

Academic Assembly
June 1st, 2020
2:05 – 3:35pm, Zoom Meeting

MINUTES

AcA Attendance: Terri Clark, Frank Shih, Mark Taylor, Sarah Bee, Nalini Iyer, Russ Powell, Shane Martin, Patricia Buschel, Michael Ng, Kate Koppelman, Katie Oliveras, Dylan Medina, Kathleen La Voy, Yancy Dominick, Chris Paul, Margit McGuire, Kirsten Thompson, Arie Greenleaf, Gregory Silverman, Felipe Anaya, Marc Cohen, Mimi Cheng, Patrick Murphy

Guest Attendance: Agnieszka Miguel, Sonia Barrios-Tinoco, David Green, Bob Dullea, Katherine Raichle

Minutes taken by Lindsey Nakatani

I. Review 05-18-20 Minutes and AcA President Updates

2:05 – 2:07

- a. The AcA President offered an overview of the current WA state statistics on COVID-19 cases.
- b. **Motion:** AcA moves to approve the meeting minutes from 5/18/20. Seconded. **VOTE:** APPROVE: 12, OPPOSED: 0, ABSTENTIONS: 2.
 - i. **Motion is passed** – 5/18/20 Meeting Minutes Approved.

II. Provost Update *Shane Martin*

2:07 – 2:15

- a. The Provost offers his sincere hope that all Seattle University (SU) community members are staying safe and healthy. The Provost acknowledges the extremely difficult situation in the local and global community in response to the tragic death of George Floyd, and the deep grief and despair these events have caused in communities across the nation. The Provost has been in touch with Dr. Natasha Martin, SU's Chief Diversity Officer, to collaborate and brainstorm ways the SU community can be proactive and supportive of ongoing measures to address these issues. The Provost wishes to address a question raised at the last meeting regarding what resources are available to staff who are experiencing physical distress or are uncomfortable in their remote office situations. Human Resources (HR) is working on releasing information about resources faculty and staff experiencing this issue. In the meantime, staff and faculty are encouraged to reach out directly to HR for assistance.
- b. **Re-Opening Campus** – An in-depth conversation will be held on this issue with the Academic Assembly (AcA) at the June 8th meeting during which, university leadership will ask for faculty feedback on several issues. A survey has been sent out to the university community to engage their feedback on preparations for the fall. These surveys are incredibly important, and the Provost encourages all community members to participate. The feedback gathered from a similar survey on academic calendar adjustments was extremely helpful.
- c. **June 8th AcA Meeting Topics** – What protocols or accommodations would the faculty like to see put in place to assist at-risk communities returning to work on campus? Specifically, those SU community members who fall into the categories designated as “at-risk” by the Center for Disease Control. The Office of the Provost has received feedback from AcA members about the open conversation forums that were recently held with the Provost, the President and the CFO. The faculty have expressed their appreciation for the opportunity to speak and ask questions of the executive leadership. There were concerns about the functionality of the Zoom Webinar platform. The faculty would appreciate greater transparency about which questions were chosen to be answered in the meeting. All questions were ultimately answered in the FAQ section of the Provost's Office webpage.

Questions/Discussion:

- d. *What accommodations will be made for family members of faculty and staff who are considered vulnerable?* University leadership, in consultation with the AcA, will talk through what mechanisms and protocols can be put in place to accommodate those faculty and staff that have at-risk family members.
- e. *The faculty would like some clarification/explanation of the role of the Center for Faculty Development in all ongoing planning conversations?* The immediate necessity of moving to online instruction has made the Center for Digital Learning and Innovation (CDLI) the most forward facing consulting department. However, the Center for Faculty development will be central to conversations moving forward.

III. Vote to Affirm the AcA's Statement of Solidarity**2:15 – 2:17**

- a. "Members of the Seattle University Academic Assembly condemn the recent killings of Ahmaud Arbery, Breonna Taylor, and George Floyd and acknowledge them as racist actions supported by white supremacist culture and systems. Further, we see them as part of the racist and oppressive history of this country, as morally abhorrent, and as starkly opposed to the vision of social justice advocated by Seattle University. As faculty members, we further understand that in order to teach social justice, we must name it and name acts, systems, and structures that oppose it. Regardless of our disciplines, we must work to name the ways in which we, our fields, our methods, our positionalities, and our own history have worked to uphold white supremacy. As Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion Natasha Martin reminded us in her message on Friday, our "willingness to acknowledge the racial terror upon which our country is built and the systemic structural forces that sustain and lock in advantage and disadvantage as a self-reinforcing system that has been operating for years is critical." If we are white-identified, we are especially called to do this work: to acknowledge how our words in classes or in scholarship might silence or damage, how our choices about curriculum, policies, and research topics might support systems that are oppressive, and how our silences about such topics might also mark our own complicity. To this end, we urge AcA to make anti-racist curriculum and pedagogy part of its curriculum review criteria and suggest that AcA form a committee to investigate how to do so, working with colleges and with the office of Diversity and Inclusion to design and implement those criteria. Finally, we stand with our colleagues and our students who are feeling scared, who are feeling alone, and who are feeling the weight of these events in ways that many of us cannot fully understand. We offer our solidarity and support as well as a renewed commitment to consider governance decisions in the light of not only structures on campus that might continue to uphold white supremacy but also in light of the events unfolding across the country and the world so that we can better support and educate our students and ourselves."
- b. **Motion:** The AcA moves to waive the one-week review rule. Seconded. **VOTE:** APPROVE: 17, OPPOSED: 0, ABSTENTIONS: 0.
 - i. **Motion is passed** – AcA waives the one-week rule.
- c. **Motion:** The AcA moves to approve the statement of solidarity so stated above. Seconded. **VOTE:** APPROVE: 17, OPPOSED: 0, ABSTENTIONS: 0.
 - i. **Motion is passed** – AcA approves the statement of solidarity.

IV. Committee on Committees Update Sarah Bee**2:17 – 2:25**

- a. Overview of Committee on Committees (ConC) Process:
 - i. Gathered the names of university committees requiring faculty appointments. There were 29 committees in total in need of faculty appointments.
 - ii. ConC gathered info from all committee chairs regarding their committee's current faculty membership, terms of office and general information about the committee, including any special requirements.
 - iii. Requested the number of new committee members needed for the next AY year.
 - iv. Collaborated with Provost Martin and AcA representatives to invite faculty to volunteer for service.

- v. Collated interest statements by committee and college.
- vi. ConC consulted with various stakeholders as a courtesy to these individuals and offices or as a condition of the ConC charter, but the ConC retained authority to choose faculty appointees, and exercised the committee's authority in full. Sent faculty interest statements to: 1) Deans of respective colleges – per ConC charter and 2) the Executive Vice President, CFO and President.
- vii. Created criteria to evaluate the pool of volunteers (listed below).
- viii. Selected volunteers for committees with reference to the below criteria.

- b. **Selection Criteria:** Specific skills and training required, disciplinary expertise (where relevant), experience (on the committee or in the work called for by the committee), distribution across colleges/schools/library, diversity, such as gender, race and other forms of underrepresented communities, balance of ranks and contingent and TT faculty: e.g. assistant, associate, full TT, FT NTT, PT, the number of terms of office served to date on a specific committee (new or returning) and applicants' ranking of interest in committee service (in other words, faculty included first, second, and third choice of committee service).

c. **Table Overview of Volunteer Selection Breakdown**

School	Volunteer	Total Full-time faculty	% of total	Selected Members	% of Volunteers Selected
ASB	18	71	25%	12	67%
CAS	20	191	10%	12	60%
COE	6	30	20%	3	50%
CON	5	62	8%	3	60%
CSE	16	112	14%	10	63%
LEM	2	12	17%	2	100%
LAW	3	56	5%	2	67%
NCS	1	6	17%	1	100%
STM	1	12	8%	1	100%
Total	72	552	13%	47	65%

- d. **Next Steps:** AcA members will receive via e-mail: 1) a process description, 2) a description of the committees and 3) a list of members selected to serve. The AcA will then vote to affirm the slate of nominees presented by the ConC. The committee chairs will then be notified of their newly appointed members and those nominees who were not selected for service.
- e. **Work for Fall 2020:** 1) Ensure all committee member lists are accurate, 2) Assist committees with writing charters
- f. The AcA expresses its thanks to the ConC Chair, Sarah Bee, for her extraordinary leadership of this monumental effort to re-vitalize and standardize the university committee membership selection process.

V. **APPR/PRC Update** *Bob Dullea & Terri Clark*

2:25 – 3:00

- a. The APPR Committee has been chartered as a working group of the Strategic Planning Council to:
 - i. Design and implement a process for assessing the university's academic programs and transitioning to a portfolio that ensures mission fulfillment and is financially sustainable.
 - ii. Undertake a process that is transparent, is guided by clear standards, developed through shared governance processes, that recognizes the differing kinds of contributions of different programs and departments, and includes appropriate consideration of contribution to mission and academic character.

- iii. The APPR committee will be aiming to provide recommendations for program sunsetting to be considered by the Board of Trustees (BOT) in February of 2021.

b. High-Level Draft Process Outline:

i. Phase One - Three Step Process:

- Step One: Develop a set of objective and measurable criteria through which all programs can be assessed with the intent of identifying a subset of programs for deeper review.
- Step Two: Conduct the indicated deeper reviews.
- Step Three: In February 2021, submit to the *Provost/President/Board of Trustees a list of programs recommended to sunset.*

- ii. Phase One of the APPR will proceed in tandem with the academic calendar review. SU has a total of 148 programs, far too many to be qualitatively reviewed in such a short time frame. Therefore, a set of criteria will be established by the committee to identify those programs in need of more in depth review by the APPR. These criteria will allow the APPR to identify programs that fall below a defined threshold (based on enrollment trends, net tuition revenue, anticipated market demand etc.) which, if not met, will mark a program to be considered for sunsetting or downsizing regardless of the outcome of the academic calendar review. While the initial set of programs slated for phase one review will be identified through objective enrollment, financial and market criteria; decisions and outcomes will give strong consideration to mission fulfillment.

- iii. **Phase Two:** Conduct a continuing evaluation of other programs which could either be combined with other like programs or sunsetted at a later date.

iv. APPR Committee Membership:

Co-Chairs: Terri Clark, College of Nursing & Bob Dullea, Provost's Office

Members:	School/College
Bee, Sarah	Albers School
Clark, Annette	School of Law
Donalson, Edward	Theology and Ministry
Fischer, Brian	Science and Engineering
Garone, Wilson	Finance and Business Affairs
Kirkwood, John	School of Law
La Voy, Kathleen	Provost Office
Lopuch, Viviane	New and Continuing Studies
Martin, Natasha	Diversity and Inclusion
Mason, Gregory	Science and Engineering
Miller, Carrie	College of Nursing
Paul, Christopher	Arts and Sciences
Serna, Ivette	University Budget Office
Taylor, Collette	College of Education

Questions/Discussion

- c. *The AcA would appreciate being informed and consulted once the APPR Phase One criteria has been established. Much of the focus of the APPR seems to be on sunsetting rather than curriculum re-development, re-formation of programs etc. Could the committee chairs speak to the role of these additional strategies?* Committee chairs encourage all faculty to reach out with any questions or concerns. The initial Phase One will be focused on staunch, data driven analysis to triage which programs require more in-depth review. In Phase Two, the APPR will then proceed to more in-depth analysis. Program sunsetting will be the central focus of Phase One of the APPR's work, however reviews conducted during the first phase will

identify areas where sunseting is not appropriate. During Phase Two, the APPR will re-evaluate programs where sunseting is inappropriate and consider other strategies such as re-alignment, curriculum re-development, re-formation, merging etc.

- d. *Faculty would like to see inclusion of critical race pedagogies and crucial race studies as a criterion for Phase One of the APPR. Additionally, the faculty would like to see more diverse representation on the APPR of faculty who teach critical race studies and more undergraduate student representation.* The chairs acknowledge that any committee membership roster will have room for improvement. However, there are members on the APPR who are well positioned to offer diverse perspectives and input.
- e. *Will the question of a shift to semesters be considered during the APPR?* The academic calendar review will be taking place parallel to the APPR. Phase One examinations of programs will consider this potential change. By Phase Two, the academic calendar review will, hopefully, have resulted in a recommendation and the APPR will be able to make more definite determinations.
- f. *How will Hanover Research be contributing to the APPR process?* The work of Hanover research will be complimentary to the work of the APPR. Hanover's research will offer a forward thinking and national perspective to the APPR. Hanover's research focuses on examining demand for programs based upon post graduate outcomes and student interest which offers valuable contextual information regarding the market viability of programs.
- g. *Has there been any update on whether or not the AcA will receive the same information shared in the Department Chairs and Program Directors' meeting with Hanover?* There is a commitment to share the information with the AcA. The Vice Provost will follow-up with Institutional Research and find the status of the information.

VI. AcA Bylaw Amendment Vote

3:00 – 3:02

Questions/Discussion:

- a. *Do the bylaws as amended on May 18th, 2020 still require a three-year service term for AcA members?*
- b. *According to section 4.2.1. of the bylaws, "Only tenured faculty, tenured-track faculty and faculty on multi-year contracts" are eligible to serve on the AcA. This language, under the current circumstances, renders some faculty, normally eligible to serve, as ineligible. Point of clarification, it was the faculty's understanding that the expansion of eligibility was to those who could vote for AcA representatives and not to those who could serve? Yes, the original amendments were only to section 4.6.3 regarding voting eligibility, however an amendment could be moved today to amend the language in section 4.2.1 as well.*
- c. The faculty would like to further amend the proposed changes to the AcA bylaws as below:
 - i. **AMENDMENT:** The faculty would like the language in section 4.2.1 of the bylaws regarding service eligibility to be changed to mirror the language in section 4.6.3 regarding voting eligibility that states "tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty and full-time contract faculty."
 - ii. **Motion:** The AcA moves to approve the above amendment. Seconded. **VOTE:** APPROVE: 16, OPPOSED: 0, ABSTENTIONS: 1.
 - 1. **Motion is passed** – The AcA approves the amendments.
- d. *Question regarding compliance with AAUP recommendations on AcA service eligibility. If the existing bylaws specify long-term contracts and the committee elects to replace this term with multi-year contracts, is it good practice to change this principle? And is the AcA responding appropriately to the current circumstance that a third of awarded contracts are being shortened to single-year contracts due to current financial constraints of the institution?*
- e. **Motion:** By direction of the Bylaws Committee, I [Gregory Silverman, Chair of the AcA Bylaws Committee] move that the proposed new Bylaws, dated May 18th, 2020, as amended, be substituted for the existing Bylaws, as the official bylaws of the Academic Assembly, effective July 1, 2020, subject only to the Provost's

concurrence thereto, as required by article VI of the existing Bylaws governing the amendment of the Bylaws. Seconded. **VOTE:** APPROVE: 17, OPPOSED: 0, ABSTENTIONS: 0.

- i. **Motion is passed** – The AcA adopts the newly revised bylaws effective July 1st, 2020.
- f. *Does the Provost concur to with the AcA's motion and subsequent vote?* Affirmed, that the Provost of Seattle University, Dr. Shane P. Martin, concurs with the Academic Assembly's motion and subsequent vote on this date June 1st, 2020.

VII. President's Task Force Update *Kirsten Thompson, Katie Oliveras & Frank Shih*

3:02 – 3:16

- a. **Updates** – The feedback received from the survey on the academic start date was instrumental in the decision rendered to move up the start date of the fall semester. The Task Force has turned its attention to the gathering of vital information such as classroom capacities, instructional methods, etc. necessary to rendering recommendations on the re-opening of the campus in the fall. The Task Force has recently released a faculty survey to gather information, feedback and concerns of the faculty regarding campus re-opening. Subjects on this survey include: preferred instructional modality, feedback on what is not being considered regarding specific teaching methods, resources and support, question on summer availability for faculty training sessions, compensation concerns regarding summer availability, what kinds of tech or tools faculty would need to teach their courses, hardware needs, feedback for CDLI and ideas for improvement. The survey closes on June 4th, 2020 and the faculty are strongly encouraged to participate. There has been concern regarding the current communication loop. It seems that the same questions are being asked over and over due to answers not being efficiently circulated. Faculty remain confused about the progress and procedure as decisions are being made. The Task Force is working on constructing a website as to more widely disseminate information. The Task Force will be conducting a course inventory and will be focusing on looping in experiential learning and lab courses. The Task Force is also drafting Decision Timeline.

Questions/Discussion

- b. *Would it be possible to include space for faculty to narrate their specific experiences teaching this quarter? It would be useful for faculty to talk through how expectations have changed, how pedagogy has been affected, how course-work has been affected etc.* The Task Force members agree with this suggestion and would like to work on creating this space. Some of these questions are reflected in the survey, but not at the granular level. It is important to remember that any solution will not be a "one-size fits all" fix.
- c. *Will there be discussion of how support will be offered to the Library faculty so that proper access to resources for faculty and students will be maintained across different modalities?* The Dean of the Lemieux Library sits on the task force and has been working on solutions for Library access.
- d. *Some programs already begin early in the fall and these programs need the extra three weeks at the end of the fall quarter to meet specific field requirements. Are all programs absolutely locked into the new university stop date at the Thanksgiving Holiday? Or will there be exceptions for programs with specific field requirements needs?* This issue has been raised and the Task Force is working with Andrew Anderson, University Registrar, to formulate solutions regarding the intersession before fall.

VIII. AcA Summer Session Update

3:16 – 3:17

- a. AcA Summer Session Dates have been set for July 6th, July 20th and August 10th from 2:00 to 4:00 pm. Meetings will continue to be conducted via Zoom. After the new AcA members are elected, calendar invitations will be sent for the summer meetings.

IX. AcA Officer Elections

3:17 – 3:35

- a. **Candidate for AcA VP for Curriculum: Dr. Terri Clark (3 min.)**
 - i. Dr. Clark made a brief statement of qualification for the position of AcA VP for Curriculum.
 - ii. Questions: *There were no questions for Dr. Clark.*
- b. **Candidate for AcA VP for Policy: Kirsten Thompson (3 min.)**

- i. Dr. Thompson made a brief statement of qualification for the position of AcA VP for Policy.
 - ii. **Questions:** *There were no questions for Dr. Thompson.*
- c. **Candidate for AcA President: Kate Koppelman (3 min.)**
- i. Dr. Koppelman made a brief statement of qualification for the position of AcA President.
 - ii. **Questions:** *The candidate mentioned “re-thinking the decision making and meeting processes.” Would the candidate please elaborate on their intentions? Dr. Koppelman would like to see the AcA spend less time hearing reports and spend more time on having robust conversations on the underlying issues or the reports themselves. Dr. Koppelman would like to re-think the time that the AcA has together.*
 - iii. *Would the candidate please expand upon their intended changes for AcA communications with constituents? Dr. Koppelman feels that the AcA representatives are not consistent with how they communicate with their various constituencies. Dr. Koppelman would like to formulate a clearer process and better articulate to the AcA representatives what their responsibilities are on report back mechanisms. In particular, Dr. Koppelman would like to better streamline a process for when the AcA representatives are tasked with presenting an issue to their constituencies and then gathering feedback. Dr. Koppelman is also dedicated to ensuring equity in the feedback process.*
- d. **Candidate for AcA President: Frank Shih (3 min.) - Incumbent**
- i. Dr. Shih made a brief statement of qualification for the position of AcA President.
 - ii. **Questions:** *What’s something that the candidate would change or do differently under a new term as President? Dr. Shih would improve the communication mechanisms of the AcA. The AcA currently relies on the CAS representatives to communicate. The AcA needs to devise new ways to report to its larger constituencies. The AcA has recently moved to conducting its meetings via the Zoom platform. Unique to this meeting modality, there is no limit to the size of the meeting and therefore a much larger faculty attendance is possible which allows for a more immediate response process for the faculty. Dr. Shih would like to explore ways for this to continue.*
- e. **Process:** Officer Election Voting will commence on Friday June 5th, 2020 at 2:00 pm and will conclude at 2:00 pm on Monday June 8th, 2020. A secure, remote voting process will be implemented. If a faculty member does not receive their anonymous link to the voting ballot, they are advised to please reach out to the nomination committee contacts as soon as possible.