

**Academic Assembly**  
October 2, 2017  
2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 130

**MINUTES**

Present: Pat Buchsel, Felipe Castillo, Terri Clark, Mark Cohan, Marc Cohen, Miles Coleman, Carlos de Mello e Souza, Allison Gibbons, Arie Greenleaf, Leticia Guardiola-Saenz, Kathleen La Voy, Charles Lawrence, Emily Lieb, Michael Ng, Katie Oliveras, Erik Olsen, Frank Shih, Gregory Silverman, Julianne Slate, Colette Taylor, Kirsten Thompson

*Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes*

- I. Review 9-25-17 Minutes
  - A. Approved with no abstentions or oppositions
- II. Update on Matteo Ricci College (*Christina Roberts, Emily Lieb, Bob Dullea*)
  - A. Task Force report
    1. Overview
      - a. Submitted last spring, discussed at AcA in May 2017
      - b. Task force work is complete, ongoing work will be undertaken as faculty members
      - c. Three major areas: cultural/pedagogical reform in the college, curricular change, institutional migration to College of Arts and Sciences
    2. Curricular change
      - a. Divided into two sets, changes for this year were already made and now future changes are being developed
      - b. Goal to create Peace and Justice Studies program for fall 2020, in the meantime integrating many of the new courses into the three existing programs
      - c. Not clear whether three current degrees are turning into specializations within one degree or remaining as three separate degrees until the Peace and Justice degree begins, under which all will be integrated
      - d. No longer sending students into community work in their first year starting, the new curriculum will better prepare them for community engagement
      - e. Nearly every MRC core curriculum course now has a 1:1 correlation in the University Core – makes it much easier to transfer in and out, as well as more internally coherent and scaffolded
      - f. Changes have been approved by MRC and are now at CAS curriculum committee
    3. Cultural/pedagogical reform
      - a. Goal to diversify MRC faculty, as identified by the external reviewer, faculty response, and task force report
      - b. Full time faculty jobs in MRC need to include tenure track lines
    4. Institutional migration to CAS
      - a. Task force members came to personal conclusions about what would work best in this regard, but the task force official report acknowledged the possibilities of both autonomy and integration
      - b. Still some energy amongst faculty to remain an independent college, but there are many considerations that speak to the strength of integration as well
      - c. Intentionally vague in task force report – did not make a recommendation one way or the other about integration

- B. Provost statement
  - 1. Heard task force ambivalence and acknowledged the strengths of both views
  - 2. After a number of considerations, moving forward to integrate MRC into CAS, perhaps as an Institute or something similar
  - 3. Several reasons
    - a. Size, relatively small (140 students last fall, 125 this fall), smaller than some departments in CAS
    - b. Many of the reasons for independence have faded or gone away over time
      - 1. Originally started as a feeder program from Seattle Prep, now no longer structured in that way
      - 2. When MRC had its own self-contained curriculum, that was a reason for independence, but that has also changed over time
    - c. Administrative considerations recommended by task force report are best facilitated within the management practices and procedures of CAS
      - 1. More sophisticated curriculum review processes and other areas of governance, especially to better proactively handle the kinds of issues that led to the student protest and task force work
      - 2. Tenure lines are more justified within CAS
- C. Consideration of motion to recommend
  - 1. Motion: Having considered (1) Final MRC Task Force report 2017-03-31, (2) university-wide statement 2017-06-07 by Interim Provost Dullea, (3) verbal reports by MRC Task Force chairs Drs. Lieb, Roberts, and Interim Provost Dullea to the Academic Assembly on 2017-10-02, the Academic Assembly recommends that the Matteo Ricci College (MRC) be incorporated into the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS).
  - 2. Discussion
    - a. CAS Dean is in favor of the move, main potential concern is that CAS is very large already and this adds another layer of complexity
    - b. Concern about staff and faculty lines that are already existing – delicate balancing that has to be done, challenges involving integrating tenure track lines
    - c. Students are unsure of the process and decision, do not have one clear opinion, some are for and some are against
    - d. Why is there a lack of social science in the program when the focus moving forward is Peace and Justice?
      - i. Students drawn to MRC are looking for a robust humanities-based education for the 21<sup>st</sup> century
      - ii. Does not exclude other methodologies, imagining a core program that students would then be able to complement with another existing degree program (social sciences, engineering, nursing, etc.)
      - iii. Need to move away from the colonization of the curriculum to allow students to use many different lenses
      - iv. Peace and Justice major will be more transdisciplinary
    - e. Would like to hear the best case for MRC independence
      - i. Some advocate for continued independence to allow MRC to keep its own core curriculum
      - ii. Best person to represent an independence voice is MRC Interim Dean Paulette Kidder

- iii. There is something culturally at play around independence, concern from some students around identity, community, and safeness for certain populations, given the history of the college
    - iv. It may be possible to maintain some of the unique character of MRC by having an independent curriculum committee even after integration
  - f. Organizational structure and climate work both need to be done
    - i. Whatever structure allowed this to happen is what needs to change along with whatever program changes happen
    - ii. Need to make sure the structures are in place to support systemic changes
    - iii. Integration may be perceived as a punishment – you couldn't manage yourself so now someone else needs to
    - iv. Task force was never thinking of this as a punitive measure, hope that students feel their voice has been heard
  - 3. Frank will begin online discussion on Canvas, and invite Paulette Kidder for an independence perspective
  - 4. The motion will be voted upon at next meeting
- III. Interdisciplinary Ethics Minor program proposal
  - A. Overview
    - 1. Uses all existing courses, no new courses
    - 2. Five learning objectives
    - 3. Ethics minor can be very valuable for employers and graduate programs
    - 4. PRC recommends program proposal approval
  - B. Discussion
    - 1. The final learning objective (*Upon completion of the Ethics minor, students will be able to compare a philosophical approach to a moral issue to the approach of another discipline.*) may be hard to assess
      - a. This is a question of methodologies and disciplines, perhaps left intentionally vague
      - b. Should not allow learning objectives to be determined by assessment calendar, but should be somewhat aligned with program review seven year cycle
    - 2. Interesting that it brings up gender issues specifically, when it isn't clear whether there are any faculty in Philosophy that can speak to feminist ethics issues specifically
  - C. Motion to approve program proposal, pending Canvas discussion and vote next Monday
- IV. Review of Brainstorming Survey
  - A. Top areas, highest to lowest
    - 1. Budget & data transparency
    - 2. Concern for faculty voice in decision-making
    - 3. Corporatization of the university
    - 4. Budget crisis
    - 5. Adjunct pay
    - 6. Communication and interaction with committees
    - 7. AAOR report
    - 8. Campus climate – need info on how to address
    - 9. PRC as place for economic decision-making
    - 10. Inclusivity and diversity
    - 11. Faculty complaint process
    - 12. Increase AcA scope and responsibility
    - 13. Expand authorizations of AcA

14. Access to data
  15. Provost search – next steps?
- B. Next steps
1. In considering these items, we need to ask “What is actionable?”
  2. Develop a broader set of priorities that encompass related issues, perhaps: campus climate, budget and governance, pay and faculty/staff quality of life
  3. Need to develop a strategy to approach these with action items this year
  4. We had a resolution from AcA a few years ago for greater budget transparency and never followed through on our end
  5. Faculty handbooks at the college level need to focus on college-level governance
  6. Need data on tenure track to non-tenure track faculty ratio across university by college, and by gender
  7. Need to be preparing proactively for budget cuts and potential strategic reorganization based on AAOR report
- V. Preview of Dean’s Evaluation reporting on October 9, 2017
- A. Overview
1. AcA subcommittee was first going to create their own evaluation instrument/process
  2. As time went on and the work progressed, it became clear that an outside consultant was needed to guide and manage the project, especially to maintain confidentiality of data
  3. Pilot process last spring was conducted for the deans of Arts and Sciences, Nursing, and Education
- B. Next steps
1. Consultant coming to campus next week to meet with Provost, each of the deans who was evaluated (with and without Provost), and AcA
  2. A final report will address four strengths and four weaknesses for each
  3. Using the report, each dean will propose their own set of issues to work on and a plan for improvement
  4. At the meeting with AcA, we should pay close attention to what the company did, what they had to offer, the cost (approximately \$7,000 per evaluation), etc. to make sure this is the company we want to continue with for future evaluations
    - a. Driven by an AcA initiative, original AcA questions were not used in this process after it went to the consultant firm
    - b. Four individual instruments used for each dean, and many hours of individual interviews
  5. Upcoming evaluations are for deans of Theology and Ministry, Law, and Albers