

**Academic Assembly**  
June 4, 2018  
2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 130

**MINUTES**

Present: Rick Block, Pat Buchsel, Terri Clark, Mark Cohan, Miles Coleman, Carlos de Mello e Souza, Allison Gibbons, Nalini Iyer, Kathleen La Voy, Chuck Lawrence, Emily Lieb, Agnieszka Miguel, Michael Ng, Katie Oliveras, Erik Olsen, Steve Palazzo, Tracey Pepper, Frank Shih, Colette Taylor, Kirsten Thompson

*Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes*

- I. Review 5-21-18 Minutes
  - A. Several proposed amendments to the Provost Update and Diversity and Inclusion Update sections, will be proposed in writing at the next meeting
  - B. Motion to table the motion to approve the minutes, pending review of proposed amendments at the next meeting
    1. 12 approve, 0 oppose, 2 abstain
- II. MRC Seat on AcA
  - A. Overview
    1. Two years remaining on term
    2. Representative (Emily Lieb) will leave for just next year, then come back the following (final) year
    3. No MRC representative currently on FSS in A&S, will not be able to vote for leadership, important to keep MRC seat on AcA during the transition process of MRC into A&S
    4. Proposal to elect a substitute for next year (AY18-19), then have Emily back the following year (AY19-20), at which time the transition process will be assessed and the matter of AcA representation decided
  - B. Discussion
    1. Other departments in A&S do not have specific representation
    2. Perhaps to go back to the college and let it be decided there
    3. A&S will not gain another seat, proportionally MRC does not add enough population to add another A&S seat on AcA
    4. Given the level of organizational change, good to have continuing representation
  - C. Motion to leave MRC seat on AcA for the duration of the term (two years) and then take up as a body during the expiration of that term in two years
    1. Formal motion will be developed and emailed to AcA
    2. Vote will take place at next meeting
- III. AcA Board of Trustees Representatives Elections
  - A. Vote via paper ballot
    1. Finance: **Rich LeBlanc** (CSE) 8, Russ Powell (LAW) 6, Olha Krupa (CAS) 3
    2. Facilities and Technology: **Paul Kidder** (CAS) 9, David Boness (CSE) 3, Dylan Medina (NCS) 3, Deidre Bowen (LAW) 2, Francisco Guerrero (CAS) 0
    3. Investment: **Vinay Datar** (ASB) 12, Deidre Bowen (LAW) 5
    4. Student Development: **Mark Cohan** (CAS) 8, Jen Sorensen (CSE) 7, Deirdre Bowen (LAW) 0, Trish Thomas Henley (NCS) 1, Kimberley Harden (CAS) 1
    5. Intercollegiate Athletics Oversight: **Chris Paul** (CAS) 12, Deirdre Bowen (LAW) 5

6. Catholic Jesuit Identity: **Dan Washburn** (MRC/CAS) 12, John Topel SJ (LAW) 3, Kirsten Thompson (CAS) 3
- IV. NSF Advance Grant** (*Jean Jacoby, Sarah Trainer*)
- A. Overview
    1. SU receiving lots of external recognition for high number of women in STEM fields
    2. SU is the only US institution in which women head all of the engineering departments
    3. Women still face challenges in advancement, especially advancing from associate to full professor – data show that women stay at associate rank longer than men
    4. Proposal attempted to address misalignment of promotion standards, perceived expectations, and mentoring standards through the lens of gender
  - B. NSF Institutional Transformation Program
    1. Five year program
    2. Aim – faculty-led project to better align requirements for promotion with the activities of a comprehensive, mission-focused university: science education research, community engagement, public policy work, leadership service, etc.
    3. Broad participation across the institution and partnered with Loyola Marymount
    4. Three phases
      - a. Phase 1: Information gathering and communication – nearly 70 individual interviews with faculty, focus groups, administration, advisory board to consider the relationship between teaching, research, and scholarship – trying to figure out how to manage these requirements for promotion
      - b. Phase 2: advisory board will create a task force to work on data from phase 1 to develop a recommendation for new promotion and tenure guidelines, including ongoing and strategic training for chairs, deans, and rank and tenure committees
      - c. Phase 3: guideline revision process through all channels of faculty governance, including Aca
  - C. Parallel and overlapping programs with ADVANCE
    1. PAR-informed consulting on fairer practices for Contract Faculty
    2. Partnering with CSCE, Diversity and Inclusion, Center for Jesuit Education, Wismer, and others
  - D. Discussion
    1. Important work moving SU to realizing its better self
    2. Potential to inspire governance practices
    3. Collaborative process will begin in the fall with the formation of the task force – need to form the representative group first
    4. Five year grant with three phases: the phases don't exactly line up with the academic years
    5. Recommendation from AACSB to enroll in the Partnership for Responsible Research, too much money going into research that no one reads, looking at the overall picture of academia and scholarship requirements in general
    6. Structurally designed to connect to issues of hiring?
      - a. Not specifically tied to hiring, but can be used as a resource in the future
      - b. Valuable array of information
- V. HR Updates** (*Michelle Clements, Matt Philip*)
- A. Market Equity Study
    1. Staff portion just completed
      - a. 2012 study showed the staff gap to market was about 10%, faculty were closer to 5% gap

- b. Leadership requested additional wage pools to close those gaps
- 2. Now undertaking a similar updated study for faculty, referencing both national and peer 11 data
  - a. Faculty pay study based on full time
  - b. Nearing the end of the faculty pay study and will bring recommendations to the President and incoming Provost
- 3. Discussion
  - a. Concern with the way market rates are set for the part-time faculty salaries – unclear how these are determined and requests for more information are repeatedly denied
  - b. Cost of living must be taken into account – measuring cost of labor, not cost of living currently
  - c. New provost will provide an opportunity to look at pay structure
  - d. Should we take a fresh look at how we define our peers and take this into account for differing local markets?
  - e. Where are we drawing talent from, what is the level of engagement, who do we lose to? – need to understand comparative groups from this perspective
  - f. Concern with the pay for staff with the cost of living
  - g. Would be helpful for AcA to receive the reports that are being presented to the administration – need greater grasp of the details, without a union, who is protecting the faculty and staff here?
  - h. Pay grades are published on the staff side, will be a conversation for the faculty levels with the new provost
  - i. There is a cultural aspect – when pay levels are not published it makes people nervous and suspicious
  - j. Other ways to ease cost of living through benefits – housing benefits, other creative solutions that would help the university
  - k. Need to integrate conversation between Provost’s Office and HR about recruitment packages with regard to faculty compensation and faculty recruitment
    - i. Wages are definitely important, but recruitment packages often include stuff like research start-up funds, etc.
    - ii. Need to coordinate to think about total compensation for faculty recruitment and retention

**VI. Program Review Memos**

**A. Master of Legal Studies in Compliance and Risk Management Online (*Paul Holland, Erica Wolf*)**

- 1. PRC had a few concerns with resources and OPM, since it is a new model, but no major concerns
- 2. Discussion
  - a. Concerns with ratio of tenure to NTT faculty lines
    - i. Those who will be teaching in these adjunct roles (currently at the law school or new) need to be working in the field
    - ii. Practice oriented program, preparing people for work in the field
    - iii. The way in which one teaches law to law students is very different from what these students need – pragmatic ability to navigate the law, not performing analysis or preparing arguments, instead reviewing documents and compiling reporting
    - iv. Difference between compliance officer and attorney

- v. Hopefully drawing on those who have supervised these types of roles and drawing on the professional expertise
- vi. Assessment of these faculty would happen each term, on an ongoing basis
- vii. Traditional notion of adjunct, working professionals who are not piecing together a paycheck with courses
- b. Face-to-face Master of Legal Studies have different foci – not in compliance – these are taught by a mix of career and adjunct faculty because they overlap with JD programs
- c. Learning outcomes – only difference is related to the substantive area of law: compliance
- d. No risk that current students would switch to this program – completely different skillset
- e. CDLI will work with CAP to develop the courses, adjuncts will receive the fully formed courses to teach, AcA will review the full courses when they are ready
- 3. AcA discussion
  - a. Concern with the teaching exclusively by adjuncts, when there seems to be significant overlap with existing curriculum
  - b. Still unclear how this will be managed, with the current lack of curriculum detail
  - c. PRC memo includes recommendation to return to PRC/AcA when curriculum is fully developed
- 4. Motion to suspend the one week voting rule for all three new program proposals today
  - a. 16 approve, 1 oppose, 0 abstain
  - b. Motion to approve the PRC memo
    - i. 15 approve, 1 oppose, 1 abstain
- B. Master of Science Business Analytics Online (*Carlos de Mello e Souza, Joe Phillips*)
  - 1. Overview
    - a. Projection for hundreds of new students over the next several years
    - b. PRC recommended to accept proposal and work closely with CDLI to develop courses
    - c. Concern with OPM external vendor, lack of precedent and unclear relationship
  - 2. Discussion
    - a. S&E will offer 5 of the 16 courses
    - b. Curriculum was approved by curriculum committee and faculty in separate unanimous votes
    - c. Relationship between this and the existing program
      - 1. Side by side programs, students will be in one or the other
      - 2. Will not routinely move between them, however, there will be certain situations where students want to switch and will be considered on a case by case basis
      - 3. Course prices are the same
      - 4. Many faculty teaching in both programs, some faculty just teaching in one or the other
      - 5. Most of the time, a faculty member will teach in both
  - d. Market analysis
    - 1. Existing cohort for in-person will stay the same – approximately 35
    - 2. Enrollment estimates for program are for all students (in a two year program)
    - 3. Deficit figure is both salary and non-salary – startup costs for faculty training
    - 4. How many new faculty will be hired for the program, and what is the current ratio of TT to NTT in face-to-face program?

- b. In the current 15 course program, 14 courses are covered by tenure track faculty
  - c. Expect to hire tenure track, non-tenure track full time, and adjuncts (60-20-20 – same ratio that AACSB requires) across the lead instructor role
  - d. Also anticipate hiring 2-3 tenure track, 5 non-tenure track full time, and 15-20 adjuncts to teach sections under the lead instructors – will depend on program enrollment
  - e. OPM contract update – has not been signed yet, but negotiations are going well
  - f. Prerequisites became part of the program as it was developed this spring – that is one reason it is slightly longer
  - g. Considered doing a 3-2 program for current students and that way a BS wouldn't need to be a prerequisite, but could be combined into a full undergraduate to graduate degree track – this will need to be explored further after the program is launched and we see the results
  - h. Do not anticipate the online program drawing students from the face-to-face
- C. Professional Master of Business Administration Online
- 1. Discussion
    - a. Very similar to the above program discussion
    - b. Copyright issues for faculty developing courses
      - i. This will follow the existing university policy: if the faculty member leaves, they can take the course with them, and the university can continue to use it for two years
  - 2. Vote on MSBA
    - a. 16 approve, 0 oppose, 1 abstain
  - 3. Vote on PMBA
    - a. 17 approve, 0 oppose, 0 abstain