

## **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.