

**Academic Assembly**  
May 18, 2015  
2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 130

**MINUTES**

Present: David Arnesen, Sarah Bee, Patricia Buchsel, Isiaah Crawford, Lynn Deeken, Bill Ehmann, Linda Frothinger, Meggie Green, Trish Henley, Mike Huggins, Arun Iyer, Kate Koppelman, Chuck Lawrence, Margit McGuire, David Neel, Michael Ng, Erik Olsen, Katherine Raichle, Rob Rutherford, Heath Spencer, John Strait, Dan Washburn

*Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes*

- I. Review of 5-11-15 Minutes
  - A. Approved with no edits
- II. Introduction of 2015-16 SGSU Representative to AcA, Paul Dewater
- III. Trustee Confidentiality Agreement
  - A. Overview
    - 1. Last year, AcA asked for and were granted membership on many Board of Trustees (BoT) committees, but were required to sign a longstanding confidentiality agreement
    - 2. Over the past year, AcA representatives have worked with University Counsel to develop a new draft that allows AcA reps to report back in a timely way on reasonably public information as shared in the BoT meeting
  - B. Discussion
    - 1. Number 1 contains phrasing that may be confusing: service could be read as service as a faculty member, instead of service as a representative of AcA on BoT
    - 2. Number 2, “professional manner” is broad but intentionally so, AcA representatives should act in a manner that best represents capacity on AcA
    - 3. No proposed edits
  - C. Motion to approve as written
    - 1. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions
- IV. Ombuds Charter Approval
  - A. Overview
    - 1. Non-reporter is the ideal that Ombuds would like to follow
    - 2. Washington state has a mandatory reporter law in respect to sexual abuse, child abuse, elder abuse, etc.
    - 3. Compromise in draft: communication with ombuds office is privileged except where by law required to be disclosed (similar to attorney-client law)
  - B. Discussion
    - 1. Informality section includes language about how all records are destroyed at the Ombuds discretion
    - 2. Suggests that discretion pertains to the destruction of the information as opposed to the timing of the destruction – if the latter, should be spelled out
    - 3. This charter should be an attachment to the Faculty Handbook, would like to get the document in place now and then can edit further
    - 4. No proposed edits
  - C. Motion to approve as written
    - 1. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions

**V. Senate Proposal Perspective Revisited**

**A. Overview**

1. Document was circulated last year and no further action has been taken this year
2. Would like to increase organization and management of AcA structure and meetings
3. One main recommendation is to add 3-4 additional committees, which would be comprised of AcA members and possibly other faculty members
  - a. Faculty affairs
  - b. Policy
  - c. Budget
  - d. Strategy/planning
4. If we do adopt this model, AcA could possibly meet less often and focus on issues as raised by the subcommittees

**B. Discussion**

1. Proposal is not yet ready for vote
2. Will need to move forward in the fall with this or another version
3. Perhaps host fora and bring in guests from aspirational institutions to advise
4. University Assessment Committee is also an AcA subcommittee that is already doing good project work
5. Also developing a university wide policy committee to serve as interim until AcA has finalized committee structure

**C. Motion to revisit Senate proposal at second meeting in the fall**

1. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions

**D. Following notes**

1. The structure also includes an HR subcommittee
2. In addition to fora, may also want to consider polling, etc. to make sure that there is broad faculty input and vote
3. Need to make sure these are following a timeline in the fall
4. Need to develop mechanism to pass these items along to next year's leadership – would like to have new members at June 8 meeting

**VI. Bylaws**

**A. May need to overhaul the Bylaws if the Senate proposal (above) passes**

**B. Ongoing discussion of possible edits**

1. Goal to balance time with each other as voting members (previously, Executive Session) with the broader conversation with administrative and student members
2. Executive Session does not have published minutes, so now seeking alternative group structures
3. Options
  - a. Voting-member-only option: anyone can attend but the floor is only open to voting members, for discussions that are more limited but also have record-keeping – want to be able to have independent deliberations by voting members
  - b. Struggle with finding voice as faculty members
  - c. Still raises the confidentiality issue – if confidentiality is still required, need to make that explicit and make it clear to guests

**C. Discussion**

1. Why isn't the default that faculty meet and then invite administrative partners as needed?
2. Idea to have a regular Executive Sessions scheduled throughout the year and then cancel as needed

3. Idea to not discuss and vote in the same meeting
  4. Allow for motions to record votes so there is record of votes
  - D. Motion to encourage Bylaws committee to proceed with the ideas above and present a proposal when ready
    1. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions
- VII.** Clarification of Faculty Summer Employment
- A. No issues with current language in Faculty Handbook around summer employment for those on a 9-month contract
- VIII.** Faculty Athletics Representative (*David Arnesen*)
- A. Overview
    1. FAR is a role independent of the Athletics department
    2. FAR signs off on student athlete participation quarterly
    3. FAR reports back to AcA and various others about work with Athletics
  - B. Gender Equity Committee for Athletics
    1. When men's baseball spots were added, SU started the GEC to bring us into compliance with Title IX requirements
    2. First year, GEC recommended adding women's crew, popular in this region and relatively low cost, very successful
  - C. Challenges moving forward
    1. SU Student-Athlete Absence Policy – FAR is working with colleges/schools to modify this to help the student-athlete not be punished for missing class due to scheduled practices and games
    2. Challenges of the schedule
    3. Senior exit interviews
    4. Administering the Coaches Recruiting Exam
    5. Three tiers of SU sports (funded differently)
      - a. Men's and Women's basketball
      - b. Men's and Women's soccer, baseball, softball, volleyball
      - c. Other sports
    6. Equity issues concerning provision of locker rooms and competitive facilities
  - D. Discussion
    1. Would be helpful to have comparative data of student-athletes before and after SU Division 1 membership
    2. Cost of renovating Connolly is not in the operating budget of Athletics, which is concerning when we are consistently told that Athletics is less than 5% of the overall budget – needs to be factored into true cost of Division 1 membership