

**Academic Assembly**  
Agenda  
October 8, 2018  
2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 130

**MINUTES**

Present: Felipe Anaya, Sarah Bee, Pat Buchsel, Terri Clark, Mark Cohan, Marc Cohen, Miles Coleman, Kelly Curtis, Arie Greenleaf, Ben Howe, Naomi Hume, Nalini Iyer, Kate Koppelman, Kathleen La Voy, Shane Martin, Michael Ng, Russ Powell, Frank Shih, AJ Stewart, Colette Taylor, Mark Taylor, Kirsten Thompson

- I. Review 10-1-18 Minutes
  - A. Approval of minutes- Seconded to approve
  - B. Correction read to the point AAUP Statement on Governance from 1961- Number of issues were outdated-phrasing off the minutes needs to be edited
    - a. Proposed to specify the 1961 Statement
    - b. Vote: Those in favor of meeting minutes as corrected -17
    - c. Vote: Those opposed- 0
    - d. Vote: Abstention- 1
  
- II. Formulate Agendas/Priorities for the Year (small groups)
  - C. Frank Shih divides AcA Members into four groups at random (AcA members draw blindly from bag) to discuss agendas and priorities for the year - Each group to report top three findings/issues to the larger group upon reconvening. Ex-officio members divided evenly amongst four groups.
  - D. Frank Shih welcomes NTT part-time members – Michael Ng and Pat Buchsel and Heather Casimere, covering Rosa Hughes
  - E. Frank Shih calls group to order
    - a. **Group 1- Top Three**
      - I. Faculty roles and responsibilities for part-time non-tenure, one year contract non-tenure, multi-year contract non-tenure track , what are all the expectations and roles and responsibilities for different categories of faculty
      - II. More transparent process on cut programs- both academic programs as well as peripheral programs such as learning communities
      - III. Faculty benefits package ranked to peers, including salary as well as benefits
    - b. **Group 2- Top Three**
      - I. AcA input on Strategic Plan –Strategic Plan is coming up, would like to know what is coming up
      - II. Continue to Develop and define the role/scope of AcA –for instance, what happens when we make a motion
      - III. Tracking access to and interpretation of data – What kinds of data go around, how do we keep track of and interpret data

**c. Group 3- Top Three**

- I. Issue of equity compensation and the need for a new market equity survey, making sure that we have shared standards or developing shared standards across the university around teaching, scholarship, service, workload, esp. for non-tenure track faculty
- II. Shared governance – campus wide shared understanding of what that means so that we can move forward with work
- III. Data transparency and communication- we wanted to bring to this body that faculty/staff senate in arts& sciences has just done a moral survey of the arts & sciences faculty, and we would like to make sure that this body keeps track of that

**d. Group 4- Top Three**

- I. Campus continues to be a safe place for people of Color and people of non-traditional gender. We're looking at that as an issue of lack of procedural fairness and a lack of policy/ will to implement policy that will prevent some of the things that are happening
- II. Equity for non-tenure track faculty
- III. AcA input online and hybrid classes as that continues to move forward

**III. Breakout Group #2-** Members of AcA draw out of bag for letter groups within which conversation is furthered around priorities/agenda for the year. Frank Shih instructs members not to touch on items that have already been raised, but to revisit the topic of what needs to be addressed (within newly formed groups)

- A. Announcements- HR is making some changes to retirement plans. That decision was made in August and the formal announcement will be sent out in November. Would you like to see them come here to give us a briefing on that?
- B. Assemblies answer is: Yes!
- C. Question raised to assembly around visitors- think about prioritizing the most important visitors for a quarter, to set some ground rules such as requiring them to circulate the basic information in advance of coming so that we could spend our time questioning them instead of hearing a presentation.
- D. Ten minutes talk, ten minutes Q& A.
- E. If all that's changed are the options in Fidelity, then I say no.
- F. General assembly says yes!
- G. LGBTQ Improved dormitory accommodation processing -How many people would like to like to hear a briefing on that?
- H. This issue came up as a result of the issues around the Spectator, and the forum that came about as a result.

- I. From the minutes from last year, June 4 there is a Faculty Market Equity Survey that was done. Report was sent out to Shane and Bob. We'll work with Shane on how we get that info to AcA. Do people want to know more about that?
- J. General assembly says yes!
- K. United Way the chair this year is Sarah Bee and Jordan- launches in November
- L. Is there a way to make an impact on doing business differently this year to make sure that the children who need it are impacted?

**e. Group A**

- I. Revisiting the work on college handbooks so that every college has a handbook
- II. Conversation about revenue sharing- incentive for Deans to accept new course offerings
- III. 3a. Revisit assessment -program review, assessment of faculty, and assessment of programs, esp. small programs; 3b. Switching to semesters

**f. Group B**

- I. Research support research requirements have increased, but the support has not
- II. The role of program review, having consistency between the colleges, having the information that comes up to AcA Program review be more uniform- the need for programs who have been approved by AcA to come back for a secondary review which was promised in the letters that would come from the provost.
- III. 3a. Budget transparency and the relationship between mission and budget 3b. Exploring digital humanities 3c. Computer refresh

**g. Group C**

- I. Policies and procedures for student complaints- who do they go to if they are having an explicit problem or a behavioral problem with faculty, bundled with Grievance procedure, and the ombudsperson- clarification of those different roles and Title 1X as to who students, in particular, go to
- II. University strategy for hiring faculty- what is it? How is its focus on academic careers connected to current ratios of contingent labor to tenure track labor
- III. Procedures for AcA including report back procedures and representation on Cabinet for Academic Assembly

**h. Group D**

- I. Shared governance at the college level- report back on what have the colleges done in regards to shared bylaws

- II. Silo mentality of the university and facilitating an infrastructure for communication between colleges
- III. Faculty assistance and student advocacy- if a student advocates and graduates, creating a thoroughfare so that what they have advocated for can be moved forward; example MRC

**III. Faculty Handbook Revision Committee Membership Vote**

- F. FHRC –Ajay Abraham nominee – 3 year appointment - Kirsten happy to support this person
- G. Nominees are called through canvas and the nominations can be posted- so far four NTT faculty wish to share names
- H. Vote- Those in favor of Ajay Abraham: 17
- I. Vote- Those opposed: 0
- J. Vote- Abstention: 0
- K. There are two vacancies on this specific committee; invite volunteers. We don't need anyone additionally from Law and Albers, but we do need those from everywhere else; Email for nominations sent out a couple of days ago

**IV. Affirm University Assessment Committee Membership**

- L. Is there any issue with the UAC Roster? We have a say. We need to affirm this roster.
- M. Seconded- Sarah Bee
- N. Vote-Those in favor:17
- O. Vote-Those Opposed: 0
- P. Vote- Abstention: 0
- Q. Susan Meyers is the Chair of the committee.

**V. Discussion on Provost Participation at AcA –Provost asked to leave prior to discussion**

- R. Shane Martin- Would like to clarify my comments made at the last meeting- I offered to come meet with you as often as you'd have need to meet with me. In no way am I suggesting that I should be present at every meeting or attending the entire meeting. I think you need time to do your work. What I am suggesting is if we are going to build shared governance we have to have an ongoing place where issues can be agenda-ized. I'd like to use this group as consultative election of the body. When things come up I would like to be able to bring them to you and request your advice. That's really what I am looking for, to clarify. That was a great list of issues
- S. Assembly laughs. Shane and Kathleen exit.
- T. Discussion amongst Assembly on Provost participation in AcA meetings:
- U. Think that provost intent is good, but be careful to have provost in AcA only as much is absolutely necessary. Slippery place to advise provost on his agenda and have other push back; advice and consent seems like open door to executive branch dominating legislative branch.

- V. Second this motion. Recalls the days of serving under Isaiah and how presence of provost could be less than helpful at meetings. At times could be problematic.
- W. Thinking through shared governance and the way Shane talked about this was about shared governance. Where is the balance?
- X. Assuming the best intentions of Shane. He wants to be our advocate. He will be more effective as our advocate with more regular contact. Appropriate for him to have a twenty minute block. He does have the right to come for the whole meeting.
- Y. Generally advocate for moving with best intentions. Calling executive session is always an option, SFS is an example. Make space on every agenda so that people have the opportunity to say things they don't want to be said in front of provost. Another option to say "this is how we would like to proceed now, we would like to revisit it at x amount of time."
- Z. Inclined towards team-building strategy. The more time spent face to face the more you understand their points of view. On the other hand, the presence of the provost can have a very inhibiting effect on discussion. We should reserve the right to hold exec session at our discretion.
- AA. Tend not to like executive session for the reason that it is not minute-ed. Could choose at certain points to have provost please leave and then have those points of conversation minute-ed.
- BB. My understanding is if we wanted to minute that, we could do that.
- CC. When Rosa is here, once we get to executive session she walks away.
- DD. Better off not having an official policy. Once we go throughout our list of priorities, I would like to pick an outcome that goes with each priority. It would be awesome if this body could speak with one voice. We are more effective when we speak with one voice. That works if we formulated what we want to say before he is here.
- EE. Everything needs to run like a train.
- FF. We have the opportunity to structure this to balance the opportunity to have good team building opportunity for shared governance and move the most pertinent things ahead as we move ahead into this new relationship
- GG. Team building approach is the way to go. Suggested an executive committee with whom he is meeting more regularly. The membership of that committee is not entirely clear. I like the suggestion that there is a section of the meeting where we can talk informally each week and deal with issues that are coming up and also have outcomes peaked to our priorities.
- HH. I endorse the team building aspect which has been emphasized. I also hear the need for consistency in regards to the executive session. Perhaps this could be built into every meeting.
- II. I have to respectfully disagree. I hear the need to be more inclined to invite the provost as needed. This is an important time for us as we develop relationship with him. I would advocate that we be more generous with Shane as it is an opportunity to get to know him.

- JJ. I agree we should be friendly and also the importance of a regimented executive session. Yet we could be splitting him in a way where he may not get things effectively done.
- KK. The new provost is not tied down to existing policy. He could revamp anything that he wishes. Father Steve is leaving. While I understand good will at this point, we should also be cautious, play by ear. No need to be adversarial.
- LL. Persuaded by what happens in Arts & Sciences with open executive session in the beginning. If we started with executive session at the beginning, we could say 2:05-2:20 will be open session and then at 2:20, provost and ex-officio come in at 2:20 then we could have both happen.

**VI. Open Discussion**

- A. Chair of Board of trustees wants to work with us more and we need to decide what modality she could come in. How do we want to go about interacting with the chair of the BOT, as they will hire the next president?
- B. Mixer at Benaroya Hall. (Assembly laughs)
- C. In regards to executive time at the beginning before the agenda starts and then starting the meeting 20 minutes after, would that be something that is implemented even if there is nothing problematic on the agenda? We can barely get through the agendas as they are. I can't think that 15 minutes will be useful to resolve anything.
- D. Not about resolution so much as helping identify things. If there is an issue that needs resolution, like the Spectator issue, then that's a different thing.
- E. I'll check with Chris Paul as to how it works in SFS and we'll shoot for ten minutes to start, see how it works.