Academic Assembly Meeting No. 16
Monday, May 1, 2023
2:05 p.m. – 3:35 p.m.
ADAL Stuart T. Rolfe & Zoom

MINUTES


I. Opening Remarks 2:08 p.m. – 2:09 p.m.
   a. Meeting was called to order at 2:06 p.m. by Academic Assembly (AcA) President, Frank Shih.
   b. MOTION Moved by Frank Shih: “Move to approve the agenda for the May 1, 2023 meeting of the AcA.” Seconded. Approved.

II. Provost Update, Shane P. Martin 2:09 p.m. – 2:17 p.m.

Last Friday, President Peñalver delivered the State of University Address to the Board of Trustees and external partners, during which he announced Seattle University’s commitment to becoming a Minority Serving Institution. Provost Martin expressed his support of this announcement and encouraged faculty and staff to join the President’s quarterly Town Halls for ongoing updates and information.

The Chapel of St. Ignatius was vandalized. This event followed the recent act of vandalism at the Temple De Hirsch Sinai. This news has been disheartening for many members of the University community and highlights the need to attend to campus climate issues within our community.

III. Mission Priority Examen Listening Session 2:17 p.m. – 3:02 p.m.

Jen Tilghman-Havens and Jessica Palmer

Jen Tilghman-Havens and Jessica Palmer from the Center for Jesuit Education were welcomed to AcA. All Jesuit colleges and universities in the United States participate in the Mission Priority Examen (MPE), which is a self-study and peer-review process for reaffirming the institution’s Jesuit and Catholic mission. Seattle University underwent the MPE in 2017. The current examination is well-timed to align with the Reigniting Our Strategic Directions (RSD) initiative’s foundational goal, which seeks to anchor Seattle University in its Jesuit and Catholic character. During the meeting, members were invited to reflect on how the University embodies the Jesuit
tradition in small group discussions. Written comments were collected before the session concluded.

IV. Faculty Handbook Revision Discussion 3:02 p.m. – 3:33 p.m.
Shane P. Martin, David R. Lance, Sarah Cox and Frank Shih

Provost Martin opened the discussion by describing the nature of the Faculty Handbook, which serves as a contract between the University and its faculty. Revising the Faculty Handbook is part of the shared governance process. The Faculty Handbook is collaboratively revised, involving faculty at large, the Academic Assembly, the Provost and the President as recommendatory roles to the Board of Trustees (BoT). The Faculty Handbook undergoes annual revisions and a comprehensive revision every fifth year, but due to significant changes at Seattle University, last year’s comprehensive amendment process was extended to a two-year period, with Academic Year 2022-2023 being the second year.

Seattle University is a Jesuit and Catholic institution, as reflected in its founding charter and vision statement, and one of the proposed amendments seeks to add language about Seattle University’s Jesuit and Catholic character to the Faculty Handbook.

Associate Provost David Lance and Associate University Counsel Sarah Cox, both ex-officio members of the Faculty Handbook Revision Committee (FHRC), joined the AcA. FHRC has approved the proposed revisions and recommended that the university adopt them. A copy of the proposed revisions was distributed to faculty on April 27 and faculty were invited to provide feedback. Assembly members provided feedback on the proposed revisions:

a. Ambiguous language in the Faculty Handbook may not account for the differences between the law faculty and the main campus faculty, as the School of Law has a distinct contract with the main campus. The lack of clarity in the Handbook is especially apparent when describing promotion processes and clinical faculty.

b. The process and timelines for revising the Faculty Handbook seemed rushed for a May/June Board of Trustees vote.

c. To make the proposed revisions to the Faculty Handbook easier to review and consider, members suggested annotating the Handbook and categorizing the proposed amendments.

d. Faculty expressed concerns about the proposed revisions regarding the University’s Jesuit and Catholic character.

e. A question was raised about why the section on the Faculty Ombudsperson was revised. The section was updated at the request of the new University Ombudsperson, considering the role now serves faculty and staff. The University Ombudsperson also requested that a link to the office’s webpage be included in the Handbook as a resource.

f. An Assembly representative requested that the deadline for submitting faculty grievance be extended to 60 days.

g. AcA members requested that the AcA President call an ad hoc meeting to address the issues that have been raised by faculty.

The AcA President stated that faculty input on Faculty Handbook revisions has been ample over the years, and these revisions aim to address feedback offered by them.

The AcA President agreed that an ad hoc meeting is necessary and it will be scheduled for next week before the May 15 meeting.
V. Program Review Committee, Margit McGuire 3:33 p.m. – 3:49 p.m.

The Assembly resumes the discussion on a motion previously tabled by the Program Review Committee (PRC) to approve a new program, M.Ed. Transformational Teaching and Learning.

AcA previously provided feedback about the lack of a specific market study for the program and the potential for cannibalization with a reduction of credit hours from 60 to 45. Some members stressed the importance of following the standard process of approving new programs only after reviewing a market study. The Teaching Education Program Director, an AcA representative, stated that sufficient data has been collected indicating the program’s success and that it would benefit a large group of future teachers. Attracting prospective teachers is challenging for Seattle University, given the tuition rate, and this unique and highly accessible program could help recruit more students. The Provost proposed that graduate programs might have a different process than undergraduate programs. AcA members questioned what the standard process for generating new graduate programs would be.

MOTION Moved by Margit McGuire: “I move to put the former motion forward as it came.”
Approved. 12 yays, 0 nays, 3 abstentions.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:49 p.m.