

Academic Assembly
January 27, 2020
2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 130

MINUTES

Attendance: Chris Paul, Yancy Dominick, Frank Shih, Mimi Cheng, Katie Oliveras, Sarah Bee, Marc Cohen, Margit McGuire, Terri Clark, Russ Powell, Felipe Anaya, Shane Martin, Nicole Harrison, Mark Taylor, Kate Koppelman, Michael Ng, Arie Greenleaf, Gregory Silverman, Clara Cordova, Pat Buschel, Nalini Iyer

(Attendance Notes: *Kirsten Thompson respectfully sends her apology as she is unable to attend this meeting of the Academic Assembly due to a prior commitment.*)

Minutes Taken by Lindsey Nakatani

- | | |
|--|--------------------|
| I. President Update | 2:05 – 2:06 |
| a. Tacoma Dome – 2020 Commencement | |
| b. The AcA president has been in attendance of budget meeting and other essential Strategic Planning meetings. Discussions have been conducted with a focus upon decisions having the least amount of negative effect upon the faculty as possible, while also remaining mindful of the impact on all communities of Seattle University. | |
| II. Review 01-13-20 Minutes | 2:06 – 2:07 |

the question? Do the AcA members have any suggestions for this process? Individual work will have to be done on the college/department level to revise guidelines. University wide guidelines would have to allow for some flexibility depending upon the requirements and needs of the school/college. There is currently a lack of coherent, consistent information and guidelines for promotion, rank and tenure processes at SU.

- ii. *How has this work re-defined or addressed the idea of service?* In theory, instructors are asked to demonstrate excellence in teaching, service and scholarly work. However, the practice is a continued focus and prioritization on scholarly work. Institutions are not as successful if they ask their faculty to focus on scholarly work alone.

c m 68pouhb8-0.003 Tc 0.902 (v) 2078 (1) (v)

- i. Communication Program Review
- ii. Theaters Program Review
- iii. Masters Professional Accounting (MPAC) Revision
- iv. Masters Non-Profit Leadership (MNPL) Review
- v. Women and Gender Studies (WGST) Review

d. Questions/Discussion:

- i. The Academic Affairs Committee of the BOT has noted a lack of a consistent process for evaluation of financial implications of program revisions/creations. When the academic portfolio review is conducted, a consistent methodology for consideration of the financial implications of any revisions will need to be in place. Faculty will need to have a close look at their budgets and factor in the growth and aspirations of programs.
 - ii. Past practice has been to encourage faculty to write program reviews/creations/revisions with a heavy emphasis on advocating for more resources. This has proven to be an unhelpful framing for faculty writing these reviews, especially during a period when resources are being reexamined and reallocated.
 - iii. What is the required standard number of majors for a program to be considered viable? Does it differ based upon the department/discipline? Some disciplines are often taken as a minor, do those student populations count? There are no standard benchmarks within colleges to quantify this measurement.
- e. **Motion:** Move to table the 5 PRC memos until next meeting of the AcA. Seconded: **VOTE:** APPROVE: 10, OPPOSED: 2, ABSTENTIONS: 1.
- i. **Motion is passed** – PRC Memos will be re-visited at the next AcA meeting after further review.

VI. Semester Consideration Process Update

3:00 – 3:34

- e. The Strategic Planning Committee felt that movement on all the other action items in the Strategic Directions document, hinged upon this decision. Progress on other items would be stymied if this decision was not made first. The taskforce would have to include representatives who could speak to the changes this would cause in the technological infrastructure of the University. WouldWoo e(l)gT. (l)gT.6 (o)Woo e(T. (l)g0 Tc 0 i)2.

- p. The tone of the discussion to this point has made this question seem like a done deal. Given all the data that has to be considered and all the different disciplines that must be represented, the committee membership must have representatives from as many of these areas as possible.
What is the percentage of local schools on the quarter system? How did all the other action items of the Strategic Directions Document become contingent upon this question?
- q. The ConC (Committee on Committees) will send an open call for faculty volunteers and will then make recommendations on committee membership to the AcA for confirmation. The Provost's office will send the ConC more details about committee service.
- r. The taskforce will consist of 12 members: 1 from each college (8 members), an NTT faculty representative, a representative from university core dept., a graduate and an undergraduate education representative. Nominees will be asked to write a 100-150-word statement.
- s. SGSU: The "Current State of the Undergrad Survey" is currently being conducted and this issue is being surveyed. Data from the survey will be available in two months.
- t. Enormity of process has been recognized. The question of flexibility of the deadline will be explored with the relevant parties.

VII. Financial Repositioning (Questions & Discussion)

- a. There is concern within the CAS (College of Arts and Sciences) that the deadline for impending cuts and budget changes are in two weeks and there has been little, to no discussion before the deadlines.
- b. The financial repositioning appears to be happening rather quickly in comparison to the timeline and process outlined by the Strategic Directions Document.
 - i. **The AcA moves to hold an additional meeting on Monday Feb. 3rd, 2020 to address questions surrounding the financial repositioning of the University.**

VIII. AcA Internal Project on Evaluation & Workload Benchmarking 3:34 – 3:35

- a. Workload: AcA President will send out templates of typical, faculty weekly hours for AcA membership to consider for later discussion on workload.
- b. Student Evaluation: AcA membership will review sample questionnaires for later discussion.