Academic Assembly  
May 18th, 2020  
2:05 – 3:35pm, Zoom Meeting

MINUTES

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


Minutes taken by Lindsey Nakatani

I. Review 05-04-20 Minutes 2:05 – 2:07

a) Motion: AcA moves to approve the meeting minutes from 5/4/20. Seconded. VOTE: APPROVE: 16, OPPOSED: 0, ABSTENTIONS: 0.

i) Motion is passed – 5/4/20 Meeting Minutes Approved.

II. Provost Update Shane Martin 2:07 – 2:20

a) The Provost continues to offer his sincere gratitude to the faculty for their dedicated work and perseverance through this ongoing crisis. The AcA Bylaws revision process has proceeded seamlessly, and the university leadership offers its gratitude to the subcommittee for their work, especially David Lance and Gregory Silverman for their leadership on this project.

b) Academic Continuity – The President’s Task Force on Re-Opening is continuing its work on developing strategies in response to a range of scenarios for re-opening in the fall. A survey was sent out to gather input from the faculty. The voice of the faculty is very important to the re-opening planning process. Survey results indicated strong support for an earlier start to the academic year. There was significant reservation on including Saturday as a day of instruction. University leadership feels that it did not adequately explain its idea for the Saturday instruction model. This model would allow for faculty to work on either a Monday, Wednesday, Friday OR Tuesday, Thursday, Saturday schedule. Written in comments on the survey indicated concerns regarding child care and workload. Based upon the survey results, the re-opening task force has decided to table the Saturday instruction model. The target deadline for a campus re-opening decision is the end of SQ.

Questions/Discussion:

c) Are all regularly scheduled program reviews being suspended for a year? Yes, the current plan is to suspend regular program reviews for the upcoming year unless there is a specific reason that a review would need to be performed, i.e. accreditation needs.

d) Staff and faculty have been suffering physical pain from remote work environments due to improper at-home office set-ups. Is there a way the university can assist? For example, can employees bring home their office chairs? Is there any funding for home office equipment? The Provost’s Office is aware of this problem and is actively working on solutions. Human Resources has been organizing accommodations
for these issues. The Office of the Provost will coordinate with HR on possible solutions for faculty and staff.

e) Would it be appropriate for AcA members to notify their schools/colleges that an early start to the fall quarter is a very likely possibility? Yes, that would appropriate.

f) Will there be exceptions to on-campus instruction for faculty with pre-existing health conditions or at-risk family members? Yes, the safety of the SU community is paramount. The President’s task force is taking into account accommodations for people with these specific needs.

g) Will the AcA receive the same information that was presented to the department chairs and program directors by Hanover? Yes, the university will be inviting Hanover representatives back during the fall quarter, at which time more information can be presented to the AcA. Hanover Research Associates is a research firm that partners with higher education institutions to provide research services and broader perspectives on market landscapes surrounding programs. Strategic decisions need to be based on data. Hanover does not recommend decisions; they simply provide accurate, comprehensive data for the university.

h) The Seattle Public School District has not announced a decision on re-opening for the new school year. Is the Presidential Task Force considering the situation of faculty who are childcare providers? Yes, survey results clearly indicated that faculty are concerned about child care options for the fall. The re-opening task force is including this issue in its discussions.

i) How will the delay in awarding contracts for the fall, impact onboarding of new employees? Contract decisions have been delayed from mid-May to mid-June 2020, due to current staff capacity and due to enrollment data not being available until June 1st, 2020. As of May 18th, there are 800 confirmed deposits for the 20-21 AY. An additional 600 students will make their decision by June 1st. Transfers are tracking ahead of projections and graduate enrollment is tracking normally. Enrollment management and faculty are making incredible efforts to build next year’s class.

j) Will there be isolation protocols, testing and contact tracing in place for new students traveling to SU for the first time? There are protocols in place for isolating any symptomatic students. Further plans to implement these measures are being researched and designed by the President’s Task Force.


a) The University Rank and Tenure Committee will be sending out two personalized letters. The first is a general cover letter outlining the accommodations being made to those currently moving through the tenure process. The second letter is a form for faculty to complete, sign and return to request a one-year delay in their normally scheduled reviews.

Questions/Discussion:

b) Will the completed forms be included in a faculty member’s portfolio so there is documentation for their delay request? Evaluations will not count for any faculty member currently in the 6-year track for tenure, unless a faculty member chooses to opt-in.

c) Perhaps the wording of the message could be a little clearer? The current language makes it appear as if these accommodations only apply to faculty who are coming up for mid-term review this year, rather than reviews further into the future. Even if a faculty member is delaying a mid-term review a few years down the line, this letter should be in their file.

IV. SGSU – State of the Undergraduate Student Survey (SUSS)  2:35 – 3:05

Nicole Harrison, Marrakech Maxwell & Erika Moore
a) **Context:** Every year the SGSU sends out the State of the Undergraduate Student Survey. In the 18-19 AY there were 994 respondents and this year, in the 19-20 AY there were 1,118 respondents. This notable rise in respondents is due to increased incentives and a shortened survey time from 20 to 10 minutes.

b) **Student Success & Wellbeing** – Food security has been a growing concern for students. From September of 2019 to January of 2020, there were 300 individual visitors to the OMA food pantry (both undergrad and grad). The SGSU is looking for a food security program that is more sustainable. 36% of students have had to miss a meal at least once because they could not afford one. The SGSU is committed to working with the OMR, RHA and Chartwells to provide more resources to assist students with food security including: providing resources for the food bank, food recovery for distribution to the students, increased awareness of student-to-student meal plan donations and educational resources about larger nationwide food insecurity trends.

i) The student government is recommending renewed focus on more robust food security initiatives and the strengthening of vital partnerships. The student government understands that during these times of budgetary limitations it is vital to prioritize high impact practices, especially those designed to benefit marginalized students.

c) **Campus Climate** – This section of the survey breaks down experiences to see how students are engaging on campus. Questions asked on the survey:

i) “Within the past year, have you personally experienced any exclusionary (e.g. shunned, ignored, condescending) behavior at Seattle University?” Response: 66.47% have never experienced any exclusionary behavior. 7.86% preferred not to answer and 25.67% have experienced exclusionary behavior at SU.

ii) “What do you believe the conduct was based upon?”

iii) “Who/what was the source of this conduct?” Almost 40% of the exclusionary conduct was attributed to other students and 22.19% was attributed to faculty.

iv) “Are you aware of the appropriate channels for reporting bias incidents or micro aggressive behaviors on campus?” Response: Yes 49.39 % and No 56%

v) “Have you considered leaving SU?” Numbers have largely remained the same from previous survey results: 38.9% responded yes, 55.3% responded no and 5.8% preferred not to answer.

vi) “Why did you seriously consider leaving Seattle University?” The top 5 reasons for leaving have largely remained the same: (1) lack of belonging (2) financially (3) personal reasons (4) interactions on campus and (5) homesick.

vii) Further break down of statistics regarding students who have considered leaving SU: 80% of students with exclusionary experiences based on socio-economic status, 53% of Native Americans or Indigenous students, 49% of students with disabilities and 44% of Black, African or African American students.

d) **SGSU Commitments:** The SGSU will continue to work with Dr. Natasha Martin and Alvin Sturdivant, Student Persistence, and cultural groups to expand the resources available to intentionally support the success and well-being of underrepresented students. After assessing the needs of students given the situation with COVID-19, SGSU will work with the Student Persistence team to identify ways to support students and seek out opportunities to collaborate with other organizations to increase a sense of belonging on campus. Leverage new student orientations and course syllabi to educate students about:

i) Bias, microaggressions, and strategies to mitigate these issues in campus community
(1) Bias-related harassment and reporting options
(2) Encourage colleges and departments to do community-specific networking and social events for undergraduate students, including but not limited to: Students of Color (Native-American/Indigenous, Black), and students from a lower socio-economic class.

ii) Encourage Office of the Provost to arrange focus groups to provide space for students to share feedback on their overall academic experience, with particular attention on experience based on socio-economic status, race and ability.

e) Accessibility – This portion of the survey explores students experience with accessibility accommodations.
   i) “Have you received an academic accommodation at Seattle University?” Response: Yes - 85.5%, No - 12.98% and Prefer Not to Answer - 1.53%.
   ii) “On what aspects of providing accommodations and facilitating inclusive learning environments for students with disabilities do faculty need more training?”
   iii) “Please respond to the following statement: Faculty members are prepared to facilitate an inclusive learning environment for students with disabilities?”
   iv) “Which CAPS resources have you utilized?”

f) SGSU Commitments – Host “Know Your Rights” events focusing on the rights of students with disabilities. An SGSU member will work together with Dr. Kim Caluza to assess where the university is with the Maximize Counseling Center Operations and Efficiency road map outlined by the Educational Advisory Board.

g) Accessibility Recommendations – Revise course evaluations to gather feedback on how well a professor has accommodated student accessibility needs. Continue to prioritize resources to expand individual or urgent care in CAPS, in light of budget constraints.

Questions/Discussion
   i) The faculty are appreciative of the question about how well teachers have accommodated student requests for accommodations. Would it be possible to expand the question to include how students have felt in class?
   ii) When the SGSU refers to the 2020 survey results not having changed from previous surveys, they are referring to experiences students have felt over the past year and not necessarily to the 2015-2016 campus climate survey. The SUSS is an annual survey, so data comparisons were made between this year and last year. The amount of exclusionary behavior incidents has remained relatively the same but the reasons for exclusionary behavior have changed significantly.
   iii) Faculty have found the CAPS data very striking. Faculty continue to recommend that students use the resources offered by CAPS. The survey data suggests that there is an urgent need to broaden the services offered by CAPS.

h) The SGSU representatives greatly appreciate the AcA’s time and thank the faculty for their dedication and their continued hard work to improve the education and lives of SU’s students.

V. APPR Member Election Process 3:05 – 3:10

a) There are currently 9 candidates, 5 of which are AcA members. The APPR is currently missing a Law faculty member. This position will need to be filled as a LAW representative is required on the
committee. However, there are challenges with finding a Law faculty member. The law school is out for the quarter.

b) There is concern on who will be voting to affirm the APPR nominees as there are 5 AcA seeking appointment to the committee. Any AcA member running for a spot, will not be allowed to vote to affirm nominees to the APPR membership. APPR will appoint members basked upon a ranked list of affirmed nominees. Ballots will be sent out to the AcA via e-mail. Terri Clark (Chair of the Program Review Committee), Frank Shih (President of the AcA) and Lindsey Nakatani (Administrative Assistant) will aggregate voting data. APPR Committee Nominees are as follows:

i) Nalini Iyer (CAS) English, current AcA member
ii) Chris Paul (CAS) Communication, current AcA member
iii) Sarah Bee (ASB) Accounting, current AcA member
iv) Kirsten Thompson (CAS) Film Studies, current AcA member
v) Greg Mason (CSE) Mechanical Engineering
vi) Ben Miller (CON) Nursing
vii) Jason Wirth (CAS) Philosophy
viii) Brian Fischer (CSE) Mathematics
ix) Margit McGuire (COE) Teacher Education, current AcA member

VI. AcA Organizational Discussion/Decision Bylaw Update (Gregory Silverman) 3:10 – 3:20

a) The AcA bylaw amendment process has proceeded well, and all stake holders have approved of the current bylaws draft. The AcA bylaws are missing a Seattle University statement of shared governance. The university would like to draft a shared governance statement to be endorsed by the BOT, the Cabinet, the President and the AcA.

b) The AcA would like to express its gratitude to the Provost’s Office for their hard work, compromise and collaboration to provide a foundation for the future work of the AcA. These bylaws are meant to be a living document that will evolve with the work of the AcA. A vote to affirm the bylaws will be held at the next meeting of the AcA.

c) The faculty would encourage that the language from section 4.2.6 be changed to reflect the changes made to other sections. The language in this section is not meant to exclude faculty members, it is meant to clarify.

d) The most recent draft of the bylaw amendments was circulated at 1:00 pm today, May 18th, 2020. Sincere thanks are offered to former and current AcA members, the Provost and the University counsel for the many long hours dedicated to creating and formulating these bylaws. These newly drafted bylaws will allow the AcA to continue to evolve into a truly equal partner in the shared governance of the university.

VII. Summer 2020 Extra Sessions 3:20 – 3:30

a) Questions for Extra Summer Sessions: (1) Normal AcA sessions are scheduled twice a month. Does the AcA membership feel that this is a reasonable frequency of potential summer session meetings? (2) Will current AcA members be invited to these meetings or will the new members be invited? The AcA feels that summer sessions should be optional for both constituencies, although the attendance of existing AcA members would be appreciated for their knowledge of how AcA works.
b) The Provost would hesitate to add to the existing workload of faculty, especially under the current circumstances however, the Provost would welcome summer AcA sessions.

c) **What potential issues are anticipated for the AcA summer sessions?** The Provost and university leadership are aiming to have all major decisions be made before the end of the quarter. However, the situation is ongoing, and the best laid plans in June may have to be changed come August. The BOT has called a special session in July, and the Provost would welcome an opportunity to inform and consult with the AcA over the summer about the contents of the BOT July meeting.

d) It is the faculty’s opinion that is necessary for the AcA to meet over the summer. AcA meetings over the summer will also allow the faculty at large to be looped in on any ongoing university decisions.

e) The AcA will meet about 3 to 4 times over the summer.

f) In the event that an AcA vote will be called during summer sessions, it needs to be clarified which AcA members will be voting members, and which will be ex-officio.

g) **What is the effective date of the new AcA bylaws and the effective date for new AcA member successors?** Traditionally the effective date for new bylaws and the institution of new members has been July 1st, however in practice it is effectively the fall quarter since the AcA doesn’t usually meet over the summer.

VIII. Leadership 2020 (Available Positions/Plan) 3:30 – 3:33

a) AcA Officer Positions Up for Election: AcA President, VP for Curriculum and VP for Policy

b) The bylaws indicate that four members, not running for an AcA officer position, are needed to run the nomination committee. The following AcA members volunteer to serve on the nomination committee: Greg Silverman, Margit McGuire, Sarah Bee and Michael Ng.

c) AcA Officer Elections will be held at the AcA meeting on June 8th, 2020. The nomination period will officially open today Monday May 18th and will close on Monday May 25th at 11:59 pm.

d) At the AcA meeting on June 1st, 2020, candidates will make their statements to the AcA membership.

e) **What happens if the nomination committee receives a nomination for a candidate that does not wish to serve?** The Nomination Committee will contact all nominees and determine who is eligible and willing to serve. Once eligibility and willingness to serve is verified for every nominee, the nominee’s names will be published ahead of the June 1st AcA meeting.

IX. Additional Questions/Issues 3:33 – 3:35

a) **CDLI certification for hybrid courses must be completed by June 1st. This date seems very early and will be difficult for faculty to meet, is there any update?** CDLI will be sending out an update on this deadline. Certification for online courses or hybrid courses has been suspended for the summer quarter with a few exceptions. The CDLI is developing additional development opportunities for the campus community. Checks and verification for online/hybrid courses will continue, but it will be a paired down process.

b) The faculty would like to thank the Provost for re-considering the faculty Ombudsperson furlough and reversing the decision.