CALL TO ORDER
President Danny Anderson called the meeting to order and offered remarks on the following topics.

President Anderson thanked Vice President Michael Fischer for his service as Interim President during the Spring 2015 semester. He also thanked Linda Campbell and Kris Howland for serving as Interim Vice President for Alumni Relations and Development and Interim Assistant Vice President for Alumni Relations and Development, respectively.

President Anderson called the members of the Trinity community to work together (1) to strengthen Trinity pride; (2) to ensure that Trinity is recognized as a leader in redefining the liberal arts and sciences for the twenty-first century; and (3) to ensure the success of the Trinity Tomorrow strategic plan and the Pathways curriculum.

VICE PRESIDENT FOR FACULTY AND STUDENT AFFAIRS
Vice President for Faculty and Student Affairs Michael Fischer continued the meeting as chair. He noted that this year’s Reading TUgether selection is Dave Eggers’s novel *The Circle*. He also noted that this year’s DeCoursey Lecture will be given by Jane Goodall.

Vice President Fischer introduced the key staff members associated with the three strategic centers: the Center for Experiential Learning and Career Success, the Center for International Engagement, and the Student Success Center.

Finally, Vice President Fischer invited Professor Diane Graves, Chair of the Campus Master Planning Committee, to report on the initial progress of the master planning process. Professor Graves reported that the committee has selected an architectural firm to serve in a consulting role during the process, pending approval by the Board of Trustees. The committee intends to complete the master plan by the end of the 2015-16 academic year.

ELECTION OF SECRETARY OF THE ACADEMIC FACULTY ASSEMBLY
Associate Vice President Duane Coltharp was elected by acclamation as Secretary of the Academic Faculty Assembly.

ELECTION OF PARLIAMENTARIAN OF THE ACADEMIC FACULTY ASSEMBLY
Professor Benjamin Harris was elected by acclamation as Parliamentarian of the Academic Faculty Assembly.
APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE ACADEMIC FACULTY ASSEMBLY OF MAY 5, 2015
A motion was made and seconded to approve the Minutes of the Academic Faculty Assembly of May 5, 2015. The motion carried.

REPORT FROM THE QUALITY ENHANCEMENT PLAN TOPIC SELECTION COMMITTEE
Professor Ben Surpless, Chair of the Quality Enhancement Plan Topic Selection Committee, summarized the process for selecting the QEP topic. The first round of proposals will be due on October 30, 2015, and the second round will be due on January 4, 2016. The committee will identify six finalist proposals, which will be presented to the campus in an open forum. The selected QEP topic will be announced in late February.

REPORT FROM THE FACULTY SENATE
Professor Adam Urbach, Chair of the Faculty Senate, noted that the Senate plans to explore ways to ensure equitable faculty workloads. Professor Urbach also reported that the Senate has completed and distributed a statement on the value of faculty scholarship. The first issue of Impact, a magazine showcasing the scholarship, creative activities, and community engagement of Trinity faculty members, will appear in September 2016.

REPORT FROM THE UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COUNCIL
Professor Kevin Livingstone, Chair of the University Curriculum Council, thanked Professor Glenn Kroeger for his leadership of the UCC during the 2014-15 academic year. Professor Livingstone noted that all elements of the Pathways curriculum have been populated with courses, although more courses are needed to fulfill the Digital Literacy, Oral and Visual Communication, and Creative Expression requirements. Finally, Professor Livingstone introduced the members of the UCC for 2015-16.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW FACULTY AND CONTRACT STAFF

Alumni Relations and Development
Mike Bacon, Vice President for Alumni Relations and Development
Patricia Cooper, Associate Director of Special Events and Stewardship
Karen Williams, Major Gifts Director
James Stryker, Assistant Director of the Phonothon
Selena San Miguel, Associate Director of Annual Giving Communications

Trinity University Police Department
Osvaldo Crespo, Director, Environmental Health and Safety

Student Financial Services
Stephanie Enoch, Front End Drupal Developer
Carlos Anchondo, Writer and Editor
Abel Ramos, Marketing Specialist/Analyst
Anh-Viet Dinh, Digital Content Producer
Institutional Research
Adam Baker, Assistant Director of Institutional Research
Larissa Walker, Director of Assessment

Information Technology Services
Lei Wang, Programmer Analyst

Center for Learning and Technology
Wendy Apfel, Instructional Support Manager

Coates Library
Jeff Lacy, Instruction/Liaison Librarian and Assistant Professor

Student Life
Jeremy Allen, Coordinator, Fraternity and Sorority Life
Esther Kim, Coordinator, Student Programs
Stephanie Ackerman, Residential Life Coordinator

Student Success Center
Stacy Davidson, Director, Academic Support
Katherine Hewitt, Wellness Coordinator

Career Services
LadyStacie Rimes-Boyd, Assistant Director of Programming and Marketing
Melanie Coulson, Assistant Director of Coaching and Advising
Annie Cutler, Employer Relations and Career Readiness Specialist

Experiential Learning
Erin Hood, Internship Coordinator
Abbie Nickle, Americorps Public Ally

Admissions
Mia Spigel, Business Intelligence and Reporting
Jesse Gamble, Admissions Counselor

Center for the Sciences and Innovation
Alexis Logan, CSI Laboratories and Chemical Stockroom Technician
David (Marc) Carpenter, CSI Electronics Shop Technician
Richard Silver, CSI Laboratories and Field Technician

Collaborative for Learning and Teaching
Sophia Abbot, Post-Baccalaureate Fellow for Student-Faculty Collaboration

Business Administration
Dominic Morais, Visiting Assistant Professor
Yi Liu, Assistant Professor

**Finance and Decision Sciences**
Dominik Kalisch, Visiting Assistant Professor
Diana Young, Visiting Assistant Professor

**Chemistry**
Brittany Long, Visiting Assistant Professor
Christina Cooley, Assistant Professor

**Classical Studies**
Benjamin Stevens, Visiting Assistant Professor
Johannes Wietzke, Visiting Assistant Professor

**Communication**
Camille Reyes, Assistant Professor

**Computer Science**
Yu Zhang, Associate Professor

**Education**
Laurie Klose, Associate Professor

**Engineering Science**
Dany Munoz Pinto, Assistant Professor

**English**
Aaron Pratt, Assistant Professor

**Entrepreneurship**
Mark Hill, Entrepreneur in Residence

**History**
Lauren Turek, Assistant Professor

**Health Care Administration**
Brad Beauvais, Assistant Professor

**Human Communication and Theatre**
Michelle Bisbee, Visiting Assistant Professor and Scenic Designer

**Mathematics**
Kiryl Tsishchanka, Instructor

**Modern Languages and Literatures**
Ana Maria Mutis, Lecturer
Physics and Astronomy
David Pooley, Assistant Professor

Psychology
William Ellison, Assistant Professor

Religion
Simran Jeet Singh, Assistant Professor

Sociology and Anthropology
Kathleen Denny, Visiting Assistant Professor

ADJOURNMENT
Vice President Fischer invited faculty and staff members to attend the President’s reception in the foyer of the Dicke/Smith Art and Music Building immediately following the assembly. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Duane Coltharp
Secretary of the Academic Faculty Assembly
CALL TO ORDER
President Danny Anderson called the meeting to order and offered some remarks on the following topics:

- In response to Texas Senate Bill 11, the University will sponsor open fora for students, faculty members, and staff members on the question whether the University should allow firearms on campus.
- In an effort to strengthen Trinity pride, the University has commissioned the composition of a new fight song, and Alumni Relations will host a tailgate party for alumni on November 7. The University has also held a number of “thank you” events for various donor groups, including faculty and staff donors.
- In his meetings with academic departments and programs, President Anderson has heard many impressive and inspiring stories regarding the ways in which faculty members work to engage students.
- In his meetings with alumni chapters across the nation, President Anderson is encouraging alumni to tell their own Trinity stories.
- President Anderson is taking speaking invitations from many local and regional organizations and is giving interviews to the local media.

VICE PRESIDENT FOR FACULTY AND STUDENT AFFAIRS MICHAEL FISCHER
Vice President for Faculty and Student Affairs Michael Fischer continued the meeting as chair. Vice President Fischer thanked the faculty for their contributions to the implementation of the Pathways curriculum, including the First-Year Experience and the Core Capacities. Vice President Fischer noted that funding from the Mellon curricular implementation grant is available to support faculty members who wish to develop their ability to teach the Core Capacities, particularly Written Communication, Oral and Visual Communication, and Digital Literacy.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE ACADEMIC FACULTY ASSEMBLY OF AUGUST 20, 2015
A motion was made and seconded to approve the Minutes of the Academic Faculty Assembly of August 20, 2015. The motion carried.

REPORT FROM THE QUALITY ENHANCEMENT PLAN TOPIC SELECTION COMMITTEE
Professor Ben Surpless, Chair of the Quality Enhancement Plan Topic Selection Committee, reported that the committee has held four facilitated brainstorming sessions. Following the initial submission deadline (October 30, 2015), the QEP committee will review the first round of proposals and will provide feedback to proposal sponsors. The deadline for the second round of
proposals will be January 4, 2016. The committee will then narrow the field by identifying the strongest proposals, and sponsors will present these proposals to the campus community in late January. The committee will then review final proposals and will make its recommendations to the President’s executive staff and the Board of Trustees.

REPORT FROM THE FACULTY SENATE
Professor Adam Urbach, Chair of the Faculty Senate, noted that the Faculty Representation and Elections Committee is working to correct some errors in the current listing of faculty members for standing committees of the University. The FRE committee has developed new Standard Operating Procedures that will guide future committee appointments and are meant to ensure an equitable distribution of service responsibilities.

Professor Urbach also reported that the Senate is working with the administration to analyze faculty workloads, with the goal of aligning faculty efforts with the mission and values of the institution.

Professor Urbach then presented a motion to revise the Academic Honor Code by creating a Decision Committee to participate in the appeals process (Faculty and Contract Staff Handbook, Chapter 6J, Article III.F). The motion carried.

Professor Urbach then presented a motion to revise the Academic Honor Code by creating policies that address violations committed by students not receiving a grade in a course (Faculty and Contract Staff Handbook, Chapter 6J, Article III.E.3.c.2). The motion carried.

Finally, Professor Urbach presented a motion to revise the Academic Honor Code by revising policies that address negligent or careless scholarship (Faculty and Contract Staff Handbook, Chapter 6J, Article III.E.3.a). The motion carried.

REPORT FROM THE UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COUNCIL
Professor Kevin Livingstone, Chair of the University Curriculum Council, reported on the implementation of the Pathways curriculum. Professor Livingstone noted that the Council hopes to develop a proposal to fine-tune the requirements associated with the Interdisciplinary Cluster. Professor Livingstone also urged departments and programs to be as explicit as possible when submitting proposals related to the Pathways curriculum or the credit hour policy.

The Council has recently revised the name of the Committee for the Assessment of the Common Curriculum – the new name is the Committee for the Assessment of Pathways Elements – and has also approved the creation of an Interdisciplinary Cluster Steering Committee.

Finally, Professor Livingstone noted that he is working to develop an online submission system for UCC proposals.

ADJOURNMENT
There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:20 p.m.
Respectfully submitted,

Duane Coltharp
Secretary of the Academic Faculty Assembly
APPENDIX

Here follow the motions that were presented to the meeting of the Academic Faculty Assembly on October 23, 2015.
Honor Code Section III.F

3. Composition
   a. The Appeals Board shall be made up of seven (7) members of the Academic Honor Council selected by the internal chair.
   b. Among these seven (7) members, there shall be one of the three (3) original hearing members (one who voted with the majority) in order to offer insight into the rationale for the original decision without having sufficient power to uphold that decision should the majority of the Appeals Board disagree with it.
      The original panel member is not to serve as the presiding member on the Appeals Board. Case-presenters assigned to the case being appealed cannot serve on the Appeals Board.
   c. The Decision Committee shall be made up of the internal chair, the external chair, and one of the three (3) original hearing panel members (one who voted with the majority). The Decision Committee is responsible for determining, by a majority vote, whether a petition to appeal a case will be accepted.

4. Procedures for Appeal Process
   a. Professors, other complainants, or accused students who wish to appeal the Academic Honor Council’s decision shall submit their request in writing to the external chair within five (5) class days following receipt of the Academic Honor Council's opinion or the discovery of new information.

      The external chair shall notify the internal chair, the accused student, the originating complainant, the faculty advisors, and the AVPAA of the receipt of any petition for rehearing by the end of the first class day following the day of its receipt.

   b. Within five (5) class days following the notification of the receipt of a petition, the Decision Committee will meet and vote whether to grant a rehearing.

      In order to gain insight into the rationale for the original decision, the Decision Committee will have access to the file for the original case, kept in Northrup Hall.

      For petitions that request an appeal on the basis of improper procedure, the committee must determine whether the petition has made a “reasonable argument” that the Honor Council has not followed procedure. A “reasonable argument” is an argument that could be substantiated; it is not the job of this committee to determine if proper procedure has been followed.
For petitions that request an appeal on the basis of additional evidence, the committee must determine whether or not the new evidence is pertinent to the original case. That is, if the evidence were submitted in the original case, would it have been considered relevant by the original Hearing Panel? If so, then the evidence is pertinent. The new evidence submitted does not need to be sufficient to determine responsibility on its own, it must only be worth consideration.

Petitions that request to amend a sanction will be automatically accepted by the committee.

The internal chair, by the end of the second class day following notification by the external chair confirmation by the committee that the petition has been accepted, will assemble the Appeals Board, appointing one of the seven (7) members to preside over the appeals board. The internal chair will notify these members of their appointment and set a date for all seven (7) members and the faculty advisor(s) to meet. The internal chair will also notify the accused student and originating complainant of the date, and encourage both to attend.

c. Any sanctions imposed by the Academic Honor Council shall be delayed during the appeals process.

d. In the case of appeals a rehearing to amend a sanction, the Appeals Board will accept or deny the appeal by majority vote of four.

In the case of an appeal of a sanction, the Appeals Board will hear from the petitioner should he or she be present and willing to address the Board. The Appeals Board will then hear from the student should he or she desire to respond to the petition. A faculty advisor must be present for deliberation to ensure due process.

In addition to the evidence and statements provided by the accused student and the originating complainant, the Appeals Board will receive the file for the original case by the internal chair before the rehearing. The file contains all of the evidence and statements used in the original case, as well as the corresponding opinion letter. The Appeals Board may consider the file during questioning and deliberations.

If the Appeals Board decides to amend a sanction, the Board must assign a sanction under the Honor Council’s class-based system.
e. In the case of **appeals a rehearing** to reconsider a finding of “Responsible” or “Not Responsible,” the Appeals Board will accept or deny the appeal by majority vote of four. The rehearing shall follow the same procedures as the original hearing.

   The presiding member of the Appeals Board will be the presiding member of the rehearing. The accused student and the originating complainant will not have case-presenters, although either party may elect to ask the internal chair to assign them one. If either the accused student or the originating complainant asks for a case-presenter to be assigned to them, the same case-presenter who served on the original case will serve in the rehearing unless the basis for appeal involved one of the case-presenters. The same case-presenters who served on the original case will serve in the rehearing unless the basis for appeal involved one of the case-presenters. In such a case, the internal chair will assign a new case presenter. A faculty advisor, as usual, must be present to ensure due process.

   The presiding member of the rehearing panel of Appeals Board will notify the accused student, the originating complainant, and the AVPAA of the rehearing panel’s decision by the end of the same day the rehearing panel of Appeals Board meets. The announcement of the opinion and the release of the written opinion will follow the same procedure as that pertaining to an original opinion.

Rationale

Currently, the Honor Council’s appeal process mandated the assembly of an Appeals Board for every petition. The Appeals Board decides, for each petition, first whether to accept the petition, and then to either rehear the case or amend its sanction, depending on the petition. The problem with this is that an Appeals Board may find difficulty separating the act of accepting or rejecting a petition from the subsequent rehearing that results from accepting the petition. The purpose of the Decision Committee is to compartmentalize these two actions. By having a different group of people analyze each separate issue, there is no room for confusion on what facts to consider when making either the decision of whether a petition is worthy of a rehearing or whether the appellant’s argument warrants an altered decision. Thus, the Appeals Board benefits by entering the rehearing without any bias from the acceptance of the petition. It will also prevent valid petitions from being rejected. For example, an Appeals Board reviewing whether to accept a petition in light of additional evidence may reject the petition if it believes the new evidence would not change the original decision of responsibility, **even if the new evidence is pertinent to the case**. The Decision Committee provides insulation from such a decision because it does not have to decide a student’s responsibility, so it is not biased at any point in the process of reviewing a petition.

*Construction of the Decision Committee*
The Decision Committee should be composed in a way that allows the Committee to meet quickly so that the petitioner may receive a fast decision. For this reason, the Committee should be a small group: one person on the Hearing Panel who voted in the majority on the original case will be able to provide additional insight into the deliberation process. Including the internal chair and external chair, who receive the petition, allows for a small group that can meet quickly, and does not compromise the confidentiality of the case.
2. Violations committed by students not receiving a grade in a course

Guidelines: such violations involve students who do not receive official grades for their coursework (e.g., a student or faculty member auditing a course).

Sanctions:

- Completion of a CD-ROM focusing on ethical principles as they apply to academic integrity.
- Completion of an annotated bibliography, consisting of 200-250 words per entry, of ten peer-reviewed articles and books dealing with academic integrity, or completion of a 2500 word essay report on a recent book dealing with academic integrity.
- In addition to the above, depending on the nature and seriousness of the violation: suspension, expulsion, or revocation of a degree (when relevant). In the case of expulsion or revocation of degree, the first two sanctions above become irrelevant.

Bylaw pertaining to annotated bibliography/CD-ROM deadline:

*It is suggested that students complete the course on ethical principles and annotated bibliography assignment (where applicable) within two weeks of the sanction being assigned. The registration status of the student will be put on hold until all assignments are completed.*

Rationale:

The purpose of the proposed adjustment is to clarify how students who do not receive standard letter grades would be sanctioned when found responsible of academic dishonesty. Currently there is no explicit procedure for attending to the circumstances in which a student’s work is not graded. Letter grade reduction is one of the main parts of our current sanctions, and without the capacity to apply it to the offending student, the process would become unbalanced. This could generate confusion in the absence of a clear outline for how to sanction these students if left to a case-by-case *ad hoc* procedure to determine proper sanctioning. We feel it would not be appropriate that students who do not receive grades to receive accidentally lighter sanctions than students who commit violations of comparable severity in graded courses.

In order to resolve this problem, this proposal adds to our sanctioning guidelines to apply the Annotated Bibliography assignment to violations involving students completing courses without receiving official grades. The particular sanctions we suggest for these cases are already present in the code to account for cases in which we cannot apply our
normal sanctions (for instance, when a student is found responsible for a violation in a course in which they are not currently enrolled). This alteration will now make it explicit that this is one of the unusual circumstances to which this sanction will now be applied.
Sloppy Scholarship Proposal: Letter of Warning

[Location: IIIE.3a]

a. Finding of non-responsibility that nevertheless merits a warning
Guidelines: This classification is merited when one of two three conditions applies:

1) The evidence in the final analysis was not clear and convincing but was indicative of a likely violation of the Honor Code.
2) The student's failure to satisfy requirements was due to a reasonable misunderstanding of the instructor's guidelines. However, students have a responsibility to clarify any instructions that they are not certain they have fully heard or correctly understood.
3) The panel finds the alleged violation to be a result of negligent or careless scholarship (e.g., a student properly cites the majority of her sources in her paper but fails to properly use in-text citations in an instance in which she pulls material from a source in her bibliography). It is important to note that this sanction does not apply to cases in which a student is ignorant of the rules the Academic Honor Code or proper citation practices. For example, this class would not apply to a case in which a student claimed to be unaware that she needed to cite encyclopedia sources in her paper.

Sanction: In the case of lack of clear and convincing evidence, a letter will be issued warning the accused student that the behavior or actions described in the allegation are not tolerated, and that all future academically related behavior and actions should avoid even the appearance of violating the Academic Honor Code. In the case of unclear or verbal only instructor guidelines, a letter will be issued directing the student to be more aware of the need to be clear about what is and is not allowed, and to seek clarification from the instructor if there is any doubt. In the case of negligent or careless scholarship, a letter will be issued warning the student that extra caution should be taken when completing coursework in the future. In addition, the student will complete a CD-ROM focusing on ethical principles as they apply to academic integrity, or similar assignment at the discretion of the Hearing Panel.

Necessary Changes:

Class 1: Negligent and Careless Scholarship Minor Violation

Guidelines: there is no clear evidence of intent to cheat, and the assignment contains offending material; however, the vast majority of the assignment is done appropriately. (e.g., on a paper, most quotations and sources are correctly indicated and cited, and any missing citations do not involve major sources used in the paper but not cited anywhere).

Sanctions:
• Completion of a CD-ROM focusing on ethical principles as they apply to academic integrity, or similar assignment.
• The instructor gives an appropriate grade to the assignment, including a zero, taking into account negligent and careless scholarship the offending material.
• A 1/3 letter course grade reduction (e.g., an A- to a B+, or a C to a C-), calculated after the grade on the assignment is recorded.

Class 2: Minor Violation—Moderate Violation
Guidelines: the offending material is not minor in question is a minimal part of the assignment, but if deleted, would not significantly impact the rest of the assignment.
Sanctions:
• Completion of a CD-ROM focusing on ethical principles as they apply to academic integrity, or similar assignment.
• The instructor gives an appropriate grade to the assignment, including a zero, taking into account the offending material.
• A 2/3 letter course grade reduction (e.g., an A- to a B, or a C+ to a C-), calculated after the grade on the assignment is recorded.

Rationale

The members of the Honor Council believe some modifications to the sanctioning class system are needed to better attend to cases in which a violation is the result of a student’s negligent scholarship. A student can be said to commit an act of negligent scholarship when 1) the offending material in an assignment is produced unintentionally and 2) this unintentionally produced material is not the result of a student’s ignorance of the Honor Code or other relevant rules pertaining to the appropriate completion of an assignment. For example, a student commits an act of negligent scholarship if the offending material is due to some error such as a typo or forgetting to cite a particular quote in a paper; a student does not commit an act of negligent scholarship when, for example, the offending material results from ignorance of proper citation practices.

We believe that the current sanction class prescribed for cases of negligent scholarship—Class One—is not appropriate for cases in which the offending material in an assignment is due to a careless error of the sort described above. We reason that a student who commits an act of negligent scholarship should not be found responsible for violating the Honor Code and that the current sanctions are too harsh. Although caution should be taken when completing coursework to ensure it is completed in accordance with the assignment guidelines and the Honor Code, some leniency should be afforded if an apparent violation is the result of mere negligence.

We propose that an additional option be added to the sanction type “finding of non-responsibility that nevertheless merits a warning” that applies to cases of negligent scholarship. This option would follow the model of the current two types under this heading: a letter of warning will be issued and, at the discretion of the hearing panel, the student will be required to complete a course on ethical principles.
Some minor changes to the current sanction classes must be made to accommodate this change. First, “Class One: Negligent and Careless Scholarship” will need to be retitled “Class One: Minor Violation,” and all wording pertaining to negligent scholarship must be deleted. We would like to keep this sanction class as an option for cases in which offending material in an assignment is minor, yet is not the result of negligent scholarship. Second, “Class Two: Minor Violation” will need to be renamed “Class Two: Moderate Violation” to accommodate the altered Class One.
CALL TO ORDER
President Danny Anderson called the meeting to order and offered some remarks on the following topics:

- President Anderson thanked the faculty and staff for making his recent investiture a meaningful experience.
- President Anderson congratulated those faculty members who were recently awarded tenure or promotion. He also recognized the Student Life division, which has received several recent honors and awards from the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.
- President Anderson thanked Professor Adam Urbach for his dedicated service as Chair of the Faculty Senate, and he recognized Professor Diane Smith and Professor Brian Miceli, incoming Chair and Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate respectively.
- A joint task force of faculty members and administrators is studying the many kinds of faculty work at Trinity and the ways in which that work can be adequately measured and recognized.
- The University has selected its topic for the next Quality Enhancement Plan – Starting Strong: Intentional Strategies for Improving First-Year Student Success at Trinity University. The University will look for ways to incorporate other proposed QEP topics, including Sustainability, into future campus initiatives.
- In the effort to recruit next year’s first-year class, Trinity is currently exceeding most of its admissions goals.
- Fund-raising is well under way to enable the planned renovation of the Bell Athletic Center.
- Alumni Relations and Development reports that Trinity has seen an increase in gift amounts as well as the alumni giving rate.
- President Anderson is exploring ways to fund the renovation of Chapman Center and Halsell Center at some point in the future. Renovation cannot move forward until a feasible funding plan is in place.
- Work on the campus master plan continues to move forward. The plan is to report to the Board of Trustees at its May 2016 meeting so that the Board can review the proposed master plan.
- The University is beginning to lay the groundwork for a comprehensive capital campaign.
- President Anderson is in the midst of an alumni listening tour. He has visited fifteen alumni chapters so far, and in early April he will visit seven cities in five days.
• Professor Sheryl Tynes, currently Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, will assume the position of Vice President for Student Life in June 2016. The search for a new Vice President for Academic Affairs is moving forward as planned and has generated a strong slate of candidates.

**VICE PRESIDENT FOR FACULTY AND STUDENT AFFAIRS MICHAEL FISCHER**

Vice President for Faculty and Student Affairs Michael Fischer continued the meeting as chair.

Vice President Fischer described some of his ongoing projects:

- The search for an interim Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs: Student Academic Issues;
- The process of determining faculty salaries for the 2016-17 academic year;
- The continued implementation of the Trinity Tomorrow strategic plan and the Pathways curriculum;
- The renovation of Chapman and Halsell;
- Determining the appropriate size of the faculty and the appropriate size of each academic department.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE ACADEMIC FACULTY ASSEMBLY OF OCTOBER 23, 2015**

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the Academic Faculty Assembly of October 23, 2015. The motion carried.

**REPORT FROM THE FACULTY SENATE**

Professor Brian Miceli, Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate, introduced the new and returning members of the Faculty Senate and also thanked the outgoing members of the Senate.

Professor Miceli reported that the Senate continues to examine policies that would address professors of practice and other poorly outlined positions.

Professor Miceli also reported on the progress made by the faculty workload task force. The task force has updated Professor Diane Smith’s earlier faculty workload report, which analyzes data related to departmental enrollments and class sizes. The updated report shows that the use of non-tenured and non-tenure-track instructors remains relatively high, as does the number of overloads and the number of faculty members teaching overloads. The report also shows that the supervision of student research is not awarded teaching credit in a consistent manner across all departments. The task force has recommended the creation of a handbook for department chairs, which would include guidelines for the fair distribution of courses and service duties.

**REPORT FROM THE UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COUNCIL**

Professor Kevin Livingstone, Chair of the University Curriculum Council, reported that the initial offering of the First-Year Experience in Fall 2015 was well organized by the topic
coordinators and was well reviewed by the first-year students themselves. There will be a two-day workshop for FYE instructors, May 16-17.

In other matters related to the Pathways curriculum, more seats will be needed in Creative Expression (one of the Approaches to Creation and Analysis) as well as in two of the Core Capacities – Oral and Visual Communication and Digital Literacy. Professor Livingstone encouraged science departments to consider adding courses to Written Communication, and he likewise encouraged humanities departments to consider adding courses to Digital Literacy.

Professor Livingstone then presented a motion to revise the Core Capacities (Courses of Study Bulletin, “Degree Requirements”). The motion carried.

Professor Livingstone then presented a motion to add a “General Guidelines” section to the UCC Bylaws (Faculty and Contract Staff Handbook, Chapter 2B, Article VII). The motion carried.

Professor Livingstone then presented a motion to revise the Interdisciplinary Cluster (Courses of Study Bulletin, “Degree Requirements”). The motion carried.

Finally, Professor Livingstone presented a motion to revise the Interdisciplinary Cluster (Faculty and Contract Staff Handbook, Chapter 2B, Article VII).

A motion was made and seconded to commit the proposal to the University Curriculum Council. The motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT
There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Duane Coltharp
Secretary of the Academic Faculty Assembly
Here follow the motions that were presented to the meeting of the Academic Faculty Assembly on April 1, 2016.
MOTION TO REVISE THE CORE CAPACITIES  
(COURSES OF STUDY BULLETIN, “DEGREE REQUIREMENTS”)  

Proposal:  
To clarify language governing the Core Capacities within the Pathways curriculum.

Rationale:  
The Pathways curriculum includes language that limits the way in which courses may be placed within the curriculum (“No course may be listed as satisfying more than one of the Approaches to Creation and Analysis requirements”), and it also includes language that limits the way in which courses may be used by a given student (“No course may be used to satisfy both the Approaches to Creation and Analysis and the Interdisciplinary Cluster requirements”). Unfortunately, the language that addresses the Core Capacities (“No course may satisfy more than one Core Capacity”) is ambiguous enough to support either or both of these meanings. The present motion attempts to resolve this ambiguity and thus to clarify the intentions of the faculty members who drafted this language.

This motion also provides language that clarifies the way in which cross-listed courses are treated for the purposes of the breadth requirement within the Pathways curriculum.

Proposed bulletin language:

CURRICULAR GENERAL GUIDELINES

To encourage students to experience a broad range of educational experiences, the University maintains the following guidelines:

● The eight courses used to fulfill the Approaches to Creation and Analysis and the Interdisciplinary Cluster must come from at least seven different disciplines.*

● No course may be used to satisfy both the Approaches to Creation and Analysis and the Interdisciplinary Cluster requirements.

● No course may be listed as satisfying more than one of the Approaches to Creation and Analysis requirements. A course that has been approved for one of the Approaches to Creation and Analysis may not be approved for another.

● No course may satisfy more than one Core Capacity. A course that has been approved for one Core Capacity may not be approved for another.

● The First-Year Experience (FYE) may not be used to satisfy any other graduation requirement.
A minimum of 24 credit hours must be earned outside the major department and major requirements (n.b., only Engineering Science majors may include the FYE).

* For the purposes of this requirement disciplines are the subjects as categorized by the subject codes used in the designation of courses.

* Each discipline is designated by a particular three- or four-letter subject code, such as “ART” or “ARTH.” When a student completes a cross-listed course to fulfill the Approaches to Creation and Analysis or the Interdisciplinary Cluster, it is as if he or she has taken any of the subject code versions of that course, which may exclude future course selections. As an example, URBS 1310 is cross-listed as SOCI 1310, and ANTH 3360 is cross-listed as SOCI 3360, so a student who completed URBS 1310 and ANTH 3360 would be considered as having taken two SOCI courses and could not apply any further course from or cross-listed with SOCI to the Approaches or Cluster requirements.
MOTION TO ADD A “GENERAL GUIDELINES” SECTION TO THE UCC BYLAWS
(FACULTY AND CONTRACT STAFF HANDBOOK, CHAPTER 2B, ARTICLE VII)

Proposal:
To create a statement of General Guidelines for the presentation of the Pathways curriculum in the University Curriculum Council Bylaws.

Rationale:
The proposed language already appears in the Courses of Study Bulletin. Because some of this language controls the way in which courses may be categorized within the various elements of the Pathways curriculum, it seems wise to add this language to the UCC Bylaws.

A previous motion on the April 1 agenda calls for some revisions to this language in the COSB. These revisions have been incorporated into the present motion.

Proposed handbook language:

GENERAL GUIDELINES

To encourage students to experience a broad range of educational experiences, the University maintains the following guidelines:

- The eight courses used to fulfill the Approaches to Creation and Analysis and the Interdisciplinary Cluster must come from at least seven different disciplines.*
- No course may be used to satisfy both the Approaches to Creation and Analysis and the Interdisciplinary Cluster requirements.
- No course that has been approved for one of the Approaches to Creation and Analysis may be approved for another.
- No course that has been approved for one Core Capacity may be approved for another.
- The First-Year Experience (FYE) may not be used to satisfy any other graduation requirement.
- A minimum of 24 credit hours must be earned outside the major department and major requirements (n.b., only Engineering Science majors may include the FYE).

* Each discipline is designated by a particular three- or four-letter subject code, such as “ART” or “ARTH.” When a student completes a cross-listed course to fulfill the Approaches to Creation and Analysis or the Interdisciplinary Cluster, it is as if he or she has taken any of the subject
code versions of that course, which may exclude future course selections. As an example, URBS 1310 is cross-listed as SOCI 1310, and ANTH 3360 is cross-listed as SOCI 3360, so a student who completed URBS 1310 and ANTH 3360 would be considered as having taken two SOCI courses and could not apply any further course from or cross-listed with SOCI to the Approaches or Cluster requirements.

The following guidelines are intended to assist the University Curriculum Council in the work of implementing and assessing the Pathways Trinity Curriculum.
MOTION TO REVISE THE INTERDISCIPLINARY CLUSTER  
(COURSES OF STUDY BULLETIN, “DEGREE REQUIREMENTS”)

Proposal:
To revise policies governing the Interdisciplinary Cluster in the Pathways curriculum.

Rationale:
The current Pathways curriculum includes the following requirement: “The Interdisciplinary Cluster must be fulfilled by successfully completing three courses (totaling no fewer than 9 credit hours) from three disciplines in at least two disciplinary groups.” The final phrase within this requirement (“in at least two disciplinary groups”) raises at least two problems:

- Students are completely unfamiliar with the system of disciplinary groups at Trinity and are not likely to internalize this system anytime soon. There is a high likelihood that many students will fail to recognize which course selections do or do not fulfill the requirement.
- Our system of disciplinary groups does not account for courses whose home “department” is an interdisciplinary program – for example, AFAM 1310 (Introduction to African American Studies) or ENVI 1301 (Introduction to Environmental Studies). There is no easy way of knowing to which disciplinary groups such courses belong.

The present motion attempts to simplify the Interdisciplinary Cluster requirements by removing the reference to disciplinary groups.

This motion also provides a cross-reference to the language that clarifies the way in which cross-listed courses are treated for the purposes of the breadth requirement within the Pathways curriculum.

Proposed Courses of Study Bulletin language:

CURRICULAR ELEMENT IV: THE INTERDISCIPLINARY CLUSTER

Students should demonstrate the ability to explore a complex subject of enduring or contemporary significance by employing multiple disciplinary methods.

Requirement:
To qualify for graduation with a bachelor’s degree from Trinity, a student must complete at least one Interdisciplinary Cluster.

The Interdisciplinary Cluster must be fulfilled by successfully completing three courses (totaling no fewer than 9 credit hours) from three disciplines in at least two disciplinary groups. These courses may be structured as a part of a faculty-designed Interdisciplinary Cluster or student-
designed three-course learning experience that meets the above guidelines and is approved by
the University Curriculum Council. All courses in the Interdisciplinary Cluster must be taken at
Trinity University, and only one of these courses may be used to fulfill the requirements of the
student’s primary major.

**Note:** ID Clusters hold great potential to integrate Trinity’s liberal arts and pre-professional
programs and to encourage productive collisions among disciplines. Courses used to fulfill the
Interdisciplinary Cluster requirement may also be used to fulfill Core Capacity requirements, a
minor, or a second major. It is envisioned that most students will complete the Interdisciplinary
Cluster by the end of their sophomore year.

* For the purposes of this requirement disciplines are the subjects as categorized by the subject
codes used in the designation of courses.

* See the “General Guidelines” above.
MOTION TO REVISE THE INTERDISCIPLINARY CLUSTER
(FACULTY AND CONTRACT STAFF HANDBOOK, CHAPTER 2B, ARTICLE VII)

Proposal:

To add a requirement that one major assignment in each course within an Interdisciplinary Cluster draw upon the previously completed courses, and to drop language requiring students to complete courses in two disciplinary groups.

Rationale:

According to the Curricular Guidelines in the University Curriculum Council Bylaws (Faculty and Contract Staff Handbook, Chapter 2B, Article VII), students who complete an Interdisciplinary Cluster should be able to “draw connections between the completed coursework.” Currently, however, the Curricular Guidelines provide no specific mechanism to ensure that students will actually draw these connections. The present motion attempts to provide a uniform mechanism by requiring that students utilize what they have learned in previous courses in completing at least one major assignment within each course that belongs to an Interdisciplinary Cluster.

The rationale for dropping the requirement for taking courses in two disciplinary groups has already been explained in the accompanying motion to change the Courses of Study Bulletin description of the Interdisciplinary Cluster.

Proposed handbook language:

CURRICULAR ELEMENT IV: THE INTERDISCIPLINARY CLUSTER

A. Learning Outcomes

Upon successful completion of an Interdisciplinary Cluster students will have demonstrated the ability to:

- place the cluster topic in a critical context and articulate how multiple disciplinary methods inform the study of the topic.
- use analytical and interpretive methods appropriate to at least two disciplines.
- exhibit a critical understanding of differences in methodology between multiple disciplines.
- draw connections between the completed coursework.

B. Requirements

To be designated as fulfilling the Interdisciplinary Cluster requirement, an Interdisciplinary Cluster will:

- enable students to employ analytical and interpretive methods from two or more disciplinary approaches to examine a significant question.
• consist of five or more courses from at least three disciplines that address a particular topic or theme.

C. Student Requirements
To receive credit for successful completion of an Interdisciplinary Cluster, students will:
• take three cluster courses from three disciplines and at least two disciplinary groups.
• complete at least one major assignment in each course that integrates material from the course or courses previously completed in the cluster.
• maintain a portfolio that includes assignments produced in each course.

D. Additional Notes
• To fulfill the student requirement, each course within an Interdisciplinary Cluster must include at least one major assignment, and that assignment must include the following instructions: “Please draw upon the course or courses that you have previously completed in this Interdisciplinary Cluster in accomplishing this assignment.”
• For each course within an Interdisciplinary Cluster, the syllabus must articulate the official Learning Outcomes and Student Requirements as listed above.
• The cluster requirement can also be met by a student-designed three-course learning experience that meets the requirements in A, B and C above and is approved by the faculty involved in those courses, the committee in charge of interdisciplinary clusters, and the University Curriculum Council.
• Courses used to fulfill the Interdisciplinary Cluster requirement may also be used to fulfill Core Capacity requirements, a minor, or a second major. Only one course of the Interdisciplinary Cluster may be used to fulfill the requirements of the primary major.
• Clusters must have a means of coordinating among participating faculty, and reviewing new courses proposed for a cluster, and conducting final student evaluations.
• Ideally, students will complete the Interdisciplinary Cluster by the end of their sophomore year.