

Academic Assembly
February 12, 2018
2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 130

MINUTES

Present: Rick Block, Pat Buchsel, Terri Clark, Mark Cohan, Marc Cohen, Brooke Coleman, Miles Coleman, Carlos de Mello e Souza, Allison Gibbons, Arie Greenleaf, Nalini Iyer, Kathleen La Voy, Chuck Lawrence, Emily Lieb, Agnieszka Miguel, Katie Oliveras, Erik Olsen, Steve Palazzo, Frank Shih, Gregory Silverman, Colette Taylor, Kirsten Thompson, Travis Tweet

Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes

- I. Review of 1-29-18 Minutes
 - A. Issue with order of motions and associated votes for Faculty Handbook proposals
 - B. Minutes tabled until we have clarity on the order in which the motions were voted
- II. New Program Proposal NCS/COE K-8 Specialization (*Rick Fehrenbacher, Trish Henley, Julie Kang*)
 - A. Same teaching certification program add-on as offered currently in Interdisciplinary Liberal Studies and Matteo Ricci College
 - B. Discussion
 - 1. Market analysis skepticism about NCS programs, after much lower enrollment than projected when school started a few years ago
 - 2. City University is a local competitor, however, we are competitive with them both in pricing and reputation
 - 3. MOU signed with Seattle public schools will funnel paraprofessionals into the program
 - C. AcA Discussion
 - 1. Motion via email on 2-5-18, to approve PRC memo as written
 - a. Approved with 15 approve, 0 oppose, 0 abstain
- III. Academic Affairs Updates
 - A. English proficiency pilot program
 - 1. Currently running a pilot, 63 students in fall 2017
 - 2. Expanding pilot from students from six local community colleges to many more throughout the state
 - B. STM new certificate proposal (approved at AcA meeting 1-29-18)
 - 1. Increase of credits from 8 to 12, to meet university policy
 - C. President's and Provost's undergraduate awards at graduation
 - 1. Too many students meeting the GPA threshold, with no clear process beyond that to decide one recipient for each of the awards
 - 2. Proposal – all students with a 4.0 GPA will receive an academic excellence award, and these two individual awards will be decided by the deans (nominees from each school)
- IV. Dean Evaluation Update
 - A. Piloted the evaluation process on three deans last spring, three more lined up for this year
 - B. Cabinet has also decided they will go through this process, selecting three for this spring
 - C. Many issues with pilot process, but we are moving forward with the three for this year in order to keep up momentum
 - D. May consider other consultant options, AcA subcommittee is exploring future options

- E. The main issue has been the disconnect between how corporate the consultant process is, and who we are as a university – have not found the right balance between norming the process and fully seeking faculty feedback
- V. Accreditation Update (*Bob Duniway, Sophia Sansone*)
 - A. NWCCU site visit April 25-27, 2018
 - B. Accreditation
 - 1. Financial aid
 - 2. Recognition of credits and degrees
 - 3. Prompts regular review of institutional practices and policies
 - 4. External feedback on the quality and sustainability of our educational endeavors
 - C. Cycle – seven year self-study of five standards
 - 1. Mission and core themes
 - 2. Resources and capacity
 - 3. Planning and implementation
 - 4. Effectiveness (assessment) and improvement
 - 5. Mission fulfillment, adaptation and sustainability
 - D. Core Themes
 - 1. Enhancing transformational education
 - 2. Fostering professional success
 - 3. Responding to external change
 - 4. Creating infrastructure for excellence
 - E. Timeline
 - 1. February 1: Report finalized and submitted to NWCCU
 - 2. March: Meetings requested and scheduled
 - 3. April 25 – 27 : Requested meetings with students, staff, and faculty; presentation of findings
 - F. Concerns from Year Three Visit/Report
 - 1. Shared governance
 - 2. Integration of campus-wide plans with the university Core Themes and strategic plan
 - G. After Visit
 - 1. May 11, 2018 - Notations of “Errors of Fact” submitted by the university to NWCCU
 - 2. June 27-29, 2018 - Commissioners review visiting team’s report and finalize decision on the university’s accreditation status and follow up requirements and deadlines, send formal communication to President Sundborg
 - 3. September 15, 2019 - University submits the *Mission and Core Themes Report*
 - H. AcA Discussion
 - 1. Accreditor team will read the report on how shared governance is happening and then requests meetings as needed to clarify areas that may be vague or confusing
 - 2. Reviewers will likely request to meet with members of AcA, will convene a meeting outside of scheduled time upon request
- VI. Evaluation of Deans Discussion with Korn Ferry Hay Group (*Deborah Brown, Julie Staggs*)
 - A. Overview
 - 1. Completed assessment last year and learned a lot from it
 - 2. Beginning assessment cycle next week for three more deans
 - 3. How do leaders measure against key competencies?
 - 4. Heard from last year’s process that there were disconnects, too much corporate jargon
 - 5. The leadership standards are normed in the industry, but need better translation for a higher ed audience

6. Working with AcA subcommittee to improve these areas of mismatch in language
 7. Concerns around timing as well, need to have more time between feedback to deans and discussion with school
- B. New Process
1. Increase user-friendly side of the process
 2. Focus on how to make leadership concept central in the process, and creation of development plans
 3. Putting tenured/tenure track and full time non-tenure track faculty feedback in two different groups for analysis
- C. AcA Discussion
1. Survey will be Feb. 19 – March 5, seems like a tight timeline for those who have children out of school for mid-winter break
 2. Feedback from Law School
 - a. Faculty self-nominated, and the finalists included Associate Deans
 - b. After reflection, the faculty realized nominees should not be direct reports to the dean moving forward
 3. Inclusion of part time faculty in feedback process
 - a. Part time faculty were invited the last time, with low turnout
 - b. May not have much interaction with the dean, varies greatly depending on the school/college
 - c. An important voice that needs to be heard in the process
 - d. Might be an important finding if people do not have a relationship with the dean
 4. Instrument is the same, but with a “cheat sheet” for interpreting corporate terms
 5. Can be compared to other institutions of higher ed, as well as comparable positions in industry
 6. Deans receive the full report back and then work with the provost to decide what to share back broadly to the faculty
 7. Deans evaluated and normed their job description last year, this will be circulated as part of the process
 8. How can the evaluation be normed when the job description of the deans is different from job descriptions at other institutions?
 - a. Leadership points that go across job descriptions
 - b. Broad norms of leadership
 - c. Engagement, empowerment, energy
 - d. Information in report is voluminous
 9. Issue with deans writing their own job descriptions – we need to come back to this as a shared governance issue, AcA should contribute to this process
 10. Push for students to be involved in the process in some regard – open forum, etc.
 11. There was also a discussion of having a greater faculty/AcA role in the evaluation process in the future, including a process for sharing the results with faculty
- VII. United Way Discussion (*Le Xuan Hy, Scott McClellan*)
- A. Last cycle, there were concerns raised about how data were used and how further contact happened after the drive
- B. Overview
1. Two week campaign, standard fundraising procedure
 2. Co-chairs selected ambassadors in colleges/schools to push within their areas
 3. Goal was to increase participation level to 100% participation amongst those who can
 4. Asked people to participate individually via email to promote this goal

5. Message of care to community is very important
- C. Discussion
 1. Concerns of faculty – frequency of contact, perceived perception of compulsory tithing, privacy concerns (targeted emails that suggest there are lists of those who have not contributed)
 2. Volunteer staff person who works with United Way to maintain usage lists – does use these lists to send emails to those who have not contributed
 3. People who have not contributed feel targeted, experienced it as shaming
 4. Reasonable concerns about the United Way, people may choose to contribute in different ways based upon those concerns
 5. Larger question is about how we are approaching our relationship with United Way as a university
 6. Suggest AcA ad hoc committee
 - a. Need information from the university about whether this campaign is in compliance with the data privacy policy of the university
 - b. Speak with Fr. Steve
 - c. Develop recommendations for these concerns moving forward

VIII. AcA President Report

- A. Hope to develop processes for different goals of AcA
- B. Grievance process; college-level governance; NTT issues; AcA web/documentation; SU processes on hiring, R&T, serving as chair, serving on AcA; AcA processes