

Academic Assembly
October 22, 2018
2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 130

MINUTES

Present: Felipe Anaya, Sarah Bee, Pat Buchsel, Terri Clark, Mark Cohan, Marc Cohen, Miles Coleman, Kelly Curtis, Cayla Duckworth, Arie Greenleaf, Ben Howe, Naomi Hume, Nalini Iyer, Kate Koppelman, Kathleen La Voy, Shane Martin, Agnieszka Miguel, Ben Miller, Michael Ng, Russ Powell, Frank Shih, Gregory Silverman, AJ Stewart, Colette Taylor, Mark Taylor, Kirsten Thompson

- IX. Amendment needs to be cited. We can use this process to not second it, if people are cautious...
- X. Or we could have a motion to return it to PRC.
- XI. Wasn't here last year, but my impression from Rose and David Powers is that the conversation had already happened, and it seemed that this was an end-run around the process. They seemed to think it was already in there anyway.
- XII. Two things: One is motion and the other is the amendment that was placed. Is there a second for the amendment?
- XIII. Amendment- there is no second, amendment is not to be considered.
- XIV. Motion on the floor is to accept PRC memo as written or Program Review Committee.
- XV. Seconded.
- XVI. Vote: In favor: 19
- XVII. Vote: Opposed: 0
- XVIII. Vote: Abstention: 2

3.

- VIII. There were a number of guests who were here for more than ten minutes, and there was a lot of looking at PowerPoint slides. Oftentimes we were limited to discussion time that felt confined. I support the second half of the statement (as presented by Kirsten in the statement shown). I agree that it is not as feasible as it seems to rank at the beginning of the quarter. I'm wondering about the 48 hours in advance, since our meetings are on Monday, that means Friday at 5, Friday at 1...
- IX. Two Business Days.
- X. We knew about a large number of representatives who were coming to visit us at the beginning of the quarter. Not speaking to usefulness of the individuals, but prioritizing given everything else that is on our agenda, we need to think about the proportion of time that is allocated to them. Want to avoid announcing the next week's visitor the week before.
- XI. Not sure about need for a motion like this; No one has right to appear before this assembly without being invited. No one can be invited without a motion to invite being moved and voted on. Over the quarter, someone has to move the invitation; we'd discuss pros and cons. Not sure how do we come up with a list of proposed issues at the beginning of quarter? Perhaps should decide on a case by case basis. Not sure we need a rule; if we do, perhaps should submit to sub-committee on bylaws to get that figured out.
- XII. That has not been a general practice. I've gotten many emails where the next week's visitor was announced.
- XIII. Maybe our bylaws have to clarify the process.
- XIV. Shane- Appreciate the dilemma presented here. Encourage folks who sit in leadership positions at the university to consider AcA as voice of the (collective) faculty. There are times when people want to consult with faculty and may ask to come here as well. How could this be done in the most expeditious way possible?
- XV. We should have something that goes across all the speakers that would be consistent.
- XVI. Can we separate the two parts? Is there an amendment to separate this?
- XVII. Like the idea of a practice that materials get circulated in advance.
- XVIII. Instead of 48 hours can we say two business days?
- XIX. Why not just submit them with minutes and agenda from the last meeting, and people could take it up as a piece as we are prepping for next meeting? That would be my suggestion.
- XX. Practically, I look at this with greater and greater restrictiveness. We had our meeting last week, Wed meeting minutes come out, three hours after meeting minutes went out, I sent out the agenda. I don't know who is being invited to speak with Bob Dullea, just aware of non-generic "faculty"
- XXI. Very soon we will be into the fortnightly meetings, so soon the pressure of meeting the next Monday will not be there. There will be more time and space to have it still be two business days after the meeting and agenda come out.
- XXII. When there were endless PowerPoints, what was the factor which allowed them to go on endlessly?

- XXIII. I agree that we should be able to give people parameters around " this is what we want to hear from you." As time is so precious, some of the talks go on and on, and we don't get to our business.
- XXIV. Is there an amendment being introduced?
- XXV. Would you like to amend the second part?
- XXVI. We amend it to say we should request materials the middle of the week before the presentation and we could separate the two parts and vote on them separately.
- XXVII. Motion to divide the proposed statement after the word " further."
- XXVIII. Second.
- XXIX. The second part is a good thing to put as practice, but the first part seems to be unnecessary and potentially limiting. Reduces flexibility.

1. Vote on amendment to divide:
2. Vote : In favor- 19
3. Vote: Opposed- 0
4. Vote: Abstention- 2

- XXX. Vote on first part of the divided motion:

That, as a general practice, AcA are asked to rank all proposed visitors at the beginning of each quarter (allowing for exceptions of urgent issues that may emerge), in order to more effectively plan and prioritize its meeting time.

1. Vote: In Favor: 4
2. Opposed: 13
3. Abstention: 4

- XXXI. Should be proposed as an amendment to bylaws? If we are going to vote on the bylaws, should we wrap it all together? In normal governance procedure, it would come out as a motion; I just want to make sure it ends up where it needs to end up.
- XXXII. My understanding is that it is not being proposed as an amendment to the bylaws, but as a simple motion.
- XXXIII. Guidance that could be incorporated into the bylaws,
- XXXIV. I don't see why it couldn't be incorporated considered by the bylaw committee.
- XXXV. For now, we'll just vote on the second part of the divided motion.

Further, that as a general practice (for which occasional exceptions can be made), that all proposed visitors are asked to provide informational materials for circulation to the membership at least 48 hours in advance, so that meetings with the visitors are spent on questions and further discussion rather than presentation

1. Vote: In favor - 21
2. Vote: Opposed -0

3. Vote: Abstention -0

- XXXVI. Wasn't there an amendment to lengthen the amount of time...
- XXXVII. Two business days.
- XXXVIII. (Deliberation over how many business days.
- XXXIX. We had a motion to divide the motion. The first vote that was taken up was the first half that was voted down. Now we're turning as the next motion the second half. Anyone can amend the pending made motion from 48 hours to 72. You did it implicitly when you said it, but we should probably do it expressly.
- XL. Move to amend the second half so that it says at least two business days in advance...

Further, that as a general practice (for which occasional exceptions can be made), that all proposed visitors are asked to provide informational materials for circulation to the membership at least two business days in advance, so that meetings with the visitors are spent on questions and further discussion rather than presentation

- XLI. Seconded.
 - 1. Vote: In favor - 21
 - 2. Vote: Opposed -0
 - 3. Vote: Abstention -0

XLII. Those in favor of the motion raise your hand. (Vote is the same)

4. Strategic Planning & AcA's Role (4th ranked issue) 2:30 – 3:05
Bob Dullea & Faculty Guests Jen Maronne and Maureen Feit

- I. Dullea- Two objectives; 1. Update AcA on process to date 2. Provide AcA with context of your role in the process
- II. Dullea- Three goals: 1. Engage university community through broad outreach. 2. Work in spirit of continuous learning and improvement, use best practices in planning and organizational decision making. 3. Produce a plan that fulfills the mission, has enough purchase and continues to be pertinent to the university, focuses on success of all students, and advances Jesuit educational purposes. Integral part of the strategic plan will be the financial plan.
- III. Process to date: pre-designed work; broad map with two fixed points- steering committee; present to BOT in May retreat a plan that is well developed so that May review can be final review of the plan. May will be penultimate time.
- IV. Two main phases: identity articulation: Who are we when we are at our best? Who are the students we can teach uniquely well?
- V. After goals are identified, we will develop task forces. Task forces will be working with

- VI. 1st part of the year context and analysis, then develop and implement action plan. Challenge in doing this work, worked toward financial realism. Never really got there. Started with "DREAM BIG", then widdled away the dream.
- VII. 15-17 members for Steering committee; two co-chairs, Jen and myself; AcA asked to nominate 8 faculty, 4 of whom will be selected. The provost will be key in that work. Steering committee and staff council will identify 6 staff nominees, president and HR will select three of those; 1 or 2 trustees; Lucas Sharma will be member of the committee; Cabinet member Natasha Martin will serve; grad and undergrad student and provost will select dean to be part of this work.
- VIII. Frank mentioned it would be 1s it

- XV. Call attention to 1.a. of Draft Process Overview. This has echoes of what happened last year around shared culture. Must recognize that we are multiplicity. Don't want to put into process imposing an identity upon some of us.
- XVI. How best to find leaders in the community?
- XVII. Each institution has done it differently. For example, the Youth Initiative-

- IV. Do you have enough people to teach 2020 Course?
- V. Theresa: We are being thoughtful about it. This year Connie Anthony is teaching it, next year

- IX. Opportunity to think about scope of AcA role on campus
 - X. The interpretation of faculty handbook rests with the provost.
 - XI. That is one of the places where conversation between this committee and the faculty handbook revision committee is worthwhile.
 - XII. Expanding the scope, reach, and influence of this body and pushing its vision.
 - XIII. This could be an opportunity to make it provost proof.
 - XIV. Like the idea of seeing what visions is. May want to separate this between operational bylaws versus expanding. Focus on operational and make this a two part process.
 - XV. Supposed to be using Robert's Rules of Order. Would make our job easier.
 - XVI. More vision along with process.
 - XVII. The bigger question about where our university is and where we see ourselves participating. Like the idea of separating them. The processes might be different. Not prepared to commit to this as a process.
 - XVIII. Hate to lose the expertise of Michael Ng. Your history is an excellent piece.
 - XIX. Create separate motion to about how to tackle shared governance and vision. Additional motion to strategize how we're going to talk about shared governance. In addition to our work with the bylaw committee.
 - 1. Motion to expedite the vote. Seconded.
 - 2. Vote: Approved -21
 - 3. Vote: Opposed - 0
 - 4. Vote: Abstention -1
-
- 1. Vote on the Motion
 - 2. Vote: Approved- 20
 - 3. Vote: Opposed-0
 - 4. Vote: Abstention-0

7. Open Discussion

3:25 – 3:35

- I. Motion to ask for volunteers to serve on AcA Bylaws. Seconded.
- II. Volunteers are: Kate Koppelman, Kirsten Thompson, Greg Silverman, Ben Howe, and AJ Stewart, Arie Greenleaf
- III. Kelly Curtis – announcement: Interviewing for Vice President of Student Affairs so may not be in the next meeting November 5. Kate Hannock, chair of Civic Engagement is willing to do communication with the SUSS. Working on Statement for Trans and non-binary students on campus. Would you as faculty feel comfortable putting out statements in support of your students in light of the antics of the current Trump administration.
- IV. Perhaps we can propose a motion at the next meeting to work together on drafting something to address that.
- V. Propose increasing membership for bylaws sub-committee to 6 since we have 6 volunteers. Seconded.
 - 1. Vote: 17 in favor

2. Vote: Opposed -0
 3. Vote: Abstention- 0
- VI. Comment: Procedural issue with FHRC motions. Faculty handbook requires consultations with all full-time faculty and that a report be sent out. I understand that did not happen.
- VII. Response: That email was sent out March 9 around nine o'clock.