

Academic Assembly
December 2, 2019
2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 130

MINUTES

Attendance: Chris Paul, Heath Spencer, Nalini Iyer, Yancy Dominick, Kirsten Thompson, Frank Shih, Mimi Cheng, Katie Oliveras, Sarah Bee, Marc Cohen, Margit McGuire, Dylan Medina, Patrick Murphy, Terri Clark, Russ Powell, Bryan Adamson, Felipe Anaya, Shane Martin, Kathleen La Voy, Nicole Harrison, Angie Jenkins, Patricia Buschel

Visitors: Mark Cohan

Minutes Taken by Lindsey Nakatani

- I. Review 11-18-19 Minutes 2:05 – 2:06
 - a. VOTE APPROVE: 14, ABSTENTIONS: 1, OPPOSED: 0
 - I. Motion is passed – AcA 11/18/19 Meeting Minutes Approved
- II. Provost Update 2:06 – 2:07
 - a. The quarter has progressed quickly, and a lot of excellent work has been done. The Provost wishes all faculty and staff the best for their remaining projects, classes and work, through the remainder of the quarter.
- III. CFO Wilson Garone Introduction & Discussion on University Budget 2:07 – 2:40
 - a. *Mr. Wilson Garone Self-Introduction:* The Chief Financial Officer (CFO) is looking forward to working with the new Budget Advisory Committee of the AcA. Mr. Garone is originally from Brazil. He moved to Seattle to join Microsoft in the Sales and Marketing Division where he worked for 22 years and reported to the CFO & CEO. Mr. Garone joined Seattle University four months ago. Mr. Garone was very inspired and drawn to Seattle University's core values. Mr. Garone's family has a long history

- drop in enrollment. The university was 204 students short of its enrollment estimations which caused a \$6 million dollar budget shortfall at the beginning of the year. Breakdown of the loss: \$4 million short in undergrad, \$2 million short in grad.
- c. *Changes to the Budget Process:* At the beginning of the year, the decision was made *not* to ask individual departments to make cuts to balance the budget. This was mainly due to the concern that these cuts would cause major disruptions of normal university operations. Instead small changes and one-time adjustments were made to cover the budget shortage. The FY 20 budget is now balanced. However, the FY 20 budget does currently have a projected loss of \$3.8 million. Looking forward to the budget structure for FY 21; Mr. Garone noticed there was a consistent voice during his interview process articulating an immediate need for budget process improvements. FY 21 is the now the primary focus. It is the Board of Trustees' (BOT) view that the university must reach a point where it is no longer losing money or drawing off its endowments to fund the university. A multi-year plan is needed. The BOT and the Seattle University governance has created the Strategic Directions document with these goals and other visions in mind. The main questions are: What is Seattle University moving towards? Who do we want to be as an institution?
- d. *Development of Enrollment Strategy:* The current demographics, at large, do not favor higher education. The strategic partner that Seattle University was working with on enrollment strategies was, unfortunately, not proving effective. Last year the University decided to move its business to Maguire Associates. With consultation from Maguire Associates, Seattle University is now looking into new pockets of students to market to with the following strategic questions in mind: What is the shape of the class that we want? Who are we trying to attract? How does our pricing compare to that of our peers? What changes can be made to the deployment of financial aid? (Murdock presented the idea that financial aid distribution could be adjusted to favor more students.)
- e. *Key Challenges, Concerns & Changes:*
- I. Budgets will now be constructed as multi-year plans (approx. five-years)

- IV. How is space going to be made for investment into the Strategic Plan? Community wide commitment will be essential to the structuring and success of the plan.
- V. How are resources going to be applied to support the Strategic Directions document?
- VI. Re-Invention of the Operating Model of Community Investment: How can responsibilities be re-assigned to give budget managers more incentive to bring in more revenue for the university? What kind of incentives can be given to encourage community-wide involvement in supporting the Strategic Directions document?

f. *Questions and Discussion:*

- I. How do we assess the attitude towards the University as a whole? What is our image? How do we attract students who know nothing about us? How do we go about being the University we want to be? How well is Seattle University connected to the city? Visibility within the city and attracting more students is a major challenge. Data collected from the current class is still being analyzed.
- II. Looking at different demographics, what is the algorithm we will be using to balance advertising to different communities that may not be able to afford tuition? In consultation with Maguire Associates there is research into the possibility of re-allocating financial aid to better assist a wider range of needful students. How are we going to allocate our recruiting funds? Data gathering, and the assistance of Maguire Associates has been exceptionally helpfully in finding new ways to structure resources and address these recruiting/enrollment questions.
- III. Responsibility Centered Management (RCM) Model - How will we adjust/remain flexible to these longer 5-year budget plans? We will extend the visibility and estimations forward each year to help create accurate estimations. We will give incentives to revenue units to properly manage revenue and expenses i.e. if improvement is made to operational margins, those returns can then be reinvested back into their respective programs.
- IV. Does the Strategic Directions plan have any specific guidance regarding how to reach out to different demographics/groups of potential students? As we build the enrollment strategy we need to define the shape of the class, how they value academic quality etc.
- V. How is the research into each division and/or program going to happen and who will ultimately be making decisions based upon the research? The first step is to determine where each university program currently stands and how it functions. Compared to our

institutional peers, Seattle University has more programs. Which programs are seeing growth, which ones are not? Where can improvements be made?

VI. AcA will receive a budget summary document from Mr. Garone.

- IV. Presidential Search Committee & AcA's Role 2:40 – 2:50
- a. Should the ConC (5 members) or AcA (21 members) make selections of members for the Presidential Search Committee? Response by AcA members: AcA, the whole body of 21 members, will make the collective decision.
 - b. AcA will appoint at least 6 T/TT names (possibly and likely 8, unranked), and 2 NTT names (delegating 2 other NTT names to the NTT committee).
 - c. The deadline for nominations is January 13th, 2020. AcA membership to issue call for nominations this coming week. Nomination statements should be no more than 150 words and are due by January 8th, 2020.
 - d. Essential Qualities of Nominees ~~Writing Prompt for~~ Nominees
 - I. Are respected by colleagues and co-workers;
 - II. Maintain a record of active engagement in university affairs or service;
 - III. Exercise good judgment;
 - IV. Demonstrate the ability to maintain strict confidentiality;
 - V. Demonstrate the ability to work collaboratively with others; and
 - VI. Are willing to devote the time necessary to the process.
 - e. Does this work move to the Committee on Committees or does it stay with the AcA at large? AcA has decided to keep the work with the larger body.
 - f. Possibility that this vote will be conducted offline. Candidate submissions will be posted to AcA Canvas for review.
 - g. Ground Rules: AcA members may *either* vote *or* run as a candidate in the election, not both. Co-Chairs of the committee will be responsible for making sure that faculty diversity is accurately represented by the committee membership.
 - h. *Discussion/Questions*: Should a conversation be held within the AcA before voting to bring to

- j. Concern raised that some of the bulleted items to be answered by the candidates are a little unorthodox to leave to self-evaluation.
- V. Faculty Handbook Update (Kirsten Thompson) 2:50 – 2:57
- a. The Faculty Handbook Committee (FHC) has only met once this quarter so far. Onboarding of new members has taken longer than anticipated.
 - b. *Frist Meeting Overview:*
 - I. Reviewed and drafted a timeline for the work on the faculty handbook, focused particularly in the areas of: workload, merit-pay and NTT.
 - II. The timeline was presented to the Provost for feedback.
 - c.

- VI. Successfully held an election for two part-time NTT representatives to the AcA.
- b. *Current Projects* – Re-Structuring of the Titles and Promotions Processes for NTT Faculty
 - I. Currently there is a concerning lack of clarity and consistency surrounding existing processes, across all colleges and schools. It is unclear what the career trajectory is for NTT faculty members that have made longer time commitments to Seattle University.
 - II. There is a clear intersection of existing AcA committee discussions and the current work of the NTT Steering Committee. The work of the NTT Steering Committee falls under the larger question of how we evaluate the complimentary and unique contributions of different types of faculty? I.e. Every college uses the “Clinical Professor” title differently, therefore there is no consistency to the language or understanding of hour requirements.
 - III. Next Steps for the NTT Committee – Committee to hold open fora for NTT faculty in the WQ and SQ to get feedback and opinions.
 - IV. Committee Governance – The NTT Committee will be looking to the ConC for guidance and instruction on establishing the NTT Steering Committee bylaws.
 - V. The oddity of the current language around expectations for instructor vs. clinical professor vs. lecturer etc. should be under strong consideration by the NTT Steering Committee during their work.
 - VI. Coordination of efforts should be addressed. The College of Nursing has a sub committee already examining the “clinical professorship” at their college level, as does the College of Education.
 - VII. The NTT Steering Committee should present quarterly

O'Brien CAS Sociology Full, Margit McGuire COE Teacher Education Full, David

- IV. How is this work to be conducted without the decision about a semesters system being made yet? The work should be of a high enough level to address both a semester and quarter system. The strategic directions document rollout will have a call and process to examine the semester decision and a task force will make a recommendation to the president by October 2020. Provost will engage more with the AcA in January about this process, how the question is going to be addressed and how all factors will be considered. The research done on workloads and evaluations could help inform the decision about semesters.
- V. The proposed work timeline is 6 months. The first goal is to set up the charges of the subcommittees and populate the committee memberships.