Academic Assembly
November 16, 2015
2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 130

MINUTES

Present: Eric Bahuaud, Rick Block, Pat Buchsel, Maggie Chon, Terri Clark, Isiaah Crawford, Leticia Guardiola-Saenz, Mike Huggins, Georg Koszulinski, Charles Lawrence, Vivian Lopuch, Margit McGuire, Michael Ng, Luan Nguyen-Tran, Erik Olsen, Katherine Raichle, Rob Rutherford, Heath Spencer, Dan Washburn

Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes

I. Review 11-2-15 Minutes
- A. Approved with no oppositions and one abstention

II. Degree Requirements Policy Revision
- A. Summary of proposed revision to policy
  1. Edits to section of policy for students completing two graduate degrees simultaneously
  2. Instead of current policy with a maximum of 12 "overlay" credits allowed to count toward both graduate degrees, revision now has a limit of 20% shared credits
  3. Proposed language, "A maximum of 20% of the credits of each degree program can be shared between the degrees."
  4. Also calls for clearly established parameters in both programs for the sharing of credits
- B. Unanimous endorsement of Council of Deans
- C. Motion to approve revised policy
  1. Approved with no oppositions and one abstention

III. Proposed University Leadership Advisory Council
- A. Overview
  1. New committee established under President to move forward with shared governance and include faculty as ideas arise instead of informing after decisions have been made
  2. Will replace three standing/standing ad hoc committees: President's Advisory Council, Budget Consultation Group, President's Leadership Summit
  3. Membership – over 60 members total proposed
     a. Many with leadership roles in Academic Affairs, Mission and Ministry, Student Development, Finance
     b. Deans
     c. Cabinet members
     d. President and VPs of AcA
     e. Faculty representative from each school/college and the library
  4. Meet at a minimum on a quarterly basis or as needed as substantive issues arise
  5. Offer advice and recommendations to group and President
  6. Faculty members from each school/college were nominated by respective deans
  7. Will not replace Budget Advisory Committee
- B. Discussion
  1. Concern that faculty were elected independently of AcA, AcA is voice of faculty and should be central to these types of decisions
  2. Provost made decision to have Deans facilitate the selection process this year in the interest of time

3. Next year, AcA can be more involved in the process and can collaborate to clarify length of term and other details as the group is built out
4. Staff representative membership was determined by President
5. Advisory to President on issues of strategic focus, response to findings from university surveys, decisions with real estate, etc. and will not bypass purview of AcA
6. Communication between this new group and AcA will be facilitated by the AcA President and VPs through sharing of minutes, a standardized brief to AcA, etc.
7. The size of the group seems quite large, but some have experienced success with groups this size before

IV. Two Bylaws Amendments

A. Summary of proposed bylaws changes posted to Canvas, with very little faculty response and no major concerns expressed
B. Motion to reintroduce motion to approve proposed changes, as tabled at previous meeting
   1. Approved with no oppositions and two abstentions
C. Motion to approve two bylaws amendments as written
   1. Discussion
      a. Use of "their" as singular pronoun for gender neutrality
      b. Concern that non-tenure track members are in AcA leadership positions, they can face potentially vulnerable situations without the protection of tenure
      c. All faculty are stakeholders at the university and have a right to participate in making policies that affect them
      d. Should be based on experience, motivation, and willingness to participate, not rank
      e. These revisions strike a good balance/compromise, with one VP position remaining restricted to tenure and tenure track faculty only (program review), and the other open to non-tenure track faculty (faculty handbook)
      f. SU is still relatively conservative with these changes compared to peer institutions
      g. Need to revisit AcA leadership structure and restrictions as part of Faculty Senate model
   2. Approved with one opposition and two abstentions
D. Make sure full bylaws document is consistent with use of "their" as singular pronoun and then add a note at the end of the document that language was used for inclusivity

V. ERP Steering Committee

A. This committee will address how the new ERP system will be implemented
B. Seeking one AcA-appointed faculty member who can speak to faculty-related issues such as: grade input, pay advice, benefits, data management, degree progression and advising, accreditation management, etc.
   1. Rich LeBlanc – Science and Engineering
      a. Chair of Computer Science
      b. Served on the Finance subcommittee of BoT
      c. Track record of protecting rights and responsibilities of faculty in college
      d. Served as chair of Faculty Technology Committee
   2. Catherine Camacho-Carr – Nursing
      a. Familiar with data management and accreditation needs broadly
      b. Similar track record of faculty service in college
C. Next steps
   1. Colleagues will confirm if Rich and Catherine will serve on the ERP Steering Committee and forward names to Bob Dullea
   2. Motion to approve these two nominees if they are willing to serve

a. Approved with no oppositions and two abstentions

VI. AAPOR

A. Overview
   1. AcA have discussed whether there should be more faculty members on this group (currently two, from Arts and Sciences and Science and Engineering)
   2. Group is open to adding a third faculty nominee
   3. Important group in terms of academic policy and affairs, a planning group that will decide what kind of data to seek from across Academic Affairs
   4. After AAPOR group has completed work, there will be a new group formed that will decide what to actually do with results
   5. AAPOR work will likely go beyond the May goal and seek timeline extension from Board of Trustees

B. Third faculty representative
   1. In the interest of time, may inquire with the second most popular candidate from our previous vote (Chris Paul from Arts and Sciences)
   2. To date, have developed groundwork for what kind of data will we provide to schools/colleges
   3. Nomination of Mike Huggins to AAPOR
      a. Helpful to have an AcA member on the committee to report back directly
      b. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions

VII. Faculty Senate Proposal

A. Task force summary
   1. Focus is on basic structure and principles, with a similar proposed committee structure as that in the previously proposed Faculty Senate model
   2. Those who serve on the Faculty Senate would also serve on another committee in the structure to ensure communication
   3. Need to form a specific Bylaws committee
   4. In contact with Santa Clara about their model, researching Fordham and American
   5. Will share links about those models with AcA and arrange Skype conversations with representatives from these three models
   6. Goal to make this as smooth a transition as possible from AcA, with overlapping membership, etc.

B. Discussion
   1. Previous SU Faculty Senate was a senate model in name only, this proposed model is a fully realized model
   2. Model document needs to be updated (add NCS, remove authorizations chart, etc.)
   3. Next steps will include a forum to present updated model to faculty broadly
   4. Provost will advise President and Board of Trustees that the proposal may be complete this academic year
   5. Recommend to invite President to AcA early in winter quarter to inform of materials and general plan

VIII. Announcements

A. Update from UAC
   1. Christina Nilsen will replace Lynn Deeken as library representative

B. Academic Policy Review Committee
   1. Need an AcA representative as co-chair