

Academic Assembly
October 20, 2014
2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 130

MINUTES

Present: Jeffrey Anderson, David Arnesen, Sarah Bee, Maggie Chon, Terri Clark, Brooke Coleman, Lynn Deeken, Bob Dullea, Bill Ehmann, Mike Huggins, Michael Kinnamon, Chuck Lawrence, Emily Lieb, Suzy Martinez, Margit McGuire, David Neel, Michael Ng, Erik Olsen, Katherine Raichle, Roshanak Roshandel, Rob Rutherford, Heath Spencer

Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes

- I. Welcome and Review of Prior Minutes
 - A. Approved with no abstentions
- II. AcA BOT Trustee Appointment Confidentiality (*Rich LeBlanc, Jeremy Stringer, Galen Trail*)
 - A. AcA representatives are now on several BoT subcommittees, but feel like they are not allowed to report back to AcA because they have signed confidentiality agreements
 - B. Concern with how this will limit shared governance with lack of feedback loop from AcA
 - C. Rob will continue to invite University Counsel to AcA to address this concern
- III. Discussion and/or Q&A of Trends in Higher Education
 - A. During difficult economic times, the discussion surrounding higher education value and “third space” identity becomes much more challenging
 - B. Pressing issues for graduate schools, significant enrollment declines in Law, MBA, and others across the country, and conversation has now extended to undergraduates
 - C. Presentation would be further strengthened with emphasis on the connection between education and democracy, citizenship and global community participation
 - D. Our A credit rating limits our borrowing to very conservative rates
- IV. University Rank and Tenure Committee
 - A. College of Science and Engineering nominee Kristy Skogerboe for three year appointment
 - B. Motion to appoint approved with one abstention
- V. Program Proposal for MS Structural Engineering
 - A. Motion: Resolved, that given the volume of new program proposals, the Academic Assembly (AcA) shall continue its process of focusing its meeting times on any proposal(s) which either the Program Review Committee (PRC) or an AcA member deems in need of AcA review. In cases which the PRC determines are routine, the AcA members shall still be presented with the written proposal and the PRC memo prior to an upcoming AcA meeting. AcA members are encouraged to review the memo and proposal and contact the PRC Chair either before or during the meeting, if they feel a formal review is necessary. Given that a formal vote is required for all new programs, AcA members may choose to vote on a proposal at a meeting or request a delay in voting if an issue is raised.
 1. Approved with no abstentions
 - B. MS Structural Engineering
 1. Discussion
 - a. Market demand – you can only be hired in a Civil Engineering firm with a masters degree – our civil engineering students go elsewhere for their masters currently
 - b. No new faculty lines, will require adjuncts for certain courses

- c. PRC finds it very difficult to evaluate programs without budget understanding – evaluated by a different office
 - 2. PRC memo approved with no abstentions
- VI. Budget Update (*Connie Kanter*)**
 - A. Target budget cut of 4%
 - 1. Financial aid was larger than anticipated
 - 2. Fringe benefits costs raised quite a bit
 - 3. Across the board cut not ideal but does allow strategic planning within each area
 - B. Enrollment issues
 - 1. Winter quarter 2014 had retention issues
 - 2. Mid-year financial forecast (better for graduate enrollment tracking) indicated that we were going to come up short
 - 3. May/June, we anticipated FTIC and retention issues would impact budget
 - C. Concern with initiative funding during budget crisis
 - 1. No new funding for centralized advising FY15, budget proposal for FY16
 - 2. NCS revenue anticipated by year three
 - 3. ERP funded by internal loan, non-cash reserves
 - D. Precautions to mitigate future budget issues
 - 1. Planned underspending was incorrect and enrollment goals were much too aggressive – these issues will be addressed in budget planning for FY16
 - 2. Need budget volatility built into budget, which will mean saying no to more proposals and initiatives
 - 3. Need to address retention issues, especially with transfer students
 - 4. Development of comprehensive Viable Financial Model that separates revenue of each school and college and allocates university expenses according to prioritization
 - E. Graduate projections
 - 1. FY16 projections will be adjusted in conversation with deans
 - 2. Concern that departments are being asked to offer new graduate degrees without additional university resources for market research, development, marketing, etc.
 - F. Concern that across the board 4% cut does not take into account which areas directly affect student learning (academic versus non-academic programming)
- VII. Request for Budget Transparency**
 - A. Discussion
 - 1. Request athletic budget expenses and detail on staff and administrative compensation
 - 2. Perhaps cut down timeframe of past records to three to five years
 - 3. Not possible for IR and Finance to compile this data so quickly
 - 4. AcA needs to develop voice of faculty in a process of collaborative shared governance and establish precedence for future expectations
 - B. Amendment to have A1 items 3 and 4 moved to A2 and broken into existing expenses and new expenses, and to change the request date for a preliminary summary report to November 2
 - 1. Approved with two abstentions