Academic Assembly
October 19, 2015
2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 130

MINUTES

Present: Jeffrey Anderson, Eric Bahuaud, Sarah Bee, Pat Buchsel, Terri Clark, Brooke Coleman, Carlos de Mello e Souza, Bill Ehmann, Jan Hartley, Leticia Guardiola-Saenz, Arun Iyer, Kate Koppelman, Chuck Lawrence, Viviane Lopuch, Margit McGuire, Michael Ng, Erik Olsen, Katherine Raichle, Heath Spencer, Frank Shih, John Strait, Dan Washburn

Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes

I. Announcements
   A. Pat Buchsel and Michael Ng elected as part time AcA representatives
   B. Motion to add agenda items
      1. Academic Affairs Portfolio and Operations Review (AAPOR) nominations
      2. Health plan enrollment change
      3. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions
II. Review of 10-12-15 Minutes
   A. Discussion
      1. Total number of AAPOR members unclear (full committee composition)
      2. Focus will be on operational efficiencies – class scheduling, sizes, etc.
   B. Motion to approve as written
      1. Approved with no oppositions and four abstentions
III. Removal of Legacy Printers
   A. Overview
      1. AcA voted in spring to request to have faculty keep legacy printers and purchase their own supplies
      2. Cabinet considered the request, as presented by Chuck Porter, and voted not to approve
         a. Faculty member can keep a printer if it was purchased personally, will not be supported by ITS
         b. Printers purchased with grant funds can be kept
   B. Discussion
      1. AcA should start asking for rationales when motions are overturned by Cabinet
      2. Have to consider cost/benefit analysis – may save money for the university, but at what cost to the faculty and students?
      3. Margit will follow up with Chuck Porter to request a rationale
IV. Cultural Anthropology Program Review Follow-up
   A. Overview
      1. Routine program review of the Cultural Anthropology program was submitted last academic year
      2. At the final AcA meeting of spring quarter, the program contested areas of the PRC memo, so AcA called for a subcommittee to independently review the program review and memo over the summer
      3. PRC reviewed the feedback of the independent AcA subcommittee and incorporated it into their memo through a few brief edits

B. Motion to accept the revised PRC memo as written
   1. Discussion
      a. Vast improvement to memo
      b. Still a concern to try to operationalize the word understanding for assessment purposes (robs the word of richness and depth)
   2. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions
V. AAPOR Representatives
   A. Overview
      1. Committee starts work tomorrow
      2. Roshanak Roshandel was already elected, need to elect another member from nominees today
      3. Concern that two representatives may not be enough, faculty are very interested and want to be involved
      4. Elect someone from this list today, then request to have more representatives
   B. Motion to elect another faculty representative today, request composition of committee, urge Provost to have stronger AcA representation
      1. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions
      2. Discussion
         a. Chris Paul has an excellent written statement and identified as a concern the "business-ification" of the university
         b. Chris Paul is strategically positioned due to his work with other university and college committees, collegial
         c. Dave Madsen has been here for many years and understands core values of the institution
         d. Dave Madsen has impressive breadth of knowledge and vision for moving forward
         e. Dave Madsen has experience at the institution and does work across the university
         f. Chris Paul is President of Faculty/Staff Senate in A&S, Dave Madsen was on the committee that developed the model for that body – both would be good on AAPOR
      3. Vote
         a. Dave Madsen – 11, Chris Paul – 9 (1 written ballot was unreadable)
         b. Dave Madsen elected as second AcA representative to AAPOR
VI. University Assessment Committee Representatives
   A. UAC is a subcommittee of AcA that works to assess Undergraduate and Graduate Learning Outcomes through rubric-based assessment
   B. Nominate David Carrithers as faculty co-chair
      1. Works with assessment in Albers and understands assessment broadly
      2. Approved
   C. Need additional faculty representatives
VII. Revised Academic Policies Committee Description
   A. Overview
      1. Related to ongoing discussion of the proposed Faculty Senate model (equivalent with Academic Policy Committee in the model)
      2. Until AcA decides how to proceed with the Faculty Senate model, the university needs a policy committee in place to handle backlog of policies that need revision and updating
      3. Senate committee proposal included student recruitment and advising
   B. Three areas of discussion for Academic Policies Committee proposal
      1. Whether AcA's VP for Faculty Handbook should be one of the co-chairs
      2. The term of service for faculty members (3 years?)

       3.   How to incorporate student advising
- C. Motion to adopt to proposal in general and then address three issues above
    1. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions

VIII. Ombudsperson Updates (*McKenna Lang*)
- A. Ombuds offfice website launched in spring – charter, events, resources, etc.
- B. Open to all faculty, current office hours are Mondays and Tuesdays (part time position)
- C. Upcoming workshops based on faculty suggestions and needs: understanding multiple viewpoints, enhancing communication, conflict management, etc. (listed on website)
- D. Anecdote of success: faculty member had an issue with a supervisor, visited Ombuds office on multiple occasions to explore how to use different styles of language to address situation, faculty member then spoke with supervisor and successfully moved forward in working relationship

IX. Faculty Senate Model
- A. Moving incrementally toward the proposed senate model
- B. Question is now where to go with the full model
    1. Still some areas of concern, such as with budget model involvement, benefits, etc.
    2. Perhaps have campus-wide fora to discuss and gauge interest
    3. Perhaps invite advisors from other universities (Santa Clara) to speak about experiences
    4. Need to update and finalize model
    5. Need to clarify goal of senate model
    6. Perhaps focus on incremental issues such as representation on Cabinet
- C. In order to decide priority, need to know what other issues are for the year
    1. Budget issues and faculty handbook are not as big this year
    2. Will have some new programs coming forward, but probably not as many as last year
    3. New ERP and work of AAPOR
    4. AcA leadership will propose a system for moving forward on senate model work

X. Healthcare
- A. Some AcA members received a postcard to their home addresses from HR over the weekend announcing all SU employees will have to login and select a healthcare plan or will be automatically enrolled in Premera HAS plan
- B. Change from "rollover" of previous years
- C. No campus announcement – need more information
- D. Invite HR representatives to attend an upcoming meeting