**Academic Assembly**
**December 7, 2009**

<u>MINUTES</u>

**Present**:  Nalini Iyer, John Strait, John Weaver, Valerie Lesniak, Paul Fontana, Flora Wilson Bridges, David Arnesen, Jason Wirth, Mary Graham, Kristen Shuyler, David Neel, Jen Sorensen, Karen Feldt, Chuck Lawrence, Isiaah Crawford.

**Absent**:  Chips Chipalkatti, Jean Tang, Francisco Guerrero, McKenzie Weber, Jacquelyn Miller, Tracey Pepper, Katherine Raichle, Nina Valerio.

*Minutes taken by: Kristen Heinemeyer*

1) **Welcome**

2) **Review of Minutes**

**Action Item:**    Present Assembly members unanimously approve the November 16th minutes.

3) **EthicsPoint**
   a) Mary Petersen, Vice President and University Counsel, along with Jerry Huffman, Assistant Vice President Human Resources, joined Academic Assembly to discuss and answer questions regarding EthicsPoint.
   b) What is EthicsPoint?
      i) A mechanism, a technology tool as part of overall ethics and compliance. A tool to bring forth ethical concerns.
      ii) This does not replace any current policies.
      iii) EthicsPoint is a company based out of Portland, Oregon. Currently works with 250-300 higher ed institutions, including other Jesuit Universities.
   c) How does EthicsPoint work?
      i) EthicsPoint is a service that is hosted by a 3rd party where Seattle University faculty or staff can file a complaint anonymously.
         (1) The source of the complaint remains anonymous unless the source has agreed that information can be released.
      ii) The system is set up so that Mary and Jerry are the only persons who can see the details the report. They will then discuss and determine what process at Seattle University will be the next follow-up step.
         (1) If the complaint is about Mary or Jerry, it is not seen by that individual, only the person the complaint is not in reference to.
      iii) All complaints, after being received by Mary or Jerry through EthicsPoint, are investigated using the policies currently in place at Seattle University.
      iv) If a vague, anonymous complaint is submitted through EthicsPoint, there's nothing to investigate, especially if it is anonymous.
      v) Complaints can be assessed via a "Case Management Tool" within EthicsPoint to show where the complaint "lives" in the process.
      vi) There have been six complaints submitted via EthicsPoint, so far.
   d) How would an Ombudsperson be related to this system?

i) The EthicsPoint program wouldn't be related to the Ombudsperson. This technology based reporting system doesn't replace any system currently in place at SU, but provides an additional vehicle to investigate the situation.
e) What happens if we discover holes? Have we discovered any yet? Are there problems within our structure, absence of policies, and lack of policies?
   i) The process of reviewing and updating the faculty handbook is an opportunity to address various protocols and procedures.
   ii) Potentially thinking about a faculty "code of conduct". Something to think about in the review of the Faculty Handbook.
   iii) Our institution could do a better job in the clarity of policies and procedures.
f) Response to Discussion
   i) Is there a way Academic Assembly could follow-up on this by trailing with the Ombudsperson position? Such as, it's great to have an ethical process for complains, which is why we should revisit the position of the Ombudsperson.
   ii) Working on determining the "cost" of an Ombudsperson: the person, their own administrative assistant, a computer structure that may not be related to SU. Provost would like to bring this information to Academic Assembly to discuss what to do with funds on other possible avenues such as the Academic Strategic Action Plan.
      (1) In this economic situation, we should think about the cost of putting in a massive structure (Ombudsperson) that may take up a lot of dollars that could perhaps be relocated elsewhere. Is this something we really need with only six complaints on EthicsPoint so far?

**4) Update on Board of Trustees (BOT), John Strait**
   a) John Strait attended the Board of Trustees Academic Affairs Subcommittee on November 19, 2009.
   b) At this meeting the Academic Affairs Subcommittee endorsed the proposal of the Academic Strategic Action Plan.
      i) This affirms the good and hard work that faculty, staff and students brought forth developing thought papers, discussions, so that the Provost could bring together the ideas and create the ASAP. The BOT was pleased with the direction to take the University.
      ii) Provost is creating a letter to the broader University community regarding the support of the ASAP.
      iii) Budget-wise: currently trying to put some dollars toward some of the initiative priorities, framing this under "dollars needed to implement ASAP".
      iv) CORE renewal: in the process of establishing the faculty committee. Curriculum is the province of the faculty; this will be a broad and collaborative process from the University Community.

**5) Update on Interim Library, Kristen Shuyler**
   a) Kristen Shuyler provided an update on process of the new library and the current interim library.
   b) Interim Library
      i) The biggest difference is the space. Only about 20% of the books are available.
      ii) Physical space aside, the location is popular, full, but doesn't seem crowded.
      iii) Writing Center is currently located in the Interim Building.
      iv) All services are still available, added a direct chat service where individual will talk with an SU person first.
      v) Participating in the Teagle "Writing Across the Majors" grant.
      vi) None of the print journals are available, but have added online journals.
      vii) Interlibrary loads are running the same, article requests are about the same, book requests have increased.

        viii)      Hours are the same, and they may or may not increase with the new library.
- c) Renovation, New Library Update
  - i)   New building will have three times as many computers as Lemieux.
  - ii)  Planning to move back before Fall.
  - iii) Logistics will begin planning in January.

**6) Governance of Graduate Programs**
- a) There is a need to coordinate graduate programs.
- b) How could Academic Assembly meet the governance needs for graduate programs?
- c) There is a minimal discussion of graduate schools, how can we address this?
- d) 45% of SU students are graduate students.
- e) There is a need for a body to discuss graduate issues and concerns, a graduate culture on campus, coordination of programs.

**Action Item:**    Valerie Lesniak to coordinate with the following to serve or delegate representatives for this subcommittee to discuss this issue:
                **STM** Valerie Lesniak
                **STM** Flora Wilson Bridges
                **ED** Mary Graham
                **NURS** Karen Feldt
                **LAW** John Weaver to delegate
                **S&E** David Neel & Jen Sorensen to delegate
                **ALBERS** David Arnesen & Chips Chipalkatti to delegate
                **A&S** Randy Horton

**7) Announcements, Updates, Etc.**
- a) E-Portfolio Committee
  - i)   Currently looking at using e-portfolios across the education process, i.e. courses, work outside of courses, career development, advising.
  - ii)  Asking for a representative from Academic Assembly for this committee.

**Action Item:**    Nomination and election of a representative for the E-portfolio committee to be further discussed and voted on at the next meeting.

*Next Meeting: January 11ᵗʰ, 2010 1:30-3:30pm Student Center 210*