

Academic Assembly
March 17, 2014
2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 130

MINUTES

Present: Jeffrey Anderson, Brady Carlson, Carol Wolfe Clay, Karen Cowgill, Isiaah Crawford, Lynn Deeken, Bill Ehmann, Terry Foster, Sean McDowell, Charles Lawrence, Patrick Murphy, David Neel, Erik Olsen, Katherine Raichle, Roshanak Roshandel, Rob Rutherford, Heath Spencer

Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes

- I. Review of 3-10-14 Minutes
 - A. Add Rob Rutherford and Heath Spencer to list of those present
 - B. Minutes approved with no abstentions and the above edit
- II. Governance Model
 - A. Authorizations Resolution
 1. Discussion of the differences between determinative, co-determinative, and recommendatory power
 - a. Determinative and recommendatory are fairly straightforward (determinative cannot be overridden, recommendatory can be overridden)
 - b. Co-determinative needs to be defined
 - c. Certain areas require more than just a 50% vote, need to identify
 - d. Several categories are unclear on the authorizations chart because AcA lacks necessary budget information to make an informed co-determinative decision
 2. Provost Statement
 - a. If SEIU unionization effort moves forward, the authorizations chart and faculty handbook will need to be fully revised
 - i. AcA may want to prioritize governance revision efforts pending that decision
 - ii. Many areas of faculty governance involving adjuncts will not be within the purview of existing documents, and new processes will have to be developed and negotiated with SEIU and other involved parties
 - b. Issues with areas on the authorizations chart involving fiduciary responsibility, particularly areas of elimination
 - i. The proposed determinative X's may be in conflict with the university's Bylaws
 - ii. Administrative personnel can be held personally liable and as such are protected by insurance, which would not cover AcA
 - iii. Proposal needs revision in light of these points, but overall very strong
 - c. Recommendation to remove the Academic Affairs Budget Officers column from the approvals chart
 3. Discussion
 - a. AcA needs to develop a process for how to proceed in instances when we make a recommendation to the next step (Provost) and a different decision is made
 - b. Unknown how peer institutions handle these issues under their Bylaws (approvals, co-determinative power questions, fiduciary responsibility)

- c. Faculty need more meaningful input on budget and AcA should request regularized budget reporting to provide appropriate, meaningful numbers especially in instances of curriculum change that affect faculty lines
 - B. Next steps
 - 1. Invitation to Provost to formally respond to Faculty Senate proposal
 - 2. Request to Bob Dullea and University Counsel to provide information on which areas involve fiduciary responsibility and/or conflict with University Bylaws
 - 3. Need to review committees and how to streamline work, Sean will present to Governance subcommittee
- III. Program Review Committee Recommendation
 - A. After reviewing the Environmental Science program review, PRC noted opportunity for a comprehensive review to identify optimization of environmental/ sustainability programming on campus across colleges/schools, centers, and offices
 - B. AcA Discussion
 - 1. While there is desirability of a unified curriculum, complex issues may arise (e.g., programs with faculty in more than one college/school, may overstep bounds with deans, etc.)
 - 2. Appropriate recommendation would go to the Provost to begin conversation with all involved areas
 - 3. We do not have a university curriculum committee where this type of issue would usually be reviewed – perhaps AcA should discuss this in the future
 - C. Proposed amendment, “The PRC will undertake this study, reviewing programs university-wide, and then make a recommendation to the Provost to bring together the people involved.”
 - 1. Approved with three oppositions and one abstention
- IV. Nascent Senate Committee
 - A. Proposed Senate Committees should begin to meet informally prior to approval to discuss language and develop agenda items
 - B. Rob will send committee membership proposals
- V. Core Director Proposal from Core Executive Committee
 - A. Core Executive Committee voted to temporarily modify Bylaws to allow Jeff Philpott to serve for one additional year as Core Director (currently in the end of his three-year term)
 - B. Ideally hire new Director this spring to serve as Assistant Director next year under Jeff’s Directorship, and then transition to full Director in spring quarter 2015
 - C. Motion to endorse proposal
 - i. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions