

Academic Assembly
November 19, 2018
2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 130

MINUTES

Present: Ken Allan (for Kate Koppelman), Felipe Anaya, Sarah Bee, Pat Buchsel, Terri Clark, Mark Cohan, Marc Cohen, Miles Coleman, Clara Cordova, Arie Greenleaf, Ben Howe, Naomi Hume, Nalini Iyer, Amber Larkin (for Cayla Duckworth), Kathleen La Voy, Shane P. Martin, Ben Miller, Michael Ng, Russ Powell, Frank Shih, AJ Stewart, Colette Taylor

Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes

- I. Review 11-5-18 Minutes
 - A. Motion to approve
 - 1. 12 approve, 0 oppose, 1 abstain
- II. Provost Update (*Shane P. Martin*)
 - A. Popko Lounge
 - 1. An alternative solution was reached: the McGoldrick Collegium will be staffed to remain open until 8:00pm, Monday through Friday, for the remainder of the academic year
 - 2. No longer a need to ask for Popko Lounge usage; motion at previous meeting was not seconded
 - B. Board of Trustees (BoT)
 - 1. At recent BoT meetings, nine faculty came to dinner and 10 came to the meeting
 - 2. Faculty were able to share their experiences at SU; discussion was candid
 - C. Pilot program to reimburse 50% of transportation cost for non-benefits eligible NTT faculty – details were in an email announcement
 - D. Updates from AJCU’s Provost and Chief Academic Officer meeting at Georgetown
 - E. Student Success
 - 1. Memo from Dr. Charles Schroeder, retention consultant to faith-based universities
 - a. Scheduling challenges, financial issues highlighted as barriers
 - b. We do not have the right infrastructure and relationship between Academic Affairs and Student Development – need to bring together what happens in and out of the classroom
 - c. Faculty do not feel like they have been invited to be part of the solution
 - 2. There is a group putting together a set of recommendations and a plan forward with an integrated approach, tapping into faculty expertise
 - 3. Discussion
 - a. Recommend to look at literature outside SU (e.g., calculus class size is a gatekeeper for STEM) and move now on what we already know from extensive research
 - b. Call for us to look deeper at class size and course management – could be an area to enhance Chair training
 - F. Strategic Planning Steering Committee
 - a. Faculty representatives are Marc Cohen (ASB), Katherine Raichle (CAS), Brooke Coleman (LAW), Erica Martin (STM), and Julie Homchick Crowe (CAS), co-chair Jen Marrone (ASB), Lucas Sharma, SJ (CAS), and Natasha Martin (LAW)
- III. Preliminary Faculty Pay Market Review (*Michelle Clements, Matt Philip*)
 - A. Overview

1. HR conducted a faculty compensation study over the past year
 2. Last study was in 2011, since then HR has not been involved in faculty pay analysis
 3. Committed to looking at this systematically moving forward, market equity is critical for our work, seek to balance doing it right and responding to urgency
- B. Summary of full time faculty pay benchmarking
1. A number of comparison groups, including Peer 11 (which has historically been our goal)
 2. On average, compared to all 4-year institutions in US, we compensate comparable faculty positions at 111% of median rate– this falls to 93% when compared to Peer 11
 3. Would like to continue with a ‘total rewards’ philosophy where we consider the competitiveness of pay and benefits, while also paying attention to cost of living, etc.
- C. Pay guiding principles
1. SU salaries target the average of the external market median
 2. Individuals salaries are determined by: internal equity, performance, and capability, prior related experience, teaching discipline, track/rank and time in rank
 3. Periodic market reviews/updates
- D. Discussion
1. Would be helpful to have exit data – not kept consistently at SU
 2. Difference with market rates in private industry (STEM, Nursing) is challenging
 - a. Look at the totality of pay, benefits, work-life, professional development opportunities
 - b. These need to add up to a compelling offer even if base pay cannot compete
 - c. Retirement benefit is one of our big drivers to compete in the job market
 3. One major issue is that faculty are pushed to seek competitive offers and then use those to negotiate for higher pay here to retain
 4. Need to also consider part time NTT faculty pay discrepancy
 5. Peer 11
 - a. Perhaps build out the Peer 11 up to 30 institutions and adjust for cost of living so that we have more accurate comparisons
 - b. Pay doesn’t always follow cost of living, some local markets are high and don’t have matching high salaries, or vice versa
 - c. Peer 11 was built for more than just salary compensation – meant to guide programming, financial structuring, and other areas
 - d. Could change the Peer 11 if SU determined that was best for the institution
- E. Potential next steps
1. Immediate: phase two of analysis being completed with each Dean to evaluate faculty roles in each school/college
 2. FY20 planning
 - a. Work with faculty subcommittee (populated with input from AcA) to develop pay structure and practices
 - b. Scope of impact determined, funding proposal developed
 - c. Presentation to BoT
 - d. Market adjustments funded for those roles below market median as needed
 - e. Pay program developed, communicated and posted transparently
 - f. Look at other factors to relieve living cost pressures
 3. Further issues to consider
 - a. Our pay increases for promotion may be below other schools
 - b. Need to make market compensation a regular process, every two years with a guiding philosophy

- c. Not yet determined how funding will be dispersed
 - i. Needs more discussion and a process in place to ensure equity across SU
 - ii. Perhaps not implemented at the Dean/college level
 - F. Other HR announcements
 - 1. On December 3, HR will announce that TIAA mutual funds are all shifting to Fidelity, will be complete in February, TIAA annuity options will continue
 - 2. Staff Council Steering Committee proposed a plan to Cabinet and it was approved
 - a. Email announcement forthcoming about next steps
 - b. Highlights: 19 seats on the new Staff Council, goal to be up and running by end of WQ19, council will request a non-voting seat on AcA
- IV. Update on Dorm Room Request for Transgender Students (*Alvin Sturdivant*)
 - A. Overview
 - 1. In Spring 2018, following a Spectator article and ensuing campus incidents, it emerged that there was a need for a housing policy for transgender, gender non-conforming, or non-binary students
 - 2. Through meetings with students, staff and faculty, and leadership, a change in policy was proposed for students to choose their housing situation based upon their self-identity
 - 3. Our online housing portal did not provide the ability to self-identify, instead, it was auto-populated pulling from student's listed identity in Colleague – have now developed a workaround
 - 4. Two commitments to students: open line of communication and open to meetings as often as needed
 - 5. Student Development will write the final policy, but will incorporate all discussions as best as possible
 - 6. Student response has been positive
 - 7. The focus from students is identity (transgender, non-binary, and gender-non-conforming) and not sexuality (LGB+), at this time
 - B. Discussion
 - 1. Other universities consulted including University of San Francisco, University of Redlands, and others – we have incorporated guiding principles and also our own lens
 - 2. Larger issue is safety, and the question is: are there other elements surrounding housing that still need work in that regard?
 - a. Nothing that was asked for that we were not able to accommodate yet – conversation is ongoing
 - b. Additional training has been provided for RAs, desk assistants, and full time staff to make sure they are responding appropriately and adequately to needs, language, and reporting
 - 3. How to make this public
 - a. Update website, integrate into recruitment and enrollment areas
 - b. Triangle Club offered a presentation this year at Summer in Seattle, and at Preview Days and other recruitment events
 - 4. Restrooms on campus
 - a. Already in practice for students to use the restroom that best aligns with identity
 - b. LGBT task force will be looking at campus and facilities (restrooms, etc.) this year, with recommendations forthcoming
 - 5. For students who change their identity while at SU, they can do so at the housing portal
- V. PRC Online Course Review Proposal (*Terri Clark*)

- A. Two parts to consider
 - 1. The pilot study of two online courses in Core Module 3 and two online course in Arts and Sciences (one each during WQ19 and SQ19)
 - 2. The larger question of how to approach the question of online courses moving forward
 - B. Discussion
 - 1. PRC has not solicited pedagogy research, there are small controlled populations that have been teaching online well already
 - 2. CDLI has a wealth of knowledge on this
 - 3. Student Athletes bring up another scheduling concern
 - 4. Do not want two-tiered Core experience, need clear parameters for online courses
 - C. PRC will clarify and bring a formal memo to next AcA meeting
- VI. Announcements**
- A. Next meeting
 - 1. Vote on URTC appointments – need to also look at this process across the university
 - 2. Need to get back to minimum governance standards across colleges
 - 3. Invite BoT Chair to discuss strategic planning and next President search
 - B. International students in doctoral programs need a social security number/employment – if looking for student employees, email GSCChair@seattleu.edu