Academic Assembly
April 1, 2019
2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 130

MINUTES

Present: Felipe Anaya, Sarah Bee, Pat Buchsel, Terri Clark, Mark Cohan, Marc Cohen, Miles Coleman, Clara Cordova, Charlotte Garden, Arie Greenleaf, Naomi Hume, Nalini Iyer, Kate Koppelman, Kathleen La Voy, Shane P. Martin, Agnieszka Miguel, Ben Miller, Michael Ng, Frank Shih, Gregory Silverman, AJ Stewart, Colette Taylor, Mark Taylor, Kirsten Thompson

Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes

I. Review 3-11-19 Minutes
- A. Proposed amendment
  1. Item IV.B.7. "Would like to see opportunities for students (e.g., projects, research, employment) as part of this plan – could add student inclusive language"
- B. Motion to approve with amendment
  1. 16 approve, 0 oppose, 4 abstain

II. Provost Update
- A. Recently attended the American Council on Education, a group with a strong commitment to diversity inclusion initiatives for administrators of color and women
- B. Faculty Contracts
  1. Normally faculty contracts go out on or about April 1
  2. This year contracts will be issued around April 15, in order to be thorough in the process
     a. Faculty Services has been working on merit with the deans, HR has been working on the market study – need to bring these two areas together
     b. Merit side is a 2.5% pool for faculty merit
     c. Additional .5% for faculty – previously called equity but more appropriately called administrative pool (promotions, sabbaticals, etc.)
  3. Budget situation
     a. Continued decline in graduate enrollment across the university affects the budget for the coming fiscal year
     b. Divisions are looking within for areas to cut, instead of comprehensive budget model/reallocation
  4. Faculty salaries and compensation adjustments that will be implemented effective Academic Year 2019-2020
     a. Salary increments for faculty promotions
        - From Associate Professor to Professor: from $7K to $8K (+14%)
        - From Assistant to Associate Professor: from $4K to $4.5K (+12.5%)
        - From Instructor to Senior Instructor: from $2K to $2.5K (+25%)
     b. Minimum salary floors of full-time non-tenure track faculty and per course adjuncts
        - Full time faculty with terminal degree (1.0 FTE): from $53K to $55K (+3.8%)
        - Full time faculty without terminal degree (1.0 FTE): from $50K to $52K (+4%)
        - Per course salaries for part-time faculty with terminal degree: from $4700 to $5000 (+6.3%)

- Per course salaries for part-time faculty without terminal degree: from $4400 to $4600 (+4.5%)

C. Peer 11 Market Compensation Study
   1. This may no longer be the right comparison group
   2. Carnegie reclassification of SU – new category for the number of research doctorates we offer
      a. Decision was just finalized in January
      b. We don't yet know what this means for our new comparative group
   3. In the aggregate, CAS and CSE compensation data is below market
   4. Additional $300,000 allocated for faculty equity in addition to the 2.5% merit pool – awards to almost 100 faculty
   5. The faculty compensation committee will convene in the next week or so to talk through all of these issues and bring a proposal back to AcA: lessons learned, ideas moving forward, open questions including correct comparative group
   6. Needs to be a multi-year commitment – looking to bring this question to the Board of Trustees as early as May

D. Discussion
   1. Concern that there is not enough transparency around actual dollar salaries, and not just percentage comparison to market aggregate/median/mean
   2. Ask for dollar amounts to be shared as part of the discussion, in addition to percentages

III. Vote on Climate Positive Campus Proposal

A. This proposal is $200,000 and we just spoke about $300,000 for faculty salary allocation – there are other priorities in the budget for these amounts of money

B. Aspirational, desire that strategic planning takes this into account as a serious proposal, not actually a budget proposal

C. 15 approve, 0 oppose, 4 abstain

IV. Support for Undocumented Students (*Clara Cordova, Jorge Lara Alvarado, Alex Romero*)

A. Overview
   1. Ongoing issues, SU has been talking about this for a few years and doesn't know how to handle the issues undocumented students face
   2. Not fair for these students to come to a university that wants to help and is not equipped to do so
   3. Scarlet Group represents concerns of undocumented students on campus
   4. Last year visited AcA, and may not have given AcA a clear enough ask
   5. Specific requests
      a. Training for those working in advising, scholarship/financial aid, career advancement
      b. Dedicated space that brings together knowledge and expertise from across campus so students don't have to go to multiple places disclosing status and asking for help
      c. Hire more undocumented staff
      d. Request for solidarity

B. Discussion
   1. SU should be accountable to take more concrete steps
      a. We can look at the Law School as a good example, where community members worked to suspend the relationship with ICE
      b. Undocumented students should not be asked to explain their status every time they are asking for help

c. Support services for undocumented students should be listed on syllabi similar to Disability Services
d. A disservice to international students – especially in graduate programs

2. Dedicated space
   a. Creating a dedicated space can have the unintended consequence of making students visible in a way that may be dangerous given the national political issues
   b. There is a false sense of safety in keeping undocumented students in the dark
   c. Marginalized groups are always visible, the effects of visibility can be positive
   d. Structural problem – making students do the labor and go to multiple places seeking solutions
   e. Disappointing to expect other universities to lead the way, when we are called to lead
3. Next steps
   a. AcA passed a motion last year calling for the administration to prioritize this and address the concrete asks with positive changes
   b. Student Development and Diversity and Inclusion are working on a dedicated space in the residence halls, as well as optional trainings for faculty and staff
   c. Would be useful to do an audit of where information is held across campus and where students are sent
   d. Clara will draft a motion for our next meeting

V. Program Review (*Sarah Shultz, David Powers, Matt Hickman, Kevin Krycka*)

A. New MS in Movement Science
   1. Vote to approve the PRC memo recommendation for program approval
      a. 20 approve, 0 oppose, 0 abstain

B. New MA Criminal Justice 4+1
   1. Discussion
      a. Students would receive a BACJ with administrative focus after year 3, not take their final year of BACJ, and enter directly into MACJ 2 year part-time 55-credit program
      b. Goal to attract highly capable students who want to fast track
      c. Academic Assembly referred the questions surrounding the proposals back to EC for further consideration, and received a response
      d. Don't anticipate a large number of new students
      e. Approximately 200 undergraduate and 100 graduate students currently
      f. Intended as a precedent for similar "combo" program designs in the future
   2. Motion to waive the one week prior motion requirement
      a. 19 approve, 0 oppose , 0 abstain
   3. Motion to approve the MACJ 4+1 proposal
      a. 18 approve, 1 oppose, 1 abstain
   4. Discussion
      g. Confidence in enrollment numbers

C. New BA in Criminal Justice and JD Law 3+3
   1. Discussion
      a. Positions SU to be more competitive with alternative degree programs
   2. Motion to waive the one week prior motion requirement
      a. 19 approve, 0 oppose , 0 abstain
   3. Motion to approve the BACJ and JD Law 3+3
      a. 19 approve, 0 oppose , 0 abstain

D. New Data Science Specialization in Existing MS in Computer Science
    1. Discussion
        a. One of the classes is a Math class that is under Computer Science, with the caveat that eventually it will transition to Math
        b. Math external reviewer specifically cited that the lack of tenure track lines in a problem – AcA can discuss this issue when the Math program review comes to AcA
        c. Clarification that Business Analytics is the name of the Albers program (not Data Analytics)
        d. Insert Concern 3 – "Specific care needs to be taken into account that resources for this degree program pulls from other departments, in particular the Math department."
    2. Motion to add amendment to PRC memo
        a. 19 approve, 0 oppose, 0 abstain
    3. Motion to approve PRC memo as amended
        a. 19 approve, 0 oppose, 0 abstain

VI. Discussion of Bylaws and Membership Terms/ Prompt for School/College Elections

A. Overview
    1. Draft circulated to AcA, next step is to meet with the Provost
    2. Some are minor changes, and some are larger
    3. Memorializes a number of behaviors that are already happening, but also does make a number of new items or changes
    4. Drew on AAUP white papers with the lack of a university constitution
B. Discussion
    1. AcA needs more time to discuss this proposal
        a. Maybe a half day retreat
        b. Retreat could also be combined with orientation for new members in fall
    2. Perhaps a parallel review process with the Provost
    3. Need to figure out how to handle the transition period between current and new bylaws
    4. Four years is a long term; does the stability of extending the term affect the recruitment process?
    5. Could amend the current bylaws piece by piece as the larger document is discussed
    6. Faculty at large need opportunity to give input – AcA is representative of the faculty, so can work on the draft and then bring a final draft to all faculty
    7. Could pull out the areas for discussion and consider the rest as non-contentious
C. Next Steps
    1. Devote as much time as possible to this next meeting
    2. Rosa will send out the call for elections in the meantime, designating the meeting time and the term of service