**Academic Assembly**

April 24, 2017

2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 130

**MINUTES**

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

*Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes*

1. Review of 4-10-17 Minutes
2. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions
3. MRC Program Revision (*Emily Lieb, Paulette Kidder, Christina Roberts, Dan Washburn*)
4. Overview
5. Three new 1800 track courses, with more global and diverse focus
6. Discussion
7. Situation where some students are half or a third of the way through the old curriculum, also relationship with five local high schools – instead of trying to reform both of those at once, the old classes are on the books are can be used toward major but will not be offered going forward
8. Tenure track lines are not addressed in this proposal, but are part of the Task Force report submitted to Provost in the past weeks
9. Revision process
10. Beginning discussions, what are the main areas that need change immediately
11. New curriculum committee chaired by associate dean and with three elected faculty reps
12. Student group and task force were able to offer feedback as well
13. Transfer questions
14. Some of the credits will transfer as elective credits
15. Revamped and added courses that are equivalent to Core courses, working with Core director
16. Enough other classes that cover the issues in the Communications course (which was removed)
17. Removed some curricular redundancies
18. MRC Task Force
19. Work on rebuilding trust
20. Identify stakeholders and all different sides and layers
21. Good student participation on task force
22. Open invitation to all for town halls, committee meetings, etc.
23. Will always be a small percentage who will not be comfortable with any changes
24. What aspects are so invaluable that we didn’t want to eliminate them? Keep as many of those as possible
25. Student participation on task force was not just coalition but as wide a range as possible
26. Tried to incorporate a wide range of voices
27. AcA Discussion
28. Motion to approve curricular changes and PRC memo
29. Amendment: request update or mention that there is a larger governance issue
30. 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
31. We may also want to ask Bob Dullea to bring Task Force report to discuss – want to make sure systemic issues are addressed
32. “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”
33. “approval is conditional on subsequent report from Provost to AcA on the cultural issues”
34. One motion to approve
    1. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions
35. Motion AcA requests the provost to schedule and appear to discuss the broader issues of culture, internal controls, and university controls at MRC, along with the Task Force report at June 5 meeting
36. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions
37. Faculty Issues (*Kathleen La Voy*)
    * 1. Add Kathleen to AcA lists, etc.
      2. Overview
         1. Can we have a simple, straightforward complaint process with a clear timeline?
         2. Need to protect the rights and dignity of all involved
         3. Grievance committee – final step in process
         4. Need to be able to review ombuds office in a clear way, not working now
         5. Need a process prior to legal proceedings
         6. Parallel processes for faculty, staff, and students
         7. Current grievance committee is not functioning
         8. Is there a different between a grievance and a complaint?
      3. Discussion
         1. Should be a vote of no confidence option, there has to be a mechanism for when there is a systemic issue of that size (such as MRC)
         2. Continue discussion online
         3. Also need parallel processes for students and staff
         4. Perhaps convene a small group to discuss further
38. Budget Discussion Including A&S Faculty and Staff Survey (*Chris Paul, Kimberly Gawlik, Heather Reis, Elise Murowchick, Pete Carns??, Hannah Tracy, Sven Arvidson*)
39. Overview
40. Qualtrix survey, what is your role, how long have you been here, what is your economic reality
41. Overwhelming response
42. Points to an existential threat to the college, HUD data says household making less than 50K qualifies for housing assistance
43. Have not talked about budget on a micro level the impact on the lives of people who live here
44. Should AcA do a survey on a broader scale?
45. Might be good to have quantitative data to supplement – demonstrate input/output
46. Raises dramatic social justice issues
47. AcA Discussion
48. Budget is not just an abstraction
49. It’s for members of the community
50. Need to question decision-making process of the budget
51. Need action suggestion
52. NTT faculty have already had a vote – the union discussion
53. SEIU encourages communication with the union
54. Need to be strategic about this
55. Have to be aware of traps, establish clear priorities, if we push for one thing, may affect other areas
56. No grievance procedures for NTT
57. Workload balance is increasingly unsustainable, cutting for more funding will only increase workload
58. The 2.5% increase should be distributed to those who need it most, not equally
59. Need to talk about how the university does strategic budgeting
60. Same issues in every college, do not match social justice mission
61. Even with major systemic changes, SU will not be able to pay everyone living wage for the city
62. Need to be informed about the budget, the information is available
63. Real distributive justice issues here
64. If we can make real improvements in people’s lives, we must
65. If programs like D1 cannot be justified on a cost-benefit analysis, we cannot continue to keep them