Academic Assembly
February 11, 2013
2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 130

MINUTES

Present: Brenda Broussard, Mason Bryan, Carol Wolfe Clay, Karen Cowgill, Isiaah Crawford, Tito Cruz, Lynn Deeken, Bill Ehmann, Terry Foster, Christian Halliburton, Sonora Jha, William Kangas, Kristi Lee, Michael Matriotti, Sean McDowell, Erik Olsen, Roshanak Roshandel, Rob Rutherford, Frank Shih, Jeremy Stringer

Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes

I. Review of 1-28-13 Minutes
   A. Item III.B.1. should read "Draft will be circulated to Academic Assembly when it is complete"
   B. III.C.1. should read "Specifically raised faculty resource concerns in addition to space and personnel"
   C. Fix numbering on III.B. to 1, 2, 3, 4, 5
   D. Approved with above corrections no abstentions
II. Career Initiative Steering Committee
   A. Nominees
      1. Allison Henrich, College of Science and Engineering (undergraduate) - approved
      2. Erica Yamamura, College of Education (graduate) - approved
   B. Karen Cowgill has the name of an additional faculty member who would like to participate and John Strait will pass along to Carol Schneider
III. Faculty Handbook Revision Committee (FHRC)
   A. Faculty handbook revision process has taken several years, including an outside consultant, work by the FHRC, and review by Office of the Provost and University Counsel
   B. The working draft will go to the FHRC for final review, then the Deans' Council, Academic Assembly, faculty and the campus community, the Provost and the Board of Trustees
   C. FHRC has two open positions, to be appointed by AcA
      1. Nominated faculty must be prepared for an intensive work process and have an interest in the drafting process; prior service on University Rank and Tenure Committee and/or other broad campus service would be ideal
      2. AcA nominee John Weaver from the School of Law is approved for one position
      3. For the second position, it may be useful to think about appointing someone from College of Arts and Sciences
      4. AcA members can forward nominations to John Strait for vote at the next meeting
IV. Email Distribution Lists
   A. Identified point person in OIT who is responsible for the lists
   B. Systemic problem in determining which names belong on which lists
   C. OIT is working directly with Faculty Services to clean up the lists by hand (time intensive)
V. Syllabus Guidelines
   A. Separate University Resources and Policies section on the second page
   B. University Resources and Policies is a living document that can be updated
   C. Chuck Lawrence will check if the disabilities notice is required by law
   D. Edits to University Resources and Policies page
      1. Make font smaller

2. Remove "(as appropriate)"
3. Change to "Library and Learning Commons"
E. Guidelines approved with 1 opposed and 1 abstention

VI. Bylaws and Faculty Governance
A. Focus on bylaws changes now and begin the longer process of examining faculty governance structure as a whole
1. May host fora across campus to gather faculty feedback
2. May form a subcommittee to develop governance proposals
3. Faculty governance satisfaction was low on the 2009 faculty and staff satisfaction survey
a. May have been skewed in comparison to non-peer institutions
b. We will have more reliable information after the upcoming 2013 survey, which will be benchmarked against our peers
B. Broad faculty governance issues
1. Background on previous Faculty Senate
a. Previous Faculty Senate was not effective, did not have a say on academic policy or program review process
b. New AcA solidified involvement in academic policy development and program review and also involved some de-centralization to schools/colleges
c. One draft proposal was for AcA to have "presumptively final authority," but that phrase was not included on the final proposal; felt like a top-down decision
d. Ultimately, no major differences between Faculty Senate and AcA in decision-making processes at the university such as planning and budget
2. Academic Assembly purview
a. Effective representation on other key governance groups is important
i. Budget Advisory Committee is between budget processes, but has ongoing AcA faculty representation; need to figure out if faculty actually have a say in major decisions or just learn about decisions once they are already made
ii. Increased faculty representation on committees across campus may require workload adjustment, but this will also affect the percentages of classes that are taught by non-tenure track, part time, and adjunct faculty
b. May still be possible to add 10-12 AcA-specific questions to the 2013 faculty and staff satisfaction survey
c. AcA members should email Rob Rutherford their feedback about how the traits of effective faculty senates match up to AcA function at SU
3. Comparison to other universities' faculty governance
a. Identify two or three schools that represent strong faculty governance and develop a proposal to visit and view their governance structures, or have their representatives visit SU
b. A budget proposal for these visits could be incorporated into next year's budget
c. A major focus would be how institutions raise faculty interest and involvement
4. AcA relationship with staff
a. Staff do not currently play a role in shared governance
b. HR would have to be involved in any discussion about recognition of staff participation in governance
c. Perhaps determine whether to involve staff based upon subject matter of meetings
d. AcA has no dedicated secretarial staff and no budget
e. This topic will be incorporated into the larger discussion of faculty governance