

**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

- 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 ( )
  - 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

f.