

Chairs' Council Provost Meeting

September 13, 2023

Miller Education Building

- I. Provost Intro
 - a. Thanked us for our efforts
 - b. Here to talk about what we want to talk about – a lot of similar issues to last year, but budget issues may be less.
 - i. Likely won't have to cut lines like we did last year.
 - c. Line requests
 - i. Enrollment is up, but it's not up THAT much.
 - ii. Waiting for census to make sure regarding what is available.
 - d. What is the process for getting brand new lines, not refilling an older line?
 - i. All positions have a number, and if we have a vacant number, we can act if we have the money.
 - ii. If we don't have the money, must go through the president to ask money from the state.
 - e. Did they cut the line or are we just not spending money in those lines?
 - i. We cut the lines – those positions are gone.
 - ii. Not likely that those will be replaced.
 - iii. But likely we don't have to go through that this year.
 - f. Today is the first True Blue Tour – Ballroom
 - i. Beginning of next year's recruitment cycle.
 1. Trying to get a plan in place to give chairs and departments more details of what is expected of them month-to-month.
 - a. Here is what we suspect from chairs and here is when you should do it.
 - i. "In October, I need to do this; In November, I need to be doing..."
 - b. Going to fine tune it with chairs input and try to codify it.
 - c. Laurie Witherow can start to help automate the three "contacts" with students with the new software we have.
 - i. What departments need to do is figure out what is the message we want to send and how we send it. But the office of student affairs can send the message for us.
 - ii. We need to make sure we don't use the same thing year after year – key.
 - d. Recruiting likely will not be radically different than last year.
 - g. Enrollment moved to academic affairs – are we taking that opportunity to reenergize and modernize how we recruit?
 - i. That is his hope. Laurie is in an interim role and will need to speak to president.

- ii. A few years ago, we had a consultant come in and give ideas, but we didn't really do anything about it.
 - 1. We hope to be able to follow what they said.
- iii. Getting ready to email all of us with more info.
- iv. Can we get an hour's worth of compensation for faculty who have to do the calls, texts, etc., during the summer (specifically graduate program directors)?
 - 1. About to fix that before summer.
 - 2. Will be sent to Steve to share with us
- v. Is it better to do a flat rate across the university or a summer hour?
 - 1. Depends on department, but they will figure it out.
 - 2. They are aware this is an issue and are trying to work on it.

- II. One Main Issue Regarding Chairs – lack of strategic focus about graduate studies, research, r2 status, etc.
 - a. Graduate school is not very involved in individual programs.
 - i. Who is in control of the grad programs?
 - 1. The graduate school should be performing a service function to programs and departments.
 - 2. But we are still in a situation regarding who does what – is it the dean of the graduate college or the dean of the department's college?
 - 3. Currently, David Butler relies on deans to give messages and does not have a lot of interaction with departments.
 - b. Who is responsible for charting the course of graduate programs?
 - i. Mark – remains with departments.
 - c. At strategic level, where are we going in terms of research and grad programs with the university?
 - i. Goal is to have 20% graduate enrollment.
 - ii. If you have a program that you think is appealing to international graduate students, contact Robert Summer.
 - 1. International programs are highly active in recruiting outside the US.
 - iii. Domestic recruitment
 - 1. There is not a lot of recruiting in this area.
 - iv. What about funding for graduate students to interview or come and check out the program?
 - 1. We do not have anything like that, but we must figure out how much it costs, and the paperwork involved.
 - v. If we are trying to get 20% of our students to be graduate students, how are we making an overall graduate strategy to get us to that percentage?
 - 1. Chairs not asked about how that number came up.
 - 2. No idea of how the graduate school will help us there.

3. We've moved from 10-15% grad enrollment, but we have lessened the undergraduate enrollment.
- vi. We want the graduate school to be involved with recruiting efforts for departments.
 1. There needs to be some coordination and communication between the departments and the grad school.
 2. Once we get a system in place, we can pay a graduate coordinator to do these things
- d. We agree the departments run things, but we are not getting communication from David Butler regarding why that number is there and how we got to it. How can those numbers and initiatives work when he has not talked to us?
- e. Where is it codified what the role of the graduate school is?
 - i. Not anywhere.
 - ii. Bring David Butler to the chairs meeting to talk to figure this out.
 - iii. 20% doesn't consider lack of stipends, lack of funding in other areas, lack of faculty to teach those classes.
- f. Have there been market analysis on programs that have the potential for growth?
 - i. Yes – Hanover was the company that did it.
 - ii. Graduate studies did it and massaged, and said, “you should start these programs.”
 1. Does not consider how many faculty you must teach those classes.
 2. Need more than just that formula they use.
- g. No one from the graduate school came and talked to the chairs.
 - i. Butler talks to the deans.
- h. 10 master's programs going through for approval, but we are also being stingy with new faculty.
 - i. Then why are we asking for new programs?
 1. UG has decreased by over 5000 over the last few years, so there is some slack somewhere in the system.
- i. When President McPhee visited, he referenced how when we change Carnegie classifications, we get more money from the state.
 - i. Have we gotten that money? Why aren't we getting more money?
 1. It is all political. We do not have that many representatives there.
- j. President told Faculty Senate we are going to try to go to R1. Asking for \$20 million to make it happen
 - i. Mark – seemed unaware.
 1. Noted that this is why we should have these strategic conversations with each other
 - ii. It seems like there are high-level things going on that should require some input from below to develop that plan, and it does not seem to be happening.

III. List of concerns:

- a. Can we get the program pages up sooner?

- i. Some concentrations did not exist until now, and we need those to be up so we can recruit.
- b. Can we give graduate directors some stipend to go to recruit at a conference.
- c. We have issues getting graduate students because we are so low with stipends to pay graduate students.
 - i. We could get to 20% easily if we could increase the stipends.

IV. How can we make this better?

- a. We could move some of our lecturers to instructor lines
 - i. Could save money overall.
 - ii. Shows them we value them.
 - iii. We want to retain career people rather than last minute hires.
 - iv. The issue that prevented that was a previous person said we would miss diverse candidates.
 - v. It does move them into TT lines/permanent money – it competes with that money.
 - vi. There is no evidence that these three-year rehires increase diversity.
 - vii. Mark will have a conversation with Christy Siegler
 - viii. The chairs workgroup is looking at the current policy, 202.
 - ix. When do we apply to move a lecturer to instructor?
 - 1. Not sure – will get clarity.
- b. Could we, as an R2, respect that a 4/4 is not typical for graduate faculty – why do we always have to request to go from 4 to 3?
 - i. Save time
 - ii. Strong gesture of support for faculty
 - iii. Zero costs.
- c. Workloads
 - i. It is a constant burden for chairs for about a month
 - ii. Mark – we have gotten into this habit of paying people for everything they do, and if faculty are ok saying they are not getting paid for that 0.1 thing, we can do that.
 - 1. Protects us from lawsuits.
 - iii. Could we allow graduate faculty in PhD programs, if we could not make people justify it separate from their evaluation?
 - iv. Can codify it at the beginning with a worksheet on teaching, research, and service.
- d. The Board of Trustees wants to implement a merit-based plan.
 - i. The times that we have done that, it was a small, one time, thing. It would likely just be a bonus rather than an adjustment to a base salary.
 - ii. Caused a lot of angst before.
- e. When people get to the role they are comfortable with in terms of promotion, they do not have active research.
 - i. Suggest having post-professorial, post-tenure review
- f. With this move to R2, what are the expectations for new P&T for them?

- i. Encourages departments to look at their current P&T policy and adjust.
 - 1. As a department, what do you think is reasonable?
- V. Is it a strategic imperative to highlight research at a greater level than it has? And how will we provide the resources for faculty to do that?
 - a. I would think that conversation is spearheaded by the graduate school.
 - b. There are currently three strategic plans, and we are merging into one.
 - c. What are our goals? Plans need goals. Which road are we heading down?
 - i. You cannot plan unless someone from the top says, “This is where we are, and this is where we should go.”
 - ii. Mission statement is being revised.
- VI. Concluding thoughts
 - a. Appreciates us asking tough questions and our willingness to help them improve processors.
 - b. It all comes down to money – only so much in the pot. We are so fixated on enrollment b/c that is where our money comes from.
 - i. We do the best we can with the restrictions we have.