

Academic Assembly – 2020 Summer Session No. 2

July 20th, 2020

2:05 – 4:00 pm, Zoom Meeting

MINUTES

Attendance: Sarah Bee, Russ Powell, Frank Shih, Nalini Iyer, Terri Clark, Kirsten Thompson, Arie Greenleaf, Holly Ferraro, Yancy Dominick, Margit McGuire, Kathleen La Voy, Patrick Murphy, Carol Adams, Gregory Silverman, Angie Jenkins, Connie Anthony, Felipe Anaya, Shane Martin, Robin Narruhn, Mimi Cheng, Kate Koppelman, Katie Oliveras, Chris Paul

Guests: Christina Roberts, John Fleming, Sonia Barrios Tinoco, Michelle Clements, Nakia Reddin, Erika Moore, Ryan McLaughlin, David Green, Agnieszka Miguel, Al Moser, Bryan Ruppert, Chris Whidbey, Angela Cabatbat, Christine Cole, Cinda Johnson, Donna Teevan, Doug Eriksen, Dr. Becky Hartley, Erica Rauff, Doug Latch, Yen-Lin Han, Glenn Yasuda, Lydia Bello, Kelli Rodriguez Currie, Mark McLean, Jen Sorenson, Kimberly Gawlik, Nirmala Gnanapragasam, Kabanda Obed, Daniel Smith, Sven Arvidson, Laurel Stevahn, Joanne Hughes, Leanne Robertson, Kathryn Bollich-Ziegler, Susan Reeder, Rosa Joshi, Katherine Hoag, Rob Andolina, Lydia Andes, Michelle Dubois, Jennifer Tilghman-Havens, Wilson Garone, Allison Meyer, Teodora Shuman, Robert Dullea, Katherine Raichel, Hidy Basta

Minutes taken by Lindsey Nakatani

I. Review 07-06-20 minutes

2:05 – 2:07

- a. Review of 07-06-20 Minutes tabled until official Academic Assembly meetings resume in the fall of 2020.

II. Provost(e)3 (03205 Tc -0.601 Tw 42072 0 TdU)5 (,)c -0.60-11. (s)4.4 (r)-1.4 (e)-(s)4.4 (u)-6.1 (m)-2 (e)3 (9 TP9)-1.9 (uC (a2 Tw
 remains healthy and safe. The Executive Re-Opening Task Force, co-chaired by Provost Martin and Vice

resident Tim Eary, has moved the re-opening decision deadline up by one week. A final decision will be
 made this week, the week of July 20

th. A communication will be sent out as early as Thursday July 23rd or at
 the latest, Friday July 24th. There has been increased concern regarding the surge of COVID-19 cases across the
 nation, especially those states from which SU receives a significant number of students, i.e. California, Arizona,
 Texas, etc. Three weeks ago, the task force had formulated a plan based upon a 50/50 split between in-person
 and online courses. However, due to the surge in infections across the country, this plan is no longer viable.
 The current plan is based upon a model of primarily online course offerings, with a few exceptions for hybrid
 offerings. These hybrid exceptions would be offered to courses that ~~are~~ only at the request and
 agreement of students. University leadership is also working to create course offerings designed for students
 living on campus.

Question/Discussion:

- b. Do we owe money on Vi-Hilbert and other dorms based upon how they were developed? This question has not been answered yet. Vi-Hilbert is a third-

affect resources that are critical for the

Questions/Discussion:

- b. *What is the source of the data from which the initial subset of programs will be drawn from? Is this data informed by faculty? Is there somewhere for faculty to report or contest the data as inaccurate? How far has the committee progressed in defining criteria for deeper evaluation? Blind peer review was noted as a possible model for reviewing programs. What happens if a faculty member has a vested interest in the success of a program?* The numerical data on enrollment, program finances etc. is being pulled from Power BI. It has been noted that financial data in Power BI has not been entirely balanced in the past. All the APPR members have been granted access to this basic numerical data. The APPR is also dedicated to keeping as much personal, sensitive information, confidential. Equity, diversity and inclusivity will play a major part in the process. The committee understands that there may be ulterior motives of some review participants and will be asking members with vested interests to recuse themselves from certain reviews. The committee is also aware that, historically, data has been deemed inaccurate. The committee views itself as fact checkers during this process and will also be relying upon the informed expertise of the many stakeholders. Any data cited in a review will be accompanied by an audit trail. The group will be working with Institutional Research (IR) to make any data provided, traceable back to its source. The APPR has not yet created the evaluation criteria. Thus far the APPR has identified that the work needs to be addressed through the following lenses: financial challenges, strategic directions, university mission, diversity and inclusion and the intersection of race and equity.
- c. *Some faculty are uncomfortable with the structure of the APPR. The APPR has been created purely for financial reasons and remains a little unclear about its goals and guiding principles. The committee needs to be incredibly clear on its intentions and criteria to maintain faculty buy-in into the fairness of the process. Secondly, it's true that sometimes universities cut programs based on markets, but faculty hope that the APPR would be looking at markets with a long timeline of market variability in mind. What is the APPR's timeline/overview of market trend? The centralized, institutional data collected by the university is often inaccurate compared to what the Chairs and internal program administrators collect. The faculty would suggest that the APPR collects data from as many resources as possible from across the university. Finally, the faculty member would like to stress the need for transparency regarding how and which programs are being cut. This will help secure faculty buy-in into the process. Explanations and justifications for why certain programs are being cut and what other parts of the university are taking hits to help keep the cutting process fair.* All these points and questions are right on target and are well received. The APPR agrees that the guiding principles of the group need to be tightened up. The committee understands that institutional data can be quite unreliable, and the group will be doing all it can to conduct valid research processing in the collection of its data.

2.7 (1hd. & t)0.6 (1t)2.636f4(T)d)5
 APPR.001w [(T) o hce(t)-6.3 (t)-6.B]TJ-0.001 Tge004 Tw [(i)-0.9 (nd. & t)06t)2.636f4(T)d)5

V. Student and Faculty Fall Experience – Feedback, Planning & Discussion

3:05 – 3:20

David Green & Joelle Pretty

- a. The Student Academic Persistence Team has been brainstorming strategies to improve student retention and experience in the Fall Quarter. In Spring Quarter, the team received the lowest number of alerts from faculty about student experience. The team would like to release a series of surveys to the faculty and students during the first part of the fall term to gain perspective on faculty and student experience. The Team is especially focused on connecting students to their support systems.
- b. 3 Weeks Before Start of Term – Faculty Feedback: “Do you have what you need?” “What further resources would help you during fall?”
- c. Week 1: Survey Faculty about Students– “Who hasn’t shown up yet or appears to be struggling?”
- d. Week 2: Check-In with Students – Outreach work to connect students to resources and support systems.
- e. Week 3: Feedback from Students: “Do you have what you need to succeed in fall?” “What further resources and/or reassurances would help you during fall?” “Social belonging [Likert Scale] – I feel connected to other SU students. I feel connected to my instructors at SU.” If low responses are received to these questions the team

- f. *Regarding the faculty survey released before the start of term; would three weeks before the start of term be early enough to help resolve any issues exposed by the survey?* This timeline was suggested since faculty aren't back on contract until this time. If this survey was released the week of August 17th, it is possible that it might be too late to provide answers or assistance.

VI. Feedback on Any Topic and Open Discussion

3:50 – 4:00

- a. *Faculty leaders have heard that some NTT faculty still do not have their contracts. When will contract decisions be made and when will the contracts be released? Secondly, has the university considered buy-outs for senior faculty or phased retirement? Opening these positions could allow for the opportunity to address issues of racial equity in SU's hiring practices.* Contracts for NTT faculty should be going out by August 1st, 2020. Contracts are being released in batches. As the Deans offices confirm which courses are full courses, those NTT contracts are being released. NTT contracts for courses that are not full are being held. Faculty contract buy-outs were researched before the Provost's tenure at SU and were determined at the time to be cost prohibitive. However, this issue could be revisited.
- b. *Would it be possible to rent out unoccupied dorms to the community to help recoup some of the lost residence hall revenue?* This idea has been explored in a few different versions. The greatest challenge is ensuring the safety of SU students in residence halls that are being shared by non-SU people with different agendas. SU leadership is already working to respond to the range of reactions to the defund the police movement. SU has heard from parents regarding SU's ability to keep their students safe on campus. Renting out residence halls to non-SU personnel could exacerbate these questions.