Academic Assembly
February 24th, 2020
2:05 – 3:35 pm, STCN 130

MINUTES

Attendance: Kathleen La Voy, Kirsten Thompson, Yancy Dominick, Chris Paul, Michael Ng, Nicole Harrison, Clara Cordova, Frank Shih, Shane Martin, Russ Powell, Nalini Iyer, Terri Clark, Angie Jenkins, Sarah Bee, Arie Greenleaf, Mimi Cheng, Marc Cohen, Margit McGuire, Patrick Murphy, Katie Oliveras, Pat Buschel, Gregory Silverman

Visitors: Melore Nielsen, Wilson Garone, Alvin Sturdivant, Tara Hicks

Minutes Taken by Lindsey Nakatani

I. **AcA President Welcome and Approval of 2/10/2020 Meeting Minutes** **2:05 – 2:06**

a. The listening session held by the Office of the Provost last week went very well. Main take-away; there is a whole host of actions that the SU community can take to make SU more marketable and attractive to prospective students.

b. **Motion:** Move to approve the Meeting Minutes from 2/10/2020. Seconded: APPROVED: 9, OPPOSED: 0, ABSTENTIONS: 4.

i. **Motion is passed** – AcA 2/10/20 Meeting Minutes Approved.

II. **Provost & CFO Updates - *Shane Martin & Wilson Garone*** **2:06 – 2:25**

a. Dr. Martin offered an overview of a recent presentation made to the BOT. The presentation contained information and demographics on first time applicant and transfer students who ultimately, did *not* attend SU. The presentation also included information on the "Admitted Student Survey" conducted by the Human Capital Research Corp. What did the survey results tell us?

i. Academic Reputation: Academic excellence/reputation is a very important factor in incoming students' consideration of an institution.

ii. Financial Aid: In a few instances, very small, incremental differences in financial aid offerings would have positively influenced students' acceptance decisions to Seattle University.

iii. Personal relationships with incoming students are incredibly important. Examples of personalized elements: personalized admission letters, personalized marketing materials, etc. University will be looking into setting up a tool for SU community members to recommend potential students they know personally.

b. Deans 360 Evaluations: currently finishing the first cycle of deans. Seattle University moved from initial firm Korn Ferry Consultants to Sea Change Consulting. The Office of the Provost is committed to a more regular evaluation cycle. Provost's Office is examining a closer alignment of the deans' contracts, the 360 evaluations and the re-appointment structure. 360 evaluations currently run on a 3-year cycle timeline. The Provost is interested in instituting a longer 5-year evaluation timeline so that a complete evaluation would fall in a deans' 5th or 4th year of service.

c. **Questions/Discussions**

i. *Would the Provost share the slide deck from his presentation with the community?* The slides and information contained therein would be very helpful information for the community to be aware of.

ii. *How has the increase in early decisions/early actions improved enrollment so far?* The University is currently ahead of the curve in terms of building next year's class.

iii. *Does the fact that Seattle University is a Division I athletics school draw a lot of students?* According to survey results, 10% of students consider this fact a significant draw to the school. There will be a forum on Division I athletics later in the year to address budget implications of this classification i.e. what are the costs, what revenue does Division I athletics bring the school? *Are Division I athletics worth the trade-off of their costs?* Approx. 400-500 students attend Seattle University because of Division I athletics.

iv. *Would there be a gap year to reassess the deans' evaluation process?* The Provost would like any improvements to the deans' evaluations to be launched in the next academic year.

v. *Will there be 360 evaluations of other senior administration?* The Provost believes there should be a system for senior administration evaluations. Some existing structures are in place; however, these structures need to be improved upon as well.

vi. Strategic Planning Council (SPC) Update: The charges for the SPC working groups are being finalized. The special task force on the academic calendar is being populated and is almost ready to begin meeting. The Provost would like to appoint 2 co-chairs (1 administrator, 1 faculty member). The Provost is appointing Jen Marrone and Krycka Kevin as co-chairs to this task force.

d. Mr. Garone offered an update on the Deans and Cabinet session that took place this morning. The focus of the meeting was to expand upon the topics of the listening session, details of the budget process and determining preemptive rationale for the 5-year budget.

e. **Questions/Discussions**

i. *Could more information be provided on how much units are being asked to cut and how they are being advised through these cuts?* This information will be posted under the controller's office subpage. There will be links to the University's financial statements in the interest of full visibility. *How is the process for budget reductions being carried out?* Every dean is working with the Provost, Dr. Leary, Fr. Steve Sundborg and Mr. Garone to submit their ideas for budget cuts within their departments. The Budget Advisory Group will then review these departmental suggestions. The Budget Advisory Group will then assist each department in making the most strategic cuts. This review process is scheduled to begin March 6th, 2020.

ii. Initially ideal budget cut ranges were provided to each department. These ranges do vary depending upon the department and its needs. Departments have been asked to conduct "bottom-up" cost evaluation exercises which will then inform any cut recommendations. Transparency of the ranges provided for all departments would be welcome. For example: Athletics has been asked to cut 5%.

iii. *The Law School has cut its budget over 40% over the course of the last few years. If there is very little room left in the operating budgets, the only remaining disposable budget items are faculty salary and benefits. There is a perception that deans are not permitted to recommend these budget items for reduction. If benefits/salaries cannot be cut, there is concern that other, more essential operational costs might be cut instead.* The Provost is not aware of any university policy expressly forbidding faculty salary/benefit cuts. The Provost would urge all departments to consider all creative budget reduction options.

iv. Mr. Garone will send an e-mail to the faculty with a link to the financial statements. There will have to be larger initial cuts to acquire the best benefits in the long term. The University is looking at approximately 5% cuts across the entire school. This percentage is dependent upon variable factors i.e. enrollment, revenue, inflation, contract construction etc.

v. *What rubric is being used to determine which proposed departmental budget cuts will be approved?* Departmental recommendations have not been submitted yet, and the rubric & metrics will be decided upon once an idea of the incoming data is established.

vi. Revenue streams from each program will be forthcoming. AcA President gives his thanks to the CFO for his continued updates and support of the AcA.

III. **Semester Consideration Taskforce Membership – *Sarah Bee*** **2:25 – 2:30**

a. **Proposed Academic Calendar Taskforce Membership:**

i. Davit Adut (ASB), Kate Koppelman (CAS), Brooke Gialopsos (CAS), Anne SJ Farina (CAS), Sarah Shultz (CAS), Patrick Murphy (CON), Elizabeth Gabzdyl (CON), Eric Bahuaud (CSE), Rob Rutherford (CSE), Yen-Lin Han (CSE), Chris Whidbey (CSE), Brooke Coleman (LAW), Arie Greenleaf (COE)

b. **Motion:** Move to approve Academic Calendar Taskforce membership as proposed by the Committee on Committees, with the addition of Arie Greenleaf as a volunteer representative for the College of Education. Seconded. **VOTE:** APPROVE: 16, ABSTENTIONS: 0, OPPOSED: 0.

i. **Motion is passed –** AcA approves the Academic Calendar Taskforce membership.

IV. **Faculty Handbook Revision – *Kirsten Thompson*** **2:30 – 2:35**

a. The proposed amendments were circulated to the University for the required one-week community consultation period. No feedback was received.

b. **Motion**: Move to approve amendment to Section 1. B 5. P 3 of the handbook as proposed in the FHRC's (Faculty Handbook Review Committee) report dated January 30th, 2020.

i. "In colleges and schools with Department Chairs, these Chairs are appointed by the Deans after consultation with the Provost and, at a minimum, with the full-time department faculty members."

ii. **Seconded:** VOTE: APPROVE: 16, OPPOSED: 0, ABSTENSTIONS: 0. **Motion is passed –** AcA Approves Amendment.

c. **Motion:** Move to approve amendment to P 6, 44, 56 & 57 of the handbook as proposed in the FHRC's report dated January 30th, 2020.

i. Change "Office of Research Services and Sponsored Projects" to "Office of Sponsored Projects" and the associated acronym "ORSSP" to "OSP" throughout the handbook, to reflect the office's new name.

ii. **Seconded:** VOTE: APPROVE: 16, OPPOSED: 0, ABSTENSTIONS: 0. **Motion is passed –** AcA Approves Amendment.

d. **Motion:** Move to approve amendment to Section XV, Part B, vii, p. 45 of the handbooks as proposed in the FHRC's report dated January 30th, 2020.

i. **Amendment Language per FHRC Report:** "Any currently employed faculty member (including professional librarians and administrators holding academic rank), with the written endorsement of ten additional currently employed faculty members."

ii. **Discussion:** Language is still too ambiguous. Propose additional edit to amendment - replace "currently employed" with "have taught in the previous academic year". This additional edit was proposed via AcA Canvas conversations. AcA membership in session editing - a combination of both edits will be added to clear up the ambiguity of the original amendment.

iii. **Newly Proposed Amendment Language:** "Any faculty who proposes or signs to support an amendment should be currently employed and/or have taught in the previous academic year (and/or professional librarians and administrators holding academic rank), with written endorsements of ten additional faculty members (satisfying the same requirement).

iv. **Motion:** Move to approve the AcA's proposed amendment language to Section XV, Part B, vii, p. 45 as edited and proposed above. **Seconded.** VOTE: APPROVE: 16, OPPOSED: 0, ABSTENTIONS: 1. **Motion is passed** – AcA Approves Amendment.

e. When Faculty Handbook Committee turns to a more substantial revision, the University legal counsel David Lance (who has just joined the Faculty Handbook Committee as a Provost Appointee and who replaces Bob Duniway), has suggested that it create a glossary that will define terms like FTE, part-time, full-time, currently employed, etc., and that will apply throughout.

V. **Update on Test Optional Admission Process - *Melore Nielsen*** **2:35 – 2:50**

a. Melore Nielsen provided an overview of the work of the Test Optional working group to the AcA. The Test Optional Group will return to the Aca in late March/Early April with a recommendation. The Test Optional Working Group was formed in December of 2019 and includes a wide variety of SU community representation.

b. More than 1,070 four-year colleges and universities now offer test-optional admissions. This change has been implemented at universities spanning a myriad of different associations and disciplines.

c. Use of standardized tests are limited in their predictive power and are based upon biased assumptions and discriminations. Standardized tests have also been shown to have demonstrable and disproportionately negative impact on populations of underrepresented, marginalized and systemically excluded students.

d. The working group continues to examine the usefulness of standardized exams in predicting student success at Seattle U. The goal is to determine if the usefulness of standardized exams in the admission process merits continuing to require them from all domestic applicants. The working group intends to continue its work and return with its results and recommendation to the AcA in April.

e. Questions that working group is researching: How do standardized tests play into admissions decisions? How do the FTIC admissions processes for reviewing applicants across different levels of academic achievement differ? How are test scores used to place students?

f. Next Steps: Preparing data to determine correlations between test scores and multiple variables. Identifying existing academic support deficits. Determining what data would need to be tracked if the ultimate recommendation is to go Test Optional. Current planning is centered around a possible 5-year pilot program.

g. **Questions/Discussion:**

i. *How would you differentiate between the two groups of students, those who do submit test scores and those who do not? And how would this affect the admissions process?* The university would have to utilize a holistic approach to determining admissions eligibility and consider other contributing factors e.g. academic rigor of course work, academic achievement, community service etc.

ii. *Are test scores required of transfer students?* No, the current policy is any transfer student with 36 credits or 1 year of college schooling waives the test score submission requirement.

iii. *How could this potentially impact the university's rankings? If we do not have test scores from everybody, how is that considered in admissions decisions?*

iv. *Does "test optional" promote inclusivity in the student body? Would there be a way to measure the yield rate of students who would choose to attend Seattle University due to this change?*

VI. **Program Review Committee: Review/Approval of Memos - *Terri Clark*** **2:50 – 3:20**

a. Program Review Report – Program Review Committee (PRC) Chair, Terri Clark, gave an initial overview of the Program Review Process. There is increasing concern from the faculty about the sustainability and practical budget implications for program proposals. The committee feels responsible as representatives of both the faculty and students who will feel the affects of any review/proposals approved and has taken an advocacy role for a more holistic approach to reviewing programs.

b. **Motion:** Move to waive the one week review rule for all previously tabled Program Review Memo. Seconded. VOTE: APPROVE: 15, OPPOSED: 0, ABSTENTIONS: 1. **Motion is passed –** AcA waives the one-week review rule.

c. *What does governance do to follow-up and make sure that the PRC's recommendations are being followed and implemented?* Currently, there is no standardized process for this review. The entire program review process is due for a major re-evaluation and this consideration will be reviewed and a more accountable, detailed process will be created.

d. **Women and Gender Studies Program** (7-Year Review): The PRC's recommendation is to pass the memo as approved by the PRC.

   i. *What does the program title mean and impart?* The terminology of the course title is indicative of the larger discussion taking place on gender studies. A course title changes is being considered for later submission and review.

   ii. *There is a lot of independent study included in this review. How many independent study projects are each faculty being asked to manage?* Current approximation concedes that faculty members are most likely, over-seeing more independent studies than they should be. However, faculty are not overwhelmed.

   iii. **Motion:** Move to pass the memo as recommended by the PRC. Seconded: VOTE: APPROVE: 16, ABSTENTIONS: 0, OPPOSSED: 0. **Motion is passed** – AcA approves the memo.

e. **Theater Program Review** (7-Year Review): There were some questions about the initial review/memo, but not of great enough concern to hold the review from passing.

   i. Concerns and questions about the larger budget implications of the proposal details. *What will these changes cost? What will be the benefits?*

   ii. **Motion:** Move to pass the memo as recommended by the PRC. Seconded. VOTE: APPROVE: 15, ABSTENTIONS: 1, OPPOSSED: 0. **Motion is passed –** AcA approves the memo.

f. **Communications Department Review** (7-Year Review): There were some recommendations on this review. The two major concerns were collaboration and faculty workload.

   i. Question of collaboration**;** why has film studies not been included in the list of collaborating departments? Unfortunately, the communications department is currently too large to add course work in collaboration with film studies. Communications will be looking at specializations, at which time communications could potentially add film studies cross over.

   ii. **Motion:** Move to add a friendly amendment to add film studies to the group of possible future collaborations and cross links in exploration by the Communications Department. Seconded. VOTE: APPROVE: 14, OPPOSED: 0, ABSTENTIONS: 2. **Motion is passed –** AcA approves the friendly amendment to the memo.

   iii. **Motion:** Move to pass the memo as amended above by the AcA in session. Seconded. VOTE: APPROVE: 15, OPPOSED: 0, ABSTENTIONS: 1. **Motion is passed** – AcA approves the memo.

g. **Masters in Professional Accounting** (Program Revision): There were few concerns about to the material offered for review. Cross listings of graduate and undergraduate courses caused some concern. There was concern that the quality of the courses will suffer due to cross listings. The PRC is also looking for additional scaffolding and support for student advising.

   i. *What is the current university policy for mixing of grad and undergrad student populations?* To counter a national fall in enrollment in accounting programs and improve sustainability changes had to be made. Cross listings are very common in the accounting field due to the time requirements required before a student can sit for a CPA exam. Internship credits were also instituted to make the program more competitive.

ii. *Why was a course fee introduced for zero credit course introduction?* This course is a Leadership/Team cohort opportunity for the students to engage in an off campus, co-curricular activity. The course fee is to cover costs of the activity.

iii. The AcA moves to table this memo pending further review by the PRC. The memo will be reviewed by the AcA at their next meeting.

h. All remaining PRC memos on the agenda are tabled until the next AcA meeting, due to time constraints.

VII. **Update on Covid-19/Coronavirus Outbreak and Campus Response - *Alvin Sturdivant & Tara Hicks* 3:20 – 3:35**

a. Introductions: Alvin Sturdivant (Vice President for Student Development) and Tara Hicks (Director of the Student Health Center)

b. General Info: Official name of the Coronavirus = COVID 19. Most corona viruses infect animals. However, in 2002 SARS, and then 2012 MERS-CoV proved to be incredibly infectious corona virus strains. Currently most COVID 19 cases are in mainland China. There have been 14 confirmed cases in the United States so far. The overall mortality rate of COVID 19 is 3%. COVID 19 is spread by respiratory droplets e.g. sneezing, coughing. COVID 19 has a much higher infection rate but an overall lower mortality rate than its other corona virus counterparts. It has been determined that there is a 14 days window in which symptoms usually appear. A-symptomatic spread of the virus has not been confirmed. Symptoms include: fever, rasping cough, flu like symptoms. 1/3 of patients have difficulty breathing.

c. The response in the US have been focused on containment and preventing the spread of the disease. This has resulted in higher monitoring of travelers from mainland China and subsequent travel restrictions. The Center for Disease Control (CDC) has a travel advisory of level 3 (which is the highest travel advisory the CDC offers) and the U.S. State Department has in place a travel advisory of 4 (which is the highest travel advisory that the State Department offers).

d. *What is SU doing in response to the outbreak?* Seattle University has an infectious disease response plan, that is being initiated in it's appropriate order. The student health center is working to monitor and provide accurate reporting to the community on the unfolding situation. Precautionary preparations have been made if the university's response plan is moved to level 2. There are masks available at the student center, the health department has ordered more personal protective equipment, the department has set up quarantine exam rooms if needed, etc. Seattle University is also actively working to avoid the stigmas that have begun to populate surrounding this issue.

i. *What are the implications for study abroad programs?* Seattle University will continue to monitor the situation in accordance with the Education Abroad Office. There are currently 6 students studying in impacted countries. Seattle University is in direct communication with these students to assist them in any way needed.

ii. *What is Seattle University, and the global community, doing to combat the rising stigma and racial aggression following this outbreak? Is there somewhere people can report racial aggressions?* The Student Development Dept. is planning on sending out further communications that will include additional information and resources for anyone feeling targeted. Any additional opportunities to combat stigmatization of the issue should be fully explored and the University's policy and expectations surrounding aggression should be clearly re-articulated to the University community.