

Academic Assembly
October 22, 2018
2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 130

MINUTES

Present: Felipe Anaya, Sarah Bee, Pat Buchsel, Terri Clark, Mark Cohan, Marc Cohen, Miles Coleman, Kelly Curtis, Cayla Duckworth, Arie Greenleaf, Ben Howe, Naomi Hume, Nalini Iyer, Kate Koppelman, Kathleen La Voy, Shane Martin, Agnieszka Miguel, Ben Miller, Michael Ng, Russ Powell, Frank Shih, Gregory Silverman, AJ Stewart, Colette Taylor, Mark Taylor, Kirsten Thompson

1. Review 10-15-18 Minutes 2:05 – 2:07
 - I. Vote: In favor-17
 - II. Vote: Opposed -0
 - III. Vote: Abstentions-3

2. [Vote] Discussion and vote on motions to accept amendments 2:07 – 2:15
and program review memo of Political Science (from PRC)
 - I. Last week we had discussed with a guest from Political Science the letter that we had written last year. After we had proposed the letter and some stakeholders from in the department of Poli Sci submitted amendments, reasserting their position.
 - II. We agreed to discuss the minutes within this group with members of AcA. Everyone has read proposed amendments to the letter. 1st amendment was strengthening political theory as a subfield, 2nd amendment strengthening the recommendation to have undergrad Poli Sci students be trained in quantitative methods.
 - III. Motion to accept the memo was presented last year, and there are two amendments.
 - IV. Are we comfortable with re-adjudicating/discussing this again?
 - V. Given that PRC makes recommendations, we should feel comfortable re-adjudicating anything, even if standing committee makes recommendation. It has to come to the collective body. I am more than happy to stand in for him to propose the motions. The third motion from the PRC committee is strengthen political theory and law, and this motion is strengthening political theory as a subfield. Was there any concept of measurements for what it means to strengthen?
 - VI. My suspicion is this should be decided within the College of Arts & Sciences, not here. This is not a process that's complete, but I think this may be the wrong body. I think it should probably go back.
 - VII. Would agree. From the visitors we had last week it sounds like it was a very collaborative process, and everybody was involved. If every program we review has people in that department submitting amendments after, it seems like it will be a never-ending process. I've never seen amendments come in after it's gone to program review. I wonder if the author wasn't using their position on AcA for that.
 - VIII. Agree, maybe this isn't the place to decide this but PRC is. If we were going to vote, I say the process is already done. I wouldn't support including those amendments.

- IX. Amendment needs to be cited. We can use this process to not second it, if people are cautious...
- X. Or we could have a motion to return it to PRC.
- XI. Wasn't here last year, but my impression from Rose and David Powers is that the conversation had already happened, and it seemed that this was an end-run around the process. They seemed to think it was already in there anyway.
- XII. Two things: One is motion and the other is the amendment that was placed. Is there a second for the amendment?
- XIII. Amendment- there is no second, amendment is not to be considered.
- XIV. Motion on the floor is to accept PRC memo as written or Program Review Committee.
- XV. Seconded.
- XVI. Vote: In favor: 19
- XVII. Vote: Opposed: 0
- XVIII. Vote: Abstention: 2

3. [Vote] Discussion and vote on "Procedures for Visitors to AcA," 2:15 – 2:30
(from Kirsten Thompson, CAS)

"That, as a general practice, AcA are asked to rank all proposed visitors at the beginning of each quarter (allowing for exceptions of urgent issues that may emerge), in order to more effectively plan and prioritize its meeting time. Further, that as a general practice (for which occasional exceptions can be made), that all proposed visitors are asked to provide informational materials for circulation to the membership at least 48 hours in advance, so that meetings with the visitors are spent on questions and further discussion rather than presentation." - introduced as written by Kirsten Thompson (CAS) on 2018-10-11

- I. This is about prioritizing time, visitors are often already in a queue to visit AcA. We know that we are under pressure, know that things are ranked down because of our priorities. More of a general practice that I want to institutionalize.
- II. Would this be a rule or guidance?
- III. It would be a general practice, so it's guidance. I would imagine would go into the bylaws.
- IV. Is this something the bylaw committee could work on?
- V. Having a category of guidance which guides our practice but allows for acceptance of urgent issues.
- VI. Wasn't here last year, but prior to that, never felt like having visitors wasn't ever time that was wasted. This seems somewhat restrictive. Usually here for 10-15 minutes. We should have materials ahead of time, of course. I don't know if this is a problem.
- VII. We have guests scheduled to visit throughout the quarter, such as Bob Dullea who are on a timetable, and that becomes an issue when we rank our priorities together. We work with this accordingly.

- VIII. There were a number of guests who were here for more than ten minutes, and there was a lot of looking at PowerPoint slides. Oftentimes we were limited to discussion time that felt confined. I support the second half of the statement (as presented by Kirsten in the statement shown). I agree that it is not as feasible as it seems to rank at the beginning of the quarter. I'm wondering about the 48 hours in advance, since our meetings are on Monday, that means Friday at 5, Friday at 1...
- IX. Two Business Days.
- X. We knew about a large number of representatives who were coming to visit us at the beginning of the quarter. Not speaking to usefulness of the individuals, but prioritizing given everything else that is on our agenda, we need to think about the proportion of time that is allocated to them. Want to avoid announcing the next week's visitor the week before.
- XI. Not sure about need for a motion like this; No one has right to appear before this assembly without being invited. No one can be invited without a motion to invite being moved and voted on. Over the quarter, someone has to move the invitation; we'd discuss pros and cons. Not sure how do we come up with a list of proposed issues at the beginning of quarter? Perhaps should decide on a case by case basis. Not sure we need a rule; if we do, perhaps should submit to sub-committee on bylaws to get that figured out.
- XII. That has not been a general practice. I've gotten many emails where the next week's visitor was announced.
- XIII. Maybe our bylaws have to clarify the process.
- XIV. Shane- Appreciate the dilemma presented here. Encourage folks who sit in leadership positions at the university to consider AcA as voice of the (collective) faculty. There are times when people want to consult with faculty and may ask to come here as well. How could this be done in the most expeditious way possible?
- XV. We should have something that goes across all the speakers that would be consistent.
- XVI. Can we separate the two parts? Is there an amendment to separate this?
- XVII. Like the idea of a practice that materials get circulated in advance.
- XVIII. Instead of 48 hours can we say two business days?
- XIX. Why not just submit them with minutes and agenda from the last meeting, and people could take it up as a piece as we are prepping for next meeting? That would be my suggestion.
- XX. Practically, I look at this with greater and greater restrictiveness. We had our meeting last week, Wed meeting minutes come out, three hours after meeting minutes went out, I sent out the agenda. I don't know who is being invited to speak with Bob Dullea, just aware of non-generic "faculty"
- XXI. Very soon we will be into the fortnightly meetings, so soon the pressure of meeting the next Monday will not be there. There will be more time and space to have it still be two business days after the meeting and agenda come out.
- XXII. When there were endless PowerPoints, what was the factor which allowed them to go on endlessly?

- XXIII. I agree that we should be able to give people parameters around “this is what we want to hear from you.” As time is so precious, some of the talks go on and on, and we don’t get to our business.
- XXIV. Is there an amendment being introduced?
- XXV. Would you like to amend the second part?
- XXVI. We amend it to say we should request materials the middle of the week before the presentation and we could separate the two parts and vote on them separately.
- XXVII. Motion to divide the proposed statement after the word “further.”
- XXVIII. Second.
- XXIX. The second part is a good thing to put as practice, but the first part seems to be unnecessary and potentially limiting. Reduces flexibility.
1. Vote on amendment to divide:
 2. Vote : In favor- 19
 3. Vote: Opposed- 0
 4. Vote: Abstention- 2

XXX. Vote on first part of the divided motion:

That, as a general practice, AcA are asked to rank all proposed visitors at the beginning of each quarter (allowing for exceptions of urgent issues that may emerge), in order to more effectively plan and prioritize its meeting time.

1. Vote: In Favor: 4
2. Opposed: 13
3. Abstention: 4

- XXXI. Should be proposed as an amendment to bylaws? If we are going to vote on the bylaws, should we wrap it all together? In normal governance procedure, it would come out as a motion; I just want to make sure it ends up where it needs to end up.
- XXXII. My understanding is that it is not being proposed as an amendment to the bylaws, but as a simple motion.
- XXXIII. Guidance that could be incorporated into the bylaws,
- XXXIV. I don’t see why it couldn’t be incorporated considered by the bylaw committee.
- XXXV. For now, we’ll just vote on the second part of the divided motion.

Further, that as a general practice (for which occasional exceptions can be made), that all proposed visitors are asked to provide informational materials for circulation to the membership at least 48 hours in advance, so that meetings with the visitors are spent on questions and further discussion rather than presentation

1. Vote: In favor - 21
2. Vote: Opposed -0

3. Vote: Abstention -0

- XXXVI. Wasn't there an amendment to lengthen the amount of time...
- XXXVII. Two business days.
- XXXVIII. (Deliberation over how many business days.
- XXXIX. We had a motion to divide the motion. The first vote that was taken up was the first half that was voted down. Now we're turning as the next motion the second half. Anyone can amend the pending made motion from 48 hours to 72. You did it implicitly when you said it, but we should probably do it expressly.
- XL. Move to amend the second half so that it says at least two business days in advance...

Further, that as a general practice (for which occasional exceptions can be made), that all proposed visitors are asked to provide informational materials for circulation to the membership at least two business days in advance, so that meetings with the visitors are spent on questions and further discussion rather than presentation

- XLI. Seconded.
 - 1. Vote: In favor - 21
 - 2. Vote: Opposed -0
 - 3. Vote: Abstention -0

- XLII. Those in favor of the motion raise your hand. (Vote is the same)

4. Strategic Planning & AcA's Role (4th ranked issue) 2:30 – 3:05

Bob Dullea & Faculty Guests Jen Maronne and Maureen Feit

- I. Dullea- Two objectives; 1. Update AcA on process to date 2. Provide AcA with context of your role in the process
- II. Dullea- Three goals: 1. Engage university community through broad outreach. 2. Work in spirit of continuous learning and improvement, use best practices in planning and organizational decision making. 3. Produce a plan that fulfills the mission, has enough purchase and continues to be pertinent to the university, focuses on success of all students, and advances Jesuit educational purposes. Integral part of the strategic plan will be the financial plan.
- III. Process to date: pre-designed work; broad map with two fixed points- steering committee; present to BOT in May retreat a plan that is well developed so that May review can be final review of the plan. May will be penultimate time.
- IV. Two main phases: identity articulation: Who are we when we are at our best? Who are the students we can teach uniquely well?
- V. After goals are identified, we will develop task forces. Task forces will be working with the steering committee and functional liaisons.

- VI. 1st part of the year context and analysis, then develop and implement action plan. Challenge in doing this work, worked toward financial realism. Never really got there. Started with “DREAM BIG”, then widdled away the dream.
- VII. 15-17 members for Steering committee; two co-chairs, Jen and myself; AcA asked to nominate 8 faculty, 4 of whom will be selected. The provost will be key in that work. Steering committee and staff council will identify 6 staff nominees, president and HR will select three of those; 1 or 2 trustees; Lucas Sharma will be member of the committee; Cabinet member Natasha Martin will serve; grad and undergrad student and provost will select dean to be part of this work.
- VIII. Frank mentioned it would be helpful to AcA to have a better understanding of workload expectations will be for steering committee. Identified four things. 1. Duration of work – from when committee is appointed to end of May; 2. Amount of work committee will meet every other week for 90 minutes; 3. Responsibility of Committee to define and implement engagement strategy. Steering Committee to understand its role as: Facilitation, outreach and engagement in addition to thinking on behalf of university community; Look at this work as learning opportunity. Collective understanding of what is happening in higher ed more broadly. 4. Leadership opportunity, will be asking them to take on long term and community wide perspective. Work together with emphasis on shared governance, diversity, inclusive excellence.
- IX. Jen- Send me an email if there is anything on your mind about this process. 6 proposed names thus far:
Morris, Koppelman, Deeken, Coleman, Hudgens, Whitlow
- X. Dullea: There was discussion around having a rep from every school or college. We want to have a similar structure to that of a House of Reps. Because some schools/colleges are much larger/smaller than others, we decided that we are not going to have a rep from every School and College.
- XI. What is your sense in terms of getting 15-16 people campus wide consultations given all that will be developed/implemented over the coming months?
- XII. Dullea- In order to build a financial model, you have to have limitations put in place. In our previous process, we let an artificial deadline trump good process. That’s a mistake I don’t want to repeat. Completed plan be put forward in May to BOT. Shift to that review delay has two advantages. The Board is able to have thoughtful input; Secondly, there is a lot of flexibility in that. Gives us a release valve in that we can decide what is feasible.
- XIII. Important for us to consider the community in which we live. Has the Strategic Planning committee considered bringing in a community member to help us as a part of the strategic planning process? Institutions I have been in that have done that have gotten buy in from the community to move forward.
- XIV. Dullea- Have been thinking about engagement with community members through things like focus groups.

- XV. Call attention to 1.a. of Draft Process Overview. This has echoes of what happened last year around shared culture. Must recognize that we are multiplicity. Don't want to put into process imposing an identity upon some of us.
- XVI. How best to find leaders in the community?
- XVII. Each institution has done it differently. For example, the Youth Initiative- There are leaders that are already staked in the institution. There is an opportunity to establish relationship. Depends on what the institution wants to do in the strategic planning process.
- XVIII. How are you going to measure outcomes?
- XIX. Dullea- Yes, there will certainly be. We do want measureable outcomes, been looking at strategic plans from other orgs; Intent is to put forward a plan for which we can measure the success.
- XX. Jen- In the management area we are actively asking this question.
- XXI. Maureen- What I've seen work in strategic planning processes, when you have to entrust a committee and a board to make decisions on behalf of a very large body, we must look at how the process engenders trust. So that if people are not in the room, we must be really transparent about the criteria that is provided on the front end as to how we make decisions.
- XXII. If there are non-negotiables from the BOT or president, or decision makers, is it clear what those are?
- XXIII. Dullea: Yes, there will be. This is about fulfilling the mission, not revising the mission. Have a conversation with Fr. Steve and the Cabinet tomorrow to ask for clarity on what that list should be. Finding right balance between minimizing risk of work being down towards ends that are unrealistic, because the president will not support them, and also incorporating the voices of the community.
- XXIV. Frank- Consulted about Jen as Chair, expressed strong confidence in Jen, and said AcA Rep from Albers commented that the administration "hit a home run with this one."

5. LGBTQ Minor PRC memo (from PRC)

3:05 – 3:10

Theresa Earenfight & David Powers

- I. Non-controverted nature of the proposal, impression that proposed LGBTQ studies minor already exists; it was a matter of repackaging the presentation and learning options with the faculty and courses which were available. Consistent with mission, courses are addressing LGBTQ studies are highly solicited by the students. Doesn't take many students to have a robust minor. If there weren't enough students, courses would be offered every other year. Rec that AcA approve the development of the minor and that it be recommended to the Provost.
- II. Theresa-25 years in the making. In 1992 Women's studies began teaching within this within their program. Given that long history, it is surprising how few colleges/universities have a program like this. We're hoping that will be a draw to students.
- III. Thanks for your leadership, students are very excited.

- IV. Do you have enough people to teach 2020 Course?
- V. Theresa: We are being thoughtful about it. This year Connie Anthony is teaching it, next year we're hoping Joe Philip, Gary Perry might be able to teach it. We are hoping to make it look intersectional.
- VI. Appreciate that courses and faculty exist, is there opportunity for new faculty member to take this and run with it?
- VII. Theresa: Hopeful. Long view of what is going on; it may take five years that we have the number of students to support a full time faculty who teach sexuality. Sexual Ethics, Trans Studies, are already in the works. Realistic enough to know that there is hope.
- VIII. Frank- We vote on this in a week. Motion to suspend the one week rule. Motion seconded. Those in favor of suspending one week rule- (Unanimous).
- IX. Those in favor of accepting PRC memo as is:
- X. Vote: Approve -21
- XI. Vote: Opposed -0
- XII. Vote: Abstention -0
- XIII. Hoping this will make November BOT meeting.

6. Discussion on "Motion to Form Subcommittee on AcA Bylaws," 3:10 – 3:25
(from Kate Koppelman, CAS)

"I'd like to move that a subcommittee of between 3-5 current AcA members be formed immediately in order to review and revise the current AcA bylaws."- Introduced as written by Kate Koppelman (CAS)

- I. As a new member of AcA, it would have been helpful to have a clear set of bylaws. Happy to serve on this committee to make own job easier to do
- II. Met with John Strait, expert in organizational governance. He would be willing to meet with this committee once we form it to think about how to organize.
- III. This will help us in our work at the college level. Will help us streamline going down the road.
- IV. Second that we clarify our processes. Point of clarification: relationship between AcA bylaws and Faculty Handbook committee. Would appreciate stipulating what the relationship is between these two.
- V. Wanting to make sure that we are clear on what belongs in bylaws, or in Faculty handbook. What are the points of confusion that current/past AcA members have? Hope would be to say what goes where? Don't want to double our work.
- VI. Observation- people rely on John too much. Ask him to direct how things go; He's going to retire soon. We don't really follow Robert's rules.
- VII. What are reporting responsibilities? If that's in the bylaws, that will inform how we respond/react. There is a request for more clarity regarding agendas, meeting minutes, etc. Confusion around reporting back.
- VIII. Rosa will have something to say about that.

- IX. Opportunity to think about scope of AcA role on campus
 - X. The interpretation of faculty handbook rests with the provost.
 - XI. That is one of the places where conversation between this committee and the faculty handbook revision committee is worthwhile.
 - XII. Expanding the scope, reach, and influence of this body and pushing its vision.
 - XIII. This could be an opportunity to make it provost proof.
 - XIV. Like the idea of seeing what visions is. May want to separate this between operational bylaws versus expanding. Focus on operational and make this a two part process.
 - XV. Supposed to be using Robert's Rules of Order. Would make our job easier.
 - XVI. More vision along with process.
 - XVII. The bigger question about where our university is and where we see ourselves participating. Like the idea of separating them. The processes might be different. Not prepared to commit to this as a process.
 - XVIII. Hate to lose the expertise of Michael Ng. Your history is an excellent piece.
 - XIX. Create separate motion to about how to tackle shared governance and vision. Additional motion to strategize how we're going to talk about shared governance. In addition to our work with the bylaw committee.
 - 1. Motion to expedite the vote. Seconded.
 - 2. Vote; Approved -21
 - 3. Vote: Opposed - 0
 - 4. Vote: Abstention -1
-
- 1. Vote on the Motion
 - 2. Vote: Approved- 20
 - 3. Vote: Opposed-0
 - 4. Vote: Abstention-0

7. Open Discussion

3:25 – 3:35

- I. Motion to ask for volunteers to serve on AcA Bylaws. Seconded.
- II. Volunteers are: Kate Koppelman, Kirsten Thompson, Greg Silverman, Ben Howe, and AJ Stewart, Arie Greenleaf
- III. Kelly Curtis – announcement: Interviewing for Vice President of Student Affairs so may not be in the next meeting November 5. Kate Hannock, chair of Civic Engagement is willing to do communication with the SUSS. Working on Statement for Trans and non-binary students on campus. Would you as faculty feel comfortable putting out statements in support of your students in light of the antics of the current Trump administration.
- IV. Perhaps we can propose a motion at the next meeting to work together on drafting something to address that.
- V. Propose increasing membership for bylaws sub-committee to 6 since we have 6 volunteers. Seconded.
 - 1. Vote: 17 in favor

2. Vote: Opposed -0

3. Vote: Abstention- 0

VI. Comment: Procedural issue with FHRC motions. Faculty handbook requires consultations with all full-time faculty and that a report be sent out. I understand that did not happen.

VII. Response: That email was sent out March 9 around nine o'clock.