

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO AND OPERATIONS REVIEW

SCHOOL/COLLEGE PHASE 1 TEMPLATE



Name of school/college: Matteo Ricci College

Date: August 30, 2016

Contents

Introduction	1
Context for standard teaching load	2
Context for section sizes	3
Commentary and recommendations regarding current status.....	4
Opportunities for change.....	8
Other	9
Attachments to the school/college report	9

Introduction

Schools and colleges are asked to begin their work with careful review of the reports, data sets and guidelines provided by the university. This template is intended to inform the Workload and Operations Phase as explained in the [Process Outline](#).

Schools and colleges are required to respond to the questions below and are free to provide additional comments and analysis where worthwhile. Please note that this template is only one of the deliverables from schools and colleges in Phase 1 and is not intended to present a complete picture on its own.

Responses to the questions in the latter part of this template should be informed by completed department/program templates. Schools/colleges are encouraged to distribute the department/program templates before beginning work on the questions below.

Context for standard teaching load

First complete the [Faculty Category Overview](#) by articulating the categories of faculty employed in the school/college as well as the standard teaching load and other responsibilities for each faculty category.

Please provide the additional information needed to understand how the school or college defines or calculates instructional workload. Responses will vary by school/college but will typically address the questions below.

- What policies or practices impact faculty teaching load?
- What types of instruction are included in workload calculations? Is any credit-bearing instructional activity not counted?
- Are other instructional activities such as thesis supervision and project oversight included in the standard teaching load?
- Is your standard instructional workload based on the number of courses taught or the number of credit hours? If based on the number of courses, are there any circumstances in which the credit hours have bearing (e.g., 2-credit courses)?

Response:

Matteo Ricci College serves exclusively undergraduates in three degree programs: Bachelor of Arts Humanities (BAH), Bachelor of Arts Humanities for Leadership (BAHL), and Bachelor of Arts Humanities for Teaching (BAHT). Students in these three degree programs take a common set of Humanities-based courses that replace the University Core. Faculty who are housed in the College are either Full time Non Tenure-Track or Part time Non Tenure-Track. The College also covers a few of its courses with tenured and tenure-track faculty members from the College of Arts and Sciences.

The standard workload for Full time Non Tenure-Track faculty is seven five-credit courses. In a few cases, a three-credit course counts for a full one-seventh of a faculty member's workload. In these cases, extensive work outside the classroom on the part of the instructors justifies counting the courses as a full seventh of workload.

Independent study courses are not included in the calculations of faculty workload, but they may count toward faculty service to the College.

The BAHT and BAHL programs both include required credit-bearing internships. Faculty are compensated according to the credit hours for supervising these internships.

Faculty are not expected to produce scholarly work in order to fulfill their contractual obligations to the College. Faculty on a full-time or modified full-time contract (i.e., a part-time contract paid as a percentage of a full-time salary) are, however, expected to engage in service to the College, the University, and/or professional organizations. Faculty with greater than usual service projects have sometimes been given release time in order to work on those projects.

In 2014-15, a number of releases were assigned to faculty for service to the College, for example serving as Associate Dean or developing the Poverty Education Center, and service to the University, such as mentoring student applications for Fulbright fellowships.

Matteo Ricci College is unique at Seattle University in that the College collaborates with five Catholic high schools in the Seattle area (Kennedy, O’Dea, Forest Ridge, Eastside Catholic, and Archbishop Murphy) to offer courses in the MRC curriculum within the high school. These courses are taught by high school faculty who receive a stipend from MRC. In 2014-15, MRC spent \$11,000 on these stipends. Students who complete these courses are able to purchase SU credits for the courses at a discounted rate and apply the credits toward their SU degrees or transfer them to other institutions. In 2014-15, Seattle University received \$74,000 from students who purchased credits for these courses; this amount is for the most part not reflected in the credit hours attributed to the College in the AAPOR data, which only includes credit hours for students who matriculated at SU.

Context for section sizes

Please review the [Course Section Size Report](#) and [Summary Data Tables](#). These reports show, for sections at each level (1000, 2000, 300, 4000, and graduate), the distribution of course sections by size.

Informed by this review, explain your understanding of the drivers behind this distribution of sizes. Responses will vary by school/college but will typically address the questions below.

- What policies or practices govern section sizes?
- Are there externally imposed constraints from an accrediting or licensing agency? If so, explain.
- How does the physical inventory of rooms and their characteristics factor into section sizes? Are section sizes constrained by the size of a lab?
- What pedagogical considerations inform preferred course section sizes?

Response:

Regarding section sizes, there is a difference between humanities core and major-specific courses. Humanities core courses include students from all three programs, and for that reason these sections are larger than major-specific sections. The latter are based on size of the relevant cohort and are restricted to MRC students, so their size depends directly on enrollment in each MRC degree program. In general, we have capped courses at twenty-five. Twenty has been the preferred cap for pedagogical reasons (for example, a group of 20 is preferable for the seminar-style classes favored in the College), but enrollment fluctuations sometimes required an increase to 25.

Our section sizes are not constrained by external factors such as accrediting or licensing agencies. We have found the physical inventory of classrooms to be adequate to our needs. The university does have a shortage of classrooms suited to seminar-style discussions and some classrooms have furniture

that is difficult to move, making it challenging to employ small group discussions. Some of our courses are suitable for case rooms, which are in short supply. A greater variety of classrooms would be beneficial to MRC students and faculty for these kinds of pedagogical reasons.

If one or more of the course groupings provided in this report contains courses with different drivers for optimal section sizes such that a different method of grouping would be more informative, please identify the appropriate alternate way of categorizing course sections and provide this information to the Office of Institutional Research (IR). IR will then provide a revised report that will serve as the basis for your explanation to the questions immediately above. The section size categories (original or modified) will at a later stage be used as the basis for the [Scenario Planning Model](#).

Response:

The course groupings that are provided are appropriate.

Commentary and recommendations regarding current status

Making use of the information in the completed [Faculty and Staff Workload Profiles](#), please describe your sense of the equity of faculty and staff workload distribution. Responses will vary, but will generally address questions along the lines below:

- Is faculty workload relatively evenly distributed across your departments and programs?
- Is there a difference between the adjusted teaching loads (standard load minus any releases and leaves, as calculated in the [Faculty Workload Overview](#)) and the actual teaching loads (as calculated in the [Faculty Course Sections Report](#))? What circumstances led to this?
- Are there departments or programs that face particular challenges and how would you propose to resolve these?
- Is the current distribution of staff resources within the school/college optimal for accomplishing the work of the school/college? If not, how would you revise?

Response:

Regarding whether faculty workloads are equitable, we will focus here on the workload of FT faculty. Because MRC has not kept careful records of faculty releases, we have calculated faculty releases based on the difference between the actual teaching loads in the Faculty Course Sections Report and the standard seven-course load. Where possible, we have also consulted with the faculty members to confirm the number of releases received for service.

In general, the workloads of the FT faculty appear equitable in comparison to one another. Faculty who received releases for service seem to have had substantial service commitments that justified the releases. In two cases, it is unclear what service commitments were undertaken or completed in order to receive the releases, but in these cases the faculty were members of a religious order and their circumstances were unique. Instituting a regular Annual Professional Review for all MRC faculty,

and keeping the completed APRs on file, should assist MRC to provide accurate information for this kind of report in the future.

Regarding whether faculty workloads are equitably distributed across programs and departments, MRC is not divided into departments, and its three degree programs share staff and faculty. For example, students in all three degree programs take courses in the 1500 and 1800 series together. The staff of the College (Administrator and Program Coordinator) serve all three programs. In that sense, the three programs are supported equally. Enrollments of the three majors have varied over time. One year, a given major will be the least enrolled. The next year, it will be the most. So faculty teaching major-specific courses will have greater or lesser teaching burdens by year but not in a way that suggests we should redistribute course assignments. The efforts of staff and faculty, and their workloads, shift flexibly from one program to another as enrollments in the three programs shift.

Schools and colleges have a number of needs and responsibilities beyond the core academic functions of teaching, research and creative work, and scholarship. Examples include academic and career advising, marketing and student recruitment, technology management, and development/fundraising. The resources for such functions are in located within the school/college, centrally located, or managed through a blend of these.

- What observations and recommendations do you have regarding your ability—and the support you receive—in meeting all such needs and responsibilities?

Response:

MRC has several responsibilities beyond the core academic functions.

- **Academic and Career Advising**

The peer advising system at Matteo Ricci College is unique at Seattle University in that it is a system of students guiding students. The goal of the advising center is to provide academic guidance, often incorporating a second degree, a second major, or a minor into the student's degree program. Peer advisors help students understand degree requirements, assist them with appropriate course selection during quarterly registration periods, and encourage them to prepare for and reflect on learning from co-curricular experiences. The Director of Advising helps them build professional development into their planning process, guides them to reflect on their progress, and completes the final requirement review for graduating students. Particular attention is given to students who are transferring to Matteo Ricci College, planning for a leave of absence or study abroad, or taking courses out of sequence in a tightly structured academic program. Peer advisors attend to the various planning needs of individual students, while the Director of Advising is solely responsible for enrolling prospective students in their classes at Seattle University.

Peer advisors have no more than 25 advisees, and they are the educational guides for three out of the students' four years. The students' final year is overseen by the Director of Advising who guides discussions on post-graduation plans as well as making sure the degree requirements are fulfilled for a timely graduation.

The College is in the midst of evaluating its curriculum and culture as part of a strategic plan and program review process. The advising system at MRC is a part of that review. We will be assessing whether the current advising system is meeting its goals regarding both academic and career planning.

- **Recruitment and Marketing**

Matteo Ricci College puts substantial efforts into recruiting, marketing, and retention, including designing brochures and websites, participating in University events such as Fall Preview Day and Summer in Seattle, and hosting open houses for students from the five area high schools that offer MRC courses. The Program Coordinator spends approximately 20-30% of her time on recruitment activities.

Because MRC's degree programs have unique features, it is a challenge for MRC to make clear in its marketing materials the ways in which its degrees are structured as well as the ways that students can combine MRC degrees with degrees, majors, and graduate programs in other colleges.

In addition to the Program Coordinator, MRC's dean and faculty will be assisting with recruitment strategies and participating in recruitment events. We are working to collaborate with and build relationships with the staff of Admissions and Arts and Sciences Premajor Studies, who are our partners in recruiting interested students to MRC.

Two student assistants are now helping with recruitment, as was also the case in 2014-15.

- **Development/Fundraising**

MRC does not have an in-house development officer; rather, we share with another college a full-time staff member in University Advancement.

In 14/15, the Dean of MRC had an advisory board that met at least once to consult with the dean regarding fundraising activities. The advisory board did not meet in 15/16.

Sharing a development officer is currently sufficient to the College's needs. We plan to reach out to the Advisory Board this year and re-establish the Board as partners in developing the future vision and curriculum of the College. As these efforts develop, it is possible that the College will seek additional resources to support its development efforts.

- **Relationship with Consortium High Schools**

MRC has a longstanding relationship with five Catholic high schools in the Seattle area. At each of these schools, instructors teach courses for which SU may, upon the student's submission of a registration form and a fee, grant transferable college credit, and which students who matriculate at SU can count toward their MRC Core course requirements. The relationship with Consortium schools is maintained by the Program Coordinator, the dean, and faculty liaisons who receive a stipend (if on a part-time faculty contract) for their work with a particular high school. High school instructors of MRC courses receive a stipend from the College.

- **Poverty Education Center**

The mission of the Poverty Education Center (founded in 2010) is to promote more—and more effective—education about poverty at all levels of instruction. For the 2014-15 academic year, the Poverty Education Center sponsored events and programs that served roughly 1800 people, including Seattle University faculty, staff, and students; faculty and students from local high schools and middle schools; and members of the general public. The Center raised over \$21,000 to support its programs. Programming in 2014-15 included a series of events on higher education and inequality; the launch of the Teaching Civil Rights program; a major increase in the number of poverty immersion workshops; and an ongoing initiative on Peace and Post-Conflict Societies, focusing on Nicaragua.

Please provide an overview of the role of student workers in the school/college, responding to the questions below:

- What types of work do your student workers do? E.g., graders, administrative support, research support, etc. (This supplements the student worker information in the [Staff Workload Profile](#).)
- What logic or strategy determines which departments/programs receive student support? Is this periodically adjusted? (The [Budgeted Resource Overview](#) contains student wages by department.)
- To what extent do students replace staff support?
- Are your student wages/FTE more than you need, appropriate to your needs, or insufficient?

Response:

The student workers in MRC perform two functions; as peer advisors and as office assistants. The peer advisors mentor 15-25 students each. The two office assistants provide assistance to the Administrative and Budget Coordinator and to the Program Coordinator and Director of Advising.

MRC does not have departments, and student workers serve all three degree programs as needed. We adjust student support from year to year according to budget constraints.

Regarding whether student workers replace staff support, MRC has always had a peer advising system so in that sense there has been no replacement of staff advising support. However, if MRC makes a transition away from peer advising, we would likely need to hire a second professional adviser. The student office assistants do make up for the lack of a third staff person, which the College had until a few years ago.

Student wages currently are insufficient to our needs because when the minimum wage increased in January 2015, there was no increase to the budget for student wages. Therefore, we have cut back on student hours in order to stay within the budget.

Non-salary funding:

- The majority of the Portfolio and Operations Review is about people: faculty, staff, and students. What, if anything, is important to add regarding non-salary funding?

Response:

Of the various categories of non-salary spending, MRC tends to regularly overspend in Miscellaneous and in Bon Appetit (Food Service), due to the unpredictability of the expenses in these categories.

Opportunities for change

What else would you like to share regarding opportunities for change?

- If you had additional resources, what would you adjust operationally to improve? What would be the impact? At this time, we are not interested in academic program changes (refer to Phase 2 in the [Process Outline](#) for more about the academic program portfolio review), so focus your response on the other aspects of school/college operations.
- If you had fewer resources, what would you adjust operationally and what would be the impact? Again, in this phase, we are not interested in academic program changes.
- Are there ways that with your current level of resources, you could improve quality, effectiveness, or equity within your school/college?

Response:

Regarding the question of what MRC would do with more or fewer resources, we should have a much clearer answer to this question after completing the Strategic Planning process and the Program Review process that we are undertaking this year, and after seeing whether we can stabilize our enrollment in the next few years. A central factor in the College's future need for resources is its enrollment picture. In Fall 2016 we are under-enrolled in the freshman class. Our efforts are focused on reimagining the curriculum and recruiting students. Currently, we are cancelling unneeded course sections and we have cut back on student peer advisors. Once enrollments have stabilized, we will need to add sections to accommodate more students, and we will need greater staff, faculty, and student resources for advising.

As MRC imagines its future, there are several potential resource needs that may arise, such as faculty release time to allow instructors to retool for a redesigned curriculum. We may wish to redesign our advising system, which could necessitate either hiring an additional professional adviser or providing release time and training to faculty advisers. If we maintain the arrangement with Consortium high schools whereby MRC courses are taught by high school instructors, we will likely need to institute greater oversight for the sake of accreditation reporting. Such oversight would require additional staff or faculty time, which may need to be compensated. In addition, as curricula are redesigned and enrollments stabilize, MRC may need to hire additional FT faculty. In the future, we may consider a transition to TT faculty lines or we may wish to develop a formal means of reviewing and contracting for FT NTT faculty that provides regular professional reviews tied to greater job security and the opportunity for promotion. Such changes would likely have an impact on budgets.

Other

Please share any other information, concerns, or opportunities valuable to this process.

Response:

We are hopeful that this past tumultuous year will be followed by a period of creativity, collaboration, and renewal for Matteo Ricci College. The College has an opportunity, through its current strategic planning and program review process, to renew its mission and vision, along with its curriculum and culture. All of these potential changes will certainly have budgetary and staffing implications and impacts on future enrollments. There are some current commitments that the College maintains that it may not continue in the future, and new commitments that it may take up. Through a combination of new funding and reallocation, we hope to make those new commitments a reality.

Attachments to the school/college report

Attach any school/college policies relevant to this process, e.g., definitions of research activity, service expectations, or course release policy. Please list the documents below.

Response: No attachments.