

Academic Assembly
January 8, 2018
2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 130

MINUTES

Present: Rick Block, Pat Buchsel, Terri Clark, Mark Cohan, Marc Cohen, Brooke Coleman, Miles Coleman, Carlos de Mello e Souza, Kimberly Gawlik (FSS), Allison Gibbons, Arie Greenleaf, Kathleen La Voy, Chuck Lawrence, Emily Lieb, Agnieszka Miguel, Michael Ng, Katie Oliveras, Erik Olsen, Steve Palazzo, Frank Shih, Colette Taylor, Kirsten Thompson, Travis Trett

Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes

- I. Review of 11-27-18 Minutes
 - A. Approved with no oppositions and five abstentions
- II. University Assessment Committee (*David Carrithers, Jeff Philpott*)
 - A. Updates
 - 1. Undergraduate Learning Objectives developed in 2010, purposely broad in scope
 - 2. UAC has attempted to use these objectives as the basis for reporting on university level assessment, but over the last several years found that approach not inefficient and too varied across individual programs to synthesize into a cohesive report
 - 3. UAC is now proposing to stop reporting individual assessment results to NWCCU and instead report on student performance on the Core Learning Objectives, which is more regularized
 - 4. Will continue the process of individual program assessment, but not synthesize into NWCCU reporting
 - 5. Rationale: simpler approach to compile assessment data, no separate reports to synthesize, better able to inform faculty-led improvement processes, used elsewhere (Gonzaga, etc.) and accepted by NWCCU
 - 6. Propose renaming ULOs to “Goals of a Seattle University Undergraduate Education” – use to inform planning and reporting
 - 7. For graduate programs, only program-level outcomes are reported to NWCCU
 - B. Discussion
 - 1. Major issues with the ULO assessment process
 - a. Trying to roll up all of the individual program data was qualitative at best, not quantitative, and a very loose and inefficient process
 - b. Will continue to report individual program data, but not rolled up to ULOs
 - c. UAC was not able to get the assessment data needed from Student Development or Mission and Ministry (now Campus Ministry) to cover the co- and extra-curricular areas of the ULOs that are not covered in a student’s academic experience
 - 2. How to not lose the ULOs when switching to this new process
 - a. UAC wants to produce an annual summary of ULO reporting, to be used internally (not reported to NWCCU)
 - b. Some areas covered by the ULOs aren’t found in the Core and need to be recorded and kept institutionally
 - C. UAC Charge

1. Previous charge when committee was developed: "To oversee the development and implementation of university learning outcomes assessment plans and to establish university policies and procedures with regard to the assessment of these outcomes."
 2. Now UAC is a subcommittee of AcA and has changed organically in focus and work, need to modify charter
 3. Proposed UAC Charter
 - a. Developing, recommending, and implementing the policies and practices governing the assessment of student learning
 - b. Making sure those policies and practices produce meaningful and valuable results
 - c. Sharing those results with the university community
 - d. Ensuring that the process and results are supportive of the University's decision making and accreditation efforts
 - e. Coordinating and collaborating with the Academic Assembly Program Review Committee, the University Core Assessment Committee, University Planning, and Student Development on assessment-related matters
 4. Proposed UAC Responsibilities
 - a. Staying informed of assessment best practices
 - b. Reviewing and encouraging alignment of program and university learning objectives
 - c. Reviewing and assuring the quality of SU's assessment of student learning processes and practices on a regular basis
 - d. Proposing policies, procedures, and systems to govern and improve assessment of student learning
 - e. Supporting departments, programs, colleges and schools, and divisions in developing more effective and meaningful assessment systems
 - f. Reporting to Academic Assembly on a regular basis
 - g. Reviewing and recommending university-level assessment initiatives
 5. Proposed UAC Membership
 - a. Faculty
 - One faculty member from each college and school (appointed by AcA)
 - One faculty member from Academic Assembly's Program Review Committee
 - The Director of the University Core or a faculty representative of the Core Assessment Committee
 - b. Administrators and Staff
 - Associate Provost for Academic Achievement
 - Accreditation and Assessment Manager from the Office of University Planning
 - University's Accreditation Liaison Officer
 - Student Development representative
 - c. Student membership in this committee is welcome
- D. Discussion
1. Proposed charter support of departments, programs, etc. still keeps silos, would be great to use UAC as a liaison entity to connect assessment across programs
 2. Not enough attention to working with faculty, need more of an emphasis on working with faculty to further assessment in accord with own distinctive learning environments
 3. Recognition that learning environments are diverse, assessment is complicated and challenging, need to emphasize both quantitative and qualitative elements of assessment
 4. Charter will be posted to AcA Canvas for discussion and vote

III. Faculty Handbook Revision Proposals

A. Lecturer appointment, continuing Canvas discussion

B. Rank and tenure review process (*Katya Emm, Katie Kuder, David Leigh, Jodi O'Brien*)

1. Overview

- a. The rank and tenure submission file includes opinions by: department, chair, school committee, dean
- b. Issue is to what extent these opinions are independent: school committee and dean seem independent, but when it comes to department and chair, more room for interdependence of opinion
- c. In some cases, department chairs are participating in department level meetings and there may be interference with the departmental statements
- d. Proposed revision is to ensure these two entities are independent

2. Current Process

- a. Albers, A&S, S&E are the only schools who have the process outlined above, other schools (CoE and Nursing) don't have separate departments and deans participate on more levels of the process
- b. From the perspective of the University Rank and Tenure Committee, the multi-tier process is valuable, with the intent to derive enough evidence and insight to ensure procedurally fair consideration and also sufficient and adequate evidence
- c. The question of the chair participation has, over the years, come up because there is such variation amongst how involved chairs are
 - i. Chairs feedback can be very valuable, highlighting areas that may not come through otherwise (teaching issues, issues with racism/sexism, service not otherwise recognized)
 - ii. However, can also be negative if the chair or department is experiencing acrimonious issues, although this tends to be evident through the multi-tier feedback
 - iii. URTC encourages AcA to consider how valuable the chair feedback is in the rank and tenure process
 - iv. Perhaps these chair issues should be addressed in the chair mentorship process, as opposed to the rank and tenure process outlined in the handbook
 - v. Want careful guidelines, but also don't want to tie hands
- d. URTC is very strict about the dean: dean has responsibility to inform the candidate of the feedback from all areas, and the candidate must have sufficient time to contribute more evidence to file, including a response to the feedback
- e. Candidates do not have access to files, but the dean is charged with summarizing the general points to the candidate

3. Discussion

- a. In cases recently where departments are small and there may be conflict of interest, college will sometimes bring in additional objective colleagues to form an ad hoc committee to participate in process and vote
- b. In S&E, allowance for chairs to participate in department meetings, but atypical
- c. In Albers, chairs sit in department meetings but do not vote, had a negative experience this year with a chair using their influence in discussion – at the school level, have the chance to invite everyone to the school committee meeting
- d. May be most helpful for Albers to clarify policy internally, rather than try to make changes from the top down that may have unintended consequences across the university

- e. Faculty Handbook is the minimum set of guidelines across the university, school handbooks should be more specific if needed for their own processes
- f. Tenure is a fraught process with a lot of fear and concern, but URTC evidence-based experience is that as an institution we do a good job of objectively considering the full body of evidence in a file

IV. Non-Tenure Track/Tenure Track Faculty Ratio

- A. Given the budget projections in the next few years, and expected cuts to personnel, Marc Cohen will withdraw his statement/motion
- B. Kirsten Thompson's statement
 - 1. Summary
 - a. Larger issue, addressing the increasing role of contingent labor at the university
 - b. Given the background of the union issue and the ratio of NTT/TT faculty, AcA needs to make a strong principled statement to push back against trend toward NTT contingent faculty
 - c. Important as the major representative body of the university to speak out, urge the university to reverse the upward trend of NTT faculty ratio, and call for disaggregated data to be provided to AcA so that we know the real numbers every year broken down by college/school
 - 2. Discussion
 - a. Should not back away from making a principled statement because of budget crisis
 - b. Support the spirit of motion and intent, but the budget crisis makes it easy for the university to lay off NTT and put more workload on TT (cutting research releases), so need to be careful about making a statement
 - c. AcA needs data from the past five years to identify trends
 - d. President's statement today was disappointing, need details of what the university is actually going to do
 - e. Online programs coming will make the NTT/TT ratio much worse
 - f. AcA does need to declare something – if nothing else, about compensation
 - g. Full time NTT are also worried about being reduced to part time
 - h. Need to be careful about academic differences between colleges, in COE better to have clinical faculty NTT than TT line filled in some cases
 - i. Is the right goal more TT or less reliance on NTT part time?
 - j. Deans are put into an impossible position and reduce budget by piecing together part time lines instead of one full time
 - k. Administrators have looked at faculty as a cost generator, however, have not looked at administration (Controller function could be done centrally for many different institutions), fundamental agency problem and conflict of interest
 - l. We must be careful not to entrench the two tier system, just at a slightly higher level
 - m. AcA needs to make a principled statement about tenure track lines in the larger milieu of higher education
 - n. Cannot allow concern about budget to dictate our moves – will always limit us
 - o. We don't have the data needed, suggest to request the data and then decide how to move forward
 - p. Gender and race ratios are important to take into account
 - q. Separate data request and principle statement