

## MINUTES OF THE FACULTY MEETING

December 4, 2007

With the customary motion to adjourn not later than 6:00 p.m., the meeting was convened at 4:05, and the minutes were approved with a correction of “graduate students” to faculty in the remarks of Professor Raaflaub on page one.

Professor Colwill reported that the Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) was forwarding to the President the results of the survey of administrators, faculty, chairs, and past chairs concerning the two-year pilot project of the office of Faculty Ombudsperson. The results suggest that there is need for such an office and for the predictable and immediate response and follow-up it has provided. Work on faculty committees has been gratifying. The Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) has worked upon the Faculty Travel Fund; Associate Provost Allen and Dean Vohra are seeking external consultation on salaries; the review of scholarly leaves for senior lecturers continues, as does that of the ad hoc committee on scholarly leaves for research faculty. The Committee on the Status of Women has been reviewing data on gender and rates of promotion. The Nominations Committee continues to produce heroic results; it is now evaluating the service awards. Professor Colwill noted the large numbers of staff, undergraduates, and graduate students involved in faculty governance and hoped that the preceding reception would be just one of many occasions on which the faculty can express their gratitude to these constituencies. An FEC report on the Plan for Academic Enrichment based upon extensive surveying and meetings with all constituencies is forthcoming.

Discussion followed the motion presented by Professor Lipscombe on behalf of the Academic Priorities Committee (APC).

### **Motion by the Academic Priorities Committee to Amend its Charge**

**SUMMARY:** Motion by the Academic Priorities Committee to revise its charge, effective immediately, for the purpose of adding new language regarding review of new concentration proposals and new graduate degree proposals.

**MOTION:** That the Faculty, in Part 1, Section 2.III.B.1 of the Faculty Rules & Regulations on Standing Committees: Academic Priorities Committee (APC) amend the charge of the Academic Priorities Committee so as to add the proposed new language (underlined and in bold below), and relabel the existing Part 1, Section 2.III.B.1.d to h as Part 1, Section 2.III.B.1.e to i, effective immediately.

#### **Faculty Rules & Regulations**

#### **Part 1. Membership, Meetings and Committees**

#### ***Section 2. Committees: Faculty Members Elected by the Faculty***

#### **III. Standing Committees**

#### **B. Academic Priorities Committee Charge**

## 1. Charge

### **d. To review proposals for new graduate degree programs and new undergraduate concentrations, in coordination with the Graduate Council and College Curriculum Council, so as to assess their impact on academic resources.**

**RATIONALE:** At present, proposals for new centers, programs, or institutes come before the APC but proposals for new graduate degree programs or undergraduate concentrations do not. The APC's current lack of a formal role in the approval process of degree program and concentration proposals is problematic both because such proposals often have resource implications for the university which warrant discussion by this body, and because there is no certain route by which the Provost will be informed of such proposals in a timely manner. For these reasons, the APC wishes to insert language describing a formal role for the committee in the degree program and concentration approval process. The Office of the Provost has worked with the Dean of the College and the Dean of the Graduate School to coordinate a process by which proposals approved at the Graduate Council or CCC stage would be directed to the APC for discussion. Upon approval by the APC, proposals would be directed by the usual process to the FEC and thence to the faculty.

Professor Blumstein questioned conflict between the proposed APC approval process and that already seated in the College Curriculum Council (CCC). Professor Lipscombe and Provost Kertzer stated the APC charge was resources and the impact of a new concentration upon other programs. Professor Silverman expressed concern about adding bureaucracy to an already difficult process. Dean Bergeron shared the concerns of Professor Blumstein and noted that some concentrations do not require new resources. Mr. Patterson supported the motion but asked for clarification of where final approval would come. When Provost Kertzer replied that it would come from the Faculty, Patterson noted that CCC approval of concentrations was final, and Kertzer stated that last year graduate programs had come to the Faculty, while Patterson disagreed. Professor Blumstein asked if APC decisions would overturn those of the CCC. Provost Kertzer stated that the APC would be working on the basis of institutional information not available to the CCC. Professor Colwill stated that review by the APC was not the same as approval. Professor Rowan asked if APC review should come first followed by CCC approval; Dean Bergeron suggested that several iterations were possible. At the suggestion of the President a motion to postpone was made by Professor Silverman and seconded by Mr. Patterson; the motion carried with the understanding that a summary of comments would be sent to Professor Lipscombe for committee study.

Having noted several meetings forthcoming to coordinate the final assembly of the materials for the Academic Enrichment review, President Simmons commended the UCS leadership for reaching out to students in the process. The feedback from the review is now in place. Community members can access the forthcoming FEC report on the Plan for Academic Enrichment website, along with other documents. Results of research suggest some general indications: the Plan has had a positive impact; it provides clear

goals and direction; investments in faculty, facilities and financial aid were appropriate and helped bring us “out of a hole” since measurable progress was made. We now need to re-focus to benefit from growth and achieve “balance.” Faculty growth has been important to “catch up” and achieve goals, but we need to provide adequate research, administrative, space and other infrastructure support. Going forward, it is essential to provide commensurate space (classroom, office, research) research tools, grant-writing support; classroom technology; and sufficient number of graduate students and staff to join and support new initiatives. To benefit from expansion we must “shore up” progress made and grow more modestly for a set period, assessing areas in need of growth and hiring strategically, supporting student curricular interests, and hiring more pre-eminent scholars. The goal of achieving international prominence should be made explicit in the PAE: to emphasize departments to achieve preeminence in research; to ration the creation of multidisciplinary centers; to build around internationally preeminent scholars; to focus on climate change/energy/environment through research, curriculum, institutional commitment, community collaboration, and to assure technology supports global collaboration. We must continue to value research and teaching, highlighting the importance of research more explicitly; finding new ways to reward teaching; ensuring technology supports the demands of current science. We must continue to attend to medical education. Matters of interest in the student experience include strengthening advising, enhancing curricular innovation; expanding efforts to retain diverse students and faculty, and investing in financial aid to remain competitive (undergrad, grad, med). Facilities need to be enhanced, with more common areas, study space, performance and event facilities. We should renovate residence halls, enhance accessibility, create common space for graduate students, and expand the wireless network. Next steps include continuing outreach (with reports expected from FEC, UCS, SAC) and reporting to the A&E (December 2007). After results are compiled and time has been given for the adequate consideration of implications and possible revisions, a report to the community and the Corporation will be issued in February. The President urged the faculty to consult the information on line, and, in response to questions about whether or not it was too late to obtain support for new programs or more support for existing ones, said that table of needs is still open. In response to a question about whether there had been adequate consultation with department chairs, Provost Kertzer said that there had been discussion with chairs in October and that it can continue. Common themes of the discussion were the strains on resources placed by increased size and the need for balancing multi-disciplinary interests with department needs. As discussion continued such matters arose as addressing specific department needs; improving UTRA and internship programs; the size and balance of graduate and undergraduate education; the need for support services for international students; and support for libraries, a primary resource that seems not have been recognized. President Simmons indicated that she believed departments and chairs are consulted as part of our routine processes. Vice President Spies noted the inclusion of such library improvements as improved student study spaces as part of the plan. President Simmons called for the community to badger leadership for increased library support, noting that while special collections do well in the Campaign, the general collection does not. She also expressed her general concern about balance and continued vigilance in planning, especially when facilities projects

consume so much of our campaign goal and implementation will not be complete for a decade or more.

Provost Kertzer reported, at the request of the FEC, on the issue of admissions and budgeting for the Graduate School since strengthening the Graduate School has been and will continue to be a major element of the Plan for Academic Enrichment. We have increased stipend levels to become and remain competitive with other top graduate programs; we increased summer support; we cover the cost of health insurance; and we now guarantee five years of support to incoming graduate students. The overall financial impact of these changes is an increase by 70% of our support for graduate students over the past four years. But it cost us \$14,000 to support a student in 2002, before the start of the PAE, and now it costs us nearly \$22,000. We have also seen a steady increase in PhD enrollments over the past several years, reflecting in part larger than anticipated entering classes in 2005 and 2006, but the balance between size and quality is important. The steady rise in applications over the past three is due to the attractiveness of the Graduate School 5-year package to outstanding candidates. This year's applications are running ahead of last year's pace. Selectivity is as high as 17%. The strain on the budget has been considerable and has caused occasional localized disruptions and has unsettled particular programs. Last year was especially difficult, as we felt the full impact of the new system on the budget of the Graduate School and had to adopt a more conservative approach to admissions than had been the case in the preceding two years. Some departments and interdisciplinary programs have had greater difficulty finding RAs to work with faculty on research projects, or TAs for undergraduate courses, despite the fact that the total number of supported students has increased, and the number of TAs has been more or less constant over a four-year period. Part of our task this year and in the coming years is to assess the progress made and to address the significant issues that these transitions have occasioned. A flourishing graduate school is essential to the strength of the University. The Graduate School has proposed to the URC an increase in the size of the entering doctoral class for next fall, and the committee is in the midst of discussing this proposal as it shapes its recommendation for the university budget. Dean Bonde is chairing a working group this year that is examining the health of the Graduate School and, among other things, assessing the question of the overall size of the doctoral programs. Clearly the expansion of the faculty has strained what was already a relatively small graduate school, and we are committed to giving this issue very serious attention as part of our review of the Plan for Academic Enrichment. But growing pains are sometimes challenging.

Dean Bonde spoke to her initiative. Meetings with department chairs and DGSs took place before Thanksgiving and target numbers will follow from this discussion. The Graduate Council and the working group will examine the shape of the Graduate School in light of support available on a five or six year basis. She noted pressure to provide TAs is acute, especially for departments and programs that do not house their own graduate students. Budgeting for graduate students in good standing to complete degrees will come from the Graduate School in the form of TAs. Procedures are being developed address specific instructional needs for TAs in areas like IR and to allow appointments to come in a batch to insure adequate numbers. She believes that planning will help but not

entirely solve pressing issues. The working group will continue to press upon such issues as the relation of TA availability and the shape of the Graduate School overall. Professor Raaflaub praised the progress and called for increasing summer support to five years. Professor Blumstein called for graduate funding similar to UTRAs. Mr. Patterson suggested the possibility of linking fundraising for graduate support to the College, due to the many benefits accrued to undergraduate education by the Graduate School. Discussion followed about how many master's candidates are to be counted in the Graduate School population (1/2 or 1/3) and whether their needs are being adequately treated in the review, with Dean Bonde noting that master's programs differ from one another, some being revenue producing, and she agreed that a strategic plan is needed. During discussion of the overall cost of the graduate program and how it is best accounted for, President Simmons noted that although progress had been made in the campaign for graduate school support and that fellowship funding was at 40% of the goal, the challenge remains tough.

The nomination of Professor Coppin, Visual Arts to the Advisory Committee on Honorary Degrees was presented by Professor Andrea Simmons for the Nominations Committee through December 31, 2010 was approved without dissent. The report of the Committee on Honorary Degrees was postponed.

There being no old or new business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:29 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen Merriam Foley  
Secretary of the Faculty