Academic Assembly
April 24, 2017
2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 130

MINUTES

Present: Sarah Bee, Rick Block, Pat Buchsel, Brooke Coleman, Chuck Lawrence, Viviane Lopuch, Agnieszka Miguel, Carrie Miller, David Neel, Michael Ng, Erik Olsen, Tracey Pepper, Frank Shih, John Strait, Collette Taylor, Charles Tung, Dan Washburn, Braden Wild, Tina Zamora

Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes

I. Review of 4-10-17 Minutes
   A. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions

II. MRC Program Revision (*Paulette Kidder, Emily Lieb, Christina Roberts, Dan Washburn*)
   A. Overview
      1. Three new 1800 track courses required in all three MRC degrees, with more emphasis on global issues and diversity
      2. Several new or revised courses in the Bachelor of Arts Humanities for Leadership program
   B. Discussion
      1. In order to best accommodate students already in a program, the old program structures are simultaneously staying in place, in a "do no harm" spirit – no students will need to take additional courses than the requirements when they began the program, but no new incoming students will be able to enroll in any courses that are being phased out
      2. Faculty tenure track lines are not addressed in this proposal, but are part of the MRC Task Force report submitted to Provost in the past few weeks
      3. Revision process
         a. Beginning discussions, what are the main areas that need change immediately?
         b. New curriculum committee chaired by associate dean and with three elected faculty representatives
         c. Student group and task force were able to offer feedback as well
      4. New curriculum is more flexible to students wishing to transfer to a different major
         a. Some of the credits will transfer as elective credits
         b. Revamped and added courses that are equivalent to Core courses, working with Core director
      5. The Communications course was removed, but its content is now covered in other new courses
      6. MRC Task Force
         a. Work on rebuilding trust
         b. Identify stakeholders and all different sides and layers
         c. Good student participation on task force – not just coalition but as wide a range as possible
         d. Open invitation to all for town halls, committee meetings, etc.
         e. What aspects are so invaluable that we don't want to eliminate them? Keep as many of those as possible
         f. Will always be a small percentage who will not be comfortable with any changes

C. AcA Discussion
    1. Motion to approve curricular changes and PRC memo
        a. Discussion
            i. Amendment: request update or mention that there is a larger governance issue, "prior to the acceptance of the program review, we hear a report on the administrative changes that would address the cultural issues within the administration of the overall college"
            ii. MRC is going through program review right now, that would be the more appropriate place to raise the governance and larger college culture issues and request and update if needed
            iii. We may also want to ask the Provost to bring Task Force report to discuss – want to make sure systemic issues are addressed
        b. Motion, with no amendment, approved with no oppositions or abstentions
    2. Second motion: AcA requests the Provost to attend an upcoming AcA meeting to discuss the broader issues of culture, internal controls, and university controls at MRC, along with the Task Force report
        a. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions

III. Faculty Issues (*Kathleen La Voy*)

A. Overview
    1. Goal to build a simple and straightforward complaint process for SU faculty (T/TT/NTT) that is owned and maintained by the faculty (via Faculty Handbook)
    2. Need to protect the rights and dignity of all involved
    3. Prior to filing a formal grievance or beginning legal proceedings
    4. Ability to review ombuds office in a clear way, the reporting and review structure is not working now
    5. Align processes for faculty, staff, and students
B. Discussion
    1. Should be a vote of no confidence option, there has to be a mechanism for when there is a systemic issue (such as MRC last year)
    2. Continue discussion online, perhaps convene a small group to discuss further

IV. Budget Discussion Including A&S Faculty and Staff Survey (*Chris Paul, Kimberly Gawlik, Heather Reis, Elise Murowchick, Hannah Tracy, Sven Arvidson*)

A. Overview
    1. A&S Faculty Staff Senate conducted a survey of college employees asking: what is your role, how long have you been here, what is your economic reality?
    2. Overwhelming response that raises dramatic social justice issues of employee compensation
    3. Points to an existential threat to the college, HUD data says a Seattle-area household making less than $50K qualifies for housing assistance
    4. The university budget discussion have not considered on a micro level the impact on the lives of people who work here
    5. Should AcA do a survey on a broader scale?
    6. Might be good to have quantitative data to supplement – demonstrate input/output in real life households
B. AcA Discussion
    1. Budget is not just an abstraction, we need to question the decision-making process of the budget
    2. Need strategic action suggestion

3. NTT faculty have already had a vote – the union discussion, SEIU encourages communication with the union
4. Have to be aware of traps, establish clear priorities, if we push for one thing, may affect other areas
5. Workload balance is increasingly unsustainable, cutting for more funding will only increase workload
6. The 2.5% increase should be distributed to those who need it most, not equally – distributive justice
7. Even with major systemic changes, SU will not be able to pay everyone living wage for the city
8. Need to be informed about the budget, the information is available
9. If we can make real improvements in people's lives, we must
10. If programs like D1 cannot be justified on a cost-benefit analysis, we cannot continue to keep them