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 Update**   **2:07 – 2:15**

   a. The Provost offers his sincere hope that everyone is doing well in these challenging times and that everyone remains healthy and safe. The Executive Re-Opening Task Force, co-chaired by Provost Martin and Vice President Tim Leary, has moved the re-opening decision deadline up by one week. A final decision will be made this week, the week of July 20th. 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 include performance evaluations and/or laboratory training. In accordance with this plan, CDLI is working with departments that have recently decided to switch from in-person to online courses. SU will accommodate students who wish to take only online courses. SU does anticipate there will be some impediments to the completion of all licensure requirements on original course timelines. Some accrediting bodies have provided accommodations, however other agencies have remained more stringent in their requirements, for example, nursing. Currently, SU is planning to have residence halls open for single occupancy and for double occupancy 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-party relationship residence hall and not an SU facility. University Leadership is working to determine if SU will be able to assist students who wish to break their housing contracts with Vi-Hilbert Hall due to Coronavirus concerns.

   c. *Will a town hall or meeting be held to address the questions and concerns of students and parents and/or faculty and staff regarding the fall?* Meetings were originally scheduled for about a month ago, however those dates were postponed. The university felt it would be premature to hold those forums until leadership had decided regarding the fall quarter. University leadership is now aiming to hold these meetings in mid-august.

d. *Will the university's Counseling and Psychology Services (CAPS) be fully operational regardless if continued campus closure is necessary?* Yes, the plan is to have CAPS fully functional, no matter what modality SU decides on for the fall. CAPS was scrambling during the spring quarter to create tele-health options for students, however these issues should now be resolved.

e. *How will residence hall slots be decided? How will the university decide which students will be allowed to live on campus?* The first step is to get an updated idea of who is planning on returning to campus. A student survey is being sent out today to gather this data and to determine if there will be a capacity issue. The university will be prioritizing key groups of students for residence hall occupancy. It is possible that there will be an alignment between student need and residence hall capacity and that prioritization may not be necessary. However, residence priority will be focused on international students, foster students, students who, effectively, do not have anywhere else to go and students that will have in-person classes.

f. *How will the university communicate important information to students in nursing?* A communication will go out to the entire campus community. This general communication will then allow programs to address issues specific to their programs. The leadership is balancing distributing a timely communication with composing an informative and appropriately sensitive message.

g. **Update on the Virtual Forum with Students and Faculty of STM** – STM students requested this forum to get an update on the status and future of STM. The leadership, in working with this group of students and alumni leaders, was able to say "yes" to several of their requests. For example, the leadership was able to offer extending program completion plans out to two or three years to give students more time to complete their programs. Further development is taking place in the formation of a transition committee. The Provost will offer more updates at the next AcA meeting.

III. **Financial & Re-Opening Update – Scenarios Overview**   **2:15 – 2:45**
Wilson Garone & Michelle Clements

a. **Update from Wilson Garone:** A concrete budget update will not be ready until the fall, however there was a budget check-in with the Board of Trustees (BOT) recently. This check-in provided insight on the university's financial situation based upon the decisions announced back on June 23rd, 2020. A lot of factors have changed since that date. The discussion was focused on providing the BOT an understanding of the process and prioritization of the university leadership as they navigate circumstances. The university leadership is weighing the financial impacts of the decisions due to be announced this week and finalizing a budget update for the fall accordingly. In terms of net tuition, the university is expecting to see the largest amount of affect on first time college students and a lesser impact on transfer and continuing students, in both undergrad and grad. The university has seen more "summer melt" for first time college enrollment and expects to see even more after the first ten days of the term. As of June, there had been an 11% decline in first time college student enrollment from what was expected for the region. Leadership expects to continue to see more "melt", especially after decisions are announced this week. In terms of residence hall revenue: the university was originally planning for double occupancy in halls which would have retained almost all the residence hall revue. Unfortunately, these plans have since shifted to single occupancy which will have a significant effect on revenue. For perspective, the annual residence hall revenue is about $16 million; single occupancy could potentially cut that number in half. The scope of this impact is dependent upon the number of quarters for which single occupancy will be necessary. The budget team has also been focused on ascertaining what one-time expenses the university will incur related to safely re-opening the campus. The work was broken into four groups of expenses: 1) Safety - cleaning supplies, PPE procurement, etc. 2) Health – how we will pay for tests and screening stations? 3) Technology – preparing the university for at least a quarter, and possibly a year, of virtual operation. Lastly 4) Faculty Stipends – stipends for faculty to complete online trainings. The focus has been on determining what the university can do to minimize the impact.

b. **Defining Principles of the Budget Advisory Group's Work:**

i. Focus on addressing this one-time issue facing SU next year and the associated one-time expenses without touching base-line expenses. The budget advisory group does not want to

        affect resources that are critical for the rebound in FY 22 (assuming the larger pandemic challenges have been resolved by then).

    ii. Try to preserve the maximum number of jobs possible.

    iii. Preserve the quality of the student experience.

    iv. Preserve the financial reserves of the university

    v. Alignment to the 5-Year plan.

c. The budget group reached out to peer universities to benchmark if SU was in alignment with the actions of other institutions and found that SU is in line with sister institutions. Possible mitigating financial actions under consideration include:

    i. Reduction in retirement plan contribution. Current contribution equals 10%. Leadership is considering a reduction of some percentage points.

    ii. Continuation of the hiring freeze throughout the entire AY to preserve current jobs.

    iii. Discretionary expenses reduction, e.g. reducing travel expenses by restricting traveling through the end of the AY.

d. The budget group will consider further, more drastic measures, depending upon developing financial impacts. These further measures include: voluntary furloughs or salary reductions, a greater usage of the university's capital reserves (more than originally planned), involuntary salary reductions, etc. Last resort options would include cuts to discretionary expenses and jobs, however these are lowest on the groups' prioritization of measures. Everything is dependent upon the financial impacts. SU's sister institutions, such as Santa Clara, Holy Cross, San Francisco, Loyola Marymount, Scranton and St. Savoir have all confirmed that they are exploring the same options and measures.

Questions/Discussion:

e. *Were cuts to NTT positions being considered?* Only if the gaps cannot be covered by other measures. Contracts will be honored, but reductions will be examined if necessary. However, this action is at the bottom of the priority list.

f. *Will the cut to retirement plans be permanent, or only for a certain period?* This cut would only be for the period needed, which originally projected for FY 21. A report was just released noting that 14 of the 27 AJCU (Association for Jesuit Colleges and Universities) are looking at half, or full holds on their retirement plan contributions.

g. *Do any of the plans that involve salary cuts trigger economic exigency clauses in our bond indentures, or is there anything worth considering that might?* The answer to this question is yet to be determined. The financial gap will have to be examined first.

h. *Students workers are concerned if there will be enough funding to continue their student employment. Are there any plans to cut student worker wages or stop employing student workers altogether?* This will be a function of how deep the financial situation becomes. This measure is under consideration. However, there are potentially mitigating factors. For example, there will be fewer students than originally planned for and the need for student workers could be reduced as well. The budget group would like to protect student wages as much as possible as the group knows that students rely on those wages to live in Seattle. While not high on the priority list of measures, this action is still possible.

i. **Update from Michelle Clements** – Those staff who were furloughed three months ago will be reinstated on August 3rd, 2020. 11 of those positions have already come back early. While the hiring freeze is still in effect, there have been a few exceptions. This time last year, SU had 65 open jobs. Comparatively, there are about 10 jobs currently open. HR has just completed a workforce planning project for all staff with all supervisors and leaders. This project will assess the number of positions that will be needed back on campus for the fall. HR is operating outside of all norms and is asking for maximum flexibility from supervisors and their staff surrounding workplace operation. Everyone is strongly encouraged to read the guide for returning to the campus workplace. The guide offers a comprehensive outline of the safety and health measures the university is taking. Michelle Clements participates in a weekly meeting with other HR leaders across the AJCU to

brainstorm and keep up to date on sister institution operations. HR would advise people to please make appointments to check-in with their primary care physicians so that they understand any pertinent health risks and/or health-related accommodations they may need from the university.

Questions/Discussion:

j. *Access to the Law Library has been an ongoing problem. How will this be resolved?* The current plan is to have the Law Library open for an appropriate number of physically distanced students.

k. *What is the guidance on faculty returning to their offices to pick up necessary items?* HR would ask that faculty coming onto campus for any reason to please review the return to camps guidance. Check-in stations will be set up in the first floor, indoor area under the Wyckoff Auditorium. These stations will perform symptom checks and provide masks to those who need them.

l. **Comment from the Provost:** Many of the answers to these financial questions, and the larger scope of the financial impact, depends heavily upon the response of students (especially new/first-time students) to the decision being announced later this week. The university is currently 110 students down from its projections. If the university holds close to this current number, that will cause one scenario. If the reaction to the announcement causes the university to lose an additional 50 to 200 students that will create a completely different scenario.

m. **Update from Bob Dullea on Course Offerings for Students on Campus:** The university leadership is exploring the idea of creating in-person or hybrid courses designed around engaging academic experiences for students residing on campus while taking primarily online courses. These experiences would focus on engaging with the community, connecting students to the community and connecting the students to Seattle as best as possible under the circumstances. Activities could include viewing public art, visiting museums, etc. The leadership is trying to determine which faculty would be interested in this project, developing a way to compensate faculty for design of these courses and beginning to plan for the logistics of these experiences.

n. *Academic Advisors are usually assigned the first week of classes. Would it be possible to assign them now? Advisors could reach out to new students and make that important human connection that is so essential to retention.* Leadership feels that this is an excellent suggestion and will investigate moving this forward.

o. *Are the CORE Success classes moving forward?* Yes, CORE Success classes will be moving forward.

p. All instructional continuity plans continue to be developed in an ever-changing environment and ideas, feedback, questions and concerns are welcomed and encouraged.

IV. **Academic Portfolio Program Review (APPR) update**   2:45 – 3:05
     Terri Clark & Bob Dullea

a. The APPR representatives hope that the AcA members have had a chance to review the group understandings generated by the APPR. The APPR would like to introduce Seattle University's new Academic Affairs Program Manager, John Fleming. John will be taking the lead in supporting the APPR and the PRC once the APPR has been concluded. The charge of the working group, as well as a list of group members, is now readily available. The APPR will be returning to the AcA frequently to update on the group's progress. The APPR has met or will meet with all relevant stakeholders including student groups, alumni groups, the Deans Council and the Strategic Planning Council. The APPR committee understands the difficult nature of the charge of it's work, and while the data and facts cannot be changed, the committee is dedicated to approaching the work in a transparent, fair, sensitive, inclusive and holistic manner. The document that was sent to the AcA membership, outlines the focus of the group and how the group will approach the work. APPR is ultimately a recommendatory committee. APPRs recommendations will have to pass through all the stakeholders, then through the Provost and finally to the BOT. The APPR Committee began its meetings by establishing a shared group of assumptions and guidelines about the charge, goals and principles with which it would conduct its work.

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 it's 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, its 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. A portion of this enterprise will be based upon a Hanover market research project being conducted to assess which curricula and which programs are most viable, sustainable and have the greatest growth potential in the market. The APPR committee encourages all questions and concerns the faculty may have.

d. *The APPR's document mentioned a weighting towards the metric of diversity and inclusion. Faculty member is curious how this lens will be applied? The faculty member would also like to suggest that the APPR utilize the responses to the State of the Undergrad Students survey to address how underrepresented student populations have characterized their experiences on campus.* The full weighting of the groups determined lenses has not been set yet. The committee will continue with its next two main steps 1) determine subset of programs to be examined more closely and then 2) closely examine the programs in the subset. This second part of the work will allow the APPR to examine the more detailed, nuanced dimensions of a program, such as diversity and inclusion.

e. *Once this difficult process has been concluded, how will the university identify where it will reinvest these newly freed resources? Will the university be making much needed investments around racial equality pedagogy throughout the school's systems? The faculty would like to have some sense of how the APPR is considering this issue.* While the APPR committee will be including issues of diversity and inclusion in its considerations, the university has made a larger commitment to improving its response to this issue. The Provost would like to request more time at the next AcA meeting to better outline the university's response to this issue. It is an agreed upon fact that if the university does not invest in restructuring its education in a new way that is responsive to the needs and demands of students, the needs and demands of its community and is responsive to this time in history, then SU will lose students and market buy-in.

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 would like to have resources available to help build those connections.

   Questions/Discussion:

   i. *Will questions regarding social belonging be anonymous? Or would instructors be able to reach out to specific students?* The team feels that this is something AcA should decide. The AcA should also decide if the survey should be released via Canvas or Qualtrics and if the survey should be anonymous. The team is trying to balance confidentiality with being able to assist students experiencing trauma.

   ii. *Some faculty are completely opposed to any evaluative instrument being introduced via a faculty member's Canvas page. Canvas pages have become private, intimate, education spaces. Furthermore, Canvas evaluative instruments are sent to Chairs, Staff and Administrators via Canvas. It is already challenging for faculty to have the same kind of meaningful relationships with students in the virtual environment.* The team's initial instinct was to release the survey via Qualtrics, rather than Canvas, and to keep the surveys anonymous. Both measures will ensure the survey is as least disruptive as possible.

   iii. *Did the team or center receive any data from last quarter concerning students who didn't complete or withdrew? During SQ faculty had to figure out new ways to include and complete all students. Any data regarding this information would be useful in justifying the need for these surveys.*

   iv. *The faculty appreciate that the questions drafted thus far are trying to separate student life experience from course evaluative questions. The faculty would prefer that the survey not be tied to Canvas courses. Is there an opportunity to get faculty together to help communicate these questions to the students? This may help improve response rate as well as ease faculty concerns about the survey being used as an evaluation tool. It would also be problematic to ask teachers about their classroom attendance while faculty are simultaneously being asked to relax and remain flexible about their classroom policies.*

   v. *Is there a way to assess which modality between synchronous and asynchronous, is producing more student connection?*

   vi. *Would it be possible to include a more general question such as, "How are students finding their overall SU experience this term?"* The team would be worried about how the data gathered from such a general question would not be as informative, due to its subjective nature.

   vii. The faculty would like to suggest that the Center for Faculty Development check in with the Chairs and Associate Deans regarding dissemination of important information and decisions. Consistent, concise and timely academic policy announcements, preferably before the start of the quarter, would be extremely helpful so faculty can plan accordingly.

     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.