

**Academic Assembly**  
May 11, 2015  
2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 130

**MINUTES**

Present: Jeffrey Anderson, Sarah Bee, Patricia Buchsel, Terri Clark, Brooke Coleman, Isiaah Crawford, Lynn Deeken, Bill Ehmann, Meggie Green, Trish Henley, Mike Huggins, Arun Iyer, Kate Koppelman, Charles Lawrence, Margit McGuire, Dave Neel, Michael Ng, Erik Olsen, Katherine Raichle, Roshanak Roshandel, Rob Rutherford, Heath Spencer, John Strait, Dan Washburn

*Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes*

- I. Review of 4-27-15 Minutes
  - A. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions
- II. Policies that Cannot be Petitioned Revision
  - A. Minor change to accommodate transfer students who take Honors and do an internship, so they can graduate on time
  - B. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions
- III. Divestment (*April Atwood, Brenda Bourns, Wes Howard-Brook, Wes Lauer*)
  - A. Overview
    - 1. Student resolution to divest was supported by AcA last academic year, administration replied to that resolution that the university was not going to divest
    - 2. Now AcA is looking to take direct action and approved a Divestment faculty committee
    - 3. Faculty committee has produced an official faculty letter calling for divestment which currently has 136 faculty signatures (higher percentage than peer institutions, relative to total faculty), and is still open for more signatures
    - 4. Other Jesuit university faculties are also considering divestment
  - B. Committee recommendations to AcA
    - 1. AcA should move forward with a call for the university to divest
    - 2. Several groups on campus have requested more information or presentations, so AcA should leave letter open for signatures for a period of some additional time to provide everyone the opportunity to sign
    - 3. Request more information on the Socially Responsible Investments task force and recommend that group have open, regularly scheduled meetings that would include direct discussion of fossil fuel divestment
    - 4. Request broader faculty representation on the SRI task force
    - 5. Invite staff to be involved in the discussion and SRI meetings
  - C. Discussion
    - 1. SU does not make direct investments in individual stocks, instead has co-mingled investment funds managed by an investment manager
    - 2. The challenge is to remove SU from co-mingled funds, and then to either develop new funds that do not include fossil fuels or find existing funds that are not co-mingled with fossil fuels
    - 3. Some limitations to existing divested funds, but these continue to improve and new products will be available soon
    - 4. Is there business information available about how other organizations have done this and been successful?

- a. One challenge is how far back to look, to make accurate historical comparisons
- b. Not a way to project how much would be “lost” – no enough track record in this area to be sure
- 5. Moral argument – socially responsible investing has been shown to have no long term negative effects, but not specifically in this area
- 6. Concern with comparisons to large, well-endowed universities
- 7. We are in a part of the country that supports this type of social action, would be beneficial to the university as visibility to the market
- 8. May be intangible implications – ripple effect in the short term for those who work in these fields
- 9. Divestment is part of the equation but there is a lot more that we should be doing on many levels in terms of carbon emissions
- 10. Important that students see this letter and understand faculty leadership in this area
- 11. Motion to endorse the letter as written
  - a. Would like to see more representative signatures from across campus
  - b. Discussion of the difference between exploring divestment financially and the moral imperative to ultimately divest from fossil fuels
  - c. The letter has broad goals, but divestment is ultimately a Board of Trustees financial decision
  - d. Approved with no oppositions and one abstention
- D. Motion to authorize divestment committee to decide when/how best to release document
  - 1. Proposal to release in The Spectator
  - 2. Further conversations with SGSU about promotion amongst students
  - 3. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions
- E. Staff representation
  - 1. Larger issue of staff representation at the university
  - 2. Motion to request that SRI task force include staff
    - a. No academic freedom protection for staff, staff could feel pressured
    - b. Motion to table for further discussion – approved with several oppositions
- F. Relationship with SRI task force
  - 1. Request for environmental engineer representation
  - 2. Add topic to a future AcA meeting

**IV. Core Update (*Jeff Philpott*)**

- A. Core Budget
  - 1. Section cost is handled outside of Core budget
  - 2. Increased cap from 28 to 30 students in Modules II and III, reduced sections by 4%
- B. Core Policies
  - 1. In 2012, combined all existing Core policies into a single Core Policies document
  - 2. New updates to the document
    - a. Added language to make it clear that students can count Core credits toward Minors
    - b. Changed the title of Module II from “Exploring the Self and Others” to “Engaging Jesuit Traditions”
    - c. Removed overly prescriptive requirement for final two digits of Global Challenge course number and Inquiry Seminar course number to be different
    - d. Clarified prerequisite requirements
    - e. Sunset the rollover process, will now apply basic transfer rules equally for returning SU students who may have taken courses under the old Core
- C. Discussion

1. Most students take the Modules in rough order, but not uncommon to change order to accommodate Major scheduling requirements
  2. Students are encouraged to finish as much of Module I as possible before advancing
- V. Faculty Handbook (*Di Di Galligar, Joe Phillips, John Weaver*)**
- A. Overview of three further issues that need to be resolved before presenting to the Board of Trustees
    1. Academic Freedom
      - a. Develop language that asserts same principles in a tone that reflects the collegiality of the rest of the document
    2. External work while on sabbatical
      - a. Concern has been withdrawn based on clarification
    3. Office hours
      - a. Use the term “office and contact hours” to best represent modern faculty life
  - B. Academic Freedom
    1. Proposed language covers part time faculty members, is more concise and collegial in tone, and resolves the relationship between academic freedom and tenure
    2. Alternative section of proposed language, “Academic freedom is supported and sustained by robust processes and practices of shared governance which affirms the right of faculty to discuss, criticize, and debate university policies and priorities.”
    3. Discussion of whether to include AAUP statement on academic freedom
      - a. AAUP statement does not need to be stipulated in handbook – we can state our own stance as a university, discussion of its value as a norming organization
      - b. AAUP is a valuable body for faculty, and we should include their statement
    4. Motion to accept proposed language including above alternative section
      - a. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions
  - C. Office Hours
    1. Proposed modified language to include “office/contact hours” and part time representation
    2. Motion to accept proposed language
      - a. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions
  - D. Motion to approve the Faculty Handbook draft with the two edits approved above
    1. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions
  - E. Motion to endorse Provost to present to BoT and President to consider at September meeting and if approved put into effect retroactively July 1, 2015
    1. New faculty beginning for summer quarter would switch to new handbook on July 1 after pending September approval
    2. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions
- VI. Announcements**
- A. PRC Representatives
    1. Need Education rep, also extending invitation to Law and NCS
    2. Renewing several members’ terms
  - B. Board of Trustees Confidentiality Agreement and Ombuds Office Charter
    1. Final draft of each approved by University Counsel
    2. Both will be presented at an upcoming agenda