

Academic Assembly
November 5, 2018
2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 130

MINUTES

Present: Felipe Anaya, Sarah Bee, Pat Buchsel, Terri Clark, Mark Cohan, Marc Cohen, Miles Coleman, Clara Cordova (new SGSU rep), Kelly Curtis (outgoing SGSU rep), Cayla Duckworth, Arie Greenleaf, Ben Howe, Naomi Hume, Nalini Iyer, Kate Koppelman, Kathleen La Voy, Shane Martin, Agnieszka Miguel, Ben Miller, Michael Ng, Russ Powell, Frank Shih, Gregory Silverman, AJ Stewart, Mark Taylor, Kirsten Thompson

Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes

- I. Review 10-22-18 Minutes
 - A. Vote 18 approve, 0 oppose, 0 abstain
- II. Vote on AcA Nominated Strategic Planning Committee Representatives
 - A. Vote by paper ballot for top eight of 14
 - B. Results tabulated after meeting
 1. Marc Cohen (ASB) - 18 votes
 2. Katherine Raichle (CAS) - 17 votes
 3. Brooke Coleman (LAW) - 16 votes
 4. (tie 4) Lindsay Whitlow (CSE) - 11 votes
 5. (tie 4) Erica Martin (STM) - 11 votes
 6. (tie 4) Henry Louie (CSE) - 11 votes
 7. (tie 7) Lynn Deeken (LIB) - 10 votes
 8. (tie 7) Julie Homchick Crowe (CAS) - 10 votes
 9. (tie 7) Brian Fischer (CSE) - 10 votes
 10. Not selected: Audrey Hudgins (8 votes), Quinton Morris (5 votes), Joanne Hughes (5 votes), Mike Marsolek (3 vote), and Woo-Joong (Andy) Kim (2 votes)
 - C. Results passed along to Provost and President for final appointment
- III. Vote on AcA Appointed Faculty Handbook Revision Committee Representatives
 - A. Vote by paper ballot for top two
 1. Arie Greenleaf (COE)
 2. Ben Howe (CAS/MRC)
 3. Ben Miller (CON)
 4. Stacey Jones (ASB)
 - B. Results tabulated after meeting
 1. Ben Howe will be the AcA appointee to a one year term and Arie Greenleaf will be nominated by AcA to be the Provost's faculty appointee to a one year term
- IV. Faculty Lounge Use Discussion (*Jan Hartley, Amber Larkin*)
 - A. Motion: AcA supports Popko Lounge usage by graduate students after 5:00pm
 - B. Background
 1. Graduate students do not have a lot of dedicated space on campus after daytime business hours
 2. Only three spaces are generally used (two OMA spaces and McGoldrick Collegium)
 3. Graduate Student Council (GSC) brought forth a proposal for graduate students to be able to use the faculty lounge in the library after 5:00pm

4. The Library does not have a position, but was approached by GSC with this proposal
 - a. Data presented is drawn from two Library usage studies
 - b. General goal of the library is to best serve all users and optimize space in the library
- C. Discussion
 1. Concern that the amount of dedicated grad student space is more than the faculty dedicated space
 2. Historical issues
 - a. Years ago faculty lost the Casey Commons faculty lounge
 - b. When the Library was renovated, the new faculty lounge was dedicated to faculty only
 - c. Want to be collegial, but it can be a slippery slope
 3. Morale issues
 - a. Faculty need to feel like we have one space dedicated to our shared work
 - b. Value to space for faculty that goes beyond the number of bodies at any given time
 - c. The needs of faculty to use the lounge vary greatly depending upon where they work, tenure status, etc.
 - d. For faculty of color in A&S, office space becomes a place where students look for you – the lounge is a “safe place” for these faculty
 - e. Even the events in the space have been problematic for faculty
 - f. The social aspect of the lounge is also very important
 4. Concern with the data presented
 - a. Some of the counts do not include known usage
 - b. Concerning that individual users are tracked by name
 - c. Data is not tied to specific names, those were just anecdotal names
 - d. Usage is done by walk around counts at regular intervals (every two hours), may not count everyone
 - e. Even those who use for less than two hours should be counted, some people have regular standing 30 minute meetings in the space that may not show up on counts but speak to important usage
 5. Time aspect of proposal
 - a. Proposal is only for the evening hours, after 5:00pm
 - b. Evening usage data was very low, 5:00pm seems to be a time when most faculty are no longer on campus
 6. Proposal details
 - a. The collegium used to be open longer hours and the most recent budget cuts cut those hours – is this why GSC is seeking other spaces?
 - b. Were there other spaces considered, including other Library spaces?
 - c. Noise, food, and other restrictions on the space would stay the same
 - d. Proposal is from GSC, not administration
 7. General
 - a. When some AcA members solicited feedback from constituents, received strong feedback that faculty are not in favor
 - b. If not for the reduction in resources, we would not be in this position
 - c. Before we consider the proposal, we need to know what led up to it
 - d. The first question should be, how do we make sure graduate students have a dedicated space?
 - e. Vote on motion will be in two weeks at next meeting, discussion can continue on Canvas

- V. ITS Updates (*Chris Van Liew*)
 - A. Previous Academic Assembly requests
 - 1. New lab manager Kartika Garg, has received positive feedback
 - 2. ITS has automated much of the account provisioning process, so there are fewer gaps, delays and manual steps
 - B. Recent Outages
 - 1. Office 365 email and other applications, resolved by Microsoft
 - 2. Loss of permissions that affected many students, faculty and staff – membership data was restored from backup, but took several days
 - 3. Current brute force hacking attempts of SU accounts resulting in 30-minute account lockout for affected user, implementing countermeasures to combat these attacks
 - C. Many remaining RevSU issues
 - 1. Creation and rollout of Managerial/Analytical Reporting in InformSU
 - 2. Deploy modern and improved functionality to replace current product engine for SU Online (Web Advisor)
 - 3. Improve deployment of Learning and Development in EngageSU/HR, fully deploy Performance Management and Compensation Management for staff
 - 4. Complete rollout of multi-year budget planning (Axiom/budgeting)
 - 5. Various small items for Student Finance, Identity Management, Integration, GL, etc.
 - 6. Ultimately, decommission old Colleague system
 - D. Other IT Services Projects
 - 1. Wrapping up the last few Chartwells technology transition items
 - 2. EnrollSU: Enrollment Management replacement of Target X with Slate
 - 3. Center for Science and Innovation support
 - 4. Support for Online Program Management
 - 5. Generator for SU Data Center
 - 6. Cybersecurity improvements
 - 7. Ongoing technology refresh
 - 8. ITS transition with the end of the Ellucian managed services contract
 - E. Higher Education Technology Trends (*Educause Strategic Technology and Trends Report*)
 - 1. Complexity of security threats
 - 2. Student success focus/imperatives
 - 3. Data-driven decision making
 - 4. Contributions of technology to institutional operational excellence
 - 5. Increasing complexity of technology, architecture, and data
 - F. Discussion
 - 1. Ongoing faculty advising interface issues – send directly to Chris
 - 2. ITS will work with the Strategic Planning Committee to envision how we want to position ourselves with technology moving into the future
 - 3. Course description editor may be going away as these centralized updates take place and customizations go away – especially important for the Core
 - a. Goal to use the standard technology as much as possible
 - b. There is a plan with the Core on how to transition
 - 4. In the experimentation stage of work on the CSI – workshops and meetings ongoing
 - 5. Outage issues – part of the process issue was in how the data was structured, this process has been improved
 - 6. Develop a better communication between ITS and faculty as to what is available, many faculty don't even understand what is available

- a. Improved structured interaction plan
- b. Ongoing dialogue development
- c. These will ramp up over time, as the more pressing issues of the last few years are resolved
- 7. MPS printing
 - a. As an institution, we are saving money
 - b. Far less printing on campus overall
 - c. ITS will reevaluate the lease next year
 - d. Feedback from students has been very positive
 - e. Some pockets of frustration amongst faculty, will seek input when reevaluating contract

VI. AcA Survey Issues

- A. Tracking access to and interpretation of data
 - 1. One concern was the relation to budget
 - 2. When will RevSU data reporting be available and how will it be structured?
 - 3. Consistently acquired and normed data is the main concern – example of TESOL numbers presented that were all different during the termination proposal last year
 - 4. Chairs are frustrated with access to data on majors, double majors, etc. – multiple data pulls to find data in different ways
 - 5. Program reviews are a good example of these data issues, no connection between what the university requires and what can be provided
 - 6. Teaching evaluations need to be collected manually for APRs
 - 7. IR seems unreceptive to individual requests
 - 8. Data governance committee was supposed to define terms to improve data integrity, unsure where this work stands
 - 9. Need to ask IR about status of data reporting
- B. Minimum standards for shared governance across colleges
 - 1. Need to continue working on the minimum requirements, with flexibility
 - 2. Related to college handbooks requirement that we discussed last year
- C. Program review as a general conversation
 - 1. Revisioning the process
 - 2. Related to above data issues
 - 3. How does Core fit into this?
- D. Non-tenure track faculty need more clearly defined roles
 - 1. Need to be careful how we talk about faculty categories, NTT is not one group, there are many different categories
 - 2. Some NTT feel like they are not represented by AcA
- E. College of Education has ongoing faculty governance issues but this is ranked lower – demonstrates the need for year-to-year continuity of ranking issues
- F. Priority three on data usage is vague, but could be made more specific by applying it to other priorities, including program review and NTT issues – both could be more specific

VII. Open Discussion

- A. Still haven't seen results from student surveys – need to ask for this
- B. Returning to the Popko Lounge proposal (above)
 - 1. Perhaps we should make a statement about the collegium being cut
 - 2. Put the questions from our discussion forth to seek answers, including "If the space were restored, would that space be sufficient for grad student needs?"