

Minutes, SFA meeting, April 26, 2014  
8:15-10:00, Elkins Auditorium  
Guests: Dean Rick Marrs, Associate Dean Michael Feltner

Andy Yuengert opened the meeting at 8:15

**Devotional:** Ron Cox, given Holy Week, shared Robert Louis Wilkins's thoughts on fifth century Bishop Cyril of Alexandria, noting Christ conquered death as a human, opening for us his power to conquer death. "Human nature made a second beginning" at his resurrection.

**Minutes:** A motion was made and seconded to accept the minutes from the SFA meeting of 3-26-14. Approved!

**Honoring Retirees:** Andy noted that Victoria Myers and Phil Thomason were retiring. They were unfortunately not able to be present, but he expressed thanks for their service and noted they will be sent gifts from the SFA.

**Professor of Practice/Lecturer Proposal:** Mike Murrie explained the origins of the proposal dating back to Kevin Iga's 2010 presidency. He had created an ad hoc committee that summer out of concern about visiting faculty treatment, workload, payload, and frustrations with having business cards with "visiting" on them. The committee looked at how other universities dealt with titles and other concerns, but no consensus emerged about how to handle this. A proposal from that time was seen by chairs and SFA, but kept being put on back burner. A big concern was what to call the position, with the latest iteration being professor of practice or senior lecturer depending on discipline. The current proposal also includes a peer review mechanism, which currently doesn't exist. This proposal will provide for reviews, more permanent titles, and better treatment in terms of salaries. It won't be a neat process because we have a hodge podge of existing arrangements, but the proposal has been through three committees in five years, and this is the best we can do before moving forward.

The floor was opened to comments:

Comment: Based on experience from being with AAUP (was President of AAUP chapter) knows the statement on contingent faculty well, and the two biggest issues for them is academic freedom and faculty governance. The biggest challenge she has with this document is academic freedom; she has concerns with points in this document where lack of clarification about process, since as AAUP clearly states, contingent faculty are not protected by tenure and may be particularly vulnerable to retaliation in carrying out governance duties or pressure from administration or other faculty; would ask that this committee look at these two issues; Also raises one point in this document about the expectations for promotion in the various categories—who would decide that? One person? Finally, thinks this proposal is

contingent on the Growing Seaver proposal. If we increase contingent faculty, we'll put pressure on governance and academic freedom.

C: An E-mail from visiting faculty was read to those assembled: This person has taught here for a long time (since 2002) and not having job security has been unsettling and stressful. Every year they face the prospect of losing income and benefits; salary has been flat for a decade and has not kept up with inflation; prices of gas in particular have increased, so transportation consumes 37% of my take-home pay. Any changes from proposal at hand would be much appreciated and have an effect on quality of life.

C: Comment by reader of e-mail: This person is less concerned about title, etc., and more about basic needs. Language teachers are paying for four days of transportation, and this person can't come to today's meeting because this would be fifth day.

C: Anecdote from someone who was a visiting faculty in the past, noted that someone in advancement was making more than her with PhD. This needs to be addressed; also pay for adjuncts hasn't changed and needs attention.

C: Another visiting faculty member, finishing 9<sup>th</sup> year in visiting position, finds it embarrassing to have to present a business card when directing an internship. People think you aren't the one to talk to. Visiting professors often consider themselves part of this institution, campus, but don't feel treated fairly. She is excited about the prospect. She noted the irony that she had sat on the ad hoc committee but couldn't be official because she wasn't regular faculty.

C: Can we revisit who gets a business card? Has been a contingent faculty in the past, and the title doesn't reflect what you pour into the work. The little things count, and adjuncts, visiting, whatever role, should get business cards.

C: Business division doesn't have a lot of full time contingent faculty, but they are an integral part of our division, adjuncts, too, and the way we treat them is wrong and unchristian. We don't give them respect from the University, don't pay them adequately, and that needs to be fixed. Longer than one-year contract are needed. Q. Is anything proposed related to the period of contract? A: Yes, in the proposal There is a reference to three years and six years.

C: Someone who visited for 6-7 years before tenure track spoke, noting that when they became tenure track, had reduction in contact hours, but received a 50% increase in salary as Asst Professor II. It is shocking how little pay they had received for all those years for how much they had worked.

C: A visiting professor noted that they love working at Pepperdine, believing in the mission, but the name visiting is an issue; it is hard to buy a house because name visiting suggests you don't have long-term income.

C: Humbled by the stories and by how many Visiting Professors we've used; concerned we shouldn't use this as an excuse to hire more contingent faculty with the excuse that "now they're compensated appropriately." This is clearly happening in academia and this might make it easier for to hire more visiting professors who are still poorly paid.

C: Thanks to those who brought this proposal forward; it is long overdue, for us, and it seems a moral imperative to move forward; this is classic exploitation of labor, and we should push this and push this very hard.

C: An original ad hoc committee member who has taught here for 14 years noted that many visiting faculty are here because they love to teach; But, because of their position, they are held back and they could contribute more if they were outside that limited scope, if paid more, or given more time for research/scholarship; They think that about a dozen have been here over 6-7 years (not sure the numbers). Even if the wave of education is not to hire more tenure track, we need to remember that people here now could benefit, and this would benefit the whole university, and some specific programs like the multi-media design major which has students knocking on door to do that.

C: Kevin Iga, past president and on original committee, spoke based on experience with the first committee that some points still need to be considered; first, there was an original concern that the change would be a doorway to administration to hire more visiting faculty: we should look at that and see which positions should become tenure track and what should become something else; he noted that visiting positions are used for a variety of reasons, there are temporary or sabbatical situations and those would remain; some are working as faculty but whose job description do not neatly fit into what is professor; example, people whose main job is to teach in a program but for what ever reason, we don't envision it as research intensive position or someone whose contribution is valued for other reasons, but if they were subject to the standard RTP process we would be setting them up for failure. We looked at a lot of other universities; and there was a wide degree of opinion that others are grappling with this but there are different kinds of universities; Duke is bigger, with high research expectation, and use Professor of Practice just when they are bringing in professional experience in various areas to bring something new to the classroom; Especially in communication or business this is common where someone is bringing professional experience but they are not part of academia per se; we need a category parallel to RTP, but not with the same kinds of criteria. An industry leader who wants to teach is different from someone who we value who can teach in the classroom but never got PhD. The point is there are different kinds of categories. Thought was that details would be fleshed out after the proposal passes, with different categories, different kinds of visiting faculty and what there roles would be.

C: Didn't see in the proposal, noted we have situations where people have been reassigned (e.g. to administration) for as much as ten years, and their replacement has been a visiting person. Should there be a formal process when people are asked to do administrative activities, and they are removed from teaching, assessment, etc., and their replacement doesn't help with these. Could we do something about that problem?

Q. On salary negotiations, is it on agenda for salaries to be negotiated between SFA and administration on visiting positions? A: We don't really negotiate salaries for professors, but does put this on the table, because proposal says after promotion after 6 years that the person be given at a minimum what a new assistant professor makes.

C. No one represents visiting and adjunct faculty members. We need to raise the issue with administration, not just our (tenure-track faculty) salaries, but visiting Profs as well; It is embarrassing how much (little) we pay our colleagues. They teach more and are paid less; we should raise issue as faculty with administration in tangible ways, such as how much adjuncts are paid per course, and not just be concerned about our raise/our percent.

C: Mike Murrie noted that if anyone has language, please send it forward so it can be put in the document; we didn't try to solve all the problems in this document, hard to address all, but you've pointed out some good things, please send forward. All comments should be sent to him as point person.

Andy noted that the hope is to bring this forward in the Fall. He thanked visiting professors for their service and noted they are our colleagues and should be treated as such.

Mike noted that all full time faculty are represented by SFA, whether tenure track or visiting.

C: The SFA president's role in salary negotiation process should be clearer.

### **Growing Seaver / Merit Pay**

Dean Marrs spoke (with PowerPoint) on Growing Seaver College

He noted that he would be making general comments, not walking through the 51-page proposal.

He opened with points from a Higher Ed conference he had attended in January about the current state of higher education nationally, noting declining enrollments at undergraduate institutions (46% had noted declining enrollments), including at private universities and those with less than 4000. Even well known names are having some trouble (like Loyola in New Orleans, Trinity in San Antonio, Grinnell).

At Pepperdine, we've been discounting 30-40%, while some schools were already to 40% and even 60%, so what we consider bad news is even worse in other places; Moody's credit rating has been downgraded at almost every university in the country, with selective privates an exception; we tried to stay the same and our package presentation worked. There is evidence a lot of schools are under resourced, not getting raises, changing health and benefits, experiencing layoffs or decreases in operational funds, etc.

At Pepperdine in the last 2 years, growth has been 1.4% and under 1% in last couple of years, with no growth in revenue. So, it is hard to grow budgets, at salary line and at operational line.

He reviewed the timeline for Growing Seaver:

August 2013, concept paper presented to President and Provost

September 2013 presented to SFA as a concept paper

Oct 2013–Jan 2014, faculty/staff focus groups met to gather information on academic excellence, mission enrichment and areas needing to be addressed

Feb-April 2014, his office assembled specific information for appendices supporting proposal (including items faculty had asked about), which was presented to the president last week to favorable review, and this is now to faculty (via e-mail/link).

Dean Marrs showed the series of appendices in the document, e.g. Enrollment Plan, Enrollment Management Considerations (pace), Course Projections, Faculty Projections (lower student/faculty ration than what have); classroom analysis and course schedule; staff needs, which is a big one for divisions, deans, all kinds of departments; Space needs on academic co-curricular, housing, etc.; budget proposal; marketing; other areas (like Payson, IT, cafeteria, financial enhancements through Growth), last appendix is Monitoring and Assessment, which includes built in safety nets so we could shut growing Seaver down if as we move forward it doesn't work; metrics include admission indicators, faculty (FTE, etc.), student success, retention, student/faculty ratios, Courses, academic programs, student affairs, and financial dynamics, etc.

Dean Marrs addressed the question: Given grim data for universities, why grow Seaver? Because if we grow, we can control our destiny. Our money would come from increased revenue. He noted, that faculty often ask why don't we make the programs we have better rather than bring on new programs? Well, this is a proposal to make the programs we have better.

Another thing driving this, faculty won't see impact in first few years because there would be more resources, and in first years, as we grow, we would move overenrolled students into base budget lane, so we will have the same number of students, but we will have them budgeted differently. We'll have a different source of revenue than when you have one-time money. One way to think of this is, 15 one year growth plans, and another way, in those 15 years there will only be significant

growth (more than 10 students) in seven of the 15 years, in the rest, there will be none or less than ten students. They have tried to build in safety net.

How was material in appendices gathered? Twenty-five or so people worked on it, some faculty, but most were out of his office; primary criteria was that we need people with expertise or people who had information, e.g. mail services, Sodexo, etc. Edna Powell helped with such numbers.

Also, Dean Marrs stated that we've already put some things into play, so even though proposal wouldn't kick in yet, we had things we needed to address. We secured a firm this year to help us award financial aid. We gave them our priorities for the class, but then they worked out a system and they allocated the financial aid; they saved us money, and we think over the next few years, they will continue to do so. Another firm is helping with admit letters/financial aid, and now all students get one eight page brochure, with a customized letter in the middle; year one, every student got the same look but next year, we could customize it further by a particular major or division. A couple of universities are doing this and it's paying dividends for them; the cost is minimal. So, we are already putting things in play to deliver the classes in a cost effective manner.

Dean Marrs said would try to convince administration we need help now, and that it would help us if some things get front loaded whether we grow or not; For FY 15 we got, based on what we heard from faculty that we needed:

Increased money for faculty salaries

Money for mentor program (for a GE or major class)

Tutoring center money

Increased money for travel and research funds, about \$500 per faculty

Funding for general staff support, and support for administrative staff, including development

Dean Marrs commented further on marketing, stating that we have a commitment to deliver quality classes. We just got a new staff person to help us in financial aid area; a challenge there has been that we've had the same staffing for years; also given questions about how an increase in size will look for mission and heritage, we have hired arguably the highest profile speaker out there who speaks in front of about 60,000 teens a year, and we have secured him to help us promote Pepperdine (this will be announced in a few weeks).

Marrs is interested in faculty feedback as they look at appendices; e.g., are we missing anything, do we have numbers we need to tweak?

Dean Marrs opened the floor to questions.

Q: Is there any consideration for tracking national rankings and seeing if any impact on national ranking over time by what this will do?

A: It's not specifically in this proposal, but we are constantly looking at that; we did that a few years ago; With U.S. News, for example, we know how they calibrate the different areas, so a few years ago we worked with IT to create a dynamic model to look at what areas they use for data that already fit what we are trying to do, like faculty/student ration, which would have impact on rankings. One reason we got money for 20 opportunity hires was to get the student/faculty ration down; levels that are hard to move include alumni support, but we're always looking at that; we try to enhance things we're already trying to do.

Q: Regarding the hope that we can grow Seaver's revenues and increase the share of those revenues that Seaver can use, is this a reference to the way the university distributes resources across the schools. I'd like you to speak to that, as dean of Seaver and as prospective Provost (laughter). He feels a lack of transparency at least to faculty about distribution of resources across schools.

A: Seaver is doing well, and one reason we did well in the budgeting process was a desire in operational lines to help people do what they're doing well. Challenge is expense to revenue ratio, that's a challenge, and that did move; I've tried to argue for Seaver's sake to just move it a point or two and what we capture really helps us; There has been sympathy, but if you are wondering why we don't capture everything: We benefit from parts of universities that don't generate revenue, counseling center, library, etc.; a lot goes toward that; but we have been moving and there is a lot of sympathy in the office of financial planning to help us.

Follow up q: Can you comment on the perception that Growing Seaver is in large measure is to save GSBM?

A: Growing Seaver has always been argued even at senior admin level as well as by us, and increased expenses are going to be in Seaver, not in non-Seaver places except some university areas like mail service, parking; but we will capture revenue from Growing Seaver. It won't go elsewhere to solve challenges at other schools. He noted they haven't asked him yet to help him with their issues.

Q Will there be an academic task force? Ex: when we were considering hiring art history, we did comparison of programs to understand what would be good approach, then compared to our program and mission, then made choices about what to go for, etc. I wonder if something like that has been done for Growing Seaver, wondered if some places we'd grow, computer science issue was raised by students in the Graphic, we need a Latinist, etc.

A: as we move forward we would need a group to be looking at all this; this is where SFA Exec may play a role to see what such a task force should look like, what it's make up might be.

Q: On divisional structure, it is hard to get people to be chair now and given how hard it is to be one, are we looking at the structure of divisions?

A: informally but not formally it has come up; in the next couple of years these would be kinds of questions that are good to tackle, because in that time there won't be new students. It would be good to think about what reconfiguring would look like or if we need more reassign time, etc.

Q: What is the role of adjuncts and visiting professors in the Growing Seaver proposal? Is there any way some of this unrequested money could go to increase salaries of visiting and adjunct professors?

A: The unrequested money went to a different area; this is an already made decision. The Dean worked with Seaver chairs/cabinet, and got a positive response. Nationwide a lot of schools are moving toward adjunct and part time; we have decided to go the other way: in a number of cases, we have clustered three or five adjunct lines and created a visiting position, what we get is better from a visiting professor than a handful of adjuncts; also with the health care act, any adjunct who hits 30 hour mark, we have to provide benefits; in this climate lots are cutting back hours for adjuncts, we're in an interesting place where we could pick up people who might look at us now if we have a visiting line; already tried to visit areas we knew about, e.g. in areas where there are fewer faculty than we need like sports medicine, for example, leaving in place a visiting after someone from abroad/sabbatical came back; also very much aware their salaries are lower than they should be. Our challenge is there is one pot/pool for money and once we pull for tenure track there is nothing left. Still, we've been gathering money and have in last couple of years been bumping up visiting salaries.

Q: Had seen a proposal for new class schedule: how was that proposed and deliberated and how do you plan to vet with faculty?

A: It will be fully vetted with faculty; we've learned people are doing things all over the university, for years, we've heard that we're underutilizing space, but now space analysis shows we have significant gaps where facilities are underutilized; if Seaver used space more efficiently, and we're willing to meet you, will you help us?

It's on the table, primarily a schedule to use the day more efficiently. By tweaking we can pick up a lot of class times. No decision has been made, but we have learned in benchmarking that one way is to spread course load through the day more efficiently, incentivizing teaching at less popular hours (e.g. more money) might work; other schools do this and while we've made no decision, it's on the table.

Q. A virtue in proposal is being bold, but he is concerned about dichotomy of higher education going in one way, fewer students, and sense of faith that we can attract same high quality student. If we can't, he worries this will become a vicious cycle; rankings do matter; an equally bold move would be fewer students. He would like one of the things we measure to be whether this has a negative effect on ranking; we should acknowledge its importance in the market and use it (even if we don't like it).

A: The proposal is configured to shut growth down. There is a breather every few years to slow down. We've had unintentional growth, which the Dean attributes 125 students or so specifically to decisions to make the university better or to make Seaver better; to give one example, in 2005 and then a little later, the university was supposed to make 10% cuts over a two year period; in year 2 a decision was that the schools couldn't handle it, so we didn't do the second 5%, but something less, but at that point, Seaver said we could handle additional students rather than cut operational lines. All nonacademic areas had to do the full 10%; over the past 10-12 years we have intentionally increased our head count and it has had no impact on our rankings. We run in the 50s, with lots of schools fighting for the 35-50 spots.

We could go in the other direction, the idea suggested that what if we got smaller and improve academically. But, you'd be limited with what we could do with revenue; operational lines would drop as revenue lines drop; we could argue to keep them the same, but that would be hard to get.

On the road, the Dean has seen a dramatic demand for what Seaver is offering; there is a lot of high quality students who are a great mission fit.

Q: It was suggested that there is a lack of questions today; we're buried, and we didn't have time to read the document. Rankings haven't changed because faculty and staff have worked very hard and that can't continue. What is the timeline for input?

A: There is no timeline set. The proposal is in front of the president. He thinks that this data shows it should be going forward. Based on shared governance, we need to be in consultative mode, we need information from faculty on where we need to tweak it, change it, make it better; that's where we are at this point. The quicker the better, but there is no crunch, because the proposal is to be implemented in another year.

Andy noted: Please send comments to the Dean and Michael Feltner

Q: It's something we're going to do. Is that what you said?

A: No, it's something I've recommended, and support bubbles up all the way to the board. When we were looking/gathering data, I had an aha moment, when I saw that schools we consider aspirational (like Wake Forest) have about 65% of their total enrollment as undergraduate students. Our undergraduate enrollment at Pepperdine has moved from around a third of our total enrollment to almost half. It's an interesting dynamic, and helps us think about what our undergraduate enrollment should be.

I have asked to present Growing Seaver at the university level, the University Planning Committee.

C: Thanks for providing details as we have asked. The suggestion was made to SFA Presidents, Andy and Ron, to devote our first meeting in the fall to this proposal and to open it for review and comment, after we've had the summer to read it.

Q: Admission may gather information on why people come or don't. Could programs get more info on why we lose students to Chapman or other places? Is it scholarship dollars (likely)?

A: The Dean noted he was in Dallas, and people came from Oklahoma and afar. People kept coming up trying to figure out the financial aid. It's a huge deal; families that have ability to pay still want to know what they'll be given; we have to be very strategic. We could get the data, but it's hard to get from students who go elsewhere. UCLA, USC, UC San Diego, are some of our top competitors, and we also have NYU, Fordham, the Ivies, and SMU as our competitors.

C: Wonders if young Christian high schoolers might not have Pepperdine on the list of top Christian universities around the country.

A: There are a lot of Christian high school students, and we are now trying to get Seaver out in public arena better.

There were a few more comments on Seaver not having a brand that is well known (as opposed to the university).

The Dean made a final brief comment about Merit Pay, saying that he had asked for multiple buckets, and we're getting that. Also, Michael Feltner and he had looked at 30 years of salaries of peer and aspirational schools, and while we were behind before, in the last couple of years Pepperdine is number 2 in percentage increase behind Vanderbilt. Seaver salaries outpaced the rest of Pepperdine.

### **RTP, SFA, University Committee elections**

Andy made reflective comments. He has seen how hard people work and really appreciates people who volunteer to take difficult positions. He wanted to mention a couple of people in particular, Levon Goukasian, chair of RTP the last couple of years has had glowing reviews. Chris Heard, chair of Academic integrity, also works very hard. These are two of the hardest committees. He also thanked David Strong, for his work on salaries and his dogged pursuit of data.

Election Results: Andy showed the SFA election results:

President Elect (President 2015-2016): Karen Martin

Secretary/Treasurer: Darlene Rivas

SFA ExCom representatives: Business Administration: Regan Schaffer;

Communication: Sarah Stone Watt; HUTE: Mason Marshall; ISL: Paul Begin;

Religion: David Lemley; Social Science: Robert Williams

There will be another election to replace Karen Martin as Natural Science representative from candidates Don Hancock and Tim Lucas

Another election will also be held in the next couple of days to decide the following:

RTP

HUTE candidates, David Holmes and Steve Parmelee

Fine Arts candidates: Gary Cobb and Cynthia Colburn

Social Science candidates: Michael Folkerts and Brian Newman

Untenured Representative candidates: Ray Carr, Duane Myer, Heather Thomson-Bunn, one year position

University grievance committee choose three

Candidates: Stewart Davenport, Craig Detweiller, David Dowdey, Susan Helm, Ron Highfield, Jane Rodeheffer

University Tenure Committee: Candidates: John Jones, Frank Novak

Andy noted we also have faculty representatives on the University Planning Committee, (currently Kendra Kilpatrick) and on the University Management Committee, but that these are not elected

A volunteer is needed to be the Faculty Representative for Web Development Design Committee. Qualifications: institutional history, web experience (no programming needed). Will help to make decisions on current web updates project and will begin work this summer, though May 1, 2015, with 2 meetings per month probably.

Anyone interested who has these qualification please let Andy know. We need someone quickly to represent the faculty on this committee.

**Other business:** Ron Cox (SFA president elect) thanked Andy for his service as president. Ron noted Andy's sacrifice, hard work, authenticity and charity, and he gave Andy a small token of the faculty's appreciation.

At 10:00 a motion was made and seconded to adjourn. Adjourned!

Respectfully submitted,

Darlene Rivas  
SFA Secretary Treasurer