Minutes of September 2019 CAS Senate meeting
104 Gore
September 16, 2019


Also Present: M. Rieger, M. Trevett-Smith, D. Eruslu

1. Call to order. 4:00 pm
2. Remarks from Senate President (B. McKenna)
   B. McKenna welcomed returning members and thanked new members. John Pelesko is now Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. Last year’s CAS Faculty Senate President, Dan Smith, is now an acting associate dean.

The Middle States self-study is underway. The steering committee and the seven working groups are writing a narrative with evidence. They are here today to get the CAS faculty’s perspective. D. Eruslu took notes. A handout (attached) included questions – the first was “How can we tell the story of your unit?” and the second set included “Which successes should be considering to highlight?” and “What areas should we focus on as self-recommendations in our self-study?”

A discussion followed, with some comments recorded here. J. Morgan noted there is a wide range in faculty involvement in shared governance. B. McKenna observed that stories can be told at the individual faculty level and department level, and he gave some examples of success. S. Kaufman noted the changes in leadership; there are some new initiatives but many are too new to know the outcome, such as the Blue Hens Success Collaborative (BHSC). L. Timmins noted the launch of a new PhD program in Communication. J. Gizis noted the Data Science Institute as part of an interdisciplinary effort, and also noted core strengths in disciplinary teaching and research. J. Morgan argued it is too soon to form an opinion about the university administration, and observed that flexibility instead of stubbornness is important. E. Bell asked do we want to mainly tell success stories, but should we also tell about problems? The answer was that the committee is looking for self-recommendations in 2nd set of questions, so let’s move on. E. Bell: Asked what were the previous recommendations and how have they been carried out? In the English Language Institute (ELI), enrollment went way up but then came back down. The answer pointed to the 2016 midterm report. An example was that UD’s performance on diversity was a weakness. J. Morgan noted the need for a transparent, understandable budget. A. Fox noted the Distinguished Scholar Program.
This group of students is heavily STEM, and Fox argued that this reflects admissions issues for humanities. A more robust humanities program would need to recruit top end students. J. Gizis noted the problems with buildings and deferred maintenance, such as Sharp Lab, although the administration has started to address the issue. A. Sarzynsky brought up the retirement crisis. The positive side is a plan for replacement and growth. L. Duggan raised the classroom shortage, and argued that student housing is a “catastrophic mess.” J. Morgan noted that Sharp Lab was allowed to fall into disrepair. It used to be used for recruitment, but isn’t anymore. He believes there is an emphasis on $100 million projects when much smaller amounts of money could be used to make existing buildings much more attractive. S. Kaufman suggested that M. Rieger return to the next meeting for thought-out responses. Given the length of the discussion to this point, the topic was closed with the intention that Mark Rieger would return later.

4. The minutes of the May 2019 CAS Senate Meeting were approved.

5. Remarks from Dean (J. Pelesko)

J. Pelesko described the Dean’s office support teams. He will Budget committee, CAS budget and hybrid budget system. He noted the schedule for position planning.

The Dean is aiming to cut bureaucracy. CAS has grown tremendously but procedures and support have not changed. CAS is making special fundraising efforts for experiential learning, faculty support (mainly for our new junior faculty), and capital projects.

The Dean noted that the university missed its freshman enrollment target by 208 undergraduate students, but increased transfers made up half of that shortfall. He sees enrollment as an ongoing challenge. By and large, CAS has not worked hard on enrollment. (Some departments are exceptions.) The Dean’s office is rethinking our events, website, contact with applicants, and so on. [See slides]

The Dean made a presentation on the budget, although the slides were distorted/numbers incorrect due to a tech problem. He noted that 93% of the CAS budget is compensation (salaries + fringe benefits.) 7% = about $10 million is the rest. 85% is fixed (based on FY17 actual), the rest is considered incremental revenue, plus strategic pool allocation to fill gap. There was a discussion of budget issues. The Dean showed the draft incremental revenue chart from the May 13, 2019 General Faculty meeting. He noted that expenses are matched to income. Until the strategic pool allocation goes to zero, increased incremental revenue can’t be sent to departments unless they also get sent extra expenses!

The Dean argued that delaying decisions until there is a new budget model is a trap. Budget policies will have to be re-evaluated in light of the new system.
For position planning, updated department maps are due October 15. A book of department maps sits on Provost Morgan’s desk and she refers to them frequently. Hiring plans are due October 30.

There was a discussion. A. Sarzinsky noted that the Biden School was told that only Tenure Track (TT) faculty should appear on department maps. This lead to a distorted view. The Dean replied that other departments did include Continuing Track (CT) faculty. The map should support the hiring plan argument you want to make. J. Morrison asked how does the new budget system help long-term planning by department? The Dean answered that he didn’t think it does yet, and the system is not clear yet. For now, we should focus on excellence and the mission, the things that will always be important. D. Galileo asked is the time they are taking for a new budget system justified by the outcome? The Dean answered that he believes the committee did not have the computer system in place to track and analyze the proposed changes.
L. Timmins argued that interdisciplinary teaching should not be discouraged by the system, such as classes taught jointly by departments. The Dean said the system doesn’t impact department level decision.

6. Ed. Affairs report (J. Angelini)
   The consent agenda was approved.
   A reminder of the deadlines was sent to departments. The deadlines are on the website.

7. COCAN report (J. Morgan)

   All committees are fully staffed. There was, however, an announcement that our college needs to find a natural sciences representative on the University Graduate Studies Committee (not to be confused with the Graduate College Council.)

   A resolution for an ad hoc budget committee was approved.

8. For our information: The Biden School is considering separating from the college.
The University of Delaware is undergoing a self-study process in preparation for our spring 2021 accreditation review by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education. The self-study is a critical step in the accreditation process that summarizes how we meet the commission’s standards for accreditation. It is also an opportunity to reflect on what we do and ensure that we regularly assess and document the effectiveness of our work.

We are framing our self-study around the University’s five institutional priorities: (a) enhancing the success of our students, (b) building an environment of inclusive excellence; (c) investing in our intellectual and physical capital; (d) strengthening interdisciplinary and global programs; and (e) fostering a spirit of innovation and entrepreneurship.

WE NEED YOUR HELP!

First, you can provide feedback now at http://www.udel.edu/006302. Although you will need to login with your UD account, your responses will be anonymous. Second, we are meeting with many groups this fall to ask specific questions. Open town halls will be held in the spring on April 10, April 17, and April 24.

More information about this process, including drafts (being written), dates of future meetings, and a form where you can provide general feedback, is available at https://udel.edu/middlestates.

MIDDLE STATES COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION STANDARDS:

I. Mission and Goals
II. Ethics and Integrity
III. Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience
IV. Support of the Student Experience
V. Educational Effectiveness Assessment
VI. Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement
VII. Governance, Leadership, and Administration

QUESTIONS WE HAVE FOR YOU RIGHT NOW:

1. How can we tell the story of your unit—programs, services, people—in this report?

2. This self-study is an opportunity for us to identify successes—things that UD does well and things that add to our distinctiveness. It is also an opportunity to identify challenges and shortcomings to which we commit ourselves to address. Which successes should we be considering to highlight? What areas should we focus on as self-recommendations in our self-study?

3. We are structuring much of our self-study around our five institutional priorities: Enhancing the success of our students, building an environment of inclusive excellence, fostering a spirit of innovation and entrepreneurship, strengthening interdisciplinary and global programs, and investing in our intellectual capital. How does your unit address these priorities? Are there specific stories and examples of programs and services that we should highlight in our self-study?

4. An accredited university is one that is “governed and administered in a manner that allows it to realize its stated mission and goals [and] has education as its primary purpose.” From your perspective, to what extent does UD meet this standard?

Learn more at: https://udel.edu/middlestates