**Academic Assembly**
November 18, 2019
2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 130

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Chris Paul, Heath Spencer, Nalini Iyer, Yancy Dominick, Kirsten Thompson, Frank Shih, Mimi Cheng, Katie Oliveras, Sarah Bee, Marc Cohen, Colette Taylor, Dylan Medina, Patrick Murphy, Terri Clark, Mark Taylor, Russ Powell, Bryan Adamson, Felipe Anaya, Shane P. Martin, Kathleen La Voy, Nicole Harrison, Alex Tang, Angie Jenkins

*Minutes taken by Lindsey Nakatani*

I. **Review 11-4-19 Minutes**                                                     **2:05 – 2:07**
   a. Frank Shih – Small talks, shared a presentation by Steven Chu on Climate Change and on how quickly the world can adapt to change (urging Seattle U/AcA to act to adapt to student demographic changes).
   b. Review of AcA Agenda for 12/2/19 Meeting
   c. Comments on Minutes from AcA Meeting on 11/14/19. Clarification on conversation items from previous meeting regarding NTT and the Faculty Handbook.
   d. VOTE: ABSTAIN: 2, APPROVED: 15, OPPOSED: 0
      i. Motion is passed – AcA 11/4/19 Meeting Minutes Approved

II. **Provost Update**                                                            **2:07 – 2:15**
   a. Per the AcA's approval of the URTC charter and membership at the last AcA meeting, the next step was to present both to the President. The President has approved both the charter and the membership of the URTC.
      i. Transitional steps moving forward to begin the work of the URTC
      ii. The Committee on Committees will populate the URTC in an expedited timeline
   b. Board of Trustees: Strategic Directions for Seattle University proposed and approved by the Board
      i. A draft of the Strategic Plan was presented to the Board of trustees in September for formative feedback, in anticipation of presenting the final document in November. The Board was concerned about approving specific strategic actions in November since the multi-year enrollment and financial plans would not be developed until later in the year.
      ii. Thus, at the November meeting, the Board voted to pass a Strategic Directions document which outlines the vision and direction of Seattle University's future. Working groups and task forces will be formed to examine and prioritize potential strategic actions that flesh out the Strategic Directions document and align with the multi-year budget. The Directions document will take effect January 2020 and will be a five-year document. There will be a campus-wide roll-out of this document in January 2020.
      iii. The Board is particularly attentive towards the issue of enrollment and the subsequent monetary gap that occurred during the beginning of the 19-20 AY.

iv. Provost would like to highlight the CFO's visit to the AcA on 12/2/19. CFO will speak to what we can do and how we can move forward in the creation of a new enrollment and budget model for SU.

c. **Discussion:** Concern voiced about approving the Strategic Directions document without the appropriate action items properly flushed out. Next steps will involve assessing the budget implications of the directions that the steering committees/task forces have identified for the university and how to create a budget around these issues.

d. There are scheduled open forums for the SU community to hear how the strategic planning process is moving forward and to engage in discussion about the strategic plan and actions.

e. Update on the Campaign for the Uncommon Good. Current campaign allocation breakdown:

   i. 1/3$^{rd}$ to the Center for Science and Innovation
   ii. 1/3$^{rd}$ to scholarship funding
   iii. 1/3$^{rd}$ to a range of additional items

f. Campaign goal is $275 million. There is confidence that the campaign will bring in funds above that mark.

III. **AcA General Update & Business**                                                          **2:15 – 2:30**

a. Demo of Power BI Enrollment Tool on Inform SU – (40 students = about $1 million revenue) tool for assessing the enrollment trends of each school/program. This tool gives insight to anyone considering the enrollment issues facing SU.

b. Search for 2 faculty reps for VP Enrollment (Co-Chair Hye-Kyung Kang)

c. CFO has requested the AcA's assistance in finding faculty members for the Faculty Budget Advisory Group. This is a budget strategy working group. Membership discussion to be conducted through non-meeting communique.

d. URTC Call for members: College of Ed – 1 position, College of S&E – 1 position, 4 at-large positions. The committee will vote in their own Chair. Suggested that an e-mail be sent to the faculty informing them that URTC has been restructured and the charter has been approved.

e. Reminder regarding the URTC; this committee is in transition and flexibility will be needed to populate membership asap. AcA confirmation will either be an in-meeting vote or a non-meeting vote, whichever method best suites meeting the deadline. 6 of the 11 members will be appointed by the AcA and 5 current URTC members will roll over onto the new committee.

f. ConC will be focusing on creating a system for populating the committees moving forward.

IV. **Technology Governance Committee Proposals to AcA – CIO, Chris van Liew**          **2:30 – 3:00**

a. Primary Focus for the CIO's proposal is to improve collaboration on technology investments, communication and relationship between the IT community and Faculty of SU.

b. Technology Governance – Creation of New and Restructuring of Existing Committees

   i. **Academic Technology Committee** – Represents faculty voice regarding teaching and learning technology project priorities, relevant standards and policies, and is a subcommittee of the Academic Assembly. *This committee currently exists as the Faculty Technology Committee.* Recommendations for committee membership have been made in consultation with Frank Shih and Rich Leblanc

      ii. **University Technology Committee**: Aligns overall SU strategy to the high-level technology investment portfolio, tracks institutional-level results and approves top-level technology policies. Is advisory to the President's Cabinet. *This committee has not yet been initiated.*

      iii. **Enterprise Technology Committee**: Represents Seattle University enterprise functions and service areas that support students, faculty and staff, prioritizing relevant technology projects and advising on standards and policies. *This committee currently exists as the Technology Steering Committee.*

      iv. **Data Governance Committee**: Establishes data stewards, standards, guidelines and protocols for Seattle University data, data security, and role-based access to institutional data. *This committee has been fully operational since June, 2017.*

c. **Discussion: Questions and Concerns**

      i. Requested attention to improving support in the areas of teaching/classroom base, interdisciplinary research, groups of researchers and "creative works".

      ii. Revise standards of cloud platforms? The goal is to have one, coherent, faculty voice to research and inform IT community about the needs of the SU community and to incite deeper conversations about specific IT needs.

      iii. Question regarding possible curriculum to provide instruction on online education? There are some existing services to assist faculty in branching into online teaching, including the CDLI and Online Education Task Force. More research needed into the question: "How has the use of online education expanded? And how can SU incorporate online education into its curriculum?"

      iv. Questions concerning SU's data management plan. A plan is needed to encompass both the volume and security of the data used and stored at SU. This issue will fall under the purview and work of the Data Governance Committee.

      v. Concern regarding continuity of membership for Technology Governance Committees. Should there be backups for committee members? CIO would look to the chairs of each committee to maintain and successfully utilize their membership bases.

      vi. How often will the IT governance committees meet? Generally, each committee meets 1-2 times per month.

      vii. Improvement for Computer Lab Support

d. Motion to affirm the University Technology Governance Document

      i. VOTE: APPROVED: 18, ABSTAIN: 0, OPPOSED: 0

      ii. Motion is passed – AcA Approves the CIO's SU University Technology Governance Proposed Approach (pending minor edits)

V. **Continuing Discussion of AcA Agenda Items for 19-20 AY**         **3:00 – 3:35**

a. **Faculty Advisory Budget Committee**

b. **Compensation** – Committee to present to AcA during WQ

VI. **Workload** – A comprehensive, campus-wide statement/guidelines regarding the university's workload definitions and standards is needed.

a. **Discussion - Workload**
b. Concerns Regarding Workload Standards
   i. There is no common definition of workload across the university
   ii. Concerned voices are often territorial in conversation concerning this topic
   iii. Current workload categories are confusing e.g., service, research, teaching.
c. Question: Is there research regarding a way to workload is measured and quantified? Which schools/colleges are using which models? Action: First step should be gathering information surrounding current practice in each school/college.
d. Interest in a larger Faculty Handbook revision with language surrounding the definition of workload and how it is quantified.
e. Possible creation of task force to research workload discrepancies?
f. This has been an ongoing issue for Seattle University according to past Academic Affairs Operation Reports, "service obligations are a poorly articulated expectation."
g. Investigation into the workloads currently held by faculty. Use this research as a starting point for building university guidelines, so that workloads are descriptive rather than prescriptive.
h. Proposed Action Item: Draft proposal to University Governance calling for the creation of a task force to investigate, create report and recommend next steps regarding the standardization of workload understanding at SU. The work is to be endorsed and encouraged heavily by the AcA but not fall under the direct supervision/purview of the AcA.
i. SU Advance has performed some research already, specifically surrounding the conversation regarding the "service" workload category.
j. Concern voiced regarding a research process beginning before a decision on the SU's consideration of moving to semesters is finalized. The research could be helpful in shaping new policies
k. Revision of ARP: APRs are also inconsistent across the university and merit re-evaluation. Possibly adopt ranges of service hours that would fall into performance categories?
l. Consideration of how workloads calculate differently in Professional School vs. Internal School programs, in undergrad vs. grad and doctoral programs etc.
m. Procedural Suggestions: Initial step, identify and clearly define terminology and conduct university wide research regarding how workload is currently defined, how service is defined etc. Secondly, identify data points: credit hours, merit pay criteria, class size etc. Thirdly, examine external resources. What are some other university models? Look at both comparable and aspirational models.
n. Is the creation of a task force to be authorized by the Provost?
o. Potential Charge of the Task Force: Identify and define terminology, identify relevant data points, gather all relevant research into a report and recommend next steps to developing a plan for university standardization on workloads.
p. Points to be Considered during workload research:
   i. General understandings need to be flexible. There are expected exceptions to any model. Translation algorithm? Modifiable Model? Changing contract definitions?
   ii. General understanding of time and effort percentages for faculty responsibilities

        iii. Concern for what the 100% looks like and how the percentages break down within the life experience of each individual faculty member.

        iv. Consideration of the NTT faculty experience.

    q. Data from the Office of Sponsored Projects could be used as a starting point

## VII. **Evaluations**

    a. **Discussion - Evaluations**

    b. What would the success of a task force researching restructuring evaluations look like?

    c. Are basic/broader questions needed for better understanding?

    d. External Model: At Victoria University, faculty could propose a certain percentage of their own evaluation questions to create a more narrative response rather than a statistical response.

    e. First step should be to fix the response rate, which is currently 20-30%.

    f. The work of the URTC committee will be heavily related to the work of the Evaluations task force. The evaluations will help inform the decisions of the URTC.

    g. Research has been conducted COE regarding evaluations.

    h. College of A&S has also conducted research and the primary take-away was that student evaluations are, overall, ineffective and uninformative. Current evaluations buy too heavily into biases. Two suggested options: Professional evaluators and/or interview alumni.

    i. Could a comprehensive report of the existing internal research be compiled?

    j. Consideration: What is the purpose of evaluations? Are they informative or substantive?

    k. Concern that evaluations are not tailored towards the teaching in certain schools that is in direct preparation for a license or certification exam.

    l. Overall the large and wide-ranging differences between schools/colleges is of major concern.

## VIII. **NTT Faculty Update**

    a. Update: NTT is active and working strongly towards the advancement of their agenda

    b. NTT issues are heavily related to all the existing AcA issues

    c. Regarding the Titles and Contracts issues voiced by the NTT, would it be possible to invite them to the existing task forces or committees to give them a voice since all of the existing issues affect their faculty experience?

## IX. **AcA Primary Focus Items for the 19-20 AY**

    a. Workload

    b. Evaluations

    c. NTT Faculty