9. The academic piece is intentionally lighter in the middle of the quarter to take into account midterms in other courses
 10. While the Core courses aspire to address the skills proposed in this course, faculty teaching Core courses in fall quarter simply cannot address all incoming freshmen needs
 11. For those who teach seniors, encounter many students who are unable to reflect, this course would address that from the beginning and make more rigorous all other classes
 12. Should not try to fix problems in one area by creating a new solution in another area, if orientation is not working that should be fixed instead of development of a new course
 13. Academic content and skills (laboratory for example) are a continuum and not necessarily a clear cut division
 14. Plan for public assessment process including forums, will report back to AcA in winter quarter, if moving forward, workshops for faculty to further develop, etc.
- C. Motion to approve the proposal with the condition that the assessment of the course should come back to AcA for full approval to move forward in spring quarter 2017, including evaluation by each of the four instructors of the pilot sections
1. Discussion
 - a. SU is the outlier, all of our aspirational institutions offer a similar course
 - b. A report back in spring quarter would provide experiential data but would not provide a long-term look at how students used the skills learned in their future education
 - c. Proposed amendment to motion: the report back would include an analysis of the relationship of this course to the Core
 - i. Amendment is more a part of what the faculty should think about moving forward and not part of this first pilot proposal – perhaps add this as a recommendation instead of a condition of approval
 - ii. Amendment withdrawn
 2. Call to question to close discussion, approved with two opposed
 3. Approved with fifteen in favor, three abstentions and three opposed
- III. Administrator Evaluation Proposal
- A. The committee is currently gathering models to compare
 1. The proposed evaluation instrument is similar to those already in use, a good concurrent model is the University of Hawaii
 2. Loyola Marymount went through a similar process of evaluation development and also use a two step process, both formative and summative
 3. Seeking feedback from EDDY Associates about a third instrument model for comparison
 - B. Discussion
 1. Seeking a member of Council of Deans to join the evaluation subcommittee
 2. The committee needs to develop a plan for storage of historic data
 3. Recommendation to have a conversation with the Deans about shared governance in general, and also the President to help understand the larger context of where this evaluation fits
 4. The committee will propose an afternoon for an informal get-together with the Deans, including documents such as the AcA Bylaws, section on governance in the Faculty Handbook, letter from NWCCU encouraging shared governance, chart of approvals
 5. Suggestion to have the instrument in place by the time of the informal meeting
- IV. AAPOR discussion postponed to a future meeting

- V. Announcements**
 - A. Committee on bullying
 1. Plan to bring forward a policy proposal at an upcoming meeting
 2. Goal to have this included in the faculty handbook but also more broadly
 3. May not need to go specifically into the handbook, but procedural issue may be addressed
 4. HR does not have a specific policy on bullying