

**Academic Assembly**  
January 13, 2020  
2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 130

**MINUTES**

**Attendance:** Chris Paul, Yancy Dominick, Kirsten Thompson, Frank Shih, Mimi Cheng, Katie Oliveras, Sarah Bee, Marc Cohen, Margit McGuire, Dylan Medina, Patrick Murphy, Terri Clark, Russ Powell, Felipe Anaya, Shane Martin, Nicole Harrison, Mark Taylor, Kate Koppelman, Michael Ng, Kirsten Thompson

**Visitors:** Mary Petersen, Wilson Garone, Brenda Bourns, Stacey Jones, Dominic CodyKramers, Heath Spencer, Dion Wade

*Minutes Taken by Lindsey Nakatani*

- I. Review of 12-2-19 Minutes** **2:05 – 2:06**
- a. **Motion:** Move to approve meeting minutes from 12/2/2019. Seconded: **VOTE:** APPROVE: 10, OPPOSED: 0, ABSTENTIONS: 2
- i. **Motion is passed** – Aca 12/2/19 Meeting Minutes Approved
- II. Aca President Update** **2:06 – 2:07**
- a. “The most pressing issue facing our campus community is how to navigate through the revenue shortfall – find measures that will remedy the immediate deficit, while making meaningful structural changes (as quickly as we can) that’ll give us a shot at future health and improve our long-term outlook as an institution.”
- III. Provost Update, Presidential Search Update, CFO Budget Update** **2:07 – 2:30**
- a. Happy New Year Greetings from the Provost and best wishes for the start of the WQ. The current snow situation is being closely monitored by the Provost and his decision-making team. Feedback is welcome on this weather warning process.
- b. **Presidential Search Update: *Mary Petersen (Vice President and University Council)*** Ms. Petersen gave a legal update.
- c. **Overview/Update of the Presidential Search:** Ms. Petersen gave an update on the presidential search process.
- d. **Chief Financial Officer *Wilson Garone* Update:** Chief Financial Officer (CFO) last met with the Aca in December. Ongoing updates on budget related progress will be relayed to the Aca with more regulatory moving forward.
- i. *Progress Made Thus Far:*
1. Formation of the Budget Advisory Group
  2. Formation of the Budget Advisory Council for Faculty
  3. Upcoming Convocation for The Strategic Directions Document has been scheduled for Thurs 1/16/20
- ii. *First Projection for Net Tuition Revenue for FY21 and 5 Years Moving Forward:* The CFO’s office will be closely partnering with enrollment services and the Deans to re-structure the projection process so that it is more data driven and more accurate. The new process will rely on a combination of historical trends, market data and comprehensive

assessments. Maguire Associates is assisting in this effort by compiling data and familiarizing themselves with SU's history. The budget structures for past years have projected 6% growth when 2% growth has been the actuality. It will be difficult to reach the 6% growth marker that the original budget was built upon. Instead the most important goal of the 5-year plan, is to break even with the budget. Operating losses are projected and expected for the next few years. The CFO feels that this a reasonable ask on the part of the BOT and an attainable goal for the University as a whole.

- iii. **Questions/Discussion:** *What is the timeline for sorting out this years' and next years' budget cycles?* The timelines and goals correspond with presentations to the BOT. The net tuition numbers and projections will be presented on Feb. 21<sup>st</sup> at the next BOT meeting. At the April 3<sup>rd</sup> BOT meeting, the full budget plan and projections will be presented. The FY21 budget will be presented in full detail while plans moving forward for the next 5 years will be more abstract.
- iv. *Do the plans and projections consider the influence of newer online communities of students?* The CFO is cautiously optimistic about exploring and incorporating these numbers into the budget planning in terms of tuition numbers and enrollment projections. This caution is based somewhat upon complications and difficulties that have arisen with the marketing company hired to assist in the online education push in Albers School of Business and the Law School. One of the larger goals is *not* to have a second budget cycle. If the work can be conducted correctly in the beginning, this second "recovery re-assessment" cycle can be avoided.
- v. *Is the granular level of planning being done now, or will this planning depend upon the gathering of enrollment data?* Adjustments to tuition and enrollment will have to be made throughout the process. Variables will need to be kept open for movement and adjustment in the long-term planning.

**IV. Vote on AcA Faculty Recommendations for the Presidential Search Committee 2:30 – 2:35**

- a. Conducted via anonymous paper ballot (NOTE: Frank Shih, Kirsten Thompson and Chris Paul recuse themselves from the vote as they are nominees)
- b. Confirmed Nominees:
  - i. Rubina Mahsud
  - ii. David Neel
  - iii. Chris Paul
  - iv. Jeffrey S. Philpott
  - v. Christina Roberts
  - vi. Frank J. Shih
  - vii. Kristen Skogerboe
  - viii. Kirsten Thompson

**V. Vote on NTT Faculty Recommendations for the Presidential Search Committee**

- a. **Motion:** Move to affirm the four recommendations, put forth by the faculty. Seconded: **VOTE:** APPROVED: 15, OPPOSED: 0, ABSTENTIONS: 0
- b. Recommended NTT Members:

- i. Kevin Maifeld
- ii. Michael Ng
- iii. Wes Howard-Brook
- iv. Jennifer Shulz

#### VI. Division of Campus Services – Dion Wade

2:35 – 2:50

- a. **Introduction:** Mr. Wade joined SU in October but has been an SU community member for 7 years. As a department, Campus Services is focused on investing in the campus community and how offered services can enhance the connectivity of the SU Community as a whole. Campus Services works towards creating a more welcoming and inviting community overall. Mr. Wade and his department oversee Event Services, Reprographics, Koch Contract on the storage unit facility, the student store, the mail and copy center and many more campus services. Focus of the department has also turned towards how resources for each of these endeavors can be allocated in line with the new Strategic Directions Plan.
- b. **Questions:** *Students and faculty have noticed a 25% mark up for books in the student store?* Anything sold through the campus store does have a 25% mark-up. The intention was to create one-stop shopping for students. This is also why the course packs were sent to the student store rather than being distributed through reprographics. Experience shows that one stop shopping is of more importance to students than the increase in cost. Some faculty members have removed readings from their course packs to help keep the costs down for students. Reprographics does compete with outside sources. Faculty will often go to offsite sources because they provide the course packs as electronic, PDF versions.
- c. *What has the impact of Amazon been on the Student Store?* Significant loss has been noted in competition with Amazon. The campus store will do a price match for brand new text books.
- d. *Some students have noticed that they cannot find their course books in the Campus Store?* Most often that has to do with proper lead time for ordering books to fulfill orders. Without proper notice, the store cannot stock the books fast enough.
- e. *Concern regarding campus services not being made available to graduate student populations?* Some students are here after normal university hours and are therefore not catered to as widely as the undergraduate population.
- f. *Are textbooks marked up 25% as well?* Yes. Everything sold through the campus store receives a 25% mark up.
- g. *Some students have still not received books they ordered for the quarter.* Mr. Wade will conduct a follow-up on this issue.
- h. *Acknowledgement and thanks given to the Reprographics Team.* Commendation on the team's work ethic, response time and professionalism.
- i. *Thank and acknowledgement to the Dining Services team.* There has been an increase in better vegan and vegetarian options across campus.

#### VII. NTT Steering Committee Update/Presentation:

2:50 – 3:15

This initiative has been underway for a year and a half. The NTT Steering Committee proposes new Titles and Promotions for full time faculty in the form of the creation of a "Teaching Professor Series" that will replace the current "Instructor Series". This change also has implications for the current "Lecturer

Series” and the part-time faculty. Goal is to improve the experience for all NTT faculty at Seattle University.

- a. Main Goals of the Proposal
  - i. Improve title and promotion structure for NTT Faculty
  - ii. Consistency across colleges and schools
  - iii. Policies that advance SU’s mission and strategic plan
  - iv. Alignment of “Teaching Professor Series” with “Clinical Professor Series”
- b. The NTT Committee has created a draft proposal that is currently still a working document. The “Lecturer Series” is still under consideration by the NTT faculty. More discussion is needed with regards to the impact on part-time faculty.
- c. Key Elements of the Proposal
  - i. Clearly delineates the roles of clinical and teaching faculty
  - ii. Outlines criteria for promotion
  - iii. Budget impact
  - iv. Qualifications for Appointment
  - v. Conditions for Non-Renewal,
  - vi. “Do No Harm” policy
  - vii. Terms of service
  - viii. Conversion from existing titles.
- d. Progress: *Spring 2018* – Clinical Professor Series Task force was created, prelim discussions of “Teaching Professor Series”. *Fall 2018* – Establishment of NTT Steering Committee. *Spring 2019* – NTT Steering Committee recognized by the AcA, research and initial draft proposal created, open forums and focus groups held. *Fall 2019* – Integration of Clinical Professor Series Task Force and NTT Steering Committee, meetings with Provost’s Office and Faculty Services. *Winter 2020* – Meetings with AcA and Deans’ Council, campus-wide forums on NTT Titles and Promotions.
- e. Moving Forward: 1) Refinement of proposal 2) Submission of proposal to the AcA for approval 3) Analysis of budget and legal implications 4) Incorporation of proposal into faculty handbook 20-21 AY.
- f. **Questions/Discussion:** *There has always been a discrepancy between the SU faculty handbook language and the national standards of lecturers being of higher rank than instructors at SU. Has this been addressed by the NTT Committee?* The NTT committee has investigated more clearly defining the language for these two series. The replacement of the “Instructor Series” with the new “Teaching Professor Series” should help resolve this problem. It was the conclusion of the committee that the “instructor” title does not convey the appropriate dignity and recognition upon faculty members who are not tenured track (TT) but have a long history of service to the University. Rather than reverse the two tracks to comply with national standards, they would like to do away with the instructor series all together. This new series would maintain the crucial distinction that lecturers are not required to do service.
- g. *Why was the clinical professorship created in the first place? What is the difference between the teaching professor and the clinical professor? What is left of the clinical track once teaching comes into existence?* Clinical professors have a larger range of experience in an industry job

- outside of teaching. It is the intention that the “teaching professor” would be implemented in parallel to the “clinical professor.”
- h. *How would this affect compensation for NTT faculty? Would it bring them on par with TT of the same rank? How reliable will these tracks be in terms of job security?* The vision does not include a large salary overhaul, but the proposal would include an opportunity for small salary increases. For job security there are two options under consideration: 1) extending contract lengths and 2) ongoing appointments. Both would involve giving notice of termination of contract further in advance.
  - i. *What will be the difference between a “teaching professor” and a “lecturer”? Will it be the length of contract?* The “lecturer” currently operates as a kind of catch all for holes that open in faculty staffing. The “lecturer” series needs to be more closely examined.
  - j. *What about the term “adjunct faculty”? Does that term fit into the proposal? Does it go away? How is it defined?* The term “adjunct faculty” is used primarily because it is a required term in reporting to the Department of Education. It is a generic category for part-time faculty. It does not fit with the NTT faculty titles as they are implemented at SU. The term is also not used in any current title language in the SU handbook. The term is used solely as federal reporting language.
  - k. *Has the NTT Committee been working with the committee in the College of Nursing on their work on NTT titles?* Yes, some contact and coordination has begun between these two groups.
  - l. *Will the titles cause confusion/discrimination amongst the students? Will the titles stop some students from enrolling in classes? Will NTT faculty object to being titled “teaching professor” because it implies they do not conduct any research?*
  - m. Promotion would happen at 5-6-year intervals and NTT faculty would have to apply for promotion. Those turned down would be able to maintain their current title and reapply later. The transition for current titles into the new system will be difficult. The lateral transition has not been fully flushed out, but it is being looked at in detail.

#### VIII. **SGSU Legislative Agenda: Nicole Harrison**

**3:15 – 3:30**

- a. SGSU Guiding document for the year – what does the SGSU want to work on for the 19-20 AY?  
Vision: Reflective, Deliverable and Solidarity
- b. Student Success and Wellbeing: SGSU will work with Dr. Natasha Martin and Dr. Shane Martin to advocate for diversifying the curriculum away from Euro-centric and white narratives and content and improving ways of knowing and support undocumented students.
- c. Accountability and Transparency: SGSU, specifically the VP of Finance, will work with the University’s CFO and the administration towards full (as legally possible) university budget transparency and accessibility. The VP of Finance and the SGSU Finance Committee will keep the SGSU Representative Assembly apprised of exactly how much money was given to clubs in previous years and how much is left in our budget.
- d. Accessibility: In a commitment to improving the student experience in the classroom, SGSU will work with Disability Services to train professors about visible and invisible disabilities in relation to academics. Further SGSU will support Disability Services in ensuring students can share feedback to indicate if their professors adequately accommodate their disabilities. Partner with AcA, Office of the Provost and relevant stakeholder to remove punishments for attendance and tardiness policies in class.

- e. Sustainability: Internally, SGSU will commit to reducing its waste, including paper and other finite resources. Externally, we will encourage faculty to stop requiring printed work and articles and work with ITS to create an easier option to print double sided.
- f. Civic & Community Engagement: SGSU will work with community organizations to support community members and learn about issues in the neighborhoods around campus. SGSU will work with other colleges and universities in the Seattle Area to advocate for local issues and student concerns.

**Discussion and Questions:**

- i. *Who will decide specific cases in the absence of an attendance/tardiness policy?* Some instructors have already removed these policies from their classes. The current pedagogy surrounding these kinds of policies can and often is considered exclusive.
- ii. *What about in the case of accredited programs, where the attendance is required for the program to accredited?* To be ABA accredited, students must attend 80% of classes to pass. There are next to no exceptions to accreditation policy. Important fact to be considered when discussing removing the attendance/tardiness punishments.
- iii. Currently, accommodations go through the office of disability services. There should be an alternative, formal process for individual cases and issues. Administering an attendance policy is difficult for teachers.
- iv. Some universities have an office that verifies absences. This removes the Professor from the decision-making process.
- v. Hybrid courses with face to face time and online time are also a factor to be considered. Some students will miss the face to faces *because* they can make it up via the online classes.
- vi. Accessibility is also an important issue. There is a need for more training in addition to that already offered through the CDLI. Accessibility has presented problems to current students who rely on screen readers to attend class.

**IX. Upcoming and Preview**

**3:30 – 3:35**

- a. Student Evaluation
- b. Faculty Workload
- c. NTT Faculty ByLaws
- d. New AcA Bylaws
- e. Program Review
- f. Faculty Handbook
- g. NSF Advanced Grant Project
- h. Strategic Plant/Qtr/Semester