

CAS Faculty Senate Meeting—Minutes

September 19, 2016

- a. Senators present: A. Barrier, W. Boyer, V. Cassman (for A. Garcia), M. Cotsell, M. Dominguez Torres, L. Duggan, D. Galileo, P. Gentry, M. Greene, A. Hayes, J. Justice, S. Kaufman, J. Lambe, Y. Leung, B. Ley, D. López-Gydesch (for M. Carper), S. McKenna, J. Morgan, J. Morrison, J. Oestreich, N. Olabisi, R. Rawat, T. Rocek, S. Sarzynski, A. Selimov, T. Seraphin, J. Serrano, B. Smith, D. Smith, S. Tamioka, L. Winn
- b. Senators absent: L. Criston, M. Johnson
- c. Also attending: George Watson, Douglas Doren, Matthew Kinservik

The meeting was called to order by President James Morrison at 4:04 p.m.

Agenda

1. Welcome and introduction of officers
2. Adoption of the agenda
Adopted unopposed, save that John Morgan asked that the dates of the meetings in November and December be taken up under New Business.
3. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of May 16, 2016
4. Remarks of President Morrison
5. Transcript of Remarks of Dean Watson:

DEAN WATSON: So welcome to the new faces. Like you, it's the first time I've had a yellow card, so thanks for the bylaws revisions; I'm now a fully enfranchised voting member of the Senate. So I welcome you to this group. First, I just want to remind everybody the State of the College presentation and the faculty reception will be next Tuesday at 3:00 p.m. We're holding it an hour earlier than is traditional. There was an event that follows at 5:00 o'clock that makes that necessary. President Assanis has agreed to be part of the program. I'm giving him, as you can imagine, quite a bit of latitude, so I hope I have a few minutes to speak in the hour. We do have a very strong history of ending after an hour so that we adjourn to the reception, which is in honor of the newly hired faculty [UNINTELLIGIBLE] welcomes you.

It's not been announced broadly, but I did accept re-appointment as your dean for another five years. No applause necessary; I don't hear any coming. [LAUGHTER]

I have engaged in a listening tour of the departments. I visited with three different departments or units last week already, so I'm rolling that out. It's my listening tour. You can tell that there's a desire of some faculty members to have some more immediate access to the dean, and the issues that face you. This is an important forum for me. I've tried to use the Senate also to accomplish the same thing, but I'll be coming out to your departments, if not in the fall, then in the spring semester. If it works well I can see that we could try to continue this on an annual basis. And in terms of the listening tour, the mindset I'm trying to take as I visit is as if I'm your new dean, so as if I've just arrived on campus and I want to

hear from the faculty what's important to them. Now that's not the case at all; I've been in the Dean's office for 15 years in various capacities.

So with the indulgence of the President, that's it for my formal remarks. I'm willing to open up Q&A on any topic, for as long as you'd like me to hold forth. You could ask the first question, Jim, if you'd like; you used to play that role when you were a senator.

JIM MORRISON: One of the questions I keep getting is about the budget. The Senate has had a lot of discussions on the budget, both the University Senate as well as this Senate. Are you planning to discuss the budget at any time during the year?

DEAN WATSON: Yes, I think the format I used, in the past presentation, it might have been spring a year ago already that I did it, and I failed to do it this past spring. If that format that I used in the past is adequate, I can try to get an overall budget update position of the college. Some things to announce generally, I think it would be of interest to know, and I don't know that it's been announced formally, we were prepared to enter the final year of RBB; this current fiscal year was scheduled to be the final year. The Provost, the budget director, the deans, we had pounded out a - "pounded out" is the right term - pounded out a new budget model that, you know, I'd say we left a little blood on the table even at some of the deans' council's meetings. But we had a new budget model that we were shadowing this year and going to implement next fiscal year, starting in September a year from now. So with a changing presidential administration here, I think we're not there yet to implement that new budget model next fiscal year. So I think we are looking at, probably, unless it's tweaked, probably continuing with the same budget model, RBB, as we've been using, which was tweaked after Provost Grasso got here, under which we're flourishing a little better as a college. It looks like we'll be continuing to use that for two years. So I'll make a budget [presentation]; the budget presentation hopefully will make sense. We're in the same budget model; I'm looking at this year's projections, I'll give you a report on how we ended last fiscal year, which was in the black, by a little bit, and then look at some projections.

The challenge to the Dean's office, of course, and to the departments by extension is, we'll have budget meetings with our department chairs around January, we'll have position planning, work with department chairs. So we're always making commitments one year before they need to be budgetarily implemented. So we have searches going on now that become expenditures in the next fiscal year. So uncertainty in budget models does make me feel a little more conservative generally, since I don't know exactly, to a narrower kind of uncertainty, in where we land with the budget. You have to just be a little more cautious, and in fact, this hiring year I've felt a little more cautious than the most recent one.

Do come to the new faculty reception. We had on the order of 26 new tenure-track hires in the college. So it was kind of aggressively hiring last year because the budget projections looked like they were in alignment. I pulled up a little bit on that this year. The worst thing is to have freezes or significant budget cutting, so we do most of our budget balancing by trying to anticipate where we can allow some faculty vacancy here and there. So I will try to, what shall we commit to on that? [LAUGHTER] I think I'm in China, I think I am not able to come to the October budget [Senate] meeting. So the November re-scheduled [meeting]; how about we try to bring a budget presentation in November? I think we'll

know better where we're going also in subsequent years. How about you hold me to that? This semester. How about this semester? [OVERLAPPING VOICES] Andrea?

ANDREA BARRIER: Are you in a position to share with us how the new budget model is any different than RBB?

DEAN WATSON: The one that we are not going to do?

ANDREA BARRIER: The one that we were thinking about?

DEAN WATSON: The one that we are not going to do, or we might do, you know, we might do it with some slight revisions, or we might do RBB with some slight revisions. The similarities to me are more striking than the differences. The similarities are that there's still a lot of -, yes, I could probably do the budget; maybe this is my budget presentation today. No, in seriousness, you know, there's apportionments which are called ICOR, which was Instructor College Of Record and home school, which were whether the students are your majors in your college or not, continue to play a critically important role. We continue to have a little bit of erosion in our relative percentage of student credit hours, which is ICOR and number of majors on the campus. So because that still continues as a critically important element of any budget model that's decentralized like this, we have to really pay careful, careful attention to that.

The biggest changes are on two dimensions. Under RBB the unrestricted endowment income and the unrestricted state allocation was treated the same as undergraduate tuition, so it all went into Algorithm 1, so that not only our undergraduate tuition but our state allocation and the unrestricted endowment income was being apportioned to the colleges according to student head counts. In the new model, the state allocation is apportioned roughly to the size of the college, so relative to your overall expenditure, which is fair; I think that's fair. The unrestricted endowment income is going to first go to support the cost of the university outside of the colleges, the administration, athletics, grounds, things like that. And then the difference that it takes between the cost of running the university outside the colleges, and the amount that's available from unrestricted endowment income, is apportioned to the colleges on a flat tax against a modified expenditure, kind of like an income tax, if you will, but it's against expenditures, not revenue. So to me those were the two biggest differences.

You also moved away some more secondary things, where the so-called research incentive goes away in the new model. It's currently capped in RBB, so there's some net savings there. I think that's -, some technical things, I mean, it's still a Responsibility-Centered Model in that they're trying to put the revenue out where the decisions are made in the deans' offices and the colleges, on how best to invest those resources to have a robust enterprise. Is that enough of a sense?

I was an advocate of the flat tax. I think I still am, although any model has its pros and its cons, and when you start to understand exactly what's going on, you're going, "oh, really, I didn't expect to be paying tax on that".

Stuart, you were next, and I think [OVERLAPPING VOICES].

STUART KAUFMAN: Yes, I wanted to follow upon what Jim [Morrison] mentioned about hiring strategies. One thought that we had batted around was to ask you to give us a presentation on that, so the Senate can have sort of the big picture of what's going on with hiring this year, what's the distribution, what's the strategy behind that, what's the logic of it.

DEAN WATSON: Yes, we don't talk about that enough. I mean, after, you know, as decisions are being made and after the decisions are made. So I'd be happy to do that. Just a quick report. Of those 25 tenure-track, 26 tenure-track appointments that were made, 10 came out of 3 cluster hires that we established over the last year. So about 40 percent of the faculty that we hired this year came out of 3 cluster hires. So that gives you a sense of, you know, the 15 that came out of more traditional, departmentally-based hires. So I will give you a review of that. Again, at the State of the College [presentation], you'll see some of the outcomes of that

STUART KAUFMAN: And then going forward?

DEAN WATSON: And yes, then in going forward, so absolutely, in going forward, I think it would be good to see where, how we see the balance of departmental needs, which we did see that there were still accumulated quite a few departmental needs this year. There was a need to have more conversation about cluster hiring strategy so that everybody knows why we're doing it, how we're doing it, more importantly, so that everybody can be a full participant in that. Work to establish how it is that faculty members who are congregating around an idea for an area in which we cluster hire. Cluster hire is an interdisciplinary approach that we're planning to hire more than one faculty member. It's a cluster. There's interdisciplinary hiring. When I speak of cluster hires, that's one where we're identifying a theme that's broad enough so we plan to hire a couple of faculty members across a broader spectrum of the college, and frankly across colleges, when it's working really well.

You can imagine, if you heard President Assanis at the last week's open faculty meeting [on September 12], he's talking about, I'd heard it for a couple of days, so he's been consistent and coherent with that, as we think about expanding the size of the faculty, which will come by expanding the undergraduate student body, that will pay for it, which will lead to an expansion of our graduate programs, builds our reputation; somewhere in there there's a virtuous cycle. But that expansion of the faculty is going to be an interdisciplinary cluster hiring model. I can almost assure you of that, because that's how Stony Brook did it. If you want to know how we're going to do things, go check out Stony Brook. We did 8 years of the U. Penn model; I'm being serious, go check it out. The provost of Stony Brook over the past four or five years had faculty resources that were made available from the system. We don't have a system; we have to go get the money the old fashioned way; we have to earn it to do this expansion. So the system put, maybe it was 150 faculty lines into Stony Brook, and it was a campus competition for the best 15 areas in which to do those hires. So they identified 15 solid themes around which they could hire as many faculty members over a period of five years. I want to have from the faculty, from the department chairs, from my team, from our collaborations across campus, winning ideas coming forward, that will help strengthen graduate programs, to help meet undergraduate enrollment needs, to build the reputation of the university, etc. So it's going to be a very important year. I want to figure out how we're going to do cluster hires within the college. We're doing them well. I figured out I've got to

communicate it to you better and give you an opportunity to get your ideas out, and we'll be putting that all together over the period of the fall semester, preparing for, and hopefully, if there's any kind of central initiative that we can respond really robustly from Arts and Sciences. But even without that kind of campus-wide competition, we're investing more resources strategically from the dean's office in areas that we're identifying as significant themes of the college.

JIM MORRISON: So in graduate [education], the President said that the priority is graduate education this year. Is that correct?

DEAN WATSON: I didn't hear him being so narrowly focused on that, but that will be one of the emphasis areas.

JIM MORRISON: It seemed like it was one of his priorities.

DEAN WATSON: Expanding the faculty, expanding the undergraduate student body, expanding the graduate program. Yes? [LAUGHTER] Make your point, go ahead, I didn't allow you to make your point. So yes, it is. It is. To build programs, to have more doctoral programs in the top 10, I think will be a priority. So trying to establish where are we in a position to do that? Where are we in a position to move some our graduate programs into the top 25? How do we improve our relative reputational position as a research university? A lot of it scales extensively. As we have more faculty members, we'll have a bigger reputation, we'll be bigger. How do we pay for it? We have to teach either undergraduates or tuition-paying masters students. So we've got to expand our masters programs; we've got to have attractive masters programs, 4+1 programs and professional masters programs, whatever; graduate programs for which students will pay tuition. And then you have the extra resources to hire faculty and to more strongly support the doctoral programs. So it's not a focus on just one area. I can't advance the doctoral programs without getting it figured out how to have stronger masters programs for which students will pay tuition, professional, you know, etc., and the ability to perhaps teach an extra 200 students a year coming in. It's all part of the package.

JIM MORRISON: He mentioned at that General Faculty Meeting that he was going to, I guess he hinted, he was going to apply additional resources, right, for graduate education?

DEAN WATSON: Where do they come from?

JIM MORRISON: I don't know; that's why I was asking you. [LAUGHTER] He gave the --

DEAN WATSON: I gave you my perspective on where they come from.

JIM MORRISON: I don't know if anybody else was there.

DEAN: Yes, they can come from philanthropy. They can come from a higher allocation from the state; everybody says forget about that, that's not probably happening. It can come from increased endowment income. Let's hope we don't have another recession going into this next budget model like we did in 2007-8. Three-quarters of the revenue for our college comes from undergraduate tuition. And then you can always try to find efficiencies. So maybe there's some things that we're not doing as

efficiently as we could be to find some more resources. Did I forget one of the important revenue streams?

We're going into a capital campaign. We will get to a comprehensive campaign, and we will try to raise several hundred million dollars more. A lot of that will go into endowments to spin off rather than operating expenses. And we continue to have a lot of capital needs. The figure President Assanis uses is we have half a billion dollars, 500 million dollars, of deferred maintenance in our buildings, and where the deferred maintenance is so critical is in the science infrastructure, so how do you find the funding to do that? It's going to be a challenging couple of years as we find the resources to meet our ambitions.

JIM MORRISON: Any other questions?

DEAN WATSON: I'll take one more. John?

JOHN MORGAN: Yes, I want to thank you for the great detail you've provided us so far. I'd like to make a comment about budget modeling and all that, which is that the original motivation for RBB was that it was supposed to be transparent....

DEAN WATSON: I don't agree with that, but go ahead.

JOHN MORGAN: Well, that's what the folks in Hullahen Hall were saying.

DEAN: That wasn't a motivation, but it might be a consequence.

JOHN MORGAN: That's certainly what they were saying.

DEAN WATSON: It gets repeated a lot.

JOHN MORGAN: That's what Scott Douglass was saying, right? It was supposed to be transparent and it was supposed to incentivize faculty --

DEAN WATSON: I never did see Scott's budget, by the way. [LAUGHTER] His budget was outside of RBB, remember, of course.

JOHN MORGAN: Right, but it was supposed to incentivize faculty and departments in order to do things like start innovative new programs.

DEAN WATSON: No, it was supposed to incentivize deans' offices; that's where the money went.

JOHN MORGAN: I know, so there was a gap between the rhetoric and the reality.

DEAN WATSON: Could be.

JOHN MORGAN: And I would like to suggest that when negotiations are ongoing, when you spoke about "blood on the table" at meetings of deans, you are one of seven deans, but the chairs in this college are 50% of the chairs across the whole university. The faculty are maybe about 45% across the whole university. And I would like to suggest that I think it would be advantageous to our college if the

department chairs and the faculty were engaged in these discussions about how to tweak these budget models to get them working the way they should, especially for a university where undergraduate education is the primary revenue stream.

DEAN WATSON: Yeah, maybe. I don't know. The deans are a collegial bunch. Maybe it was "blood by a thousand cuts" or something. It's hard enough with eight people in the room, so I don't know how to engage.

JOHN MORGAN: Well, maybe the Chairs' Caucus could talk about it, right? Especially if you want to promote interdisciplinary collaboration between colleges. There's a role for chairs of departments in different colleges to have those discussions.

DEAN WATSON: Point well made. I don't know how I would do it. It's a presidential level-- The budget model is something that the Board of Trustees empowers the president to set. When RBB was brought in, President Harker brought that with him, he was kind enough to let the provost and the deans get engaged and try to figure out how we could make it work here. It doesn't need to go that way; it doesn't even need to be that transparent. We've had various centralized budgets in the past, so I welcomed the fact that at least somebody in the college had more transparency, more visibility into the process. That's a point well taken, I'll bring it up the next time I have opportunity. Thanks for the time.

6. Election of members to CAS Promotion & Tenure Committee (John Morgan, chair of COCAN)

The election of the slate of nine nominees for the P&T Committee nominated by COCAN took place. Each of the candidates receiving between 27 and 29 votes, the slate was approved. The new committee was reminded that the first thing it needed to do was to elect a chair from its own ranks. The members are: John Gizis and Klaus Theopold (natural sciences), Benigno Aguirre and Chandra Reedy (social sciences), Alan Fox and Ikram Masmoudi (humanities), Virginia Bradley and Blake Smith (arts), and Tony Seraphin (continuing-track faculty, at large).

John Morgan reported that all other college committees are now fully staffed.

7. Old business

8. New Business

Discussion of a suggestion from Stuart Kaufman regarding the formation of a committee to consider issues related to relations between the faculty and administration of the College:

STUART KAUFMAN: Yes, thanks, Jim. So as Jim said, we in the Executive Committee were kicking around some ideas for what goes on the agenda. One of the things we discovered was that some of the good ideas we had for what might go on the agenda-, we met two days ago, so there wasn't time to get them to happen. But one of the issues that we thought was worthy of discussion is re-thinking, the way it's written here is "the faculty's role in shared governance". That includes things like what's sometimes

referred to as work atmosphere. We agreed that it was unlikely we would want to put the word “morale” in the title, but since the President [Assanis] mentioned that issue, that’s something that would be on the agenda to look at. And the idea we were thinking about was establishing a committee to look into this. So I’ve been asking around to see what kinds of issues members of different departments have, and I’m getting a wide variety of responses. Some people are saying, “hey, it’s great, I think what you have here is great”. Other people are saying, “no, those idiots...”. So there’s a wide variety. But it seems to me what would be worth doing is having somebody actually pull together, you know, systematically find out what are the issues that we the faculty of the college want to address in this area. What’s working well, what are the beefs, and what can we do moving forward to improve the ability of the faculty and the administration to work together effectively. So there’s no formal proposal at this point, but the idea, just to bounce off of you, the idea of forming this committee that would gather information and try to propose ways of moving forward. My guess is probably now would not be the time to ask you, “what are your beefs and what do you want to complain about?”. But that’s about where we are. Did anybody have any questions or comments?

MARK GREENE: Was the *ad hoc* committee supposed to improve our morale, then?

STUART KAUFMAN: Well, yes, absolutely. I was planning on a really good party. [LAUGHTER] No, it would be to figure out what the sources of the concerns are so we could then figure out how to address them. But yes, I think the first step would have to be information gathering.

JIM MORRISON: So are you proposing a committee?

STUART KAUFMAN: Yes. We certainly talked about that idea. Yes, I’m proposing that as something we can consider. So if anybody wants to weigh in on that you can email either me or Jim or anyone on the Executive Committee, whether you think this is a good idea or not, whether this is something worth pursuing. And if not then, OK, but I got the impression last spring that there was some interest in this.

JIM MORRISON: So what you’re asking for is feedback between now and the next meeting?

STUART KAUFMAN: Yeah, feedback between now and the next Executive Committee meeting, which is when, do we know?

JIM MORRISON: Next month.

STUART KAUFMAN: Early next month, so sometime in the next couple of weeks, whether you think this is something you want to support. Simplest thing is I guess just email me, skaufman@udel.edu. OK?

9. Introduction of new business

At the suggestion of John Morgan, in view of the Thanksgiving break and the end of final examinations in December, the dates of the Senate meetings for those months were changed to November 14 (from the 21st) and December 12 (from the 19th).

Jenny Lambe raised the issue of the imminent appearance on campus of Milo Yiannopoulos and all the concerns about hate speech and free speech it raises. There will be a variety of responses to it.

10. Adjournment took place at 4:51 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lawrence G. J. Duggan