

Academic Assembly
May 9, 2016
2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 130

MINUTES

Present: Jeffrey Anderson, Sara Bee, Rick Block, Pat Buchsel, Terri Clark, Bill Ehmann, Leticia Guardiola-Saenz, Mike Huggins, Arun Iyer, Bruce Koch, Kate Koppelman, Chuck Lawrence, Viviane Lopuch, Margit McGuire, David Neel, Katherine Raichle, Frank Shih, Heath Spencer, John Strait, Dan Washburn

Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes

- I. Review of 4-25-16 Minutes
 - A. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions
- II. Second and Dual Degree Policy (*Erin Morgan*)
 - A. Proposed Edits to Policy
 - 1. Approved by Council of Deans
 - 2. Clarify language about additional credits needed to award a second baccalaureate degree
 - 3. Clarify alignment with Core curriculum credits
 - 4. Student can earn two degrees but not two majors
 - 5. Allow Registrar to post any completed degree(s) even if other degree(s) are not complete
 - B. Discussion
 - 1. "UCOR area" – does this refer to module, course, learning community, etc.? – consistent with the areas referred to in the paragraph prior
 - 2. Proposed policy edits effective in fall quarter, if approved
 - 3. May be an issue with students in Science and Engineering whose primary degree is in Arts and Sciences
 - a. Perhaps there is an option to relax this option across colleges
 - b. This needs further discussion and clarification
 - C. Motion to table the proposed policy edits for further discussion
 - 1. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions
- III. AAPOR Update (*Bob Dullea*)
 - A. Planning and Design Committee
 - 1. Recently hosted an open feedback session for campus and the planning committee presented recommendations, how the actual work of data analysis, workload, resources levels, etc, will actually take place based on those recommendations
 - 2. Review of academic programs should not take place during an interim year – should happen under the new Provost
 - 3. In the coming year, the goals are to complete data work, move forward with the work of the analysis committee, make recommendations, but delay the second phase – comprehensive review of portfolio of academic programs
 - B. Formation of Analysis and Recommendations Committee
 - 1. Composition
 - a. Academic Assembly will select four tenured faculty members
 - b. The Provost, in consultation with the appropriate Deans, will select three tenured faculty members

- c. The deans (or the Provost) will select one dean
 - d. The members selected through the process above will select one non-administrative staff person from the division of academic affairs
 - e. The members of the committee will select the co-chair to work with the ex officio position appointed by the Provost
 - f. The committee will be co-chaired by an administrator or senior staff person appointed by the Provost (ex officio non-voting capacity)
2. Process
- a. Receive work product from schools and colleges
 - b. Review data, templates and deliverables, articulate understanding of workload standards and identify problematic variations
 - c. Compile into a report for the Provost with recommendations
 - d. Goal to complete this work in late fall/early winter
 - e. Would be helpful to have some overlap with the faculty who served on the planning committee
 - f. Department program templates and school/college templates were designed to take into account differences between schools/colleges
 - g. There will be a back and forth between the committee and the school/college for clarity on areas that differ or are unclear
3. Bob will send the charge for committee to AcA, and AcA will seek nominations
- IV. Developing Online Graduate Program Strategy (*Marilyn Crone*)**
- A. Background
- 1. Goal 3 of strategic plan – meet the challenges and opportunities of changing economic and educational environment, initiative to develop hybrid and online courses and programs
 - 2. SU pursued by Online Program Management company in 2015, numerous informal discussions with them and deans, deans worked to narrow down options with programs
 - 3. Consensus – not committed to using OPM in developing online graduate programs but want to be more informed
- B. Benefits to SU and Students
- 1. Extend our mission
 - 2. Diversify our academic offerings
 - 3. Further enhance our pedagogy
 - 4. Increase revenue and stay competitive
- C. SU Essentials in Building Fully Online Graduate Programs
- 1. Academic outcomes: rigor, quality, degrees granted same as campus-based
 - 2. Enrollment quality and quantity: same admission requirements but targeting students seeking convenience and flexibility
 - 3. Student and faculty experience: support must be responsive and collaborative
 - 4. Preserve and enhance SU reputation and brand: focus on quality and Ignation pedagogy; deliver premium education to broader audience and build our alumni network
 - 5. Strong financial performance
 - a. Launch select programs with efficient curriculum design and delivery
 - b. Build appropriate, sustainable enrollment to achieve strong margins and high net revenue
 - c. Invest in other institutional priorities
- D. Different Approaches
- 1. Build with in-house resources and expertise

- a. Pros: full control, develop new institutional expertise, retain all revenue, clear exit strategy
 - b. Cons: slowest route to reach desired scale of 2,000 plus students (7-10 years), large capital investment, high risk of not achieving targets
 - 2. Build with vendors in fee-for-service model
 - a. Pros: control is on a selective basis, develop new institutional expertise by leveraging vendor expertise, retain all revenue, exit strategy is clear
 - b. Cons: slow to scale (5-7 years), investment remains the same, risk remains for not achieving targets
 - 3. Full-service Online Program Management
 - a. Pros: OPM funds capital, expect to reach scale in 3-5 years and recognize more net revenue, leverage partner expertise while developing new institutional expertise, less financial risk
 - b. Cons: long-term contract, partnership can be challenging, need for strong internal communication, revenue sharing highlights risk of not actually realizing higher net revenue than if built in-house
- E. Discussion
 - 1. Tracking the interest of prospective online students: business, engineering, nursing
 - 2. Completion rates would be a major concern and should be tracked closely if we move in this direction
 - 3. If we develop online content and own it completely, we would not share outside the institution – this is a culture change from the history of academia, where curriculum is shared
 - 4. Concern that resources would be routed from undergraduate programs (especially faculty and staff support) to build out these new online graduate programs
 - 5. University needs to hire more faculty and training to support the development of these programs
 - 6. Continue discussion at a future meeting
- V. Report on Bullying Ad-hoc Committee
 - A. Concern with process after AcA development, especially involvement of University Counsel
 - B. Language is broad and can be used in an unintended way – for example, against protestors who sometimes use intentionally confrontational tactics in the aim of social justice
 - C. Very difficult to define bullying in a way that cannot be used against those participating in political protest, and other applications that are unintended
 - D. Perhaps talk about this with Ombudsperson McKenna Lang at next meeting, and continue AcA discussion