

Academic Assembly
March 9, 2015
2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 130

MINUTES

Present: Jeffrey Anderson, David Arnesen, Sarah Bee, Terri Clark, Brooke Coleman, Lynn Deeken, Yancy Dominick, Bill Ehmann, Meggie Green, Arun Iyer, Kate Koppelman, Charles Lawrence, Suzy Martinez, Margit McGuire, David Neel, Michael Ng, Katherine Raichle, Roshanak Roshandel, Rob Rut TJ0 Tc 15.88 0 Td()TjEMC /LBo

- content (school psychology, school counseling, mental health counseling, principal certification)
 - b. There were no tenure track faculty in the College of Education who have training specifically in the ELL K-12 area
 - c. Need tenure track lines to support development of ELL curriculum
 - C. Special Education program revision
 - 1. Major revision was the inclusion of courses for ELL track (integrated with above degree)
 - 2. No other major changes – PRC was happy with the revision and it made sense in light of the above degree proposal and overall curriculum vision
 - D. Discussion
 - 1. There is a faculty member in the college who has a doctoral degree in ELL, seems unfair not to consider this person in the development of this curriculum
 - 2. School districts do support the endorsements but there is data lacking about how much the Master’s degrees are in demand
 - 3. Concern that teachers are not coming back for Master’s degrees, so there may not be much demand for the final 24 credits
 - 4. Curriculum committee in CoE has changed constituency recently, it is unclear how this has affected the internal politics of the college
 - 5. AcA precedent is to approve programs with questions of market demand and request enrollment updates in the future
 - E. Motion to accept the PRC recommendation on ELL for approval with the requirement for a three year review to AcA with analysis of enrollment
 - 1. 2 oppose, 2 abstain, remainder approve – motion approved
 - F. Motion to accept the PRC recommendation on Special Education program revision
 - 1. 1 oppose, remainder approve – motion approved
- III. Budget Transparency Discussion (*Bob Dullea, Connie Kanter*)
 - A. Follow-up to budget transparency presentation from previous meeting
 - 1. Need to balance confidentiality of information getting outside the university with the push for more transparency
 - 2. At this time, distribute hard copy document to members of AcA
 - 3. Faculty, staff, and students in schools/colleges can request to view document in person with their AcA representative
 - B. Discussion
 - 1. Need executive summary with interpretation of data
 - 2. Perhaps it would be better to have information on the SU website behind password protection
 - 3. AcA did not have time to analyze and process information and make recommendation
 - 4. Budget information could help inform school/college discussions (such as the ELL discussion above)
 - 5. Encourage continued discussion that contributes to good decision-making
 - 6. AcA should decide whether it is truly committed to the time and process needed to be fully involved in the budget planning processes, especially in light of not being able to staff the proposed AcA subcommittees
 - 7. Transparency alone is not the answer, need to develop partnership and working commitments with administration
 - 8. Financial and Budgetary decisions cannot be left solely at the hands of designated experts – there is a serious need to have faculty actively involved in budgetary decisions because the budget reflects the very values of the university

C. Hard copy documents distributed

1. In A2.2. the university has never broken out administrators specifically, the numbers given last week were incorrect and need to be redone so are not included in this document

IV. dTc 0 Tw 4.141 10389