

Academic Assembly
November 4, 2019
2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 130

MINUTES

Present: Bryan Adamson, Felipe Anaya, Sarah Bee, Pat Buchsel, Mimi Cheng, Terri Clark, Marc Cohen, Yancy Dominick, Nicole Harrison, Nalini Iyer, Angie Jenkins, Kathleen La Voy, Shane P. Martin, Dylan Medina, Patrick Murphy, Katie Oliveras, Chris Paul, Russ Powell, Frank Shih, Heath Spencer, Alex Tang, Colette Taylor, Mark Taylor

Minutes taken by Lindsey Nakatani

I. Review and Approval of 10-21-19 Minutes 2:05 – 2:07

- a. FOR: 15, OPPOSED: 0, ABSTAIN: 0
- b. Meeting Minutes for 10-21-19 Approved

II. Provost Update 2:07 – 2:15

- a. Invitation to the Provost Convocation – 4:00 pm Pigott Auditorium on Wednesday 11/6/2019, Provost would like to extend personal invitation to all faculty and staff, reception to follow convocation.
- b. Update on AcA Planned Parenthood Resolution – President Sundborg very supportive of the AcA's call to the provost. Next step is to invite the leadership named in resolution for a meeting, consider the 5 action items and prioritize, develop plan and timeline for meeting items.
- c. Provost attended CAS Faculty and Staff Senate Meeting last week. Provost felt that the candid discussion of the AcA Planned Parenthood resolution was productive.

III. Two Interest Items

- a. 2020 Mission Day – Sustainability and Environmental Justice: the planning committee is seeking an AcA appointed Faculty member for the committee (12 committee members for planning, 4 staff, 4 students and 4 faculty). Committee starts meeting in 2 weeks, 5-6-month commitment. Mission Day is April 16th, 2020
- b. Dean Spade (LAW) invite to attend Webinar on preparedness training on how to handle right-wing attacks from Tallie Ben-Daniel from Jewish Voice for Peace

IV. Approval of NCS Working Group 2:15 – 2:20

- a. Motion to Approve appointments to the NCS Working Group
- b. Proposed Committee Membership
 - Rick Fehrenbacher (Co-Chair, Dean NCS)
 - Sarah Watstein (Co-Chair, Dean Library)
 - Diane Fishel-Hall (NCS, Assoc. Director Admission/Marketing)
 - Wilson Garone (CFO)
 - Trish Henley (NCS, Assoc. Dean)
 - Julie Kang (COE)
 - Kevin Krycka (CAS)
 - Kathleen La Voy (Assoc. Provost)
 - Greg Magnan (ASB)
 - Travis Nation (Assoc. CIO)
 - Janet Shandley (Grad. Admission)

McLean Slougher (CSE)
Jane Snare (CDLI)
Danuta Wojnar (CON)

Discussion:

- c. Current dean and associate dean of the NCS are appointed to committee – conflict of interest? Co-Chairs clarification – guidelines for reconstruction of a college are few and vague, current committee consists of individuals best informed to assist the NCS working group
- d. Current charge of the NCS, concern voiced that the group’s focus is graduate education, is that currently the focus of the group? The NCS charge continues to develop and has been updated as of Friday 11/1/2019 to be much broader in spectrum
- e. STM and NCS operate as modified program review groups, dean’s informed opinion was extremely helpful to the STM committee meeting
- f. The NCS and STM groups will both work in consultation with the PRC – program reviews will be submitted to the PRC on 11/15/2019
- g. Interest expressed in reviewing the initial inquiry introduced 7-8 years ago, re-examination of the process for reconstruction of a program for the AcA to be brought up to speed
- h. Current structure of NCS is not adequately serving the students of the program, sense of urgency from the Board of Trustees to develop a plan of action
- i. Concern regarding lack of representation of undergraduate faculty on the NCS committee – clarification that there are reps of undergraduate education
- j. STM has longer history and has been established for 22 years, the working group’s membership and scope includes examining how religious education functions at SU and how it shows up on the campus
- k. The NCS Committee is currently reviewing how the program has changed and comparing that data with the changing levels of enrollment
- l. Student representation on PRC? Should a student rep be appointed to the NCS?
- m. VOTE: FOR: 14, AGAINST: 0, ABSTAIN: 1
 - 1. Motion is passed – NCS Committee Membership is Approved

V. Committee on Committees/URTC Update

2:20 – 2:30

- a. **URTC:** Main Motion: “Path Forward: Forming an ad-hoc URTC Committee with faculty membership selected by AcA, current URTC and Provost’s Office to come up with a more permanent bylaw on membership or other matters over Summer 2018-2019”
- b. URTC Charter Highlights:
 - 1. *11 FT tenured faculty, 6+ are full professors*
 - 2. *One each from school/colleges, all handled by AcA’s ConC*
 - 3. *At-large members appointed by AcA’s ConC*
 - 4. *Provost has final approval of URTC membership*
 - 5. *ConC manages faculty appointment to URTC*
 - 6. *ConC work with Dean, disagreement is resolved by the Provost*
 - 7. *Chair must be full professor, have 3 years of experience on URTC*

Discussion:

- c. URTC working group met over the summer 18-19 – some disagreement among the Working Group and the Deans’ Council about where the membership list generates? From the AcA or the Deans?

Generation of the membership list shall come from the ConC, in consultation with the deans of each college/school. Provost will make the final decision in the case of no agreement being reached between the ConC and the deans.

- d. ConC is seeking to fundamentally change how shared governance and committees are conducted – with ownership of process being with the ConC, however the ConC will work closely with the deans and the AcA.
- e. Under the new URTC charter draft there will be no student Rep on the URTC. This is a change in process. It was decided after advice from the university legal counsel. Student rep will need to be informed of the loss of their seat on URTC.
- f. Question regarding the open language in the charter which may lead to the misunderstanding that colleges appoint 6 reps and the ConC appoint the other 5? All member appointments will be made by the AcA via the ConC and confirmed by the Provost. 6 ConC appointed members *must be* from the colleges and the 5 remaining ConC appointed members are at large appointments.
- g. URTC appointments will need to be made quickly so that meetings can begin December/January.
- h. VOTE: FOR: 17, AGAINST: 0, ABSTAIN: 0
 1. Motion is Passed – URTC Charter is Adopted
 2. *“Moves to adopt University Rank and Tenure Charter, developed over summer 2019 pursuant to AcA19-39, version dated October 30, 2019. Accept future minor and stylistic edits and insertion of adoption date without further ratification. AcA can veto any future edits. ConC will work with current URTC, school/colleges, and the Provost office to populate the members of the URTC.*
- i. **ConC:** Election of VP Committees
 1. Needs to be a member of the AcA
 2. VP duties: will serve on the provost’s council, will work closely with the board of trustees, course release for the appointed faculty member
 3. Volunteers: Sara Bee, Dylan Medina, Katie Oliveras (candidates given 2 minutes for speech)
 4. VOTE: Sara Bee (*appointed as VP of ConC*)
- j. ConC Membership
 1. Bryan Adamson, Katie Oliveras, Kirsten Thompson & Margit McGuire
 2. VOTE: 15 FOR, 0 AGAINST, 0 ABSTAIN
 3. Motion is Passed – ConC Membership is Confirmed

VI. Discussion of Year’s Priorities and Framing of Progress

2:30 – 3:35

a. University Budget

1. What is the issue? **Discussion:**
 - i. Current Concerns: \$6 million gap at the beginning of the year due to enrollment being significantly underbudget. Funds were identified to close the gap for the current year, however next year’s budget is now a major concern.
 - ii. It was suggested that the Investment Portfolio is a budget concern and that deeper analysis of the portfolio is needed and merits further discussion.
2. Is this actionable for the AcA?
 - i. What is the AcA’s role as part of shared governance regarding budget planning?
 - ii. This question will be discussed when new CFO Wilson Garone visits the AcA in December.

b. Compensation

1. What is the issue? **Discussion:**
 - i. Retention, quality of life, cost of living, lower salaries (CAS especially) are all areas of concern for faculty and staff. Effects felt most strongly by the part-time and adjunct faculty.
 - ii. Commitment from administration to work closely with faculty to address these issues.

- iii. There is a committee currently studying equity and compensation that is also developing a multi-year plan for faculty salaries. Report to be made to AcA by winter.

c. **Workload**

1. What is the issue? **Discussion:**

- i. Workload discrepancies between the TT and the NTT, the schools, colleges and departments causing confusion and disorganization.
- ii. Discrepancies between the requirements for faculty releases – university wide standards on service releases not in place.
- iii. Semesters decision will greatly influence the discussion surrounding the standardization of workload calculations.
- iv. A general statement of understanding of the workload of a professor at an institution is needed. Currently SU has no said statement on record.
- v. Ethical responsibility is owed to the students regarding workload. How much of an instructors' workload is a tuition paying student entitled to?
- vi. Is this an issue for the Faculty Handbook? Should each college or school quantify the workload of its instructors? The service expectation of a workload is currently disproportionate to the rest of the workload.
- vii. FHRC to work on this issue to designate the percentage models for workload unique to each college & school
- viii. Class sizes are also a contributing factor to the workload issue. Allotted work units are not proportionate to fluctuating class sizes.
- ix. Semester System potentially opens possibilities for change. How much of a priority should this issue be *before* a decision is made on the semester question? Strategies to overhaul the system regardless of the academic calendar structure. Idea that a decision on semesters will have to be incumbent upon a plan being created and proposed. Input on this issue from the AcA could be directly added to the planning for the semester decision
- x. Is it a possibility for the AcA to create general guidelines that are then proposed to the schools/colleges who in turn can adapt the standardized model to fit their unique needs?
- xi. Consideration also for one, university-wide standard.

d. **Inequities**

1. What is the issue? **Discussion:**

- i. CAS-Percentages are not fair for salary increase reviews.
- ii. CAS-Measuring merit is inherently flawed. System needs to be adapted and modernized.
- iii. Albers moved to a numeric system which is appreciated by many at Albers.
- iv. Possible university-wide approach to these issues as many of these issues are interconnected.

e. **Evaluations**

1. What is the issue? **Discussion:**

- i. Concerns regarding biases in student evaluations. Evaluations are different campus-wide and there is no training for the people reading the evaluations to recognize their biases.
- ii. Inclusivity and diversity needs to be analyzed upon a structural, system-wide and comprehensive level. Diversity hires are not the only answer, structural changes are needed.
- iii. AcA could authorize some of its subcommittees to conduct internal research as well as outside research into models that other institutions have adopted
- iv. Evaluation instruments for students often gray the line between student satisfaction and student learning. Questions for students are often too all-encompassing and become impossible to answer accurately.

- v. Return rate for student evaluations is not good. Survey fatigue for students.
- vi. Timing of evaluation is inopportune. Having evaluations towards the end of the quarter doesn't give the students adequate time to intake/assess what they have learned.
- vii. During previous research into this issue there was faculty disagreement upon which evaluation questions to adjust and which to adopt. Overall it was a nonconstructive conversation. In addition, there are no adequate ways to evaluate and analyze evaluation data, so there are a lot of unanswered questions.
- viii. How much movement can AcA see on making a proposal for the re-structuring of evaluations?

f. **Non-tenure Track Issues**

1. What is the issue? **Discussion:**

- i. There are no clear transparent university guidelines in place for NTT which leads to a wide range of experience among the NTT Faculty.
- ii. NTT have been discouraged from doing scholarship work.
- iii. Revisit the creation of a new set of faculty titles in the Faculty Handbook and how instructors can enter those roles. There is a concern regarding the lack of movement opportunities for NTT into longer track titles and ranks etc.
- iv. NTT Committee creating new language regarding the issues surrounding the Clinical Titles and Teaching Professorship tracks and the language of the faculty handbook.
- v. University guidelines are needed as an institution regarding the advancement of NTT Faculty.

VII. Other Concerns/Issues

- a. AMDN building facilities – not up to standards.
- b. Tech Issues for Instructors –lack of tech resources for instructors and tech difficulties disrupting classroom experiences for students.
- c. Question about researching the idea of adjunct faculty delivering online programming?
- d. How are determinations made during the hiring process to enter a new instructor in the NTT or TT faculty? Decisions regarding whether a new hire should be NTT or TT should be addressed when the position is approved and released. Specification of the qualifications, and job duties should be aligned with their faculty placement. Clear guidelines are needed for the Deans who create these postings with faculty input.