

**Academic Assembly**  
June 6, 2016  
2:05 – 3:35pm, ADMN 221

**MINUTES**

Present: Sarah Bee, Rick Block, Terri Clark, Bill Ehmann, Charlotte Garden, Mike Huggins, Arun Iyer, Bruce Koch, Kate Koppelman, Chuck Lawrence, Viviane Lopuch, Margit McGuire, David Neel, Michael Ng, Katherine Raichle, Rob Rutherford, Frank Shih, Heath Spencer, John Strait, Dan Washburn, Braden Wild

*Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes*

- I. Review 5-23-16 and 5-25-16 Minutes
  - A. 5-23-16 Minutes
    - 1. IV.B.3.b. edit to read, "In the 2013 employee satisfaction survey, MRC had the lowest ratings on campus and it was easy for dean and others who saw data to identify who had made which qualitative remarks – dean said poor evaluation of her made it hard for faculty to receive tenure"
    - 2. IV.B.3.d. edit to read, "In February 2016, two faculty wrote a detailed letter to the dean expressing dismay at sexist and racist treatment of students by college faculty and felt threatened by the dean's response"
    - 3. Approved with one abstention
  - B. 5-25-16 Minutes
    - 1. Approved with one abstention
- II. Faculty Feedback on Administration Performance
  - A. Motion to postpone the demonstration of the evaluation until after we have formed the committee and approved the form/process (including deans' feedback) before piloting the process
    - 1. Suggestion to remove pilot from the proposal and then set a specific date for next year
    - 2. Pilot results do not need to go to the provost only now, can go to deans, AcA, and/or committee within each college
    - 3. Process should be totally open, IRB approval may influence how process works
    - 4. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions
  - B. Ad hoc committee
    - 1. All previous members will continue serving
    - 2. Margit will send an invitation to deans to invite two (or their designees) as committee members
    - 3. Should also consider representatives that can speak to job descriptions of other administrators
    - 4. May also look to include a trustee
- III. Committee Memberships
  - A. Faculty Handbook Revision Committee
    - 1. Michael Ng approved for VP of AcA, Chair of FHRC
    - 2. Emily Lieb – 3 year term, AcA appointment
    - 3. Rob Rutherford – 2 year term, AcA appointment
  - B. AAPOR committee
    - 1. Four AcA appointed faculty needed

- a. Three people elected this year have agreed to serve next year – Mike Huggins, Susan Weihrich, Dave Madsen
      - b. Nominate Chris Paul, Glen Yasuda, Jackie Leibsohn
    - 2. AcA approves the three currently serving, Margit will check with the three nominees and send out the final names, seeking email vote within 24 hours on the final appointee
  - C. RevSU
    - 1. Seeking two AcA appointed faculty representatives
    - 2. Nominate Greg Magnan and Doug Erikson
    - 3. Propose Sarah Bee for this committee instead of Greg Magnan
      - a. Approved
- IV. Policies (*Erin Morgan*)**
- A. Second and Dual Degree Policy Revision
    - 1. Minor adjustments addressing previous AcA concerns
    - 2. Motion to approve
      - a. UCOR area section has been revised to reflect the Core policy on transfer credits
      - b. There is an agreement in place that PEP can be filed for exceptions
      - c. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions
  - B. Revocation of Policy 87-2 (undergraduate course counting for graduate credits)
    - 1. APRC began to look at this policy to address course numbers, but then realized that this is not in practice at the university
    - 2. Should be left up to school/college to determine policy
    - 3. Motion to approve revocation – approved with no oppositions or abstentions
- V. Lactation Spaces on Campus**
- A. Presenting two policies – asking for consideration and support
    - 1. Faculty should support and accommodate students who are pregnant and parenting
    - 2. The university should address the lack of places and times for nursing and pumping
      - a. Currently there is one room that was not designated solely for lactation purposes, a shared space in the USVC building
      - b. Best practices – provide several portable pumping stations around campus (no more than a five minute walk from any class space), breaks should be provided every two to three hours
  - B. Discussion
    - 1. Recommend to take policies directly to Cabinet – perhaps to VP Michele Murray
    - 2. Policy that works on campus may not work with external partners (clinical sites, internships, etc.)
  - C. Motion to approve both policies in principle and indicate the AcA supports accommodation of breastfeeding and pregnancy/parenting – approved with no oppositions or abstentions
- VI. P Drive Discussion**
- A. Concern over P drive email from ITS, AcA to inform Faculty Technology Committee of this issue
  - B. Motion to contact Travis Nation to seek clarity of changes and ask for visit before implementation of Office 365 migration, public/shared folders in email, P drive, and faculty-controlled externally facing webpages
    - 1. The AcA hereby restates that, as the voice of the faculty, technology impacts our educational mission. In cases such as the below, the AcA shall be consulted in person, well in advance, such that the faculty shall have the opportunity to seek and provide input:
      - a. The Office 365 conversion (where possible, this shall be put on hold)

- b. The elimination of the P drive and web hosting (where possible, this shall be put on hold)
    - c. Retirement of the shared folder of the T drive (where possible, this shall be put on hold)
  - 2. Approved with no abstentions or oppositions
- VII.** Nature and Purpose of the Faculty Lounge
  - A. Unclear how faculty lounge gets used, booked for events with increasing frequency
  - B. Issue with room being booked for events by administration – should be a faculty space only
  - C. Used to have a faculty dining room, no longer exists – need a dedicated gathering space
  - D. Not a substitute for what happens within college/school (department meetings, etc.)
- VIII.** EDAD Program Revision (*Bob Hughes, Deanna Sands*)
  - A. Overview
    - 1. Principal track of program is being updated to reflect best practices, remain competitive, compress timeframe for student schedules, and offer hybrid course options
    - 2. Program has strong relationships with schools in the community, community stakeholders are a critical part of the program
    - 3. Implement change in spring 2017, first cohort would finish in 2018
    - 4. Cohort model creates a community of learners, coursework features targeted needs of particular types of schools (Catholic, public, alternative, etc.)
  - B. Discussion
    - 1. One issue identified by PRC was the lack of a tenure track faculty member to handle both the programmatic and administrative aspects of the program – in the time since the proposal, a tenure track faculty member was hired
    - 2. There are broader concerns at PRC about the variance of college curriculum committees across the university, and the tendency for adjunct hires with no incentive to contribute to the university broadly
    - 3. Proposed revision is for Master’s degree track, if approved, associated certificates will also be revised
  - C. Motion to approve revision
    - 1. Approved with six abstentions
- IX.** Announcements, Updates, etc.
  - A. AcA President Election
    - 1. Duties include emails, meeting planning, attendance at trustees meetings, regular meetings with provost for planning, coordination and communication with all areas of campus
    - 2. David Neel nominated – approved
  - B. Record of AcA statement on MRC situation
    - 1. It is the sense of the AcA that a just resolution of the conflict within the MRC requires open communication and involvement of all members of the MRC community including the MRC Coalition, non-coalition faculty and students, Alumni and the broader SU faculty and administration. All should be able to speak their minds and carry on the process of review and possible changes to MRC without fear of retaliation against any voice, regardless of its perspective. The AcA resolves that going forward in the review process will be substantially impaired if any form of discipline or retaliation were to occur to any of the individuals who have raised MRC coalition concerns or countered those concerns. No retaliatory action for expressed viewpoints or actions which led to the current review of MRC should be considered.