

**Academic Assembly**  
February 10<sup>th</sup>, 2020  
2:05 – 3:35 pm, STCN 130

**MINUTES**

**Attendance:** Kathleen La Voy, Kirsten Thompson, Mark Taylor, Yancy Dominick, Chris Paul, Michael Ng, Nicole Harrison, Clara Cordova, Frank Shih, Shane Martin, Russ Powell, Nalini Iyer, Terri Clark, Angie Jenkins, Sarah Bee, Kate Koppelman, Arie Greenleaf, Dylan Medina, Mimi Cheng, Marc Cohen, Felipe Anaya, Margit McGuire, Patrick Murphy

**Visitors:** Mary Petersen, Wilson Garone, Joelle Pretty, David Lance, Nicole Piasecki, Betty Woods, Dr. John Vassall

*Minutes Taken by Lindsey Nakatani*

**I. Review 01-27-20 Minutes**

**2:05 – 2:07**

- a. Welcome from AcA President & Overview of Agenda
- b. **Motion:** Move to approve meeting minutes from 1/27/2020. Seconded: **VOTE:** APPROVE: 14, OPPOSED: 0, ABSTENTIONS: 0
  - i. **Motion is passed** – AcA 1/27/2020 Meeting Minutes Approved.

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

**2:07 – 2:25**

- a. The Provost was unable to attend the meeting held by the AcA last Monday due to an illness, February 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2020. The main concern raised at the meeting concerning Full-Time Non-Tenured Track (FT-NTT) instructor job security at CAS. A clear message was shared that the strategy of replacing FT-NTT with PT-NTT as a budget reduction strategy would have been a non-starter. In response to feedback on the timeline for the semesters vs. quarters taskforce, the President agreed that the timeline needed adjustment. The deadline for a report by the taskforce has been moved to December 2020. This has moved the faculty/staff recommendatory vote to January 2021. The report and recommendatory vote results will then be presented to the BOT in February 2021.
- b. The Semesters vs. Quarters task force has only received 5 faculty volunteers to date. The AcA President suggests the deadline for nominees be moved out by two weeks.
- c. **Questions & Discussion:** *How will a decisive decision be measured by the recommendatory vote? If the decision is not clear, how will that affect the university? A faculty/staff referendum seems to be fairest and most transparent mechanism for the process. What percentage would constitute a strong majority? The Provost would consider about 70% of faculty and staff to be a strong majority.*
- d. *For the voting process; what will the definition of "faculty" be? What role would part-time faculty play in this vote?* Faculty would need a workload assessment and new workload model before they could vote on this decision. Steps will be taken to create workload models precursory to the vote.

- e. *When the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) met did they gather data, and could that data be used to jump start the taskforce's work?* The SPC did not gather any hard data. Other university bodies have researched this subject in the past and their data is available.
- f. Communication on the taskforce creation and their subsequent research should be clear, frequent and transparent to minimize concerns.
- g. *What is the threshold of participation in the vote to legitimize its result?* There is little concern that this vote will not solicit large numbers of staff and faculty participation. This issue is integral to the operation of the entire University.

### III. CFO Update, Wilson Garone

2:25 – 2:30

- a. Work Progression
  - i. Work is being done to generate 5-Year net tuition revenue projections. These projections are based upon feedback from the deans, historical trends, market trends and student demographics. The FY21 projection is very granular. Projections further into 5-Year plan are increasingly abstract.
  - ii. Initial projections are showing steady, small growth at just under 1%. This trend is in line with the institution's financial history.
  - iii. Working with the consulting firm on an enrollment strategy plan.
  - iv. Working on initial projections for the Center for Science and Innovation (CSI) and other potential growth programs i.e. Nursing, Computer Science etc.
  - v. An update on the work progression will be presented to the BOT this week.
- b. *Most departments are already operating with very little to spare and yet, are still being asked to re-assess their budget lines. In this spirit of uncertainty, how will communication be maintained so that policies are clearly articulated, misconceptions are avoided and so an additional drop-in community morale is avoided?*
  - i. Proactive understanding of the impact of the issues and formulating recommendations to best handle potential impacts. The CFO invites all faculty to be candid and frank, and to let the financial department know exactly what is happening so that solutions can be found for any problems that arise. There was a lack of coordination in the beginning of this process (regarding the NTT concern). The Provost's office is working on devising new ways of communicating and engaging with the community about the ongoing financial repositioning.
- c. Some of the SU community is feeling a disconnect between the Strategic Directions Document and the impending budget cuts. There seems to be a lack of ability for faculty and staff to give input into the decision-making process.
- d. Faculty are feeling an additional area of disconnect by hearing second-hand or after the fact about possible strategies surrounding retirements, administrative salary freezes, creative ideas and possible sacrifices being considered by administration. Communication is being received in small pieces rather than fully and transparently.
- e. Concern regarding the Program Review Process not addressing financial issues in the past when reviewing/creating programs. Moving forward, these reviews/proposals/revisions must outline budget implications. (Will be discussed later in the agenda in greater detail.)

- f. Advance notice and knowledge of impending changes would be very beneficial to boost the commitment of faculty and staff in the financial repositioning of the university.

**IV. Reviewing and Updating the Academic Integrity Policy, Joelle Pretty & David Lance 2:30 – 2:43**

Upon review of the Academic Integrity Policy, the following changes are being explored to re-write the policy to be more clear, fair and efficient.

**a. Current Challenges/Problems:**

- i. 11+ people currently involved in academic policy issues (too many people).
- ii. The criteria for burden of proof is currently unclear.
- iii. What is the basis for deciding difficult legal decisions?
- iv. Examination of other institutions and how they have structured their academic integrity policy systems to be efficient.

**b. Strategies/Steps to Improving the Policy:**

- i. Notification to AcA of the work being done. Looking to field questions and receive feedback from the AcA. The registrars Academic Policy Committee will carry most of the work to revamp and revise this policy.
- ii. The requirement of a certified copy of all submitted policy incident reports, will be removed from the policy as it has been deemed unnecessary.
- iii. A limited appeal will be added to the policy. An appeal will be decided only once with no additional appeal to follow.
- iv. While the university's policy is under revision, policies at the school/college level also need to be considered to avoid discrepancies between university policy and departmental policies.
- v. This revision is crucial because with no standard process, it can be arbitrary which students are caught in academic integrity violations.

- c. **Attrition Review:** The number of students on leave of absence jumped from 6 to 24 between this year and last year.

**d. Questions/Discussion:**

- i. *Would it be possible to get a report that is more consumable? A report would be helpful for general transparency, to assist with strategizing retention methods (an issue being addressed in budget talks) and to give a better idea of which retention methods are working.* Outreaching to students will help determine why the university is losing students and improve overall data reporting as well. More information on how retention numbers compare to the total number of students and demographics across the university would also be useful data. Questions to be answered: Where are the successes? Where are the shortfalls? Where can resources be reallocated to improve outreach? Where are resources being used successfully?

**V. Faculty Handbook Committee – Amendments, Kirsten Thompson 2:43 – 2:46**

- a. The proposed changes will be circulated to the campus community. AcA will then vote on the amendments. Feedback commentary from the community will be posted on Canvas for AcA membership review in prep for the vote at the next AcA meeting.

- b. **Question:** *Can the definition of “currently employed” be more clearly defined in the FHRC (Faculty Handbook Review Committee) memo? Should a quarter or semester standard for employment be implemented?*

**VI. Program Review Committee, Terri Clark**

**2:46 – 3:00**

Discussion on how to revise/improve the program review process to consider financial/budgetary impacts of any proposed program revisions, reviews and creations.

- a. Program Review Committee does not currently have a process for considering the budgetary implications of the revisions/reviews/proposals made. The committee usually corresponds with departmental leadership via memos. The memos are then brought to and approved by AcA. The proposals then move on to their respective executive approval bodies. Concerns have been raised about the committee’s role in approving or being involved in the creation of programs that were financially unsound from their initiation. In response to this concern, the PRC (Program Review Committee) is seeking the AcA’s input on what kind of budget criteria program proposals/revisions/reviews should be asked to meet.
- b. Past program proposals have developed processes for identifying tuition revenue streams using RevSU. Program proposals can use these processes to present good faith projection numbers in their proposals. These details surrounding a new programs’ possible success have been left largely to guesswork. Proposals have been designed based on imagination and aspiration rather than practicality and data. Program proposals should include or consider meaningful marketing studies, plans for shortages in student revenue due startup costs, effects on faculty workload, student need/interest in the program etc.
- c. **Questions/Discussion:**
  - i. What is a program review supposed to accomplish? What are the concrete needs of a program? Proposals need to generate hard budget numbers rather than wish lists. Can a budgetary process be outlined for future reviews?
  - ii. Is there or should there be a distinction between a strategic review and an academic review of a program? You can review a program internally from an academic quality perspective. Which review should come first?
  - iii. Is the subcommittee of the AcA involved in the strategic or academic review of programs?
- d. Subcommittee of the PRC will help create guidelines for this budget process. The subcommittee will also work to ensure that there is a faculty voice in the Academic Portfolio Review charged by the Strategic Directions Document. Integral to the Academic Portfolio Review will be a complete re-set/overhaul of the program review process. There is concern that committee membership is working at capacity right now. First step is to determine immediate key budgetary requirements for program review. The overhaul of the program review process will be conducted over a much longer 2-year window.
- e. PRC Subcommittee Taskforce - AcA Volunteers: Terri Clark, Sarah Bee, Marc Cohen, Russ Powell, Chris Paul.

**VII. Presidential Search Committee**

**3:00 – 3:35**

*Nicole Piasecki, Betty Woods, Dr. John Vassall, Mary Petersen*

- a. Introductions of the Board Members and Additional Guests
- b. There is a scheduled private session between the Presidential Search Committee and the AcA on March 18<sup>th</sup> at 3:00 pm for a more in-depth discussion.
- c. Ms. Piasecki thanks the AcA for welcoming the board representatives to the AcA. At the November 2019 BOT (Board of Trustees) meeting, the process for the Presidential Search was discussed. Father Steve Sundborg will formally submit his letter of retirement to the BOT this week and the Board will officially launch the presidential search.
- d. **Betty Woods** is an alumna of Seattle University. Ms. Woods has been involved with SU for many years, in many capacities. Ms. Woods was a Seattle University board member from 2005 – 2017. Ms. Woods is the retired CEO of Premera BlueCross. Ms. Woods has also been the director of other public companies including, Beckman Coulter and was a board member of Western Washington University for 8 years. Ms. Woods has a great amount of experience finding extraordinary executive leaders.
- e. **John Vassall:** A doctor of internal medicine, Dr. Vassall is an alumnus of the University of Washington. Dr. Vassall's daughter is an alumna of SU's Law School. Dr. Vassall was Vice President of Medical Affairs and Chief Medical officer at Swedish Medical. Dr. Vassall has worked closely with the SU nursing school. Dr. Vassall has been involved in searches for several CEOs and other executive searches.
- f. **Questions/Discussions:**
  - i. Hired external consultant WittKeifer to assist in the search. Several other catholic, higher education searches are being conducted this year. A team of trustees, faculty, undergrad, grad, alumni, dean and cabinet members are all represented upon the Presidential Search Committee.
  - ii. *With the closure of other northwest private institutions, the most recent being Concordia University in Portland, is the current struggling situation of higher-ed affecting or coloring this search?* The committee will be sure that any candidates will be fully briefed and aware of the situation. The Strategic Directions Document calls for major improvements and focus on changes that will make SU more competitive in an ever-changing market.
  - iii. Ms. Woods and Dr. Vassall were honored and privileged to interview a cross section of interested faculty for appointment to the Search Committee. Recommendations for search committee membership have been made but are not public until the BOT has approved the search committee roster. All interviewees were extremely qualified and decisions on membership then became based upon balance between perspective, experience and varying representation. An emphasis was placed upon candidates that have a great deal of interface with students.
  - iv. *Is there is a way to increase communication and interface between the Board of Trustees and faculty/staff? This would improve transparency, trust and overall understanding of the BOT operations, and how the board's decisions affect the lives of faculty, staff and students.* There have been interactions between the faculty, staff and BOT in the past and they have always been much appreciated and very fruitful. Further endeavors will be researched.

- v. *How can faculty help with the search?* The AcA will be available as a resource to the search committee. The committee will also be posting regular updates to the web. There will be open forums with faculty. The AcA will have a direct meeting with WittKeifer. First action item is to determine the campus' criteria for the next president. Gathering this information first will assist and expedite the consulting firms search for qualified candidates.
- vi. *Who will be directly responsible for marketing the University to potential candidates?* Every touch person during the process with the candidates will be Seattle University centralized. The consultants have immersed themselves in meeting the constituents of the university and gathering criteria for potential candidates.
- vii. The SGSU VP offers the undergraduate student government as a resource to the BOT and to the presidential search committee.
- viii. In addition to providing inspirational leadership, any candidate must be an effective fundraiser. WittKeifer consultants are a specialized division that cater to academic institutions. The consultants are well-versed in academic executive searches. There is the additional consideration that it is no longer required that the president be specifically Jesuit, however it is still required that the candidate must be Catholic.
- ix. *What is the committee's greatest challenge? And what is the expected size of the candidate pool; who is out there and who will be interested?* There is concern that similar or identical searches will be happening nationally at the same time as SU's search. Ms. Woods and Dr. Vassall are confident that if the candidates feel the same energy that they both felt during their initial interview process, that there will be a large pool of qualified candidates drawn to the University.
- x. *To what degree will non-traditional candidates be considered?* The focus of the committee will center on the candidate's understanding of the university, the role of faculty and staff, the integral operations of a higher education institution, and a deep understanding of academia.