

Academic Assembly
Special Meeting for Faculty Handbook Draft Consideration

April 20, 2015

2:05 – 3:35pm, ADMN 321

MINUTES

Present: David Arnesen, Sarah Bee, Patricia Buchsel, Terri Clark, Brooke Coleman, Lynn Deeken, Bill Ehmann, Trish Henley, Mike Huggins, Arun Iyer, Michael Kinnamon, Kate Koppelman, Michael Ng, Bill O'Connell, Katherine Raichle, Roshanak Roshandel Heath Spencer, John Strait, Dan Washburn

Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes

- I. Section I.B.2.
 - A. Would like to see clarification of what strategic priorities are
 - B. Strategic priorities – strategic planning process as undertaken by the university every five years or so
 - C. Difficult to pinpoint because these will shift depending on many changing outside factors
 - D. No edit
- II. Section I.B.5.
 - A. Department Chairpersons evaluation are described, but the Provost and President do not have a similar process described
 - B. Evaluation for Provost and President should be described, in part as related to the strategic planning as noted above
 - C. What would be the purpose of the review? AcA does not have authority over these positions, so would be more like a general survey
 - D. Can also request this separately – develop the process before it is codified in the handbook
 - E. If this is part of university governance, the two points are notice of review and opportunity for feedback
 - F. This should be looked at through a systematic AcA process and then amended to the handbook when deemed appropriate
 - G. Motion to remove the word “direct” and replace with “an” on page 10
 - 1. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions
 - 2. This leaves the door open for AcA to develop these processes and amend document
- III. Faculty Defined and Scholarly Activity and Professional Development
 - A. Faculty defined includes a very broad description of all faculty, whereas the scholarly activity section states that faculty engage in scholarship and professional development – issue for NTT faculty who are not necessarily evaluated on these criteria
 - B. Motion to add the phrase “where applicable” to make clear the distinction
 - 1. Language later in the paragraph seems to add a qualifier; “where applicable” weakens the intent of the first sentence
 - 2. Not approved – 3 approved, 11 opposed, 2 abstentions
- IV. Academic Freedom
 - A. Motion to add to II.A., new subsection 1 “The rights and responsibilities associated with academic freedom apply to all faculty at Seattle University regardless of rank or position.”
 - 1. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions
 - B. Motion to insert proposed tenure definition language from AAUP 1940 statement to Academic Freedom section and leave in place the existing tenure definition on page 17

1. Issue with conflicting financial security language in this language and language on page 17
 2. Change “men and women” to “people” to be gender inclusive
 3. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions
- C. Motion to add language as subsection 5 to Academic Freedom, “Academic freedom includes the freedom to engage in internal criticism, which encompasses the freedom to address any matter of institutional policy or action whether or not as a member of any agency of institutional governance.”
1. Remove “member of any agency of” and replace with “participant in”
 2. Approved with no abstentions or oppositions
- D. Switch to voice votes
- V. Scholarly Activity and Professional Development**
- A. Motion to strike the paragraph beginning “The University places greatest value...”
1. Seems unnecessary and may drive away established scholars
 2. Reads more like something that should be in a Rank and Tenure document
 3. Each college and school can develop their own guidelines
 4. Approved with one opposition
- B. Motion to strike the word “special” from the paragraph beginning “Seattle University expects faculty involved in graduate-level education...”
1. May be important to accredited programs
 2. Legacy statement from the previous handbook – reflects the growth and development of the university
 3. Paragraph does not make sense without special
 4. Graduate faculty does have an exceptional load when it comes to scholarship
 5. If determined by the individual school/college, they should make that expectation clear within their own materials
 6. Requiring graduate faculty to give special attention to scholarship and research is not fair when the same amount of resources are available to graduate and undergraduate
 7. Motion withdrawn
- C. Motion to add, “The faculty has primary responsibility for course and curriculum development.” to Teaching on page 11
1. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions
- D. Motion to remove five hour office hour requirement and change office hours to contact hours (“... sufficient office/contact hours and otherwise be accessible”)
1. Time requirements should be set by the school/college
 2. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions
- VI. Collegiality in Relation to Teaching, Scholarship, and Service**
- A. Motion to strike the collegiality section
1. Do not see collegiality as a necessary part of academia
 2. AAUP comment on these types of statements in handbooks – AAUP opposes collegiality inclusion in handbooks
 3. Can be used positively to encourage volunteerism and participation
 4. If not clearly defined, can be used in other hidden ways - trade-off of values
 5. No second, no vote
- B. Motion to strike the sentence “That is, it relates to collaboration...”
1. Issues such as discrimination and harassment should be dealt with in their own channels
 2. Need to better operationally define collegiality
 3. No second, no vote

- C. Motion to adjourn and begin the next meeting with this section
 - 1. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions