

Michael J. Grant Campus

# Academic Assembly

**October 20, 2020 Zoom Meeting Minutes**

1. Alexander Kasiukov called the meeting to order at 3:34pm
2. Call to order (Alexander Kasiukov)
3. Approval of [September 22, 2020 meeting minutes](http://kasiukov.com/assembly/updates/2020-09-22/assembly-2020-09-22-minutes-draft.docx)
   1. Donald Ferruzzi – Page 2, Item #5 – how many online credits can full-time faculty teach? The minutes say 1.
   2. Alexander Kasiukov – The minutes will be corrected. Motion to approved minutes as corrected. Approved.
4. [Chair's Report](http://kasiukov.com/assembly/updates/2020-10-20/index.html#Grant-Campus-Academic-Assembly) (Alexander Kasiukov)
   1. Alexander Kasiukov will post the FCCC information regarding the SUNY changes to Distance Education.
   2. Jill Giresi – Academic Standards is concerned about the process of Administration rejecting Governance decisions. The issue arose when the PE waiver resolution that was passed by the 3 Governance bodies failed to go into effect. CASC was informed that an administrator stopped it from being implemented without an explanation or reason for the denial. This illuminates a breakdown in the system. If a Governance Resolution is denied at the Administration level, we should be informed. Also, nothing has been done regarding the part-time Dean’s list. It was approved by the Administration but not implemented because of an issue with Banner. The W grades 2/3 deadline applies to parts of term classes. The information regarding these dates can be found in MYSCCC in the Key Enrollment dates section.
5. Resolutions from the [College-wide Curriculum Committee](https://www.sunysuffolk.edu/governance/college-curriculum/index.jsp):
   1. [Resolution 2020-09-[04]](http://kasiukov.com/assembly/updates/2020-10-20/assembly-resolution-2020-09-N_04-program-discontinuance-aas-business-office-management.docx) Approving the A. A. S. Business Office Management [Program Discontinuance Proposal (AEG)](https://www.sunysuffolk.edu/governance/college-curriculum/documents/2020-2021/a.a.s.-business-office-management-discontinuance-proposal.docx) (Janet Simpson) Approved 23-1-0
6. [Resolution 2020-09-[05]](http://kasiukov.com/assembly/updates/2020-10-20/assembly-resolution-2020-09-N_05-course-revision-mkt-230-sports-marketing.docx) Approving the MKT230 Sports Marketing [Course Revision Proposal (AEG)](https://www.sunysuffolk.edu/governance/college-curriculum/documents/2020-2021/mkt230-sports-marketing-course-revision-proposal.docx) (Janet Simpson) Approved 23-1-0
7. Assembly Forum on Adjunct Membership, addressing:
   1. Adjunct voting rights. Should adjunct members have full voting rights, or some portion set by formula?
      1. Tat Sang So – Adjunct members should have full voting rights. Does anyone have a different view?
      2. Joshua Wolfson – Full voting rights needs to be tied to quorum.
      3. Marc Fellenz – WE need to rethink the way quorum is stated because if adjuncts are admitted, quorum will never be made. Quorum should be based on the full-time members. There is no good reason to deny adjuncts voting membership. Faculty governance supports academic freedom. Faculty have a right to be consulted about curriculum. Adjuncts don’t have a voice without voting rights.
      4. Alexander Kasiukov – We have 2 proposals: 1. Adjunct voting rights and 2. Quorum based on full-time numbers.
      5. Tat Sang So – Adjunct members in attendance should count toward the quorum number. The objection to giving adjuncts voting rights is centered around the t possibility that adjuncts will be able to overrun the vote.
      6. Melissa Adeyeye – Where does the membership list come from? Especially with regard to adjuncts.
      7. Alexander Kasiukov – In my opinion, the best way to determine eligibility is the honor system. If an adjunct is interested in governance, they should be able to participate.
      8. Melissa Adeyeye – There are a lot of nuances to the quorum number and you don’t want to discourage them. The adjuncts should be fully counted for quorum.
      9. Alexander Kasiukov – The quorum number should not be based on adjunct numbers because it’s hard to tally. The full-time number is easier to establish.
      10. Jason Ramirez – Opening up quorum to a large number of people may affect the Curriculum Committee. There should be a failsafe to make sure everyone gets the information.
      11. Tat Sang So – The idea is that the debate occurs and then the vote so it’s live.
      12. Jason Ramirez – Bruce Seger do you have any feelings?
      13. Bruce Seger – I think you’re right. I will have to take it back to the committee.
      14. Alexander Kasiukov – It’s important to have the adjunct perspective since they teach most of the classes. The problem is the adjunct lists.
      15. Janet Simpson – I have lists that include the adjuncts. The problem is if we miss quorum, it will affect the proposal timeline. We may lose the ability to pass curriculum resolutions.
      16. Kerry Carlson – The current quorum proposal would not affect the quorum number – that would remain relatively the same. Counting the adjuncts at the meeting would assist in making quorum.
      17. Alex Kasiukov – The adjuncts will help us reach quorum without affecting the quorum number.
      18. Scott Votke – What does amending the constitution entail? Does it go to Administration?
      19. No, it’s handled by the Assembly.
      20. Alyssa Kaufman – I’m in favor of adjuncts having rights. What is the negative?
      21. Tat Sang So – We are trying to account for the hidden voice at the College. Those who have expertise but no voice. We need that voice. Maybe we don’t want part-time faculty to speak about full-time issues. It is worse that they don’t have a voice then too many adjuncts participating.
      22. Marc Fellenz – I have been thinking about this. Why not do what the FA does with each adjunct having a ½ vote. The reason is because a contract vote is much different than an Assembly vote. If the administration wants to implement something, they don’t need the adjuncts to pass it.
      23. Jason Ramirez – There can be a rallying cry to get adjunct to vote down a Curriculum Proposal.
      24. Jill Giresi – We need to be careful with the constitution language, adjunct are not contractually obligated to attend Assembly.
      25. Marc Fellenz – asked to have the FA Contract language added to the minutes: This is the contractual language regarding the duty to participate in Assembly to which I was referring today:  
            
          Article VII.c.  
          Duties of Full-time Faculty.  
          Full-time faculty members have the following duties and responsibilities:  
            
          1. To conduct their assigned classes, in the designated locations for the scheduled length of time, as described in the College Catalog and in accordance with the approved course outline.  
            
          2. To submit grades for all students in their assigned classes within the deadline published in the Academic Calendar, which grades will not be altered except as the result of an appropriate administrative procedure.  
            
          3. To attend General Faculty Meetings, and to serve in the Faculty Senate, Academic Assembly or Congress and on Standing Committees if elected or appointed.  
            
          4. To participate in discipline, departmental or area meetings and operations, including such matters as development of curriculum and evaluation of existing course offerings and instructional programs.
      26. Joshua Wolfson – With regard to multi-campus proposals, this is only a Grant proposal and is not binding on the other campuses. We can also get lists of what adjuncts taught on which campus, dates and number of credits.
      27. Alexander Kasiukov – Let’s test the Polling feature of Zoom – this is not an official vote but an attempt to see if we can use Zoom in the future for voting.
      28. Poll: Regarding adjunct voting rights: Should adjunct members have full voting rights or some proportional rights by formula?  
          Full rights: 39% (18)  
          Proportional rights: 57% (26)  
          No rights: 5% (2)
      29. Poll relaunched:  
          Full rights: 33% (16)  
          Proportional rights: 62% (28)  
          No rights: 4% (2)
      30. Alexander Kasiukov – Proportional rights may be a logistical nightmare. How would we do that with clickers?
      31. Jill Giresi – Do you get the total number of votes? We only see percentages.
      32. Tat Sang So – Only the hosts see the numbers.
      33. Jill Giresi – Maybe a way to avoid proportional rights is to elect adjunct representatives?
      34. Ginny Horan – There are adjuncts present and they need to understand that they are valued. Without adjuncts, I could not have grown my program. Why can’t we have a representative system for adjuncts by department? Make it a part of our culture and governance. The number of representatives to governance would reflect that adjunct participation.
      35. Lynn Liebert – I like Ginny’s idea of a representative body, but it should be by discipline, not department.
      36. Ginny Horan – That’s what I meant, discipline not department. What’s the problem with having people interested in the process?
      37. Alexander Kasiukov – I see none – but this has a feeling of being adversarial.
      38. Danielle DiMauro Brooks – I find it hard to hear that you think 100s of adjuncts will overwhelm a meeting is hard to hear. The adjuncts that are here are dedicated and I don’t think that we should get proportional rights but full rights.
   2. Quorum. How should adjunct members be counted for the quorum threshold, and in the event of a quorum call?
      1. See discussion above.
      2. Poll regarding quorum: Should quorum thresholds EXCLUDE adjunct members (quorum thresholds should include only full time members)?  
         Yes: 44% (20)  
         No: 38 (17)  
         Abstain: 18 (8)
      3. Melissa Adeyeye – Quorum allows us to move things forward. If we grant adjuncts full voting rights but not full quorum that is not giving them full recognition.
      4. Alexander Kasiukov – there are 2 things here:  
         1. The number on which the quorum is based. It’s not based on the adjuncts, the threshold is based on the full-time numbers.  
         2. Quorum count – which will include the adjuncts.
      5. Tat Sang So – Quorum should not be verification of faculty participation. It’s a protection against abuse. If you’re not at the meeting you can’t call for a quorum.
      6. Poll regarding preferred platform for voting: How should the online Assembly vote?  
         Blackboard: 24% (10)  
         Zoom 63% (26)  
         Abstain 12% (5)
   3. Committee membership. How should adjunct members be elected or chosen for committees?
      1. Alexander Kasiukov – How show we elect adjuncts to committees?
      2. Joshua Wolfson – We are proposing that if an adjunct is interested in serving, the adjunct would have a seat on the committee, bot by department.
      3. Marc Fellenz – The adjunct representative should be voted on by adjuncts, not the assembly. Procedurally I don’t have in mind. The adjunct representative should have a responsibility to the adjunct group.
      4. Alexander Kasiukov – There are several situations when the representative is not representative of the same group. I would consider Josh Wolfson’s proposal for its simplicity and consistency. So there are 2 proposals: 1. An adjunct representative per committee and 2. Adjunct representatives by department.
      5. Item deferred until to the next meeting.
8. Campus Update (Donna Ciampa)
9. For the Good of the Assembly

Meeting adjourned at 5:21pm