

**Academic Assembly**  
March 19, 2018  
2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 130

**MINUTES**

Present: Rick Block, Pat Buchsel, Terri Clark, Mark Cohan, Marc Cohen, Brooke Coleman, Miles Coleman, Carlos de Mello e Souza, Allison Gibbons, Arie Greenleaf, Nalini Iyer, Kathleen La Voy, Chuck Lawrence, Michael Ng, Katie Oliveras, Steve Palazzo, Tracey Pepper, Frank Shih, Colette Taylor, Travis Tweet

*Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes*

- I. Review 3-12-18 Minutes
  - A. Vote: 13 approve, 0 oppose, 0 abstain
- II. University Assessment Committee (*David Carrithers, Bob Duniway, Sophia Sansone*)
  - A. Proposal on presentation of data to NWCCU
    - 1. Vote: 15 approve (plus 1 not present), 0 oppose, 0 abstain
  - B. Proposal for updated committee charter
    - 1. Discussion
      - a. UAC exists already and is a subcommittee of AcA, this is simply a proposal for a more defined charter that formalizes UAC duties and scope of responsibility
    - 2. Vote: 15 approve (plus 1 not present), 0 oppose, 0 abstain
- III. Faculty Handbook Report
  - A. Terminal year contract versus 7<sup>th</sup> year – approved by FHRC
    - 1. Vote: 16 approve (plus 1 not present), 0 oppose, 0 abstain
  - B. Regular performance review versus annual – approved by FHRC
    - 1. This is only for tenured faculty and senior instructors, annual review is still required for non-tenure track and part time positions
    - 2. If someone is going for promotion to associate, will need to have annual reviews during that time period
    - 3. Vote: 16 approve (plus 1 not present), 0 oppose, 0 abstain
  - C. Change “substantial” to “substantive” – approved by FHRC
    - 1. Vote: 16 approve (plus 1 not present), 0 oppose, 0 abstain
  - D. University Librarian title change to Dean – approved by FHRC
    - 1. Update title in all applicable places throughout handbook to reflect position title change
    - 2. Vote: 16 approve (plus 1 not present), 0 oppose, 0 abstain
  - E. Removal of seven year limit for lecturer – approved by FHRC
    - 1. Vote: 16 approve (plus 1 not present), 0 oppose, 0 abstain
  - F. Faculty performance review versus annual review – approved by FHRC
    - 1. Vote: 16 approve (plus 1 not present), 0 oppose, 0 abstain
  - G. Promotion and Tenure: Chair and Department Personnel Committee conduct independent review – not approved by FHRC
    - 1. Discussion
      - a. After discussion on Canvas and a visit to AcA by the Chair of University Rank and Tenure Committee, apparent this process varies greatly between schools/colleges
      - b. Chair may have difficulty evaluating a faculty member in research area

- c. Issue with letters that seem to be independently written and argued and yet they are not, with the department chair involved at both the department level letter and able to write their own letter
- d. May be fears and hesitations by junior faculty (junior faculty involvement varies greatly depending on school/college)
- e. Perhaps chair should co-sign letter at department level too, to acknowledge their influence on the committee
- f. In some areas, the Chair is integral part of department and needs to be present in order to make sure the department letter is structured correctly, meets standards, etc.
- g. In departments fraught with tension, perhaps the vote count could be included in order to show the quantitative differences within the department
- h. Should discuss the legal implications if this is accepted; already separation between department and dean – meets legal standard

2. Vote

- a. 3 approve, 10 oppose (plus 1 not present), 3 abstain

**IV.** Motion to Approve Program Reviews

- A. Biology
- B. Chemistry
- C. Undergraduate Computer Science
- D. Graduate Computer Science

**V.** Motion to Approve Program Revisions

- A. Film Studies
- B. Theology and Religious Studies
- C. Vote on items IV and V: 16 approve (plus 1 not present), 0 oppose, 0 abstain

**VI.** Academic Affairs Updates

- A. Change to Graduate with Honors Policy for Undergraduate Transfer Studies
  - 1. If a transfer student with a high GPA goes abroad for a quarter, study abroad does not count as graded credits and they are therefore not eligible to graduate with honors (currently requires 90 graded credits)
  - 2. Changing this requirement to 75 graded credits, if a quarter abroad was taken
- B. Master of Sports Administration Leadership program moving from Arts and Sciences to Albers

**VII.** Motion on Online Graduate Program

- A. A Motion Regarding the Role of Academic Assembly in the Online Graduate Program Initiative:

*Whereas, under the system of shared governance at Seattle University, the Academic Assembly has the formal power to approve both “significant changes to [an] existing major, major field of concentration, or degree program” and the “creation of a new program within an existing master’s degree”; and furthermore, whereas the Bylaws of the Academic Assembly require that it “play a key leadership role in determining university policy in all academic areas, including... Curricular and co-curricular programs that require significant new resources or may substantially change the academic culture of the university,” I move the following in relation to the current initiative to implement online graduate programs: First, that the Academic Assembly be given its rightful opportunity to approve or reject this online graduate program initiative before the University finalizes any contractual arrangements regarding the delivery of online graduate programs with any vendor.*

*Second, that, before this matter is put to a vote in the spring quarter of 2018, members of the Academic Assembly be given the opportunity to ask appropriate administrators any additional questions they have about the online graduate program initiative or potential vendors, and to seek any additional information about the initiative or potential vendors they deem necessary in order to make an informed decision.*

*And third, that the Academic Assembly affirms its established process of program review such that any new curricular proposal that is part of an approved online graduate program policy and has gone through appropriate approval processes in the relevant school or college, be submitted to the Program Review Committee (PRC) for its evaluation, and that the resulting PRC recommendation be submitted for final approval by the entire Academic Assembly.*

**B. Discussion**

1. Second and third points are affirmations of what is already in existence, and are also included to make sure that the first point is distinct and the timeline is established
2. Big cultural shift with the medium change to online
3. Feels like a power grab on AcA part, AcA did not approve the use of Canvas as a platform for online learning back when it was implemented
4. There has to be a line between allowing administrative discretion in a business sense and following AcA authorizations allowed
5. AcA should have been involved in this shift of teaching format prior to the negotiation of the contract
6. We are not approving the vendor contract, we are saying that good policy requires that we go through the process for policy formulation – this has not happened
7. Provost response indicates agreement that AcA has a leadership role on campus, but does not agree that AcA has approve/reject authority on this particular issue
8. Perhaps the process has not been as clear as possible, but this was not intentional
9. This contract is a master-services agreement, sets the general terms and conditions for a relationship between two entities such that when specifics are negotiated, the two parties have already covered a lot of ground – labor, distribution of revenue, etc.
10. The plan is that the initial contract will be accompanied by an addendum that identifies the two Albers graduate programs to move forward initially, stipulating that the curricular proposals will have to go through standard approval processes (including AcA approval) – if not approved, SU will not move forward with contract
11. Any future programs that we talk about moving forward will go through the same process and need the same AcA curricular approval
12. Need to be mindful that within the walls of different schools, there are already approval processes and we do not want to railroad these
13. Outside vendor situation is what AcA should weigh in on – working with faculty will affect delivery of material, conditions of labor (head teacher, adjuncts underneath structure), etc.
14. AcA does not have approval over contracts, however, this is a major programmatic/policy initiative that overlaps with the curricular design proposals that AcA does have to approve
15. Danger that faculty are going to be alienated from many of these major changes coming

**C. Vote: 5 approve (plus 1 not present), 8 oppose, 2 abstain**

**VIII. Motion to Approve Matteo Ricci College Revisions and Discussion (Kimberly Gawlik, Ben Howe, Paulette Kidder, Dave Madsen, Jimmy McCarty, Chris Paul, Dan Washburn)**

- A. PRC approved the interim curricular changes proposed, but also found there were larger issues with how MRC will integrate into A&S
- B. Faculty Staff Senate (of A&S) sent a memo to A&S Dean
  - 1. Deans moved too far ahead without consulting the faculty of A&S and MRC
  - 2. Five basic concerns
    - a. Shared governance issues
    - b. Future leadership of MRC moving forward
    - c. Future of faculty and staff colleagues in MRC
    - d. Inequitable workload of MRC non-tenure track colleagues
    - e. Curricular overlap concerns that need to be addressed
  - 3. Executive Committee and FSS should have a vote on the merger of the two colleges
- C. Proposed Curricular Revision
  - 1. Wherever MRC ends up, need to move forward with this curriculum revision for students
  - 2. The curricular approval feels like cart before the horse, cannot separate merger from curricular issues: teaching, compensation, program structure, curricular overlap, tenure
  - 3. This revision is for the current students who are in the pipeline right now, regardless of merger
  - 4. Very clear changes to the existing core structure, but no Peace and Justice major changes – those are expected in the future and will be developed collaboratively
  - 5. MRC Task Force recommended that MRC move toward Peace and Justice, however, these revisions are not Peace and Justice
- D. Proposed plan
  - 1. Merger decision needs to happen
  - 2. Curricular change should be approved now
  - 3. If both are approved, everyone involved need to get together and discuss how they envision moving forward, given perceived overlap (two teaching degrees, etc.)
- E. Discussion
  - 1. There has to be collaboration on this moving forward if MRC is going to fit in A&S well
  - 2. Even within MRC, unclear about whether merger will happen
  - 3. Part of the curricular revision is responding to the task force to make the curriculum more inclusive, more intentionally engaging to those in other disciplines
  - 4. Regardless of merger decision, this revision is a humanities-based inclusive revision that reaches across disciplinary lines
  - 5. Even if MRC were to stay independent, this curriculum revision responds directly to the sit-in, student requests, and the task force recommendations
- F. Motion to vote on the PRC memo re: proposed revisions to MRC curriculum
  - 1. Proposed amendment – vote on the first 4.5 pages of the proposal and table the remainder, beginning with the clarification of Peace and Justice curriculum
    - a. Vote on amendment: 5 approve, 9 oppose, 1 abstain (Amendment not approved)
  - 2. Vote on main motion: 10 approve (plus 1 not present), 5 oppose, 0 abstain