

Academic Assembly
February 22, 2016
2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 210

MINUTES

Present: Jeffrey Anderson, Sarah Bee, Rick Block, Pat Buchsel, Terri Clark, Isiaah Crawford, Carlos de Mello e Souza, Charlotte Garden, Leticia Guardiola-Saenz, Arun Iyer, Kate Koppelman, Charles Lawrence, Viviane Lopuch, Margit McGuire, Carrie Miller, David Neel, Michael Ng, Erik Olsen, Rob Rutherford, Frank Shih, Heath Spencer, Dan Washburn

Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes

- I. Review 2-1-16
 - A. In Diversity Task Force section II.E., add suggestion to focus on faculty and student recruitment and curriculum development
 - B. Motion to approve minutes with edit to item II.E.
 - 1. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions
- II. Update on Administrator Evaluation Process
 - A. Overview
 - 1. Proposal to develop and conduct a pilot program this year, based on the College of Nursing instrument
 - 2. Success will be determined by response rate, relationship between quantitative and qualitative data, and feedback from both those surveyed and those being evaluated
 - 3. If satisfied with pilot, the AcA subcommittee will bring a formal proposal to Faculty Handbook Revision Committee to include process in handbook
 - B. Discussion
 - 1. Need to determine who will be evaluated
 - 2. Bob Dullea has offered to serve on evaluation development committee
 - 3. Loyola Marymount and Regis can both provide peer feedback about similar evaluation processes
 - 4. IDEAedu.org provides a feedback system for administrators
 - 5. Peers who do this typically do not go above the decanal level
 - 6. Will schedule an executive session at an upcoming meeting
 - C. Faculty Handbook Revision Committee will constitute a new staggered membership in fall quarter and begin to address proposals early next academic year
- III. Appointment to Athletic Advisory Board
 - A. Nomination of Chris Granatino, Library
 - B. Discussion
 - 1. Athletics can be a challenging issue and the AcA faculty representative needs to be focused on the relationship with academics
 - 2. Important to have tenure (or library equivalent) for longevity and long term interest
 - C. Motion to table this issue and return with more nominations
 - 1. Request for those willing to serve to write a paragraph
 - 2. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions
- IV. Visit with President (*Stephen Sundborg, SJ*)
 - A. Governance
 - 1. Support initial lines of orientation around the Faculty Senate purpose and structure

2. Interested in how the committees reporting to Faculty Senate would be coordinated with other university committees: budget, HR, etc. (replace, parallel, join?)
 3. Also supportive of the development of a staff council and how that will fit with the new Faculty Senate proposal
 4. Duties and responsibilities of committees need to be clear in Bylaws
 5. Important to design the structure as clearly and simply as possible, with primary focus on academics
 6. The new Faculty Staff Senate in College of Arts and Sciences may serve as a useful model
- B. Unionization
1. Timeline
 - a. Almost two years of deliberation about the unionization, longer process than expected
 - b. To delay the count of the vote is not the goal of the university or the reason for appeals
 - c. Significant steps over the past few years for full time and part time non-tenure track faculty – contracts, office space, benefits
 - d. Four universities, including SU, are currently appealing the decision of the NLRB regional board at the national level, have been waiting for six months and have not received judgment
 - e. Votes will not be counted until NLRB rules, at that point the university can seek to determine this in a court of law if it chooses – have not yet decided if this is the route that we will take
 2. University stance
 - a. Two essential rights
 - i. Right of the faculty to organize and choose who they are organized with and right of the university to discern whether a particular union is a good fit for the university
 - ii. Right of the university to be religious by its own criteria and not by the NLRB or any other governmental body
 - b. The second point is the one that SU is currently debating with NLRB, and the university's stance is that we have the right to be a Catholic Jesuit university on our own terms, and the government does not have jurisdiction over how SU determines which union they can allow religiously
 - c. The overall cost of legal counsel has been modest but cannot be shared while legal proceedings continue
 3. Discussion
 - a. Objections to SEIU are their limited record with higher education and general knowledge of how this has functioned in other areas
 - b. SU has unions for the trades – these were decided many years ago and are not related to the religious character of the university, whereas faculty and teaching are at the core of the university's function
 - c. SU outside counsel on this matter is the law firm Sebris Busto James (Mark Busto represents SU)
 - d. Some faculty believe that the issue is not religious identity, but the collective bargaining process for faculty
 - e. We do accept federal regulation and money in a variety of areas, so it is not clear how the unionization of faculty is different from those areas

- f. SU stance is that we consider the central activity of the university to be teaching and that the people who teach here maintain our Jesuit Catholic identity through their status with the university and their collective bargaining through a union would affect that
 - g. Forsee significant difficulties with bargaining with a union on behalf of all faculty
 - h. Universities are in a gray area between Catholic Social Teaching and how to function as a religious institution
- C. Budget
 - 1. Balancing number of students, low tuition increase, and increased financial aid makes the operating budget very tight as we try to put a better model in place long term
 - 2. Priorities
 - a. Competitive wage pool increase for faculty and staff
 - b. Respond to recommendations in Task Force on Diversity and Inclusive Excellence report
 - c. Fund new academic programs to meet market demand and generate revenue
 - d. Implementation of new ERP
 - 3. Entering into budget formation process for FY17 in the next few weeks, hopeful that priorities will all be met to some extent
 - 4. Specific areas of question
 - a. SUYI is funded \$3 external for every \$1 SU spends – \$30 million in capital campaign earmarked for SUYI to create endowment
 - b. Athletics – funding will be under 5% of total university operating budget and also has a \$20 million area in capital campaign to maintain external funding and lower internal operating cost
 - c. Fossil fuel divestment issue – recommend to have AcA reps on Socially Responsible Investment Task Force report back to AcA about details, currently still in process
- D. Health Sciences
 - 1. Great opportunity for growth given our location and College of Nursing partnerships with medical centers in the area
 - 2. Programs in informatics, physician’s assistant, etc. would be a better direction for SU than a medical or dental school
- E. Future of higher education
 - 1. Emphasis on careers and commodification of education makes the role of faculty narrower and increasingly based on efficiency
 - 2. Necessary to resist the corporatization of the university, but have to balance with the market needs
 - 3. Students have a much greater concern about career potential being driven by the economic realities and changing job market, growing need for good career advising
 - 4. In College of Arts and Sciences, departments are moving away from offering departmental honors courses due to efficiencies, these are the decisions that take away from the character of the university
- V. Academic Strategic Action Plan 2.0
 - A. ASAP 2.0 will continue the work of the ASAP 1.0, introduction of five new goals
 - B. The work now will focus on metrics, timelines, and workgroups to meet those goals
 - C. Developed by a working group of 20 faculty, staff and students, a series of fora, and various campus groups
 - D. AcA will discuss at a future meeting