Minutes for University of Delaware CAS Faculty Senate meeting
May 20, 2019
104 Gore
Present: E. Bell, M. Bush, E. Donelly, L. Duggan, D. Flaherty, D. Galileo, P. Gentry, J. Gizis,T. Holden, K. Jasinska, S. Kaufman, D. Koltonski, J. Lobasz, J.Martin, B. McKenna, S. McKenna, J. Morgan, J. Morrison, O. Olabisi, J. Pelesko, Victor Perez (for E. Donnelly), J. Serrano, A. Sarzynski, K. Schroeder, B. Shaffer (for Lopez-Gydosh), M. Stanton, D. Smith, L. Timmins, M. Werth, D. Yanich

Also Present: J. Angelini, A. Kupchik, Robin Morgan (Provost)

1. The meeting was called to order at $4: 00 \mathrm{pm}$
2. The agenda was approved.
3. The March and April minutes were approved
4. The AY 2019-2020 Senate Meeting Schedule was approved [check website]
5. Report of the Morale Committee (A. Kupchik)

Aaron Kupchik, chair of the "morale" committee made a report. Please see the attached slides. The committee was formed in 2017 to investigate and report on college morale. The committee made use of the UD ADVANCE Faculty Climate Survey. A. Kupchik noted that the CAS administration has changed since the survey was conducted. Analysis of the numerical surveys are included in the slides. The committee's recommendations were: 1) Better understand the concerns of Associate Professors and match mentoring and resources to those concerns. 2) Continued efforts at CAS-Department Resources and 3) Greater investment in recruitment of diverse faculty to change the climate and reduce burdens on the few.

There was a question on statistics for other colleges. The CAS morale committee was only provided CAS vs. non-CAS comparisons. The ADVANCE team would have other statistics.
D. Galileo noted that existing university mentoring requirement has formal mentoring of associate professors as optional.
There was no breakout of CT faculty responses.
6. Report of COCAN and election of CAS Senate officers.

Committees have been staffed (see attached slides). Elections of senate officers included an election for the post of Past President because D. Smith cannot serve next year. Both candidates have previously served as President. Ballots were cast for the elected positions: A. Fox was elected as President Elect, J. Morrison was elected as Past President, J. Gizis as Secretary, J. Morgan as COCAN chair.
7. Remarks from Provost

Note: Dean John Pelesko did not attend this part of the meeting.
John Pelesko has served as Interim Dean. Provost Morgan is considerting appointing him as Dean instead of conducting a national search. She will not do that without significant support for his appointment.

She described her efforts to solicit input. The Provost first met with the executive committee of this senate on May 8. On May 14, some Board of Trustee members met with John Pelesko. On May 15, the Provost met with the leadership team (excluding Pelesko) of the college. Last Friday, May 17, the College had a town hall. It was recorded and there is a written transcript. She is sending out a Qualtrics survey to all faculty and staff, and will read all responses.

There was a wide ranging discussion of the proposed appointment of J. Pelesko himself, the proposed procedures for soliciting input, and the relative merit of an appointment vs. an (open but with uncertain outcome) national search. D. Galileo, who served on the 3-33 committee on administrative searches, expressed his concerns about whether or not this procedure was consistent with the Faculty Handbook. He emphasized that his comments have nothing to do with J. Pelesko himself. The Provost emphasized that she would not proceed with appointment if (for example) only $55 \%$ favor, but is looking for significant support. Otherwise a regular national search procedure will be started for the next academic year.
8. Remarks from Senate President

No remarks.
9. Resolution on Ensuring Full Representation on the Proposed Graduate Council.
J. Morgan observed that this issue was raised in the ad hoc committee on representation. Two departments have declined to nominate candidates even as alternates. The Senate voted to postpone this resolution until September.
10. Remarks from Dean. (J. Pelesko)

The Dean presented some thoughts on the draft hybrid budget model presented by President Assanis at the General Faculty Meeting on May 13, 2019. The white paper should be released this summer. (See the attached slides.)

He suggested that the CAS Senate may want to form an ad hoc faculty committee to consider the effects of the new budget model.

Colleges will have a predictable base budget based on FY17 actual. Additional budget allocations to colleges are based on undergrad incremental revenue (meaning increases since FY17), paying master's degree incremental revenue, F\&A incremental revenue, all
special sessions academic revenue, and a "Strategic Pool" allocation. These Strategic Pool allocations to colleges are meant to enable the transition and should eventually go away as the budget system matures. (This does not mean the Strategic Pool disappears.) The Dean emphasized that the table with percentages of incremental revenue is a "draft." Important details such as where expenses sit (i.e., whether or not with departments) will affect the numbers. Other details (such as how incremental revenue return to PI is calculated) are as yet unclear to the Dean. He did learn that the 2\% F\&A for "Arts \& Humanities" would come entirely to our college.

The Dean thanked the Senate, Senate President Dan Smith, and the Senate Executive Committee.

The Dean took questions. J. Gizis asked about the large size of the strategic pool allocation. The Dean explained that strategic pool expenditures were doubling deferred maintenance spending, increasing scholarships, some capital projects (smaller part), and funding start-up packages for faculty. J. Lobasz asked about how the system is different than RBB and expressed concerns that it too sets up competition between departments. J. Morrison expressed concern about long-term planning and whether this budget system will help departments plan. The Dean described his hope to make long-term plans with priorities, but he doesn't know yet how plans will interact with the budget. J. Morgan observed that the incentives are important and that advisors in other colleges may advise their students not to take CAS classes in winter/summer. The Dean agreed there is the potential for perverse incentives for colleges. As COCAN chair, J. Morgan asked any senator who wishes to serve on the proposed ad hoc budget committee to send him an email message.
M. Stanton asked about changes to F\&A allocations. Currently, $96 \%$ goes to college and $20 \%$ of that money goes to departments. The Dean expressed concern about whether this will be sustainable under the new model. However, many details are not clear, such as what expenses are moved centrally. If start-up costs move centrally, then dealing with the new system will be much easier. The Dean also observed that F\&A for the university is (approximately) flat since FY17 so the effects of the new system are not (currently) large. The budget system incentives, including PI return, is meant to spark growth.

In response to a question from O. Olabisi, the Dean noted that the new budget system is not set: This is a draft and the system will be open to comment once the white paper is released.
11. New Business: None
12. Unfinished Business: None
13. Adjournment at $5: 34 \mathrm{pm}$

## College of Arts and Sciences

## Morale Committee

## Report and Recommendations

Adele Hayes<br>Aaron Kupchik<br>Robyn Phillips

## I. Introduction

- Committee formed in 2017, based on November 2016 Senate Resolution
- Prior inquiries:
- 2016 AAUP faculty survey
- 2016 CAS survey (S. Kaufman)
- Annual Advance surveys
- Meetings between Dean Watson and faculty
- Common issues reported:
- Low overall morale, College-wide
- Negative interactions with Dean's office
- Concerns about transparency of CAS Dean's office's decision-making
- Concerns about departmental autonomy


## II. Methods

- Questions added to UD Advance Faculty Climate Survey
- January 29 - March 31, 2018 (*prior CAS administrative team)
- All full-time tenured/tenure-track faculty, continuing track faculty, chairs and directors
- $\mathrm{N}=433$ responses; $36.5 \%$ response rate
- Analyses by Advance Institute, reported to us in summary form


## III. Overall Morale

- 8 questions assessed faculty morale
- Overall, faculty are satisfied (rating $\geq 4.00$ on 7-pt. scale), except for satisfaction with teaching load, which was lower than ratings for non-CAS colleges
- By rank, where there were issues, Associate Professors tended to have the lowest ratings
- URM ( $n=5$ ) in CAS reported a lower sense of belongingness at UD than URM faculty in non-CAS colleges
- Good news: Women and men had very similar ratings across items in this section


## Overall Morale: Units and College

CAS faculty members are generally satisfied in primary unit and college

- No significant differences by college or gender
- Assistant Professors are most satisfied

|  | Mean (1-7 scale) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Primary unit | 4.56 |
| CAS college |  |
| Overall | 4.14 |
| Assistant Prof | 5.00 |
| Associate Prof | 4.00 |
| Full Prof | 4.00 |

## Overall Morale: Workload

## WORKLOAD

Teaching Load: Satisfaction rated as significantly lower than faculty members in other colleges (mean=3.99 vs 4.59). Lower ratings were specific to Associate and Full Professors (mean=3.83, 3.92 vs Asst Professor=4.70). Ratings did not differ by gender.

Research Load: CAS faculty are generally satisfied (mean=4.97), with no significant differences by college, rank, or gender.

Service Load: Overall, CAS faculty are satisfied (mean=4.38) but Associate Professors less so (mean=3.86). Ratings did not differ significantly by college or gender.

## Overall Morale: Career Progression

- Overall, CAS faculty are satisfied and do not differ from faculty in other colleges
- By rank, Associate Professors are less satisfied and differ significantly from those in other colleges
- No gender differences

|  | Mean (1-7 scale) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Overall | 4.51 |
| By Rank |  |
| Assistant Prof | 5.17 |
| Associate Prof | 3.69 vs non-CAS $=4.43$ |
| Full Prof | 5.03 |

## Overall Morale

## LEAVING UD

Glad to stay the rest of my career: CAS faculty are generally satisfied (mean=4.39), with no significant differences by college, rank, or gender.

Feel a sense of belonging at UD: CAS faculty are generally satisfied (mean=4.39), with no significant differences by college, rank, or gender. However, URM ( $\mathrm{n}=5$ ) faculty in CAS report significantly lower sense of belonging (mean=3.89) than faculty in non-CAS colleges (mean=5.60).

## IV. College Governance

- CAS faculty report lower ratings of:
- Concerns being listened to
- Transparency
- Clear communication of college priorities
- Departmental autonomy
- Support in career advancement
- Results from 2018 may not apply today


## College Governance

| Faculty who raise concerns are listened to within my | CAS | Other Colleges |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| college (1-7) | 3.17 | 3.76 |
| College decision making procedures are sufficiently <br> transparent (1-7) | 2.67 | 3.19 |
| College priorities are clearly communicated to faculty by <br> my dean (1-7) | 3.13 | 3.69 |
| My department is allowed appropriate autonomy in <br> hiring (1-7) | 3.17 | 3.82 |
| Do/did you feel supported in your advancement to <br> tenure and/or promotion (by Dean of college)? (1-5) | 2.60 | 3.36 |
| *All significant at p<.05 |  |  |

## V. Diversity

- 11 questions comparing specific topics of diversity
- Department climate (sexist, racist)
- Perceived supports for diverse groups
- Service (committees) expectations for women, URM
- How hard faculty must work to be perceived as valued colleagues
- Overall: CAS faculty have slightly lower diversity-related morale than those outside of CAS
- URM and Women perceive less support, higher expectations, more sexist/racist climate


## Diversity

- In all questions associate professors in CAS, and overall, had lower diversity-related morale responses than assistant and full professors. Full professors had the highest mean overall, followed by assistants.
- In questions of workload and committee work by women and URM, men in CAS had a lower mean (i.e., less concern) than any other group in the college. Men had a higher mean of overall diversity climate satisfaction than all other groups in the university.
- URM had a significantly higher overall diversity morale rating in CAS than outside of it. Women in CAS had a higher mean of diversity satisfaction within CAS than outside.


## Diversity

|  | CAS | Other Colleges |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Department climate rating (1=Sexist - 7=Non-sexist) | 4.88 | 5.10 |
| Department climate rating ( $1=$ Racist $-7=$ Non-racist) | 5.24 | 5.40 |
| The climate within your department for women (1=Very Poor - 7= Excellent) | 4.61 | 4.54 |
| The climate within your department for faculty of color (1=Very Poor - 7= Excellent) | 4.14 | 4.08 |
| The climate within your department for LGBTQ faculty (1=Very Poor - 7= Excellent) | 4.67 | 4.68 |
| The climate within your department for faculty with disabilities (1=Very Poor - 7= Excellent) | 4.58 | 4.54 |
| The climate within your department for overall diversity (1=Very Poor - 7=Excellent) | 4.27 | 4.27 |
| Female faculty in my department have to work harder than male faculty to be perceived as valued colleagues* (1=Strongly Disagree - 7= Strongly Agree) | 3.57 | 4.05 |
| Under-represented faculty are asked to serve on more committees than their white colleagues (1=Strongly Disagree -7= Strongly Agree) | 4.00 | 4.19 |
| Under-represented faculty in my department have to work harder than white faculty to be perceived as valued colleagues ( $1=$ Strongly Disagree - 7= Strongly Agree) | 3.47 | 3.66 |
| *p<. 05 |  |  |

## VI. Summary of Results

- Deficits in morale relate to:
- Sense of belonging
- Transparency
- Communication, listening
- Department autonomy
- Diversity
- Associate Professors have particularly low morale


## VII. Recommendations

- Better understand concerns of Associate Professors and match mentoring and resources to those concerns
- Continued efforts at CAS - Department relations
- Transparency, receptiveness
- Regular and substantive briefings to CAS Senate and Department Chairs
- Is the need for Departments to sacrifice autonomy for College and University alignment worth low morale? Can it be done more gently?
- Greater investment in recruitment of diverse faculty will change climate and reduce burdens on the few


## CAS Morale Committee

Aaron Kupchik, Chair<br>Adele Hayes<br>Muqtedar Kahn<br>William Matthaeus<br>Robyn Phillips



# Resolution For Ensuring Full Representation in the proposed Graduate College Council 

May 16, 2019
WHEREAS a Graduate College has been established to provide leadership to the various graduate programs being conducted at the University of Delaware; and

WHEREAS, the President of the University of Delaware has proposed increasing the number of faculty by 500 over the next five years and doubling the number of graduate students; and

WHEREAS the Bylaws of the Graduate College call for the creation of a Graduate College Council as the deliberative and representative body of the College; and

WHEREAS the Bylaws of the Graduate College define all full-time faculty members of the University to be simultaneously members of the faculty of the Graduate College; and

WHEREAS the Bylaws of the Graduate College further provide that Graduate Council members shall be "nominated and elected as the representatives of graduate programs within the academic colleges," and that they "must be active in some aspect of graduate education;" and

WHEREAS the number of Graduate Council seats allocated for election to the Council is substantially smaller than the number of departments with graduate programs or faculty teaching graduate classes at the University of Delaware: and

WHEREAS the number of Graduate Council seats specifically allocated for election by the College of Arts and Sciences is substantially smaller than the number of departments with graduate programs or faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences; and

WHEREAS the number of departments with graduate programs has historically been limited by underfunding, the University of Delaware's chronic struggles with diversity and inclusion, and limited opportunities for graduate students from underrepresented populations; and

WHEREAS there are multiple departments at the University of Delaware desiring to participate in graduate programs afforded by the new Graduate College:

WHEREAS the Graduate College is meant to serve as a site for generating interdisciplinary graduate programs, many of which may emerge from programs without large existing graduate programs; and

WHEREAS the proposed growth in graduate education, including the development and funding of programs, the policies and procedures of the Graduate College, and increases in faculty and student numbers demonstrating diversity and inclusion should be guided by a fully representative Council; and

WHEREAS, ensuring full representation of the faculty and students at the University of Delaware engaged is paramount in achieving the quality, rigor, and full functionality of the Graduate College : therefore

BE IT RESOLVED that the CAS Faculty Senate calls for an expansion of the Council to a minimum of 50 Councillors, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the number of Councillors be subject to biannual revision, so that every department at the University of Delaware with a graduate program or faculty active in graduate education may be fully represented on the Graduate Council.

## Draft Hybrid Budget Model - Timeline

| December 11, 2017 | President charged Hybrid Budget Model Steering Committee |
| :---: | :---: |
| January 9-11, 2018 | Subcommittee kick-off meetings: Undergraduate, Graduate, Special Academic Revenue and Sponsored Activities |
| January - April 2018 | Subcommittees met weekly |
| April - July 2018 | Budget Office modeled subcommittee recommendations and developed draft hybrid budget model |
| August - October 2018 | Subcommittees met separately with the VP of Strategic Planning \& Analysis (VPSP\&A) and Chief Budget Officer (CBO) to review modeled recommendations and draft hybrid budget model |
| October 30, 2018 | Deans presentation with VPSP\&A and CBO to review strategic investments and discuss model concerns |
| December 19, 2018 | Deans meeting with President Assanis, VPSP\&A and CBO to review draft Hybrid Budget Model |
| February 3, 2019 | Chairs Caucus meeting with VPSP\&A and CBO of strategic investments and concept for Hybrid Budget Model |
| March 20, 2019 | PEC retreat, Hybrid Budget Model presented by President/VPSP\&A and CBO |
| April - early May 2019 | Hybrid Budget Model review and consultation with Faculty Senate Budget Committee and leadership in Graduate College, Research Office, CAS and Faculty Senate President. |
| May 13, 2019 | Faculty Senate General meeting - Hybrid Budget Model presentation by President |
| Summer 2019 | White paper to be released to campus |

## Draft Hybrid Budget Model Formula



## Draft Hybrid Budget Model Formula

|  | Predictable Base, FY17 Actuals | - Base includes college F\&A distribution of $96 \%$ and graduate tuition distribution of $100 \%$ from fiscal years 2017 and prior <br> - Base will NOT be adjusted for fiscal recurring expenses incurred post FY17, including new faculty hires <br> - If college revenue dips below the FY17 predictable base, colleges are expected to reduce expenses, central support will not be provided to bridge the gap. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PLUS: | Undergraduate Incremental Revenue | includes online |
| PLUS: | Paying Masters Incremental Revenue | excludes PhD's |
| PLUS: | F\&A Incremental Revenue |  |
| PLUS: | Special Academic Total Revenue | defined as summer/winter session, excludes study abroad and online |
| PLUS: | Strategic Pool Allocation | - Currently all post FY17 investments, including but not limited to business as usual merit increases, benefits, new faculty hires, capital bond repayment, deferred maintenance increased investment, scholarship quality/diversity investments, infrastructure and increased overhead to support the academic expansion are being funded by incremental revenue from expansion of undergraduate enrollments, strategic pool funds and existing fund balances. <br> - The expectation is that paying masters, F\&A and winter/summer session incremental revenue will increase to lessen the amount needed from the strategic pool overtime. |
|  | Hybrid Budget Allocation college |  |

## Phase 1 - Draft Hybrid Budget Modeling Framework

| Recommended Minimums | Undergraduate Incremental Revenue | Paying Masters Incremental Revenue (excl. PhD's) | Special Academic Revenue (winter/summer sessions) | University Wide F\&A Incremental Revenue College/Depts. | University Wide F\&A Incremental Revenue <br> - Centers and Institutes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Metrics |  |  |  |  |  |
| Student Head Count - major | 50\% | 33\% | 0\% |  |  |
| Instructor College of Record - taught | 50\% | 34\% | 100\% |  |  |
| Subject - course ownership | 0\% | 33\% | 0\% |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution |  |  |  |  |  |
| college | 50\% | 25\% | 25\% | 35\% | TBD |
| department/program | * 0\% | ** 25\% | ** 25\% | 10\% |  |
| centers/institutes |  |  |  |  | TBD |
| PI |  |  |  | *** 5\% | *** 5\% |
| Arts \& Humanities |  |  |  | 2\% | 2\% |
| Strategic Pool/Overhead | 50\% | 50\% | 50\% | 48\% | 48\% |

## Expenses for faculty are to be transacted at the college/department level.

* UG Incremental Revenue will not be distributed to departments however metric report results are to be shared with each department.
** Paying Masters Incremental Revenue and Special Academic Revenue will be distributed to departments based on Provost and Deans approval as it relates to the departments strategic plan. If no approved strategic plan is in place, the Dean will retain the funds in trust until a strategic plan is established.
*** If a grant has multiple Pl's, the department chair and lead PI will determine how funds will be distributed to co-Pl's, if at all.

