

**Academic Assembly
March 28, 2011
1:30-3:30pm, STCN 130**

MINUTES

Present: Karen Feldt, Andrew Davis, Paul Fontana, Mary Graham, Kristen Shuyler, Allison Henrich, Rob Rutherford, Mary Graham, Chips Chipalkatti, Chuck Lawrence, William Kangas, Isaiah Crawford, Jacquelyn Miller, John Weaver, Dan Smith, Michael Quinn, Jason Wirth, Jeremy Stringer, Katherine Raichle, Brenda Broussard.

Excused: Sonora Jha and John Strait.

1. Welcome

2. Minutes from 3-14-11 were reviewed and accepted.

3. Biology Programs (Dan Smith and Dean Mike Quinn)

Programs were introduced and reviewed for current needs and future growth. The programs provide an opportunity for growth in majors and insight into how to build and make hiring decisions for faculty.

(Question: Karen Feldt) – How will lab space be handled prior to building being built? **(Dan Smith)** The current space will work with creative scheduling, which will consider a mix of lab and lecture. Some courses are field work, while some will be taught elsewhere, both of which will help with handling limited space. Teaching, research can both be accommodated. The main issue will be handling the lack of office space.

(Question: Chips Chipalkatti) – Please explain the connection with SPU. **(Dean Quinn)** There are financial and curricular tracks under consideration concurrently. SU has a memo of understanding with SPU. The legality of the contract must still be reviewed. 16 students will be able to be in field work at any given time. We have looked at other opportunities (i.e., Friday Harbor) which might have worked, but Blakely Island is a unique place we wouldn't otherwise have access to.

(Question: William Kangas) – What sort of start-up costs do you expect? Answer: 75K is the start up for each new faculty member. The 32K will go to global education for students. The principle costs to the university are with faculty. It's a matter of transferring resources from adjunct faculty to handle full-time faculty.

(Question: Jeremy Stringer) – What is the difference between BA vs. BS in Biology? Answer: The new programs will help students who are not pre-med, who are trying to avoid certain classes, and will attract new more academically qualified students.

(Question/Comment: Paul Fontana) – Dr. Fontana appreciates the request for new faculty. From a pedagogical POV, would it be useful to limit students accepted to program? Answer: There is a gatekeeper class (genetics), which students must pass in order to get into program. 250 were admitted. The growth projected will be slow and dependent on resources. Allow for strategic hires in faculty to hire into disciplines.

(Question: William Kangas) – How does the new core fit in with these programs? Answer: There will be six faculty brought in to handle new demand. This new program will allow for strategic hires to strengthen programs.

4. Program Review Committee comments

- a. **(Rob Rutherford Comment)** – These programs add a great deal to field of biology.
- b. **(Jason Wirth Comment)** – Both reach out to greater Seattle community.

- c. **(Dr. Crawford Comment)** – The programs are in keeping in academic renewal program. Might provide a signature program, which would draw in faculty, students. Exciting partnership with Blakely Island. SU and SPU have a memo of understanding on how we will work together, providing a framework. Next to Board of Trustees.
- d. Motion to approve PRC Memo of recommendation for Cell and Molecular Biology. (Passed unanimously).

5. Announcements

- 1. Core Revision – will go over in next meeting. Will need to vote on approving core structure.
 - i. Paul Fontana– Can we see results of survey? Karen will ask for results then circulate.
 - ii. Reviewing comments right now and will have more information on Friday.
- 2. Andrew Davis introduced himself and is filling in for Mary Rose Bumpus.
- 3. Karen announced that minutes, agenda, and support documents for AcA are on Angel
- 4. John Strait could not be here, but FHRC – still working on all of these issues.

6. Healthcare Leadership Executive MBA (HLEMBA) Program (Marilyn Gist, Joe Phillips, Dean of Albers School of Business)

MBA/Nursing discussed joint graduate program, initial research by graduate students indicated good timing for market, but decision made to broaden scope from nursing to health.

- 1. **HLEMBA Program Proposal.** HLEMBA Program initially focuses on leadership, then business core (accounting, finance, and marketing) framework. 17 credits will be dedicated to health sector including reporting requirements and non-profits (i.e., health care delivery, lean-process, regulation). Starting potentially as early as this fall. Leadership platform is already in place, so able to start right away. Gives time to find and strategically select faculty. Health leadership students are separate cohort, but will mix with broader group.

(Question: John Weaver) – 10-credits/quarter? Answer: Yes, there will be 10-credits in spring – there will be 4-credits of new content. Some faculty will be teaching both audiences. 15-20 students in each cohort. Will need an extra classroom.

(Question: Jacquelyn Miller) - Require more sections? Answer: Yes. As the program grows, the amount of dedicated sections grows.

(Question: Rob Rutherford) – Will we see new students or are we serving current students? Answer: Changing focus to be broader as Health Care Sector, this has already brought in six students by word of mouth.

(Question: Karen Feldt) – How is it different from Health Care Administration? Answer: Main competitor is Uof W. Uof W Business School does not offer a HealthMBA. This program is unique. Will this program model the sector differently? In process of creating an advisory board, which will include alums with Swedish, Virginia Mason and will be covering that.

Group discussed proposal and thought it looked good. Some thought more research could have been communicated had it been done. Nursing faculty will be hired with expertise in business and nursing.

- 2. Motion to approve PRC Memo of recommendation for HLEMBA. (Passed).

7. Bylaws (Paul Fontana and Allison Heinrich)

- a. Representation
 - i. Group discussed that Matteo Ricci College faculty historically came from other colleges, some are tenured and some are full-time non-tenured. Dean Andrews's letter suggests that they would like representation on AcA. They serve a

substantial number of students and tenure should not be the only factor. The university currently does not have a mechanism for faculty holding multiple appointments. THE FHRC is currently looking at that issue and will codify it forthcoming. How members such as this will vote will also be considered in the FH.

- ii. Motion to approve to add member from Matteo Ricci College. (Passed unanimously).
- iii. **(Question: Mary Graham)** - Is it possible to have flexibility with 1 to 2 representatives in the language? Discussion considered that representation might include program directors, dean, or faculty as a mix. Some (I.e., COE, graduate sub-committee adds an additional strain). AcA represents the university, while all members would be only on certain subcommittees. Subcommittee membership should be codified. Think in a broad sense about shared governance and what standing committees could be in place and how they would be made-up. Might also change how often AcA meets. The statement of purpose for AcA should be expanded upon in by-laws, which would then be codified in the FH.
 1. **(Karen Feldt)** Models – provide the group with a couple of models options that give structure, taking into consideration service load for faculty.
 2. **(Dr. Crawford)** Create a subcommittee to look nationally at models for shared governance. Then come back to AcA with findings. Might take a year or two. Increase transparency.
- iv. **(Comment)** At least 50% of representation must be tenured.
- v. **(Comment: Paul Fontana)** – would like to move forward on smaller structural changes.
- vi. **(Comment: Karen Feldt)** suggested that they provide a proposal of what is considered small changes for the next meeting.
- vii. **Meeting ended at 3:40pm.**