

**Academic Assembly**  
June 11, 2018  
2:05 – 3:35 (3:45) pm, HUNT 100

**MINUTES**

Present: Rick Block, Pat Buchsel, Terri Clark, Mark Cohan, Marc Cohen, Brooke Coleman, Miles Coleman, Carlos de Mello e Souza, Arie Greenleaf, Leticia Guardiola-Saenz, Nalini Iyer, Kathleen La Voy, Chuck Lawrence, Agnieszka Miguel, Michael Ng, Erik Olsen, Steve Palazzo, Frank Shih, Gregory Silverman, Colette Taylor, Kirsten Thompson

*Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes*

- I. Review 5-21-18 Minutes
  - A. Amendments from previous meeting/email included
  - B. 13 approve, 0 oppose, 1 abstain
- II. Review 6-4-18 Minutes
  - A. 13 approve, 0 oppose, 1 abstain
- III. Faculty Representative to Strategic Planning Design (vote)
  - A. Paper ballot, mark three of the following nominees
    - Dylan Medina (NCS) – 4
    - Eva Lasprogata (ASB) – 9
    - Ajay Abraham (ASB) – 6
    - Carrie Miller (CON) – 5
    - Deidre Bowen (LAW) – 10
    - Terri Clark (CON) – 15
  - B. Results: Eva Lasprogata, Deidre Bowen, Terri Clark
- IV. Faculty Ombudsperson Report (vote) (*McKenna Lang*)
  - A. Update on the Year
    1. Steady year with gradual increases in numbers
    2. Most ombuds see 1-4% of their constituent, currently serving 6%
    3. Cases: 38 last year, 45 this year
    4. Inquiries: 28 last year, 35 this year
    5. Areas of focus
      - a. Communication strategies, informal mediation, conflict coaching, de-escalation
      - b. Strong interest in psychological safety
      - c. Interpersonal conflicts, interdepartmental, clearing house, faculty handbook review
      - d. Professional boundaries, kindness, inclusion
      - e. Compassionate communication workshops ongoing
    6. Goals for the office: offer more trainings, open to feedback to continue to develop ombuds skills and office
  - B. Discussion
    1. Expect numbers to plateau but have not seen that yet, many offices on campus to triage, including HR, Title IX, Diversity and Inclusion
    2. Seeking resources – handouts on how to deescalate conflict, communication strategies
    3. Put resources on ombuds website to make available to the community
    4. Concern with lack of visibility and confusion about what role ombuds office plays
      - a. Outreach to colleges and offices

- b. Workshops have improved visibility
      - c. Website matches the international ombuds guidelines and principles
      - d. Charter describes what office can and cannot do
      - e. Confidential, neutral, impartial, informal
    - 5. Threshold for inquiry versus case
      - a. Only serve faculty – if party is not faculty, not considered a case
      - b. Inquiry is looking for information, whereas a case is when the office actively gets involved – 45 minutes of discussion/work is usually a good threshold for determining when an inquiry transitions into a case
      - c. Not an exact science
      - d. Conflict, miscommunication, evaluation are the main areas that become cases
  - C. Motion: Support for Ombuds Office
 

*The Ombuds office serves an important function for the university faculty. AcA see its increased utilization being a positive sign that faculty members are finding the office to be a useful resource. AcA reaffirm its support for the Ombuds office.*

    - 1. Motion to suspend rules for one week
      - a. 17 approve, 0 oppose, 0 abstain
    - 2. Vote on motion
      - a. 17 approve, 0 oppose, 0 abstain
- V. Big Data Committee Report (*Joe Phillips, Steve Tapia, McLean Slaughter*)
- A. Overview
    - 1. Committee is in operation and making good progress
    - 2. Task force formed in the fall, pursuing charge to investigate important areas of big data
    - 3. Faculty and staff from across campus, including a few from off campus in industry
    - 4. Changed name to Applied Data Science
    - 5. Six areas of focus: UG Core, Graduate programs, Joint programs (G and UG), University center in data science, Infrastructure needs, Environmental scan of industry and peer institutions
    - 6. Preliminary report to campus in May, hosted open forums
    - 7. Feedback from campus – need to be specific about infrastructure needs to achieve goals
  - B. Finalizing full report
    - 1. Lots of ideas for UG Core
    - 2. Recommendation for a center
    - 3. Goal to have a final report in time for strategic planning process starting in the fall
  - C. Discussion
    - 1. Financial considerations
      - a. Too early to know the exact budget, but some areas seem expensive
      - b. Some areas will involve streamlining or connecting existing processes
      - c. Center will be a budget consideration, hope to connect to industry
    - 2. Concern with the Humanities being represented in the task force
      - a. What is the role of film and media studies specifically?
      - b. Interdisciplinary data science that can connect across campus
      - c. Need to consider STEAM (A for art) instead of just STEM
      - d. Digital design and film studies are arbitrarily split on campus, but are not in the discipline
    - 3. Proposal for the center seems thin on the rationale, will need to be built out in order to justify the cost versus other interests on campus
      - a. Institutional history for the university

- b. Generate revenue and publicity
  - c. Champion and pioneer the ethical and legal use of data
- VI. NCS Firewall Discussion** (*Rick Fehrenbacher, Trish Henley, Jeff Philpott*)
- A. Overview
    1. Provost asked for an investigation about what it would take to remove the firewall
    2. Firewall – NCS/non-NCS students cannot take the other’s courses
    3. Finding that NCS students need Core courses and elective options
    4. 18 months ago, NCS began piloting a program to remove the firewall, where NCS students could take Core courses and non-NCS students could take NCS courses
    5. Urgent issue as we approach this summer – students who would benefit from allowing a pilot program
    6. Idea to continue process through next year while assessing it for faculty and student perspective, additional research on how other schools are handling this situation
    7. Hopefully return to this body next year with a permanent proposal about how to proceed with the firewall
  - B. Discussion
    1. Concern with the cost differential – would it make sense to have those courses identified as NCS student continually needing at the NCS cost?
    2. Would want to get Jeff Scofield involved on price differential – all students in a program would need to pay the same price
    3. Students and faculty from programs were approaching NCS leadership – Communication and Digital Design were the main programs anecdotally
    4. Concern that Digital Cultures is artificially “silo-ed” from Film Studies due to the firewall
    5. Students are taking necessary courses at other institutions due to the firewall
    6. Undergraduates in traditional programs will be upset that they are paying so much more for the same courses for NCS students
    7. Course-related scholarships equal to the average discount rate for UG students could be a possibility – address the equity issue and allow for marketing
    8. A matter of opening non-NCS courses to NCS students – registration restriction lifted, do not need to lift the restriction the other way (don’t need to be done at the same time)
    9. Process-wise, proceeding carefully – urgent need for students progressing toward graduation – this is the main focus right now
  - C. Pilot will occur over the summer, full recommendation will come to AcA for review next year
- VII. Minimum College Governance** (vote)
- A. Some college processes are working well, others are not
  - B. Subcommittee (Nalini, Frank, Colette, Erik) presented a minimum requirement which was circulated for discussion at the college level
  - C. Motion to approve the draft minimum requirement
  - D. Discussion
    1. Albers faculty thought this did not apply – infrastructure would be more cumbersome and unnecessary than that college requires
    2. Purpose of document was unclear – institutional structure that would ensure governance structure under any leadership
    3. Exemption proposal for Albers
    4. Preference: amendment that this is a first draft with the goal to develop a document less about process and more about scope in the fall
    5. Need more conversation with the schools/colleges – prefer no exemptions but an open-ended and flexible framework that establishes basic process minimums

- 6. Might be appropriate to talk about shared faculty governance in the document to align it with our work here
- 7. College of Education needs a bare minimum support from AcA
- 8. Varies so much between colleges, should take this up in the fall
- 9. Perhaps work with Faculty Handbook Revision Committee to integrate into handbook
- E. Proposed amendment to add a sentence to the beginning: "This is a first draft of Academic Assembly's attempt to set a minimum faculty governance requirement in each school/college. As a first draft this articulates in rough outline what we anticipate it to be. Academic Assembly will work to finalize it in the coming academic year, and integrate into the faculty handbook."
  - 1. Vote on amendment: 16 approve, 0 oppose, 0 abstain
  - 2. Vote on amended motion: 15 approve, 2 oppose, 0 abstain
- VIII. Dean's Evaluation AcA protocol (vote)
  - A. Motion distributed prior
  - B. Vote: 17 approve, 0 oppose, 0 abstain
- IX. MRC Seat on AcA (vote)
 

*To ensure continuity, minimizing transitional disruption, and preserve a voice representing MRC faculty members at AcA, it is moved that MRC continue to have a "base" faculty representative at AcA for AY2018-19. The person who will serve in this role is to be decided by MRC faculties. How to resolve the broader issue of future MRC representation in AcA will be determined by members in AcA 2018-19.*

  - A. Discussion
    - 1. Still a concern with the continued MRC seat, would like to leave to A&S FSS to determine representative structure
    - 2. In AcA bylaws, still has a seat
    - 3. AcA has to take into account that MRC has been denied their say along the entire process
    - 4. Process has been rushed and important to leave the MRC voice during this transition process – many not be another space for representation in case anything goes wrong
    - 5. Representation during unprecedented event
  - B. Vote on motion: 15 approve, 2 oppose, 0 abstain
- X. United Way Fundraising motion (vote)
  - A. Previously introduced
  - B. Motion to accept report
    - 1. 17 approve, 0 oppose, 0 abstain
  - C. Motion to Vote
    - 1. 17 approve, 0 oppose, 0 abstain
- XI. Program Review Memos (vote)
  - A. Motion to suspend one week voting rule
    - 1. Vote: 17 approve, 0 oppose, 0 abstain
  - B. Bachelor of Public Affairs program review
    - 1. Vote: 17 approve, 0 oppose, 0 abstain
  - C. Political Science program review
    - 1. Motion to withdraw memo for further review, as there seems to be differing opinions in the department
    - 2. AcA will continue discussion in the fall
  - D. Diagnostic Ultrasound program review
    - 1. Vote: 17 approve, 0 oppose, 0 abstain

- XII. TESOL Termination (vote) (*Vong Ratts, Stacey Robbins, Deanna Sands, Jian Yang*)**
- A. College curriculum committee (ACC) process overview
    - 1. 24 hours prior to the meeting, provided with two documents requesting vote, committee was surprised by timing and process leading up to it
    - 2. Chair of the committee suggested to bring proposal to terminate to the faculty at large at the next faculty meeting
      - a. Presented a summary
      - b. Single faculty member from program spoke
      - c. Questions with the committee and the faculty member
      - d. Shock and lack of transparency around process
    - 3. After the full faculty meeting, ACC submitted additional questions to the dean and deans team, especially with regard to the market analysis
    - 4. After the process, committee considered everything and voted to reject the proposal to terminate the program
      - a. Suspicious of financial analysis conducted at the university
      - b. Felt the program was singled out
  - B. Department Chair
    - 1. Multi-year process to explore different interventions to maintain and increase TESOL enrollment across multiple deans and chairs
    - 2. Cohort model
      - c. Too small of a program for a cohort model
      - d. Cohort model and process was never communicated to students via program faculty
    - 3. TESOL market is down and ELL program is up
      - a. ELL is K-12, this program is focused on adult learners – different market
    - 4. Declining enrollment concerns
      - a. Last academic year, there were 14-15 students in the entire program
      - b. Often students start and stop the program, so the enrollment fluctuates
      - c. Other low enrollment programs in the college service other programs (e.g., Special Education courses are taken by School Psychology and School Counseling), whereas TESOL courses do not serve other programs
  - C. Program faculty comments have been removed per their request
  - D. Dean
    - 1. Do not know how far in advance of the faculty committee meeting documents were sent
    - 2. Decision is complex, involves not just finances but enrollment, career possibilities for graduates – a coming together of many ongoing issues
    - 3. Made in the larger context of the COE, as well as what has been happening with enrollments in the college over many years
    - 4. Budget
      - a. Financial analysis on TESOL was correct, budget manager prepared this based on the process used at the university level, updated annually
      - b. The figures that were turned in is that the program lost \$133,000 last year, this year in deficit \$81,000 through winter quarter (not updated to spring quarter)
      - c. Difficult to determine if this cost analysis includes all aspects of the program; revenues come in beyond just the program – on campus, continuing ed online (total revenue brought in through courses taught, grants writing, indirect cost return), tuition is one of the main aspects of revenue

- d. Costs include personnel costs including faculty, adjuncts, percentage of administrative support of program and college, allocation formula based on number of students, and other considerations such as a career director
  - e. In TESOL there are additional adjuncts that teach in the program
  - f. AcA highly recommends COE perform a program-specific analysis
5. Enrollments
- a. Annual enrollments have been on the decline, but it is complicated to track due to a rolling admission model and lack of program plan of study though the academic year
  - b. Students sometimes take up to four years to complete the degree
  - c. Class sizes range from 3-4 students to 9-10 students, complicated for the college in meeting budgetary requirements for course sizes
  - d. These students taken as a whole cost more to educate than they bring in
  - e. International students do need to keep a minimum credit requirement, approximately 5 international students in the program at this time
6. Process
- a. 18 months ago recommended TESOL move to cohort model, opportunity for faculty to implement
  - b. Marketing was not done and for the last 4-6 years, not a sufficient number of students to build a cohort
  - c. For comparison, EDLR brings in about 20-25 per cohort and other programs bring even larger
- E. Motion to accept PRC memo that recommends acceptance of TESOL termination
1. Discussion
- a. Enrollment numbers unclear
  - b. Financial analysis is not sufficient to justify ending the program on financial grounds
  - c. Process within the college is concerning – rushed, confusing
  - d. Unclear how close the termination of the faculty is with the termination of the program
  - e. Implied throughout the process that the faculty member effort has been insufficient, but never proven
2. Vote: 0 approve, 11 oppose, 2 abstain