

**Academic Assembly – 2020 Summer Session No. 3**August 10<sup>th</sup>, 2020

2:00 – 4:00 pm, Zoom Meeting

**MINUTES**

**Attendance:** Michael Ng, Terri Clark, Frank Shih, Holly Ferraro, Nalini Iyer, Russell Powell, Angie Jenkins, Obed Kabanda, Yancy Dominick, Marc Cohen, Robin Narruhn, Shane Martin, Mimi Cheng, Chris Paul, Felipe Anaya, Katie Oliveras, Margit McGuire, Patrick Murphy, Gregory Silverman, Connie Anthony, Kathleen La Voy, Carol Adams, Sarah Bee

**Guests:** Michael Quinn, Mehmet Vurkaç, Erika Moore, John Fleming, Bryan Ruppert, Kevin Krycka, Marc McLeod, Maria Bullon-Fernandez, Jaisy Joseph, Hannah Tracy, Lindsay Whitlow, Joanne Hughes, Michelle DuBois, Reilly Curran, Billie Boyd, Rob Aguirre, Jennifer Marrone, Robert Dullea, Daniel Smith, Ryan McLaughlin, Sven Arvidson, Teodora Shuman, Andrea Verdán, Yen-Lin Han, Mike Marsolek, Sonia Barrios Tinoco, Craig Birkliid, Donna Teevan, Nakia Reddin, Jennifer Tilghman-Havens, Hidy Basta

*Minutes taken by Lindsey Nakatani*

**I. Instructional Continuity Update & Comments** *Bob Dullea***2:00 – 2:25**

- a. As the pandemic continues and shows no sign of abating, many faculty have elected to switch to a fully virtual modality. A little over 80% of the courses for fall are now completely virtual. In the College of Nursing, approximately 2/3 of courses are planned to be in-person or hybrid. At last count, there were 999 students planning to live in SU's residence halls in single occupancy. Leadership is working to ensure that there are enough spaces on campus for residence hall students and commuter students to study and take their virtual courses. The Instructional Continuity Group has been asked how the administration is planning for increased amounts of absenteeism from students throughout the fall. The university will continue to prioritize policy flexibility and additional options for faculty. The Instructional Continuity Group would like to solicit feedback on a possible credit/fail option for students through the FQ. The Deans have expressed mixed perspectives on this option. The Instructional Continuity Working Group feels that current circumstances still warrant this policy allowance, but the working group would like to hear the opinions of the AcA members.
- b. Facilities has surveyed and placed classrooms into three tiers of safety ratings. The Registrar's office is then using this data to assign classrooms for in-person sections in coordination with facilities to ensure health safety guidelines are met. The Pigott building is looking like it will house the greatest number of courses as its ventilation system is the most state of the art. There has been some concern regarding late summer hires of adjunct faculty being able to complete the CDLI faculty trainings. The CDLI is working on crafting an accelerated training module for these adjunct faculty. Dale Watanabe and Jeff Philpott are coordinating to make sure there are on campus course offerings for first time international students. Academic advisors are quite active and working hard to connect with students and ensure students know the modality of their courses.

**Questions/Discussion**

- c. *It was noted that there were mixed responses from the Deans regarding pass/fail options. Could the Vice Provost please summarize both sides of the argument expressed by the Deans Council? During the WQ and SQ there was an understanding that circumstances were extraordinary enough to warrant the pass/fail policy shift. Students were unable to perform to their usual standards due to factors outside of their control. The current question is, are these circumstances still present going into the FQ? Deans who were less in favor of the policy noted that online education during the SuQ has been standard for years and going into the FQ students have adjusted to, and had advance warning of, online education. The opposite side of the*

argument is concerned that the ongoing pandemic, the continuing BLM protests, the pressures of the current political climate, etc. continue to make it difficult for students' education.

- d. *The Law School's entering class started over the SuQ with a required class that was graded as normal. The Law School did adopt a pass/fail option for the SQ. However, it becomes increasingly problematic for job placement if students are not awarded standard grades. Certain schools/colleges may have similar difficulties or requirements for their students and may need to stay away from a pass/fail grade system. Those in favor of the option have argued within the appropriate context of their specific school/college.*
- e. *The College of Education finds itself in similar circumstances with some courses requiring letter grades to demonstrate competency in certain courses. College of Ed faculty would like to see this decision left to individual programs. Students need to know that they are making the progress that is expected of them, especially when it comes to achieving certification.*
- f. *To a certain degree, there is a dividing line between undergrad and grad education. The economic crisis (on top of the pandemic, the ongoing protests, etc.) is hitting undergrads particularly hard and a pass/fail option, for undergrads at least, would help students continue to navigate these unprecedented circumstances. It is true that students have gained a greater understanding of how to cope with online education, but faculty are worried about how uncertain or rocky the fall will be.*
- g. *The leadership must consider who is advantaged and who is disadvantaged by the universalization of a pass/fail policy. Will students be compared to each other if one chooses a pass/fail grade and another opts for a letter grade? And how will this affect the perception of their education? For example, the University of Michigan MBA program does not offer letter grades but instead a pass/fail option for the entire program. If the pass/fail is framed in an appropriate way for certifiers and employers, would it stand up to scrutiny within the system? SU is including a transcript note that articulates that pass/fail grades were granted under extraordinary circumstances. Does this language still send a deficit message? The leadership and Registrar's Office will examine re-drafting the transcript language to better show that a "pass" grade in a course equates to full fulfillment of a course's requirements.*
- h. The ABET accrediting body made a lot of accommodations for the WQ and SQ but has not released guidance for FQ yet. Faculty have noticed in their conversations with students that more students chose the pass/fail for GPA reasons rather than circumstantial reasons. Faculty in Science & Engineering felt that the pass/fail option affected students' commitment to courses.
- i. The pass/fail issue will be examined in further detail in the FQ when the AcA has resumed formal sessions and can vote on a recommendation.

## II. Academic Calendar Working Group Update *Jen Marrone & Kevin Krycka*

2:25 – 3:05

- a. The ROC-ACR representatives thank the AcA for the opportunity to meet with them today. Overview offered of meeting agreements, purpose, and conduct. A list of ROC-ACR committee members was presented.
- b. **Context for the Work of the Committee:** Strategic Directions Goal 1 asks us as a community to reimagine our curriculum (ROC). It names the academic calendar review (ACR) as an essential first step toward that goal. We use ROC-ACR to reflect the active connection we have to the Strategic Directions. With the current and predicted challenges ahead, we start now to build a stronger SU in a better position to attract students, faculty and staff and retain them. Regardless of the ultimate outcome of the committee's work, we are still called to explore all options.
- c. **Common Questions:**
  - i. *What is an academic calendar?* It is a basic structure that sets major dates from billing to advising to university events. It can advantage and disadvantage certain groups of students. The lens of equity is being used throughout the review process.
  - ii. *What does it do?* The academic calendar has a huge impact on the life of students, operations, staff, faculty, etc.

- iii. *What are common academic calendars?*
  - iv. *Why review our academic calendar now?* Amid everything going on, why now? The committee finds itself asking in response to this question: why not now? The committee feels that now is the time to use the momentum of the Strategic Plan to drive us forward to answer critical questions. While the pandemic has added to the pressures previously being felt regarding enrollment, it has not, nor should not, stall the process of identifying solutions.
  - v. *We have been here before, how is this time different?* The AcA membership is encouraged to read the final document of the group convened in 2009. No major decisions were made, and nothing ultimately happened. There was not enough institutional drive or buy-in.
- d. **Charge of the ROC-ACR Working Group** – The working group is charged to explore a full range of academic calendar options by gathering data, connecting to others outside the working group and learning from the SU community so that its review is thorough and transparent. (More detailed info can be found on the ROC-ACR website.) Working Group is focused on closely examining all the calendar options and is striving to be data driven in its considerations. The stakeholders in such a decision seem to care as much, or even more, about how a decision is made rather than the decision itself.
- e. **The ROC-ACR Approach** – We approach our work as university citizens with an inquiry-based mindset emphasizing exploration rather than advocacy. We will demonstrate our commitment to inclusive academic excellence throughout the review. We are grounded in our connection to the broader aims of the Strategic Directions. The committee would like to highlight its commitment to creating an inclusive process, ensuring no voices are shut down and its strong emphasis on equity. As the group receives feedback, the working group adjusts its process accordingly.
- f. **Foundational Questions: Do different academic calendar options involve significant or meaningful differences in...1)** Student learning and experiences, inside and outside the classroom? And involve significant or meaningful differences in our capacities to attract and retain students? (Student EEE). **2)** The amount of faculty workload and the quality of work experience for faculty, holistically? (Faculty Workload) **3)** The amount of staff workload and the quality of work experience for staff, holistically? (Staff Workload) **4)** Enhancing student learning through curricular innovation, re-imagination and resetting (e.g., ROC Goal 1 aims of inclusive academic excellence, infusion of Jesuit pedagogy, universal design, professional formation)? (Curricular) **5)** Financial viability, desirability, and achievability for SU? (Transition and Financial)
- g. **Sub-Working Groups:** 1) Student Engagement, Experience and Enrollment 2) Workload Calculations Staff 3) Workload Calculations Faculty 4) Curricular Innovations and Implications 5) Transition Support Needs and Financial Implications 6) Referendum Design
- h. **Phases of Work:**
- i. Phase 0 – Design & Preparation, March-May 2020
  - ii. Phase 1 – Context & Input, May-August 2020
  - iii. Phase 2 – Initial Models, Reports & Feedback, September – December 2020
  - iv. Phase 3 – Final Report, Development & Feedback, January – March 2021
  - v. Phase 4 – Referendum on Calendar Options & Decision, April 2021.
  - vi. The report and referendum result will go separately to the Provost, who will make a recommendation to the President, who will then present the recommendation to the BOT.
- i. **Common Calendar Models:** The ROC-ACR committee presented a table of Common Calendar Options. The table is a work in progress, and there is no standard model for how universities describe their calendars. There are some universities that have dual calendar models, much like SU. Due to declining enrollment and the increased pressures from the pandemic, universities are increasingly experimenting with different calendar models.

- j. **Small Groups:** The Aca membership broke into small groups to discuss the following question posed by the ROC-ACR Working Group: Spend 7-10 minutes discussing together how and why our current academic calendars (quarter for main campus & semester for Law), as well as the common calendars presented, provide opportunities and/or introduce challenges for various academic areas on campus. From this discussion, important issues ('hot buttons') are likely to emerge that ROC-ACR is interested in understanding as fully as possible. What are the 'hot button' issues identified in your respective areas that we need to know about? What do you need to know to have an informed opinion on academic calendar options?

#### Questions/Discussion:

- k. *Currently workload (especially for faculty) is focused mainly on teaching time. The faculty would like to see workload thought of as a much more inclusive category including preparation, advising, scholarship, etc.*
- l. *Would a potential calendar change affect the identity of the college in any way? Will the perception of the university change?*
- m. *The transition will require a lot of work on the part of staff, faculty, and administration. Will additional resources be provided to support the work that will need to be done? It is possible that increased staffing will be needed to accommodate the calendar shift, is this being considered as part of the planning process?*
- n. *There is desire to center the student experience in this process, especially the experience of traditionally marginalized student populations. How will a calendar change affect retention, both in undergrad and grad?*
- o. **Next Steps:** Sub-groups are conducting research and beginning to compile reports and recommendations where appropriate. The committee will be conducting open forums, webinars, and surveys during the FQ. These events will be followed by an initial discussion of viable calendar options. **The referendum is scheduled for the first week of SQ (e.g. the last week of March 2021).**

#### III. APPR Update Terri Clark & Bob Dullea

3:05 – 3:20

- a. The Co-Chairs of the APPR Committee offered an overview of last APPR update made to the Aca. The committee is currently in Phase 1A, the process design phase. The next phase, Phase 1B, will use the process designed in Phase 1A, to review programs and recommend programs to the BOT for potential sunseting, transition or closure. The university needs to pare down its academic offerings to maintain and sustain the viability of the programmatic portfolio of the university. The APPR committee has received an immense amount of passionate faculty feedback, including important critical suggestions that are informing the design of the APPR process. The concerns expressed by the Deans have aligned with the committee's concerns. A recurring concern expressed by multiple stakeholders, is the shared responsibility of sacrifice across the university. Stakeholders are asking why the curriculum is being so closely examined and no other areas? The answer to this question focuses on the fact that a huge amount of money is invested in the curriculum and the faculty that teaches it. To this end, the committee has been asked to clarify the information needed to give a clear, comprehensive picture of a program's finances. The committee is trying to make sure they are asking the right questions. The design of the process is interactive and will be adapted to meet the concerns of the faculty.
- b. **3 Main Challenges Facing APPR:** 1) Answering the question: What is the definition of an academic program? The Registrar's office counts 229 academic programs at SU. Institutional Research performed a study a few years ago with the specification that a program must be self-sufficient to be counted. Their research resulted in a count of 80 programs. These numbers do not account for the breakdown of specializations within programs. 2) Understanding the finances of a program. While revenue streams are relatively straightforward to understand, expenses are harder to properly associate with a program. 3) How do you assess, evaluate, and include in your criteria, factors such as: how does a program contribute to the university's mission and vision? How does a program advance an intersectional lens of diversity and inclusion? These factors are more difficult to measure.

**Questions/Discussion:**

- c. *What is an indirect overhead for a program?* Indirect overheads are defined as anything that is not part of the academic program itself i.e. Registrar's office fees, administration costs, facilities expenses, etc. Direct instructional costs are clearly defined as the part of a faculty member's salary that is coded for instructional purposes and is then divided by the number of courses that faculty member teaches. Indirect expenses or uncategorized/in-between expenses would include department chairs stipends and releases, lab support expenses, administrative related expenses, etc.
- d. *Is there individual data on these direct overhead expenses? Will general measurement criteria be created for these programmatic expenses?* For example, the expense associated with a lab manager cost, that kind of expense would clearly be associated with a program. It is very important to remember that the APPR process is not solely based on financial concerns. The entire project is much more nuanced and holistic, which makes it difficult. The main goal of the APPR process is to make SU's portfolio appealing and attractive to students. The APPR is centered around ensuring that students remain attracted to the quality and character of the university.
- e. *Would the university reconsider any programs if they were offered under a different academic calendar model? Or is the work of the APPR completely independent of the ACR-ROC?* This question has not been directly addressed by the APPR committee yet. The committee would welcome any questions or suggestions from faculty if they feel a course fits this situation.
- f. *Has the APPR committee investigated how other universities have integrated the more complicated lenses and factors into their portfolio review processes?* Yes, there is a working bibliography of various resources the APPR membership is using to inform their work and research.

**IV. University Safety Update Craig Birkliid****3:20 – 3:30**

- a. The campus itself has remained pretty quiet over the summer, with very peaceful days and more activity overnight. Last Wednesday, August 5<sup>th</sup>, 2020 there was an increased amount of protest activity. The 12<sup>th</sup> Ave. Starbucks (just across the street from the edge of campus) was vandalized and is now closed. Other than this incident, the campus has predominantly felt the effects of these protests as graffiti. Although, campus safety officers were redirecting and assisting students during the CHOP/CHAZ activity last month. Campus security has noted a significant increase in IV drug use on campus property as well as petty crime i.e. theft, break ins, etc. Last night, Sunday August 9<sup>th</sup>, 2020, there was significant property damage done to the Chase Bank and the Whole Foods adjacent to the campus. This activity has been attributed to anarchist groups, and not the BLM protests. Campus buildings continue to be locked and can only be accessed via campus card swipe. Buildings will continue to be locked during the fall quarter and students, faculty, and staff will need to continue to use their campus cards to access campus buildings. All students, faculty, and staff will be required to complete the self-survey health check, each day, before they access campus. People who successfully complete the health check will have a dated, green screen to verify they are cleared for campus access that day. Campus security is working with the Public Health office to train staff to assist with contact tracing. Facilities has set up a visitor screening check-in and a COVID informational spot in the Science & Engineering building lobby.

**Questions/Discussion**

- b. *Will there be an increase in security presence on campus during the FQ?* The security department does not currently see a need for additional officers. There are currently 30 public safety staff and officers and there are 4-6 security offices in the field, 24 hours a day, every day. The safety escort program will continue in the FQ. The security office expects to run safety protocols much the same way as last FQ.
- c. *How do faculty know that students/colleagues have been successfully health screened to be on campus?* Community members will need to utilize their mobile phones to complete the health survey. A confirmation e-mail with a green screen and the date will confirm that the community member has completed their

health check for the day. Those people without mobile phones or visitors, will be screened at the visitor check-in and given dated approval stickers to wear.

**V. Provost Update and SU BLM Response** *Shane Martin*

**3:30 – 3:40**

- a. The Provost hopes that everyone continues to be well during these uncertain times. The university leadership recently re-examined a report from a task force on campus climate and diversity issues co-chaired by Dr. Natasha Martin and Dr. Alvin Sturdivant completed in 2016. The university leadership recognizes that recommendations made in that report were not fully met. Many of these recommendations are still relevant today. The Provost would like to outline the major university initiatives concerning diversity and inclusion at SU.
  - i. The Provost feels that the creation of a bias incident response protocol is an absolute necessity. Seattle University needs a clearly articulated process for responding to bias incidents within its community. The Provost considers this a major priority and task for the fall and would like to begin the work in earnest in the FQ.
  - ii. The development of a formal, documented recruitment and hiring process centered around diversity and inclusion (particularly concerning the hiring of BIPOC) should also be a priority. Such a hiring handbook, for both faculty and staff would outlay the processes by which SU can recruit faculty, in accord with relevant court rulings and labor law, establish search committee guidelines and outline requirements for meeting the university's diversity and inclusion mission. Any best practices have been, so far, dictated at the local/program level. A university policy needs to be adopted. The goal is to have both the hiring handbook and the incident response protocol written and ready by the end of the 2020-2021 AY.
  - iii. In conversations with the Black Student Union, students expressed their desire for a program with financial aid support for the black student population. The Provost's office would like to see this program launched in the fall. University Advancement will be an important partner for this program.
  - iv. Finally, the university leadership would like to embark on a complete restructuring of Dr. Natasha Martin's office. This revision would include a realignment of reporting structures, the creation of a more robust support team in Dr. Martin's office to provide the office with the necessary staffing. Leadership would like to create a university-wide structure that connects Dr. Martin's office directly with the programs, schools, and colleges and their individual diversity and inclusion initiatives. The goal is to create synergy between all university efforts. This work will also include the creation of a Diversity and Inclusion Council under the leadership of Dr. Natasha Martin.

**VI. Pilot Evaluation of (1) Provost & (2) AcA President** *Frank Shih*

**3:40 – 3:50**

- a. There is no formal protocol for Provost evaluation. The existing academic leadership evaluation systems need to be strengthened and revitalized. Provost would like to ask the AcA to conduct an evaluation of his performance at the two-year mark of his tenure at Seattle University. While not a requirement, the Provost believes it is important for us as a professional learning community to model best practices for feedback and evaluation. The Provost sincerely appreciates the AcA's feedback on his performance and the AcA's input on an evaluation structure for the future.
- b. Santa Clara University has granted SU permission to use its Provost evaluation model as a template/starting point. SU's template could potentially utilize questions from the existing SU Deans evaluations. The AcA President will double check verbiage and questions with the executive leadership to ensure that the evaluation is appropriate. The evaluation template will then be sent to the AcA to complete.
- c. The AcA President would like to institute an evaluation of his office, as well as an internal, bi-annual, self-evaluation of the AcA's work.

**VII. Open Discussion (Academic Policy Needs, Upcoming Concerns)****3:50 – 4:00**

- a. *Is there any update on enrollment?* Transfer students are tracking to be on budget and continuing graduate and undergraduate student enrollment continues to hold relatively steady. Unfortunately, the university continues to experience considerable losses in its first-time college student populations. The primary reason being given for these losses is the social unrest in Seattle. This loss spiked notably when the media began reporting that the “Starbucks at Seattle University” had been vandalized.
- b. *Faculty continue to be confused about how the evaluation rankings for the APPR process will be handled. If programs are going to be cut, there will need to be very valid and transparent reasons for doing so. Is the APPR a purely financial endeavor or is the university taking a more holistic view of its portfolio?* A number of factors will be considered, including finances which are a central factor to the process.
- c. *How will the work of Dr. Natasha Martin’s office be included in every process and level of operation at SU?* The formation of a coordinating leadership council will be the first step towards integrating the work across the university. As the university reimagines its entire curriculum, every effort should be made to incorporate diversity and inclusion into the entire academic portfolio.
- d. CFO Wilson Garone will present a financial update/perspective for the university at the first AcA meeting in the FQ.
- e. The AcA President and the Provost thank everyone for their perseverance throughout this continued time of unrest and uncertainty. The Provost and AcA President request that everyone remain hopeful and continue to come together to weather this storm as a community.