

Attachment for Agenda Item #2: (3 pages)

Notes of Special ACC Work Session on ACC Priorities 1 October 2008, Havasupai A/B, 1:00-2:30pm

The ACC held a work session to discuss ACC priorities from a list of five identified groupings:

1. The first half of item I (**University budget priorities**), and item L (**Department operations budgets: should there be some restoration of funds here, how should these funds be distributed (fairly) across departments? Should there be a consistent, cross-college approach to this?**)
2. The second half of item I (**Growth in upper administration**), and item J (**Balance in growth of faculty lines in the non-tenure track (lecturers / instructors) vs. tenured & tenure-track lines.**)
3. Item B (**Updating the ACC 2002 Chair Compensation Report.**)
4. Item D (**Impediments to recruiting and retaining faculty & staff (e.g., salaries, parental leave policy, partner assistance policy, faculty & staff housing – rental and purchase, childcare.)**)
5. Items A (**Revising and strengthening the University Academic Dishonesty Policy**) and T (**Policies concerning student-employees of the university and their access to academic buildings.**) Note: Item T was not a top ten issue, but insofar as it fits in with Item A, the Executive Committee thought it made sense to combine them.

Of the 14 or so ACC members present, there was about equal interest in items 1, 2 and 5. Working groups of 3-5 chairs convened to tackle each of these. After approximately 60 minutes of working group discussion, the full group reconvened and debriefed each other. Subsequent to the meeting, each group submitted a written report of their discussions and plans for next steps (see below).

October 1, 2008

ACADEMIC CHAIR'S COUNCIL MEETING: BUDGET PRIORITIES DISCUSSION GROUP

Participating:

Laurie Dickson, George Gummerman, Fred Solop, Todd Sullivan, Allen Woodman

- 1) The group discussed the need for proactive university-wide planning given rumors of additional budget cuts or rescissions.
- 2) Distance learning appears to be one of the few money-making units on campus.
 - a. Questions arose regarding whether DL is subject to the same budget sweeps as other units.
 - b. DL financial books should be open and transparent.
 - c. DL should be taxed like other units, with proceeds redistributed across campus.

- d. DL continues to expand at the expense of academic departments. DL should contribute to department operations budgets commensurate with the burden absorbed by departments to teach DL courses.
- 3) ACC should continue to have a voice at the presidential leadership retreat.
 - a. ACC should discuss this year's priorities, including the importance of improved funding for department operations budgets, full tuition remission for teaching assistants, support for funding of tenure track lines rather than part-time or instructor positions, improvements in staff salaries.
 - b. Operations allocations should be increased as enrollment growth continues.
 - 4) Next Steps: Continue this discussion with eye toward three goals: 1) pushing for proactive planning; 2) prioritize concerns regarding DL monies; 3) define ACC budget priorities and empower ACC representative to bring these priorities to the next presidential leadership retreat.
-

ACC Working Group: Academic Dishonesty Policy Revision

(Cindy Kosso, Maribeth Watwood, Kathleen McGeever, John Nelson, Steve Palmer)

Summary of 10-1-08 discussion

- 1) There needs to be a more formalized system of reporting infractions to Ron Pitt so that the database of previous offenses is complete and reliable. Reporting should be in all cases, even if the instructor really thinks the student didn't understand that what they were doing was cheating (as is sometimes the case with plagiarism). We discussed the concept of an online form which would generate an automatic email to the student, chair, Ron Pitt's office, etc. The SBS college apparently has a formalized process involving a particular form.
- 2) Problems with current NAU policy:
 - a) There is currently a woefully incomplete list of offenses covered in the NAU policy. Cindy Kosso has done a great job of beefing up and expanding the list and providing definitions. We should continue to look at this to make sure we have everything covered.
 - b) The current policy has inadequate procedures for dealing with academic dishonesty.
 - c) The current policy has an inadequate, and in some cases inappropriate, list of penalties for the listed offenses. We discussed having some sort of guidelines for different 'levels' of infraction giving some standardization of penalties, even while recognizing that each case will need to be reviewed individually.
 - d) The current NAU policy does not address the academic integrity issues that may arise due to the prevalence of electronic devices in classrooms.
- 3) Ideas for generating culture of honor:

a) Honor code – some type of signed agreement upon enrollment? Apparently HRM has one already

b) Integrity training and quiz on line – make either everyone pass with 100% (just like sexual harassment or ferpa training) or have first time offenders pass.

c) Instruction (on line and / or other) re: plagiarism and other types of offenses. Apparently there is something like this in Criminal Justice. Also, programs like ‘turnitin.com’, which NAU already has licenses for. Should we push to have more core courses use this? Could we use some sort of mentoring system or the writing center?

4) Path forward

a) convene additional meetings to identify and address items under 1-3. Nita Paden (chair of Academic Standards Committee) wants to be involved. The committee understands that we will be working on this issue in a concerted fashion.

Keeping an appropriate balance of tenure-track and non tenure-track faculty at NAU 1 October, 2008

(Paul Umhoefer and Francis Riemer and Sandy Stone)

- 1) **Core principal = Primary role of the university is educating students and preparing students for careers and to be able citizens.** From that it follows that:
 - a. There needs to be a fair balance between the academic and non-academic sides of the university so that this principal is maintained.
 - b. It is desired that there is more involvement of chairs or their representatives in decisions made by the Provost and the higher administration.
- 2) **Objectives that follow from the principal of maintaining the primary role of education at NAU.**
 - a. Maintain a minimum level (and percent) of tenure-track faculty of the total instructors and researchers on campus.
 - b. Define a minimum percentage of tenure-track faculty in any one unit and maintain that minimum.
 - c. Form new units only when resources are sufficient to begin with the prescribed minimum number and percentage of tenure-track faculty.
 - d. Explore how tenure-track and other faculty and instructors are treated across campus in differing units with the objective of having a consistent policy.

Attachment for Agenda Item #3: (2 pages)

From: Communications among deans and provosts staff [mailto:DEANS-PROV-STAFF@lists.nau.edu] **On Behalf Of** Karen L Pugliesi
Sent: Thursday, September 04, 2008 11:14 AM
To: DEANS-PROV-STAFF@list1.ucc.nau.edu
Subject: Move of the Administration of BIS/BAS to Yuma

Dear Deans,

One item we did not get to during our PALC meeting yesterday was move of the BIS/BAS program administration to Yuma. The plan had been to discuss this with all of you before a presenting the plan to the BIS/BAS council, which met yesterday late afternoon. Given how things worked out, some of your faculty have now heard about this and may come to you with questions. Thus, I want to brief you about this issue:

Background:

Larry Gould has served as director of the BIS and BAS degree programs for some time. When he moved to his position leading Yuma, a proposal surfaced to move the BIS and BAS programs there with him. My language is purposely ambiguous—this really means two things: 1) move of the administration of the program to Yuma with Larry and a designated faculty member there providing leadership and coordination; and 2) moving the degree programs to NAU-Yuma (like the BBA) to be part of the Yuma catalog of programs. At the same time, the proposal was made to move the public agency service program (which offers emphases and specializations for the BIS and BAS degrees) to Yuma.

Plans:

Over the summer there were a number of discussions about this involving the president, Liz, Fred, Michael S, Ron, and me. In the end, the decision was made to move the PAS to Yuma (in both the curricular and administrative sense) and to move the BIS and BAS program administration to Yuma effective this year. The plan is to move the programs into the Yuma catalog as well at an appropriate time. Two considerations inform the slower course for the curricular move of BIS and BAS. First, we want to be sure to sustain the strong engagement of Flagstaff academic units and faculty in these programs. Second, we have yet to develop a concrete strategy for moving Yuma to general curricular autonomy. We want to be contentious about the latter in relation to our institutional accreditation.

What it means:

Larry and I discussed the plans with the BIS/BAS council yesterday. I had planned to only address the administrative move, pending concrete plans for the curricular component. However, as it unfolded, the issue of the Yuma's curricular ownership of the program surfaced and became a focal point for discussion. The council members had many questions, not many we could answer with specificity, and raised some concerns. What follows is a synopsis of what we communicated to the council, some of the issues raised, and what we conveyed to the council in each regard:

- Larry Gould will continue to function as the BIS and BAS program director, with collaboration from Patrick Deegan. [No concerns expressed about this]
- The BIS/BAS council will continue to function as the academic steering group for the degree programs. [No concerns expressed about this]
- Flagstaff academic units will continue to offer BIS/BAS emphases and/or specializations as they have in the past, which means they will retain academic control over these program components (and constituent courses) and accrue SCH and HC enrollment. [There were questions and concerns about this. I believe that we allayed concerns about the allocation of SCH and HC. But, some were dubious about retaining academic control over their courses. I think there is some confusion about different levels of analysis or curriculum at work here: Flagstaff unit courses may end up being embedded in programs controlled by Yuma. I assured them that they would retain control over the courses they own, much as they do now when

a program in another unit required a given program's course. Policies and practices that pertain to staffing of courses would not change. Yuma (DL) would only control the courses that are in the Yuma catalog (right now only BBA and PAS). Another concern that was expressed pertained to coordination of cross program requirements. Those present seemed to believe that the UCC provided on-going coordination between academic units about cross program requirements in relation to projected demand for courses. This is not the case, we have been working to support chairs and directors with data to enable them to coordinate around these intersections among our programs.]

- We don't know how exactly or when precisely Yuma will achieve curricular autonomy. We are moving in this direction, but do not yet know how we will structure the transition and, ultimately, an autonomous academic unit. [There were many questions about this. Among them: Will a Yuma curricular committee review Flagstaff campus unit courses? (We indicated not, except as included in BIS/BAS specializations proposed after Yuma takes over ownership of these degrees.) Programs? (Yes, if components of Yuma owned BIS and BAS degree programs.) And, if so, will Flagstaff faculty have representation? (We don't know; there are no specific plans as yet.) Will this mean that Flagstaff units will face dual reviews for BIS/BAS emphases/specializations they offer? (In the case of this last question, we told them we were confident that would not be the case, except for new courses developed for those programs.)]

If you wish to discuss this further, we can put it on our next PALC agenda. Perhaps by that time we will have more clarity about the longer term plan. In the meantime, please let me know if you have questions.

Karen

Karen Pugliesi
Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies
Northern Arizona University
Flagstaff, AZ 86011
928-523-1580