

Academic Assembly
February 1, 2016
2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 130

MINUTES

Present: Jeffrey Anderson, Sarah Bee, Rick Block, Pat Buchsel, Terri Clark, Isiaah Crawford, Carlos de Mello e Souza, Bill Ehmann, Charlotte Garden, Leticia Guardiola-Saenz, Arun Iyer, Kate Koppelman, Charles Lawrence, Viviane Lopuch, Margit McGuire, David Neel, Michael Ng, Erik Olsen, Katherine Raichle, Rob Rutherford, Frank Shih, Heath Spencer, John Strait, Dan Washburn,

Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes

- I. Review 1-25-16 Minutes
 - A. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions
- II. Diversity and Inclusive Excellence Taskforce Update (*Natasha Martin, Monica Nixon, Jodi O'Brien, Alvin Sturdivant*)
 - A. Background
 1. Two year task force project, including campus climate survey and culminating in report
 2. Process
 - a. Five subcommittees engaged in information gathering across university, including gap identification and partner consultation
 - b. Their data along with the survey led to the report
 - c. Task force initial charge is now complete, continuing to meet with Cabinet to discuss next steps on how to advance the work laid out in the report with a five year plan
 - B. Report
 1. Structured around university strategic plan as a way to align work across the university
 2. Ensure that information presented is substantiated through research and data
 3. Highlights most pertinent to faculty
 - a. Goal 2 – Integrate inclusive excellence across curricular and co-curricular offerings
 - b. Goal 3 – Build and sustain the capacity of students, staff, and faculty to engage, teach, and lead through an inclusive excellence lens
 - C. Wismer Office
 1. Opportunity to work in tandem with the Diversity Task Force to focus on goals in report
 2. Advocacy, support, and development for faculty around issues of diversity and inclusion
 3. Center for Faculty Development is doing great work already; Wismer is a parallel partner to that office focused primarily on women faculty and faculty of color
 4. Applied for an NSF grant to provide opportunity to develop Wismer Office and promote SU as a cutting-edge institution on this kind of work
 - D. Discussion
 1. Committees
 - a. AcA has been contemplating move to a Faculty Senate model, and Diversity Task Force has recommended developing a number of standing committees – is there a way of finding commonality between the two in terms of a shared, cohesive committee structure at the university?
 - b. Initial report was submitted to President and Cabinet, who are still in deliberation about how to implement the recommendations
 - c. Task force will bring this committee cohesiveness suggestion to Cabinet

2. International faculty
 - a. Current university policy only supports international faculty immigration in tenure/tenure track lines
 - b. There may be an issue with immigration policy since the non-tenure track international faculty members make up a significant population teaching in the Core
 - c. Need to create discussions across campus that can lead to structural prioritization of these issues
 3. How AcA can assist task force
 - a. Encourage fellow faculty members to bring forward questions or concerns, serve in ambassador role to school/college faculty, encourage colleagues in intentional conversations about the report and recommendations
 - b. Center for Faculty Development and Wismer Office will develop resources for curriculum and course development – use these and participate in associated events
 4. Budget
 - a. Many of the recommendations are going to take resources (funding and people), encourage task force to share budget planning for open discussion and prioritization
 - b. Current academic year recommendations do not require financial investment, further years do require resources
 - c. Task force feels very supported by Cabinet, has to be balanced with financial realities of university as priorities are set
 5. Invite task force back for update after further discussions across campus
- E. Provost Update
1. This task force report is a major priority for the President
 2. Cannot cover every recommendation right away, so will have to find areas of synergy across the university
 3. AcA Discussion
 - a. Already do fairly well in this area in terms of graduating students, but the structure of the budget process can make it difficult for good ideas to be heard
 - b. Concern with lack of communication between major areas across campus – if the report recommendations are going to be achieved, they need to be structurally integrated with existing systems
 - c. Discussion of the need to make recruitment of students and faculty and curriculum development top priorities
 - d. Teaching and curriculum are opportunities for faculty to start on these goals
- III. Full-Time/Part-Time Student Status Policy (*Erin Morgan*)
- A. Rationale for Proposed Changes
 1. Added section on co-op students to be able to report them as full time (similar to an internship, but students are paid and do not earn credit)
 2. Other changes were for clarity and to update current practices to bring us into compliance with federal financial aid requirements, peer institutions, and best practices
 3. Endorsed by Council of Deans
 - B. Motion to approve changes to policy
 1. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions
- IV. Questions for President Sundborg's February 22 Visit
- A. Unionization
 1. Prioritize this discussion
 2. Further elaborate on link between religious institution and right to unionize
 3. Contingency plans if unionization passes

4. What budget is paying for the university's appeals and how much is it costing?
- B. Budget
1. Often have a good idea but no budget allocation within that year – budget is not flexible
 2. Need to not only minimize costs but focus on revenue to cost analysis
 3. What mechanism can we create to have a broader conversation about the strategic priorities of the university in light of what is happening with AAPOR and budget challenges?
 4. Decisions are made from within each area, but it is unclear how larger priority decisions are made both within divisions and across divisions
 5. External funding for athletics and SUYI – are there ways to endow these so we do not have to continue to internally fund them?
- C. Update on fossil fuel divestment
- D. Send faculty senate model for discussion
- V. Proposed Policy Development
- A. Motion to establish an ad hoc committee to develop a policy for the faculty handbook regarding a faculty-led review process of administrators
1. Discussion
 - a. Other schools (listed on AAUP website) do engage in similar process
 - b. Once committee is formed, it should look into this with peer and aspirational institutions
 - c. College of Nursing is engaging in this process internally with a focus on collaboration and constructive
 - d. Consider how this would affect hiring of new people down the road
 - e. Campus Climate Report references a significant portion of employees who do not feel SU is a good work environment, important to address this through a robust and open feedback process, should not negatively affect good candidates
 2. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions
 3. Members: Erik Olsen, Kate Koppelman, Terri Clark, Michael Ng, David Neel, will consider administrator input
 4. Faculty Handbook inclusion
 - a. Proposed revisions were due to FHRC by today
 - b. Erik Olsen will check with FHRC about delaying proposed amendment
- B. Motion to establish a policy on bullying
1. Discussion
 - a. Some feel this is not fully addressed by the grievance process in the faculty handbook
 - b. Issue came up in various ways in the Task Force report
 - c. Faculty/administrator and faculty/faculty will be initial focus
 2. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions
 3. Members: Pat Buchsel, Margit McGuire, Frank Shih
 4. Reach out to HR and Student Development to develop an inclusive document for faculty, staff, and students