

**Academic Assembly**  
April 21, 2014  
2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 130

**MINUTES**

Present: David Arnesen, Brady Carlson, Carol Wolfe Clay, Brooke Coleman, Karen Cowgill, Isiaah Crawford, Tito Cruz, Lynn Deeken, Bill Ehmann, Terry Foster, Christian Halliburton, Chuck Lawrence, Michael Matriotti, Erik Olsen, Katherine Raichle, Roshanak Roshandel, Rob Rutherford, Heath Spencer, John Strait, Toni Vezeau

*Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes*

- I. Review of 4-7-14 Minutes
  - A. Approved with one abstention and no corrections
- II. University Assessment Committee presentation (*Erin Beary Andersen, Bob Duniway, Terry Foster, Chuck Lawrence, Tim Wilson*)
  - A. Assessment process
    - 1. Assessment originates with departmental instructors
    - 2. Then UAC reviews these localized reports and compares results to university Undergraduate Learning Outcomes (ULOs) and in the future, Graduate Learning Outcomes (GLOs)
    - 3. UAC hopes to regularize reports of overall university assessment, including preliminary conclusions and areas of interest, to AcA as the new governance structure is developed
    - 4. AcA would ultimately decide what actions to take on results
  - B. Timeline
    - 1. Revision of ULOs and GLOs over the past few years
    - 2. Currently developing measurement rubrics for the ULOs
    - 3. Five-year annual assessment cycle for each ULO/GLO (one per year from each category)
    - 4. Assessment of ULO 2 is first, which is set to take place next year
    - 5. Other ULOs include co- and extra-curricular programming and will need to be further developed in the coming year
  - C. Discussion
    - 1. External data may need to be analyzed for accurate review of current assessment reports to determine whether or not benchmarks are being met
    - 2. AcA encouraged to find interested colleagues to fill two open faculty positions on UAC
- III. AcA Authorizations Resolution
  - A. Overview of current status
    - 1. Provost responded to proposal document with the areas that should be recommendatory, not required
    - 2. Previously, AcA leadership agreed to research more about fiduciary responsibility issues and about how other schools handle co-determinative powers, but AcA has not received any further information
    - 3. Currently, only creation of a new university level center appears on the list, and not elimination, but in the reply email, “creation or elimination” was included in line 21
    - 4. Need to discuss how co-determinative process will work logistically

- B. Motion to make all current “question marks” into “R – recommendatory,” with the exception of 21, 21a, 22, 23, which would remain “R”
    - 1. Amendment to motion: vote to approve the “X – approval required” for all areas not in dispute and leave the “question marks” as “questions marks” for those areas in dispute
      - a. Vote – 8 in favor, 7 opposed – amendment to motion passes
    - 2. Discussion
      - a. It might look unprofessional to forward this document to the Board of Trustees with question marks
      - b. Creation of new schools should come to AcA for review but under this structure it should still be able to go before the President and Board of Trustees to determine issues that are essential to the long-term success of the institution
    - 3. Vote on amended motion – 11 in favor, 5 opposed – amended motion passes
- IV. Proposal to Create a New School (*Bob Dullea, Rick Fehrenbacher*)**
- A. New academic unit – School of New and Continuing Studies, proposal authored by Bob Dullea, Rick Fehrenbacher, and Heather Geiger with the review of an advisory board
  - B. Overview
    - 1. Student base
      - a. Non-traditional age
      - b. Pursuing continuing education, especially degree completion
      - c. Approximately 750,000 potential students in target market regionally
    - 2. Market research on how to differentiate SU from competitors
      - a. Rigorous degree program based in Ignatian paradigm
      - b. Combination of face-to-face and online courses
      - c. Framework for new baccalaureate degrees
    - 3. Timeline
      - a. Work to develop school logistically (faculty, infrastructure, support services, curriculum) in AY2014-15, with a launch date in fall 2015
      - b. Degree program proposals would go through the normal curriculum approval process during AY2014-15
    - 4. Initiative
      - a. University strategic plan speaks directly to this need
      - b. Positively transformative
      - c. Can provide funding necessary to support the university as it moves forward
  - C. Discussion
    - 1. Budget
      - a. Projects annual net revenue maximum by year five
      - b. Net revenue positive as early as year two
      - c. Concern about duplication of administrative and faculty costs
    - 2. Faculty
      - a. Proposal to hire 3 full time faculty in the business area this summer
      - b. Faculty will be doctorally qualified and non-tenure track
      - c. The market for national hires will provide enough of a pool to make strong selections, even this late in the year
      - d. Possibility to hire tenure track faculty after revenue stream begins
      - e. Not offering any new degree programs that would compete with existing programs in schools/colleges currently
    - 3. Cost

- a. Rate of \$2000 – 2500 per course seems high
- b. Market studies indicate that students would be willing to pay this amount
- c. Comparable to AJCU degree completion student
- 4. Students
  - a. Different criteria for admissions, transfers, etc.
  - b. Separation from other students seems problematic
  - c. Non-traditional age students will continue to be able to pursue traditional degrees as full time students (only 5% do this under the current structure)
  - d. This new model is built for part time studies, which is better suited to their needs
- 5. Degrees
  - a. Degree completion program proposals will speak to academic excellence and historical standards of SU
  - b. Advisory groups will be formed within each proposed major or degree within a major, and will include expertise from other schools/colleges
- D. Motion to adopt proposal
  - 1. Discussion
    - a. Concern about process for hiring faculty this summer
    - b. Seems very rushed, significant academic implications with very little time to adequately review
    - c. Need to have a long discussion with leadership about how bachelor's programs are developed within the School for New and Continuing Studies
    - d. All degree programs must go through normal university approval process
  - 2. Vote – 7 in favor, 3 opposed, 6 abstentions – motion to adopt proposal passes