

Academic Assembly
February 25, 2019
2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 130

MINUTES

Present: Felipe Anaya, Sarah Bee, Pat Buchsel, Terri Clark, Mark Cohan, Marc Cohen, Miles Coleman, Charlotte Garden, Arie Greenleaf, Naomi Hume, Nalini Iyer, Kate Koppelman, Kathleen La Voy, Shane P. Martin, Ben Miller, Michael Ng, Frank Shih, Gregory Silverman, AJ Stewart, Colette Taylor, Mark Taylor, Kirsten Thompson

Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes

- I. Review 1-28-19 Minutes
 - A. 18 approve, 0 oppose, 1 abstain
- II. Provost Update
 - A. Updates on Provost Office staff
 - B. Snow Days
 - 1. Feedback on process is welcome
 - 2. Lack of centralized plan, underprepared as an institution for major unexpected events
 - 3. In the future, we want faculty to have a range of options for how to deal with situations
 - C. Academic Affairs Subcommittee of the Board of Trustees
 - 1. Three changes to faculty handbook previously approved by FHRC/AcA were recently approved by the Board of Trustees; three others are still pending
 - 2. Suggestion to consider a process for a major revision next year to address many areas of ambiguity (e.g., grievance process)
 - D. Looking into faculty concerns with Student Integrity development process
- III. Faculty Handbook Revision Committee Report
 - A. Overview
 - 1. Three AcA-approved revisions (brought forth last year) passed the Board
 - 2. The other three pending are related to workload and equity issues around workload
 - a. APRs – shift from mandatory annual process to optional three year process
 - b. Tabled currently pending workload task force
 - 3. FHRC also has a list of small revisions to discuss next year, but no new proposed revisions for AcA to review
 - B. Discussion
 - 1. Faculty Titles
 - a. Our Lecturer and Instructor titles seem to be switched from most universities
 - b. Perceived hierarchy that is counter-intuitive to industry standard
 - c. Should be brought to faculty task force and staff council as part of broader consideration of titles across the university
 - d. Was flagged by FHRC but should be considered by the other bodies with a request for recommendation
 - 2. APRs
 - a. Shift from APRs to three years should be considered as part of a larger question as well
 - b. Chairs may be concerned because it is the one time of year to give formal feedback
 - c. More conversations needed, are we ready for all implications of this change?

- d. Merit is not consistently calculated across campus, wide variations across colleges
- e. Instructors are often on two year contracts, three year APR would not work for them
- f. ADVANCE grant implications also need to be considered
 - i. \$5 million grant to examine equity questions for women and faculty of color in STEM areas
 - ii. Will have an influence on the campus structures
- 3. Non-tenure track
 - a. Some faculty in this community do not like the use of this term – negative positionality
 - b. Maybe part of a broader discussion – perhaps a task force that would look at different options, and should include NTT faculty
 - c. Contingent, Adjunct, Term are some options used elsewhere
 - d. Need to look at what other terms and structures are used across higher education
 - e. AAUP recommends Contingent

IV. Strategic Planning Faculty and Staff Engagement (*Katherine Raichle, Ruth Tressel*)

- A. Sub-task force within the larger Strategic Planning group
 - 1. Goal to engage faculty and staff as broadly and deeply as possible
 - 2. Seeking feedback and to develop a relationship with AcA
 - 3. Task force also includes Henry Louie, Stephanie Lewis, Heather Geiger
 - 4. Round 1 for initial feedback and round 2 for a more structured framework that allows specific and productive responses
 - 5. Fora, listening sessions, online survey will all be communicated to campus
 - 6. Separate task force engaging with students to seek their feedback, and another engaging with the external community
 - 7. Goal to reach people at the margins of our community, those whose voices are not always heard
- B. Discussion
 - 1. Strategic planning is separate from donations, Capital Campaign is focused on donations
 - 2. Confusion between this and the Campaign, there seem to be a number of big picture data-gathering emails over the last few days that we often don't have access to after the fact – hopefully this data at least in aggregate can be shared back with strategic planning
 - 3. Multi-year plan for China has dropped off the website
 - 4. AAOP report is not one of the documents on the website, and that had a lot of big picture issues and data that would be important for the strategic planning process
 - 5. To what degree are external interests involved?
 - a. The external community engagement group is handling that aspect and it will be integrated into the broader strategic plan
 - b. Local business community, employers, technology, partnership potentials
 - 6. Faculty and staff of color may not want to raise issues in a public forum
 - 7. Allowing people multiple options of providing input
 - 8. Would like feedback to be made public for accountability
 - 9. How do we write a plan that has built in accountability, dedicated financial commitment, and consistency in action?
 - 10. Suggestion that part of the strategic plan should include budget planning
 - a. Critically important to address budget issue that we have been dealing with every year

- b. The strategic plan, if done right, will have buy in and understanding about why we make choices about funding and cuts
 - c. SWOT committee is looking at the budget model of the university
 - 11. AcA members can reach out to constituents to encourage to fill out survey and come to fora and listening sessions
 - 12. Feedback on how to reach underrepresented populations would be helpful within the next week
 - C. Credibility of strategic planning
 - 1. History of giving feedback, not knowing where it goes, no one knows or understands how or why decisions are made, and then poor budget management in light of priorities
 - 2. Commitment to earn back trust from the campus community
 - 3. Concern with timeline – cannot seem like the deadline is driving everything
 - 4. Recently extended timeline to the end of the calendar year (instead of academic year)
- V. Program Review Committee
- A. Criminal Justice program proposals update
 - 1. AcA motion is with A&S waiting to be considered by Executive Committee (EC) of CAS
 - 2. Although we received clarification after previous AcA meeting that EC had reviewed these proposals already, our questions still stand and we would like to hear the response from that group
 - 3. Some of the issues that AcA raised may not have been fully considered by EC, and we would like to draw their attention to these issues
 - B. Motion to waive the seven day waiting period to vote on new motions
 - 1. 19 approve, 0 oppose, 0 abstain
 - C. Revision: Master of Divinity
 - 1. Discussion
 - a. Unclear whether Christian Sexuality course is being expanded or being deleted
 - 2. Motion to approve PRC memo
 - a. 18 approve, 0 oppose, 1 abstain
 - D. Revision: MA Transformational Leadership
 - 1. Motion to approve PRC memo
 - a. 19 approve, 0 oppose, 0 abstain
 - E. Revision: MS Structural Engineering
 - 1. Discussion
 - a. No report-back required to AcA for a contingent approval, but this is on the record as recommendatory to the Provost
 - b. Bigger question: our whole process of reviewing programs against benchmarks
 - c. Recommendations and concerns noted in this process are an important part of benchmarking for review
 - d. Part of Bylaws revision – what power does AcA have to say: what were the recommendations and what was done?
 - e. Need to decide how this is tracked and by whom
 - f. At a recent Budget Advisory Committee meeting, it was discussed how new programs with budget asks get approved and then are not operationalized or implemented correctly, then we are surprised when new programs struggle
 - g. Operations is a structural gap at the institution
 - h. Suggest that previous PRC memos are included in the body of evidence that gets submitted
 - 2. Motion to approve PRC memo

- a. 20 approve, 0 oppose, 0 abstain
 - F. Revision: Master Professional Accounting
 - 1. Motion to amend memo to strike the Initial Concerns section
 - a. Not part of normal PRC process to leave this in, will loop back to PRC for process improvement
 - b. 20 approve, 0 oppose, 0 abstain
 - 2. Motion to approve PRC memo as amended
 - a. 19 approve, 0 oppose, 1 abstain
 - G. Revision: BS Mechanical Engineering
 - 1. Motion to approve PRC memo
 - a. 20 approve, 0 oppose, 0 abstain
- VI. Previous Motion: UAC Charter Revision Proposal
 - A. Motion to approve
 - 1. 20 approve, 0 oppose, 0 abstain
- VII. Introduction/Discussion of Motions on Consultants
 - A. Discussion
 - 1. Huge resource drain to gather this information
 - 2. Need to be clear: how we are going to do this, why we are going to do this, and what we are going to do with it?
 - 3. Larger worry with whether resources are being managed correctly with the best interest of the institution at heart
 - 4. Recommendation before we ask anybody to do this to ask: what is the process? Is there a competitive bid? Feedback? Performance assessment?
 - 5. We see email announcements of new projects and consultants, never see feedback of what happened and how this decision was made in an environment of limited resources
 - 6. Unclear what the term Consultant means in these motions?
 - a. If every person who is a PR or working on a grant, we would be inundated with unnecessary information
 - b. Took this to be about business and operational consultants, not academic – unclear how this is broken down in budget reporting
 - c. Need to be explicitly clear about our goal and what our end result would look like
 - 7. May be best to ask for a broad number for all consultants, and then decide if this is enough of a priority for AcA to take up
 - 8. Working toward a friendly relationship with administration, but AcA should not let go of the need to agitate in ways that produce action
 - 9. These numbers (consultant dollars) are major numbers when compared to the budget cuts we have been asked to make
 - B. Motion that Sarah Bee and Mark Cohan will do fact-finding on behalf of AcA and bring back a clearer motion
 - 1. Would help to talk to Joe Cater and Bob Duniway first
 - 2. 16 approve, 0 oppose, 0 abstain