

Academic Assembly
October 31, 2011
2:05-3:35pm, STCN 130
MINUTES

Present: David Arnesen, Brenda Broussard, Mary Rose Bumpus, Carol Wolfe Clay, Isiaah Crawford, Karen Feldt, Terry Foster, Sonora Jha, Tina Johnson, William Kangas, Andy Kim, Chuck Lawrence, Michael Matriotti, Sean McDowell, Jacquelyn Miller, Kristen Shuyler, Chris Stipe, John Strait, Jeremy Stringer, John Weaver, Alanna Welsh, Jason Wirth.

Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes.

- I. Corrections to 10-17-11 Minutes
 - A. Terry Foster and David Arnesen were not present; David Reid was here in their place.
 - B. Item II, D, 3 should read: "been reviewed by SEP and reviewed by the deans."
 - C. Minutes approved with noted corrections.
- II. University Accreditation Committee – Faculty Participation
 - A. Accreditation reports in Years 1, 3, 5, and 7 with visits in years 3 and 7.
 1. Year 1: Definition of mission, core themes, specific expectations
 2. Year 3: Personnel, policy, physical infrastructure necessary to fulfill expectations
 3. Year 5: Measurement of success
 4. Year 7: Complete cycle, full circle report
 - B. Currently Year 2
 1. Seeking faculty participation in committee as reports are becoming broader.
 2. Writing is not required, but very much appreciated.
 3. Regular bi-weekly meetings, not a huge workload.
 4. No volunteers at meeting, taken under advisement. AcA members will nominate other faculty who can report back to AcA.
- III. Political Science Program Review (*Guests: Dan Dombrowski, David Powers, Kathleen La Voy*)
 - A. Program Review process:
 1. Department/program self study (substantive and detailed)
 2. External reviewer's report
 3. Department response to external reviewer
 4. Letter of reflection/recommendation from the dean
 5. Items 1-4 compiled into a document and submitted to Program Review Committee (PRC – subcommittee of AcA)
 6. PRC memo of recommendations submitted to AcA
 7. AcA meeting with program chair/director and dean
 8. AcA vote to modify, amend, and/or approve PRC memo
 9. AcA-approved memo submitted to Provost
 10. Provost meeting with program chair/director and dean
 - B. History of Political Science program review.
 1. The program review came to PRC and was received as a strong program.
 2. After evaluation by PRC was finished, the program went into receivership (may not be the correct term). The former chair resigned and a new chair from another department (Dan Dombrowski, Philosophy) was installed.
 3. It was noted in the program review documents that there were tensions, but they did not strike PRC as especially salient.

4. External reviewer visited 18 months ago, and the department was not clear about critical setbacks until 6 months ago, when the program review was already submitted to PRC.
 - C. Chair from outside department
 1. The goal is to stabilize the department with the clear leadership of Dan in a standard 3 year chairmanship (not interim or standing chair). The department can establish best practices and consistent governance under his leadership.
 2. A solution within the department was not possible, so a chair from another department was the strongest and most positive next step available.
 - D. There has been little to no effect on students in the program, either academically or otherwise.
 - E. The future of the Political Science program
 1. The dean and chair are confident that in 3 years there will be leadership in place from within the department.
 2. Junior faculty will be in conversation with senior faculty about chairmanship.
 3. Recommendation to submit a report on collegiality sooner than the typical 5 year program review.
 - F. Discussion on Poli Sci recommendation of PRC.
 1. The fact that academics were not affected speaks to the strength of the program.
 2. A chair from outside the program was a careful decision made in the best interest of all involved: students and faculty. Provost will monitor the situation over the next three years.
 3. PRC memo is adopted as written by unanimous vote with no abstentions.
 - G. Issue of collegiality in program review process
 1. No procedural rule in place for PRC or AcA. How can the PRC modify its guidelines (in process this year) so as not to be caught off guard by a similar issue in the future?
 2. Perhaps ask questions about how the internal governance is structured.
- IV. Graduate Learning Outcomes Update**
- A. The newly formed Graduate Learning Outcomes Revision Committee has met, combined the 9 current outcomes into 5, and has formed 5 small groups to revise the language of each. The revision will be complete by the end of fall quarter, representatives will take the draft to their schools/colleges for feedback, and then a final draft will go to the Board of Trustees for approval in May.
- V. AcA Appointment to Graduate Council Chair (1)**
- A. There was concern last year about inadequate representation for graduate issues, since AcA typically focuses more on undergraduates. The Deans and Associate Deans were comfortable with the idea of forming a Graduate Council.
 1. Proposal needs structure and membership.
 2. Council consists of at least one duly elected AcA member who teaches graduate programs plus others appointed by the AcA.
 3. Would also include Associate Deans who work specifically with graduate issues.
 - B. Purview: strategic planning, academic quality, student recruitment and enrollment, curricular or co-curricular programming, coordination across curricula at university level.
 - C. Mary Rose Bumpus will be the AcA representative to initiate the Graduate Council.
 - D. Tina Johnson will be on the committee as the Graduate Student Council representative.
- VI. Report on Current Enrollment 2011-12 (*Guest: Melore Nielsen*)**
- A. Enrollment this year is very strong, with a total enrollment of 7,755.

- B. Majority of incoming freshman are from out of state (mostly California, Hawaii, Colorado, and Arizona). For the first time, the majority of undergraduates are from out of state.
 - 1. The underrepresented minority population has dropped to 15% of freshman, probably due to a lower discount rate.
 - 2. International students have increased from 1% to 3% of freshman.
 - C. Graduate enrollment is down in programs with higher tuition.
 - D. Law school enrollment is steady. 20% drop in applications, but no significant drop in LSAT scores.
 - E. Retention rate is strong at 86%, but is less than last year (89%).
 - 1. Higher than usual drop outs during the summer after freshman year.
 - 2. Financial difficulty is a major factor in the drop in retention.
 - 3. Marilyn Crone, Chuck Lawrence, and Carol Schneider have developed an early warning system and exit interview to improve retention.
 - F. Our discount rate is lower this year than last year; our rate is reasonable, we are on the higher side in comparison to our peer and aspirational institutions. Focus on growing endowment to support students without having to increase discount rate.
 - G. Percentage drops (discount rate, underrepresented minorities) are only over a one year period; it would be helpful to have data over 5 years. Isiaah Crawford will meet with John Strait to arrange distribution of a dashboard report.
- VII. AcA Appointments to Faculty Technology Committee (2)**
- A. Email suggested appointments from each school/college to John Strait.
 - B. Contact Randy Horton for more information.
 - C. Onsite demos of 4 LMS candidates in the next few weeks – details forthcoming.
- VIII. Meeting adjourned at 3:33pm.**