



**Academic Assembly Meeting No. 3  
Monday, October 10, 2022  
2:05 – 3:35 p.m.  
ADAL Stuart T. Rolfe Community Room & Zoom**

**MINUTES**

**Members Present:** Carol M. Adams, Mark Cohan, Marc Cohen, Douglas Eriksen, Nalini Iyer, Angie Jenkins (*ex-officio*, Staff Council), Shane P. Martin (*ex-officio*, Provost), Margit McGuire, Jodi O'Brien (*ex-officio*, Associate Provost), Katie Oliveras, Kyle Peet, Russell Powell, Gabby Rios (*ex-officio*, GSC), Gayle Robinson, Bryan Ruppert, Patrick L. Schoettmer, Frank J. Shih, Gregory Silverman, Kirsten Moana Thompson, Phillip Thompson, Rev. Michael Reid Trice and Glenn Yasuda.

**Guests:** Colette M. Taylor, Amelia Derr and Katherine Raichle.

**I. Opening Remarks, Frank J. Shih**

**2:09 – 2:12 p.m.**

- a. Meeting was called to order at 2:09 p.m. by Academic Assembly (AcA) President, Frank Shih.
- b. **MOTION** Moved by Frank Shih: "Move to approve the agenda for the October 10, 2022, meeting of the AcA." Seconded. **Approved.**

**II. Provost Update, Shane P. Martin**

**2:12 – 2:50 p.m.**

Provost Martin recently attended a Jesuit conference and learned a lot from other universities on how to bolster support for students. We need to rethink and reset our focus from strategies at the school/college level to the university level. We can explore applying a uniform system of assessment and feedback earlier in the term so professors can clearly communicate their expectations sooner rather later. This can provide all students an opportunity to pivot and become successful before the end-of-term. Furthermore, Seattle University can invest in a grading mechanism that is user-friendly for faculty and supportive to student success. Allowing students to know their real-time standing in a course will allow students to seek help when needed. We can also regularly analyze courses that students are not successful in and respond by supporting them on an institutional level. If students typically struggle with a quantitative analysis course, our Learning Assistant Programs could provide support in quantitative literacy. These strategies and high impact practices have been successful at other Jesuit universities. Some AcA members mentioned they already practice these strategies in their school/college/program, and other members are concerned that one practice may not be suitable for the entire campus.

For a variety of reasons, Seattle University is struggling with our retention rate. One way to approach this issue is to recreate Student Development and Academic Affairs into one cohesive team. Assembly members are interested in the retention rate for faculty and staff. Even though

this information is not available at this time, Provost Martin can bring this data to a future meeting. Lastly, Provost Martin will bring back written reports to AcA so they can be shared.

**III. Systemizing Faculty Workload**

**2:50 – 3:37 p.m.**

*Shane P. Martin, Jodi O'Brien and Colette M. Taylor*

The recent revisions to the Faculty Handbook did not address faculty workload, and what the University expects from faculty regarding student support, teaching, research and creative works. There are concerns about the lack of equity across campus and about the variety of expertise that is demonstrated differently in individual workload. This conversation relates to merit reviews and how to equitably reward faculty.

We are currently working on revising the Annual Performance Review (APR) process by reconsidering the definition of service and the expectations for curriculum, teaching, preparedness and outcomes for students. In general, faculty evaluations need to be more comprehensive on how faculty are contributing to the University and how they can be rewarded. As a part of Reigniting Our Strategic Directions, the APR Working Group is undertaking recreating an APR process that is comprehensive, equitable, interdisciplinary and uniform across campus, programs, curriculums, titles and so forth. This process needs to be flexible to meet the needs for the variety of faculty with different expertise that helps build our institution as a whole. Challenges include reforming student evaluations, faculty not getting elected to institutional service positions and varying sizes of classes and lecture. This group is currently working on getting baseline of minimum expectations while remaining fair and encouraging faculty to contribute. Once a new APR process is launched, we will be able to better understand what works and what does not work. Then we can fine tune it. School of Law AcA representatives were concerned about how their school fits into this prospective process. Their APR process requires a strenuous write-up with no impact. Assembly members would like to see better communications from the Deans on how new faculty fit into faculty performance as a collective.

*Meeting was adjourned at 3:37 p.m.*

*Minutes taken and submitted by the AcA Administrative Assistant,  
Caroline Pedro, Senior Administrative Assistant, Office of the Provost*