

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.
 - 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. 1/3ⁱ
i. 1/3

- 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

- 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 term

