

## A&S Faculty Meeting // Fall 2021

Dean Joseph Messina:

I'll go through some of the things that are happening in the college. And also sort of tie together some of the bits of information that either I present to different groups to make sure that all of you really see the things that we're saying and talking about with everybody. But also, I decided to add in more things from some of the associate Dean's in particular, so that you can see other things that are happening in the college as well. So, what I would like to do is, go to the presentation, and then hopefully, even though you know, we are starting 10 minutes late, because of the move, I'd like to save most of the questions until the end. As we go through, there's actually quite a bit of material today. I was looking at the presentation length, and there's a lot of stuff to this. So, I'll try to go through relatively, trying to keep us on time as we're going through. But there are quite a bit of parts to this. So, I'm going to go ahead and jump into it.

So, the first thing is just some numbers, I thought it would be interesting. It usually is the case that people don't see what we're doing. You know, it's hard. Everybody has an idea of who we are, what we do, and how many students we have all these kinds of things. I just wanted to put some up here for everybody's benefit. Some of the chairs may have seen some of these numbers in their own context. I'm just looking at the Fall. We're **actually 230,000 student** credit hours for the College, which is the fourth highest we've ever done, which is a really good number. It's important for us, of course, student credit are translated into our budget directly. And so, there's the fact that we have a large number of student credit hours this year is really important for our budget in the future. And that's 9000 more than the same semester last year. We have 9806 students. Our four largest majors, department chairs probably know this, are biology, psychology and political science and CJ. 94% of our classes are full. This is kind of an optimization question when we think about it. And I know the institution looks at this. But we've gone through this exercise — we're trying to change our class sizes, reduce our class sizes across the board to change our rankings, and it will work. It will absolutely work. But it does have a budget impact. I'll show you a little bit about that too. Our cost per credit hour stayed the same, which is actually a really good thing. And it's also quite hard to do. So, there are two areas where cost per credit hour get translated into our general budget. The first thing is that, it's just simply the cost of instruction in terms of the numbers of people that we have, and the different wage rates that everybody has and how it's all structured together. Every department has its own cost of instruction. GRS and CJ are the lowest cost of instruction in the college. The University very much looks at this. The Law School cost more — it actually loses money with every student teachers. Alright. But that's kind of to be expected, because we have departments that are more expensive to offer courses than other departments. That's just the way it is. But from my standpoint, we are the cost leader on campus. And again, we're costing change over the year, despite the fact that we have released substantial changes in our student population. You know if our students go down, for example. This is from last year. So, it's the two previous years, not this fall. Last year, our student numbers went down and our cost didn't go up. You would expect it to

go up. So that's a really good sign for us. We also had 296 new graduate students, that's our largest incoming class. That's a good thing. And then English, communicative disorders, music, and biology have our largest graduate programs. When I was meeting with the leadership board earlier in the semester, this was a slide. Most of this material I presented to them. Because I think for a lot of people coming in, it's hard for people to understand where the distribution of students are in the college and also that things shift around. Not every department is a replicate of the other departments with just different names and classes is something too.

So, part of this vision statement, this vision slide I actually showed at the chairs meeting. But I've been thinking about it more lately because sometimes people like to see a very explicit arts vision articulation. Something that we have, like on the college's door. You walk in and you see the vision articulation. You see, strategic planning committees and groups come up with the vision statements. And vision statements are great, but they're also very much sanitized. What you actually believe and what you want to say. So, I put this up there because I just think about it, I think about this all the way through with what we do. Number one, I believe in the public liberal arts tradition. I believe in what we do. What the mission is of our college, is what appeals to me about this kind of job. I believe in music. And I believe in math and philosophy and biology. That kind of rounded education, I think is the core of what our education system should do. I also believe in all three parts of our mission. So, we talked a lot about "but we're an R1." You'll hear me say it a lot of times, we're an R. We had to do all these things for the research mission. What's important really is that it is we have these are all three legs of the stool. If we're trying to sit here and be a steady rock, and society writ large, it's really all three parts of this that we have to do. And so when I look at what faculty are doing, or what chairs are doing, I looked at all three parts of these things along the way. Another thing, and this is something that's very dear, that's may sound trite, but it actually changes how I invest. So, I believe in investing in people. What does that mean? So, you can build an institute, for example, and then populate it. From my standpoint, I'd rather invest in somebody who wants to build an institute. So, there's a timing, there's a sequence there, I'm not going to presume that I'm that I know what the next great initiative is for the college. Now I have my own ideas of things that I would like to do. But when it comes to actually making things happen in the college, I'd rather invest in somebody who has a great idea than invest in one of my ideas, and then try to use all of the money that essentially floats around in the collective buckets, and try to prop it up and make it work. So, when we think about investments, and I talk about closing down center, or evaluating centers, and things like that, it's about the people, more so than that thing. Okay. So, I actually stole a line from Skip. I did, I cited you though. But when I talk to people, what is Arts and Sciences doing in the really tiniest nutshell, I like to say we're the truth and beauty college. The fewest number of words to describe who we are. Truth and beauty. But then Skip made this statement and I like it as well. "We make life possible — we're the collage that does that — we also make life worth living, with the arts and the rest of the humanities. So I like both of those, but actually believe in that stuff. I'm not just using it as a slogan, it's actually easy for me to say this.

So, when I was looking at the college and thinking about where we are, and what are the some of the challenges that we face, we actually face some challenges. There are real challenges ahead of us. Are there challenges across higher education, everybody knows about the demographic transition. And the reduction in students that are, you know, that are projected over the next few decades. The next decade really, starting fairly soon. And we as an institution, have a greater threat. So, I'm gonna actually run through a couple of these things that I just put up here is where I think we have some strengths and weaknesses and challenges across all of this. And so, I just mentioned student trends right here, just because that's prep for us and our viability in the long run. And it kind of is, and we have a really large out-of-state population. Our students, you know, that's how we balance our budget. You know, we have a fairly reasonable cost of education, you know, nationally speaking, and we've been able to largely avoid increases in tuition, because we're bringing in more out-of-state students. Now, of course, we have the pressures for the state to increase the numbers of in-state students. And I always thought that this was the case, that there was a percentage. That we needed a percentage of out-of-state or in-state students to the total population. Actually, it is not the case. I found out this year that all we had to do was bring in one more than last year. That was what enrollment management and Rose really wanted to do. Circle one more than last year, and we wouldn't get in trouble. And then we can bring in as many out-of-state students as we want. And in fact, much of the growth this year is in fact out-of-state students. So, the university as a whole actually gave out a bunch of scholarships to out-of-state students to try to increase those numbers, to induce them, to incentivize them. And so and it worked, you know, we have far more than we've ever had before. There's still some other challenges that we face. You know the cost of education is still pretty high. Online education never manifested as a threat the way everybody thought it would be, or the disruption that everyone thought would be. And everybody has experience with online education sort of at the fundamental level. And one of the real big takeaways from it is that for a lot of people, it's not appealing. You know, I mean, it works. And I think a lot of people did a great job at it, but, but from the standpoint of the students, not the experience that they want. You know, if they're searching for a credential, they can go to the University of Phoenix, and get their credential that they might want. But for most of us, it hasn't turned out to be the threat manifest we might have thought. It still resonates with the public and with our political leaders. And then of course, politics we face. There's the CRT threads of the state, there are the end of tenure in states all around us. Right. So, there are a number of those kinds of political threats that we face as well. I'm going to go through some of the rest of these pretty quickly, because I think the opportunities you already know. Reputation. It's going to get a lot better in the US News rankings because of our class size efforts. I think we're all going to be shocked by the change. Our research profile is good, and it's getting better. The R1 matters to us. It really does. And frankly, our location is a positive. You know, you think about coming to the south. If you look at the makeup of our students, and quite frankly, a lot of our faculty, we sort of bring people up from the Upper Midwest here. That's what it kind of looks like. We do have some internal weaknesses that I'll say to anybody, that not everybody wants to hear. Our budget models kind of a problem. You know, we have there are too many touch points. It's pretty inflexible. I put forward a proposal to change our course fees to match business. And frankly, it'll change everything for us that we can do. It really changes everything for us. So, you

wouldn't think that something that's small would do that, but it will. And the budget itself is inflexible. We have a very small amount of money that we can carry over from year to year. Basically using unfilled faculty lines to run operations. And then institutionally, we have what I refer to as a vetocracy. There are a lot of touch points to say "no" to things. And there are very broad that many touch points that say "yes" to things. So, that's one of the things that's been the most, it's kind of been frustrating for me. But it's something that it makes things very slow to happen, because there are so many ways for random people to break into a process. And then when you're really trying to make something happen. Some of the good things that we have. I think our demographics are working in our favor. We've hired more assistant professors than any other university in the country, over the last four years. We have the largest assistant professor class. And I think that's a great thing. That's, you know, the dynamism and all the rest is really positive. Our facilities are really nice. We may complain about them, sometimes. But comparatively, our facilities are very nice, and they're fairly low cost. Like we don't the university does not charge the same way that many other places charge for facilities. And just the fact that we're growing as an institution is a big positive, and it changes the dynamics of the institution. Even within the state, some of our peer institutions are in a much, much more difficult position. University of Alabama Huntsville, you know, they haven't had a raise in a couple of years, a few years. And they're in a very different financial position that we are, for example.

So, I asked Academic Analytics to actually produce some custom things for us. So, these are charts that none of you have seen. So, this is where colleges is. Our actual college ranking over time. One of my goals is to prove our college ranking. So, our comparison group is the SEC. For perspective. So everybody knows, we're obviously the red one, the crimson. This is Mississippi State. Up here, sort of on the right hand edge is Vanderbilt, and at the very top is Texas A&M. To give you a perspective, so it's basically size of faculty versus scholarly research impact. Alright, the good thing about us is that — so we're probably where you would have guessed in terms of size — we're about midway in the group. We're about the 50th percentile in terms of size of one of the universities in the SEC. And, this is looking back to 2015, we were in the 40th percentile in scholarly research. And now between our growth and impact and research, we can go towards the 70th percentile and scholarly research and we moved up to a little bit below the 60th percentile in size. This is absolutely a great thing for us. It's really easy for me to take this to Rose, put it up there and say "Here is independent data. We're great. We're getting better and don't bother us." And it's somewhat compelling. Now, if I compare it with, another comparison group, the AAU, Association of American Universities, best universities in the country and where we fit in that group. So we're both are tiny and our scholarly research is kind of low in that space. But we're with good company here. These are good universities that are in this. This group right here is Iowa State, Texas Tech, Kansas, is this one, you know, so we're with a good group of reasonable group. I'm okay with where we are. And clearly, the trajectory is still positive. This quarter was 2015. But circles last this past spring.

We can do this for departments as well. And so, I'm actually highlighting three departments who really improved over the last five years here. So, I showed this to the leadership board, college

leadership board. So, the squares are 2015. So here are three squares here. And the three circles are now. All three departments moved up a lot in rankings, the greatest spread over that time is actually Anthropology, in terms of recruitment. But those three departments really improved over this, this period. We are still small. Again, this is the number of faculty that were sent out. So we're still small. We haven't purchased our way out of this, per se. But we haven't. Absolutely. I think that's a really nice trajectory for us. To use a data point for us. To this is a dataset, that that is not available. It's a custom thing, right. Now, some departments have not moved that much. So, this department is one that didn't change in size at all. And really all of its movement there is just because of demographic shifts within the field. And here's a department that's pretty low in the scholarly research index. But we did hire into it, but it really didn't move the needle on research that much. And so we do have to pay attention, I have to pay attention to that. And I think all the department chairs out there have to pay attention to this as well, as we think about our departments and how we structure them and how we do hiring over time. But we want to work our way up this trajectory across this to the top right. We have to be intentional in our hiring. The universities in the top right or on the right-hand side are places like Harvard and Michigan, some of those.

So, where are we pressured right now. So, the biggest pressure that I felt this past year was number one, we had the 3% budget cut, which came out almost exclusively of salaries. Alright. For faculty salaries, not existing current people salaries, but faculty salaries, open lines. The provost had said he was going to start taking the money back. So, the only use the open faculty lines, say we have 20 or 30 — we have about 30 right now — he would take back 10. I'd be down to 20. And then he would just pick what 10 other things he wanted to give us. Okay. And I really didn't want that to happen. So, I was trying to come up with ways to convince him not to do it. So, I actually used Academic Analytics for this argument. But basically, the arguments are right there. So, we're not that big. We're actually quite small as a college and the other charts, which I didn't have until just recently, showed as well. But compared to our peers we're quite small. Alright. Some of our units are actually the smallest of their kind. So, the smallest department of x, y, or z. None are larger than median and the median is sort of what I call the right-size department. Here's sort of the median. And that's even being somewhat generous, to be honest.

But we have clearly the goal to reduce class sizes. We also want to increase research expenditures along the way. Those kinds of transactional activities require more people, there's just no getting around that. So, using this argument, I went through each of the departments to look at size. The colors [on the graph] are a little bit hard to see, maybe. The departments that actually shrank in size during this period--from that period, it is actually a little bit difficult to measure faculty because they float over windows — their timestamps — and it's a continuous data collection. But actually, all of our departments are pretty small. So, I highlight a couple of interesting ones just from programming samples, like Geography and GRS got new programs. So did theatre and dance with their new graduate degrees. Art history did as well. But, you know, when you take a look as a whole, we just haven't increased that much in size. And, you know, the Department of Community

Disorders, CD, which is quite small, but has its full, as well, is one that any additional faculty member results in a direct increase in size, certainly their graduate programs.

So I was able to use this argument along, and the provost counterargument was here. So they're looking at trends in enrollment. That's why used to see all of the chairs, the chairs have seen this — the faculty, you may not have — but these trends in enrollment are really important. Because a look at a department — this isn't in all of our departments, it's actually only geography, geology, math, and chemistry. Is biology in there? No. So the, it would look at that and say, "Well, look, your enrollments aren't growing — you don't really need more faculty, what do you need more faculty?" So there's that that additional pressure because again, student credit hours play a big part in our overall institutional budget. You're always trying to balance this negotiation between student credit hours, and what we really need to run our graduate programs or fill holes in our research portfolio, things like that. But these quadrants reflect different kinds of trajectories.

So if you're on the left hand side of the screen here, you have declining enrollments over time, even if you're a big, very big program, that's a declining program. And then if you have up to the top, the further you are up to the top is actually retention. Are you keeping your students? Are you losing your students to the Business College? Are you losing them somewhere else? So that's another argument for not hiring tenure system faculty, because the kinds of courses. Now, we actually do pretty well on the retention side, much better than, in fact, the other colleges. So but that's the Provost's counter, like "look, your enrollments aren't growing, I'm not going to give you new faculty." That's especially the argument when we when it historically, chairs were asked to produce, to say, "Well, how would your enrollment materials look like, and how are they going to change? Why do you need these additional people?" So I split it up into the departments, the different divisions. So and this is what I presented to the provost, so you see exactly what I presented. So I had religion and art has been roughly right sides; GRS, music and philosophy, needing fewer than five tenure track lines to get to the median. The metric here is difference from the median. Alright. And then significant needs would be in English, Modern Languages, and Theatre and Dance, to get to the median of our comparison group, alright, being the AAU. Alright, so if we want to move up to the middle of that chart, basically, from near the beginning, we're going to be fairly substantial sizes here.

Now, some of the departments are complicated, you know, like, they'll use, you know, Art, you know, Art is a good citizen department for the College, you know, but the mix of faculty they have may not be the perfect mix for their ideal things. For example, Music is tough, because, you know, the trombone professor's not going to teach violin. And so they're clearly some pieces there that are different. Modern Languages is also another one of those departments where, you know, there's Spanish professor, and the French professor, different professors, we're not seeing a lot of, there's not a lot of cross-fertilization there. So it's hard those kinds of numbers are the same as in some of the other departments.

In the Social Sciences, American Studies is right-sized. New College, I put a dash there is because New College is enrollment -capped. So it's right-sized, but it's the only department that has a real true enrollment cap. So we could increase the size of New College and then they'll get bigger, their enrollment will go up as well. So it's adjustable up and down. It's kind of unique in that regard. But Anthropology, History, Psychology, all the faculty that need fewer than five to get to the median. CD, Criminal Justice. and Political Science all need more than five lines to get to their peers, just to get to the median of their peer groups. And the numbers — I didn't mention on the previous slide — the numbers show, actually, from how close you are to being the smallest department in the AU. So CCJ is number one, it's the smallest department in the AU. CD is second; Political Science is six. All right. But then there are 62 top universities in the AU, so you can see how small we are in comparison.

And the Natural Sciences and Mathematics. Geology is right-sized, is right at the median. Geography is also at the median but they do need a couple of lines. Physics and Astronomy is really tiny for its size, its comparison group, it's only second. I should say Geography has the misfortune of having me and Lo Han as faculty members, so we mess up their stats. So, and then Chemistry, Math and Biology are all very small, except for Biology. Biology is a weird case. Biology is actually, most of the most of our peer institutions, they would have more than one biology department that might grow and there'll be a column, there'll be split up, but we just have one big one. And they're all lumped together. so that both of those, all three of those departments need more than five just to get up to their peers. And that was the argument I used to the Provost and the Vice President of Finance and it worked. They didn't take anything and I don't think they're going to so it's actually been really good, that piece of it all paid off.

Now on staff, the chairs have all heard this, and I know faculty would love to have more staff, but we're, staff is a really difficult position for us to be in for a couple of reasons. Alright, so number one, we've been cannibalizing staff positions to fund other positions. When you come to me with an argument, "I really need a new staff person," that means somebody else in the room is losing a staff person. All right. Now, I'm not talking about instructors, I'm talking about in the staff line space. If you need a new department secretary, you need a grant administrator, you need, you know, all these different kinds of positions, somebody else is losing for you to get that position. So, we cannibalized them. In the Dean's Office, we've only added one development officer. We didn't really have a choice. I'm glad I have them. But it was a reorganization centrally and, frankly, the money doesn't really come from my budget anyway. So, it actually works out okay. But we've added the development officer, otherwise, we haven't had added staff at the dean's office. And we've been sitting on empty staff lines in the Dean's Office to try to fund some of the other ones that are needed around the College.

Some of you may have heard me talk about buckets of money. When we have our buckets of money, we have a bucket of money for tenure system faculty, we have a bucket of money for instructors, renewable contract faculty, we have a bucket of money for staff. And until this year, we

were never allowed to mix buckets. Buckets had to stay the same. Now, we had the bucket for faculty is much bigger than the bucket for instructors, because we have twice as many, not twice as many, we have 60% more tenure-system faculty than we do instructors. And we have more faculty than we do staff. A bit more faculty than staff as well. But the salary differentials are quite substantial. So, while the numbers of people, of lines, you can imagine, in each bucket aren't that far apart, the size of the bucket is really quite different. And so not being able to move money around between those groups was just **oh boy (1:04)**. So, the first couple of years I've worked on the budget, we weren't able to do it. This year, we were able to do it for the first time. So, we were able to move money between faculty and instructors who were in the raise pool. And then we got the secondary raise pool, which apparently had never happened before. We were able to move, I was able to use that money to really change salaries for staff. So, I moved a bunch of that money because it was a single bucket. And I think I'm sure the Provost intended for me to put all of that money in faculty. But I moved at least 50% of it into staff, and maybe 10% more instructors in that group, because I'd already moved from the early part of the summer, faculty and instructors. And then I moved to read the rest of the faculty. So we were able to fix some things there. But this is still a real challenge for us. And it's going to continue to be a challenge. We also have some HR employees restrictions or classification that are a real problem.

We did add the Bryant Museum. Some of you probably knew that. Some of you may not some of you may not even know that there is a Bryant Museum. But we added the Bryant Museum, it's beautiful if you've not been inside. It's really nice. It's added to the museum's group. We're mixing, we're trying to mix and match people over there with the museums as well. It's working great. So, that changed our budget. We moved Brewer Porch out, the Brewer Porch moved out. So, the biggest hit for the College with Brewer Porch, of course, is the fact that they're almost exclusively funded by contracts with the state. So, if you look at the College's grant generation production over this past year, way down from the year before, but it's almost exactly the same as the prior year, minus Brewer Porch. So, so it's okay. But anyways, Brewer Porch moved out. But what that did do to us is that move that bucket of staff money in particular, it made it much smaller. Because the Brewer Porch had about 110 people working, all staff. So it made our staff problems a little bit worse.

So, there's some reallocation that's occurring, what are we doing? So, we're moving towards things — we're moving money towards digital humanities, we're moving money towards neuroscience. There's new money coming in for Biology, whole cluster higher in Biology this year because of the Provost's money. And then of course, we're moving money towards graduate programs. We've moved away money from instruction, demand driven hiring; moving money out of the inactive centers, or sort of low-performing center. Centers are one of those things that I believe should ultimately be self-sufficient. There should be a path to sustainability for centers. Moving money away from out-of-mission centers, so centers that don't do things that are directly related to our truth and beauty and make life better. And then also overlapping research areas. It's actually a harder thing to think about than you might realize, because of the nature of communication, and the College. You know, I'm the only person in college, basically, who does like remote sensing of

agriculture, things like that. But if Math wanted one and Political Science, one on one and Chemistry one and one — which I think it'd be great — it's a, I couldn't do that, right. I couldn't divvy up those dollars that way. But usually, the departments don't realize that they're asking for the same things. And this is, frequently the case will have departments asking for the same kinds of decisions over the same thematic areas, more so than you might realize. And so if the department doesn't get a faculty member who studies film, and another department who does get their faculty member's study. So that kind of communication isn't always apparent. But there we may need to come up with new ways of communicating across departments as we put in position requests.

Startup costs. So, this is one of our, our the biggest, this is the biggest financial unknown for me, and the Provost office, And Matt Fajack and the finance people, they had no idea as well. So, fortunately, Ray did this for us this summer. I really want, I knew that they didn't know. I had the budget meeting with them in the spring and I told them, "if you guys don't know how much we owe," I said to the Rose Administration, "so you have no idea what our obligations are. You take money out of positions from us, there's no way that I can pay this debt." So, these are real costs. \$2.4 Million. \$2.1 Million. \$3.2 Million. \$2.3 Million. \$1.7 Million. And those are declining, because the new people haven't been hired. So, these are future College obligations and startup that we already owe. Alright. So, it's huge, just a huge amount of money. Again, I can only carry over a couple of million dollars, legally. So I need that those empty faculty salary lines, most of which I gave back in the tax cut, to make to meet our obligations and startup. So it is one of those things, I think the central administration realizes that now, and they're uncomfortable with it. But when I think it's important for the departments and all the faculty to know that there's, we're not sitting in buckets of money, and a pile of, there's like bags of money in the drawer like that. And it's really because of the startup commitments. Fortunately, Ray's started paying very close attention to Jimmy to make sure that we're able to meet all these obligations. But I want to make sure that the faculty, all these new faculty we're hiring are able to use their dollars when they want to use them. Alright,

I'm almost ready to turn it over to some others from his. So, there are a number of there actually a lot of initiatives that are going on right now in the College. I'll talk briefly about bylaws. So, the fact is doing your, our bylaws, bylaws become our policy. So that's the reason we're not talking about bylaws more today. Bylaws are policy and are required by the board of trustees to go through the compliance bridge. So, our bylaws that the fact is created, and they look fine to me are under review by Rose right now. And they're going to come back and get voted on by the faculty. And then they're going to go back through compliance bridge formally, where they'll get approved and then they come back and then they become enforced. It's a cumbersome process. But that is where we are.

Starting in January, we're going to kick off strategic planning. We've got, the chair members are already set. A new performance evaluation process was super timely because the provost just asked all the other colleges to do it. So we did ours last year. All you are done. You don't have to do anything new. The provost has asked the other colleges to do this as well. So that much is good. We're still doing the postdoc hiring in DEI, that process is going on just fine. We have a new center,

Lisa Pawloski is going to talk about. Community Engagement Academy kicked off with its first class. The Southeast Asian International Initiative is going and will hopefully be able to leave the country next summer. Ray is working on space management very seriously for the College. Lots of research areas in the college as well that we're investing in through people. And then also some financial modernization. There are a number of barriers at the College, we spend a lot of money that we have historically not been tried. The one that I'll mention right now are overloads for teaching. Overloads for teaching, especially during the academic year, come out of the College's budget, come out of our free budget, so the budget that you would use to pay for startups or that I would pay for graduate students, or pay for travel. So, it's really important that we don't do those unless they're really necessary. Alright, Because it turns out that this, this dollar amount translates into nearly a million dollars a year that we're giving out those ways. Some of the money is not coming from me, there's a portion of that it's coming from CCS, but then the vast majority of it is coming from us. And in CCS, CCS gives us our recovery. So, we front-load the money, CCS pays us back. Sometimes it's more money than the cost. But if the class is small, then we actually lose money on CCS classes too. And so, it's important that we, as a group, as a collective group, work towards modernizing this process. We have a number of longer-term goals that we'll be talking about with DEI. Also, the research goal was to get us to the third of the 33rd percentile in the SRI. That's why I was showing these charts before with the AU. Getting the PAAC up off the ground, and that's coming along well now. I'm actually feeling good about it. And then still, I would still like to 50% increase in graduate students. If we can get, frankly, we can get our course fees adjusted, I think we're going to be able to offset a lot of faculty teaching responsibilities in a way that's going to help us have more students aboard, and a lot more GRAs, as well. With soft money, course fee money, that comes back to me or can give out some of those dollars that can give out to GRAs, beyond GTA.

Budget, I think this is my last slide, and then I'm going to transfer it. So it's a little bit hard to see, I was hoping you could see this, but this is. So, our budget is actually pretty complicated. It's fairly sizable. There are a number of things in here that are interesting to me. Alright, so one thing. So we are, we're actually over a lot in faculty salaries of \$1.2 million, that's almost exclusively reducing class sizes. So, when all the departments were doing the hiring to reduce class sizes, this is how we did it. So that's what it cost for us to do that. You know, you know, some other things too. But basically, basically, that \$1.2 million there that's over is our cost of reducing the class sizes. This money right here, though, \$48,194,000 is the pool of money that I'm able to use. The difference in how much I'm actually spending in there with tenure system faculty. And that total budget, that budget is what I have to spend on other stuff, for the startup, the startup packages are paid for. There's a lot of things that come out of that pool. And that right now we're actually over it. Now the Provost is going to pay us back, that was the thing. The Provost said he's going to pay us so we don't have to worry about it. But my hope is that the Provost makes those dollars permanent, he just adds them to our budget. And then we're able to keep the class size program going. But we went out on a limb to reduce the class sizes. And so it didn't really cost us.

There's a couple of weird things on here that I always forget about I have to give you the \$27 million here that we're over is actually healthcare. So if you're ever curious about what our healthcare costs are, the difference between the projected the original budget, which is \$6.6 million, versus our actual budget, \$27 million, is what health care costs. Basically, it's almost exclusively healthcare is the \$21 million difference there. So, you think about what we when we talk about Healthy UA and things like that, that's where it isn't just translate In the money. Now they usually take it out, they'll take it out. So, we don't actually, we're not in a hole of \$20 million. But the bottom line is, when you think about a real operating budget for the College, what we really have sort of to work with coming in September 30: \$457,000. All right, that's the other money. That's not part of the unused faculty dollars. So, when we've given up money in the past to increase operating budgets for departments, it comes out of that. So, it's out of that pool. So, it's actually, it's an interesting budget. It's actually pretty tight, you know, financially. But it works fine. But that is part of the reason why we keep money set aside in salaries and wages and try not to fill every single one that we have that's open, because that's the only way that we can top off that number, that \$457,000 number. And it's probably you're looking at that thinking, "how can you possibly get that total?" So, our real total expenditures, when you put it all together and everything else, we would give some grants, it's close to \$150 million. And we're our margin, operating margins are pretty slim.

Alright, so now we're going to transfer to some of the associate deans. I spoke for a pretty long time, not too long.

**Ray White (41:26)**

I'm going to try to not use the mic. You guys hear me? Okay. Okay. All right. So, there are two sets of procedures that are circulating among departments now: one related to space, one related to teaching load and funding a buyout. So well, so start off with the less contentious policy that stays. So, what's driving this is that we have case for people-- departments are kind of unaware of their underused space. Departments who are not nominating hearing to long-standing conventions about allocation. For example, faculty should have no more than one solo office. Well, some departments have been having multiple solo offices for faculty. In the last seven or eight months, I've had several chairs come to me, insisting that they need more space for the faculty, etc. And in each case, when I kind of dove into what space they had, what allocations that already been assigned to faculty turns out each of these three cases was really internally solved, because they had either number of faculty with multiple offices, or they are unaware of the space they had on their own building. So, I'm starting kind of an inventory of everybody.

So far, I've been concentrating on my own area of science and math because I know that area better, but we're going to be branching this out to the other divisions as well. So, there's sort of codified, some long-standing norms for space allocation, and I'm trying to quantify expectations in some historically ambiguous areas. So, for example, the very first one is faculty have one solo office. If there's a need for them to have other offices, they must be shared.

Second point is, what is the target amount for grad students versus FTI versus PTIs versus postdocs? Some departments think the suggested allocation to their grad students are too small. Other departments can't imagine providing any such space for their grad students. Because we have a variety of cultures here, we're trying to come to some sensible norm, [unable to hear]. Actually, let me emphasize something that's very important about these space norms. The idea is not to cause an imminent reshuffling of people in existing space. Rather, it's for chairs to prioritize the use of their space in case they need more space. So, this is going to be a response to particular space attention, their roles are first. So, the chairs need to know what is the kind of rank-ordered list of excess space, or rather, underused space that they're going to tap if they actually need to find more space. Then the idea is not to simply say, "Okay, starting such as such we want ever to be in these kinds of spaces." No. There's going to be very little movement. Initially, it's more about how do you prioritize? How do you solve to your space problem in the future?

Another issue that we're trying to address is that we have historical allocations of laboratory space to people who have not nearly as productive as they used to, but there's kind of a legacy sense of ownership about lab space. So, the idea is to have some criteria for how you assess whether someone needs to be resized, and what's a reasonable thing to expect. So, one key point is for collaborating departments to consider increasing the amount of shared resources they have. A driving principle here is that your lab space is tied to your external funding. And the third point here quantifies what is whose budget allocation. \$60 per square foot per year for research. And where did this come from? Two places. I did a distribution for the lab-oriented departments in my area, their distribution of the space allocation compared to funding in the natural sciences departments, [unable to hear] and found that this magic number of \$60 per square foot was about median for most of the departments already, what they've already achieved. Alright. So, after half their faculty were already generating more than that. Secondly, I compare this to national norms, which is a little bit difficult to find, but I found some analyses of republished universities, and found this is about 1/3 to one half of what is typical, at our aspirational peer institutions. So, it's way below what is the normal expectation that the institutions that we will diversify into.

While we're already there, most of our departments, secondly, it still struggle with what's expected from some of our official peers, which should not be the biggest, but still allows kind of a comparison for chairs to help decide where are their possible opportunities for resizing lab space in the departments. We want research people who are short on funding to still be able to continue their research. And so, this point here addresses kind of the principal on minimum original box testing for research activity, perhaps shorter funding. And again, this is based upon national comparisons, what is reasonable for about half size labs and some of the newer science research programs that share a lot of space together. There's the expectation for research lab space. The point is, in these shared resources, I wouldn't want to keep track of what faculty is actually using them because they contribute to the space budget.

Another long-standing issue with some of you are aware of the space police. More specifically, but they're very interested in patrolling your halls. And for those of you who have research a lot in the building, records of who is present, which they'll mark any labs that they see anybody in, and they go in your lab and find out everything moved, what kind of stuff you have in there. They're extremely sensitive to labs being used as storage. I am constantly being harassed by these guys to, in turn, to harass you. Okay, so this is something Art and Science has...So this is such a problem that Arts and sciences doubled the size of our off-site storage, just to be devoted to researching storage. I've had a three-and-a-half-year project trying to get some additional storage spaces in Bevill, for example, which only now is being built. So, the space police do not appreciate that some amount of storage is actually required for healthy research programs. So, we have to work with this constraint. So that Arts and Sciences is actually subsidizing that space.

This is mostly about retired faculty. The faculty are about to leave. And so this point, so we come back to the first question retired faculty at another time. So, I'm going to transition to the more contentious proposal to have some norms for what tricks how do you determine what teaching loads should be. What's the mechanism by which you buy out courses in some very nice way. So what problems are we solving here? Well, there are several. There are a couple of departments who have been longtime had trouble cultures, where the faculty had to earn their reduced teaching load, through funded research activity. Other departments have had the issue those not tied at all to funding activity. Okay, so there's been a long-standing inequity of employment.

Another one is that some departments have historically been required to buy out explicitly every course reduction that their faculty earned through funding, whereas other departments didn't have to buy out anything explicit, because they were associated with such high levels of funding as a department as a whole, a reduced teaching load was just kind of granted to the department at large, regardless of whether every individual department actually had [unknown] or not. So there's another inequity that I'm trying to address.

So just to remind you, it's about finding that cap load, it's about finding that R2:2 teaching load particulars by default, that is already acknowledging coursework reduction for research-active faculty, so 2:2 the baseline research activity. To get below that require some funding. So, the proposal here is there's two possible paths to reduce your teaching load. One is called implicit because it's like, it's like these departments were, because they had such high historical levels of funding, the entire departments was sort of granted course release, really is whether individual faculty had kind of earned that through funding or not. The second is a continuation of the explicit model which other departments have had to use to reduce their funding. And that is the opportunity what happened to the budget, take out, of course, etc. Proposing, a way we can do both. The other driving principle here, for either, the guiding principle here is that we want to encompass two very different cultures: 1.) traditionally very highly-funded, and 2.), say, all of the humanities, and social sciences, where that load of funding is never reasonable, but there are

smaller grants that are accessible. And we want to encourage more humanities faculty, and half the social sciences faculty to go after those smaller grants.

So, the point here is to make an attempt to have one policy that encompasses both cultures. The immediate consequence of that is that the incentives are not proportional to one another in the sense that the implicit threshold for getting to a 1:1 teaching is \$100,000 a year, for example, but to buy out a portion of time is between those, and the disparity between that the lack of proportionality is due to trying to come to these two very different cultures. Alright, so it's not strictly a course it would cost you this-- we want to increase, which really matters, and have social science to start issuing more foundational grants, etc, that are substantially smaller than what you can expect the natural sciences. So, the attempt here is to have some thresholds that accompany and incentivize both cultures. So, all the chairs know this, I would like the chairs to transmit that to the faculty because I'm getting... So, I've been soliciting feedback from the chairs for some time now, the latest route without [unable to hear], I'm still getting numerous, kind of, complex modeling outreach responses to the lack of partially here, or as I just explained, so I appreciate the chairs actually transmitting that to their faculty. Now, and also people have counter-proposals of what this should be.

Okay, so the other wrinkle here, so for some first threshold to get below a 2:2 is to have at least 20k per year, and external funding. The second threshold is to have \$100,000 a year to get a 1:1, or a second simultaneous grant, to the tune of the small grant. Again, to incentivize people in areas where the grants are smaller, but nonetheless, they still have access to this possibly implicit costs much amount.

In addition to that, if you don't want to buy out your course the implicit way you can do it explicitly, as you've always been able to do. And so here's just something following that. So, for those of you who missed the memo for last year or so, Joe agreed to have a buyout of one course for one semester that is 10% of the faculty member's salary. And this is long overdue, used to be 12.5%. But some years ago, three, four years ago, our FT allocations were redefined for... 80% was your full-time teaching load, and 20% of service. So that means one course corresponds to 10% of your 9-month salary rather than 12.5%. And so the College's expectation is aligned with our FTE renormalization. Other colleges are still charging their faculty 12.5%. So that the highest-paid faculty are not gouged, there's a cap of \$10k for buyout. The highest paid faculty by there's no way to replace the teachers in the cost as much as they do, as well more of an unlikely place to teach a class.

One important part of this is that the explicit buyout funds is totally to the department, which is conducive to [...], it's up to the chair. By the way, we're normally this sprinkled throughout because there's all sorts of ... . It has been the case that the courses have not been allowed in previous regime to buy down below 1:0. But Joe, is, is going to allow that to happen with criteri on the next page. How you get to a 1:0. Until now, below 1:0 is normally not possible. Well, there's extremely

strict cases where someone might need to take a leave of absence or gets released to do something, you know, internationally. But 1:0, I'm sorry, below 1:0 is not achievable; 1:0 is now achievable with this criteria. So if you achieve a 1:1 teaching load through implicit buyout, that is your funding level is high enough to get here, to get to a 1:0 is possible, but you have to buy up two courses, the one that was already implicitly gifted to you by your high threshold, and the second one to get you to 1:0. This is meant to be hard, right? It's not a bug, it's a feature, okay. The chairs now, if they added a whole bunch of capacity suddenly be able to get to 1:0, that would be very problematic, relying on resources. Okay, so this is meant to be hard. I'm gonna skip this plot-- this alludes to the relatively new opportunity for us to buy out your research time during the research portion throughout the academic year. It's hardly happened ever on campus. It's new to people on campus. So I'm not going to spend that much time on this part because it's gonna affect only very few people in the future. The last point here is that, as Joe alluded to, the College stats over \$700,000 on supplemental pay, which is quite a mystery, **supplemental pay will only not go to faculty** ....

### **Utz McKnight**

When I came into the job, I have a bit of a problem. And that is... I've been here 18 years. Now, it's not like nothing was done. Okay, it was not like nothing was done. But the existing process of course, after 18 years, it's invisible to me. Right. Okay. So the type of thing, without going into it, the type of diversity initiatives that we develop in the college under Bob were such that, we had almost an entirely flat number of African-American faculty hired over 18 years. Right. There are a lot of reasons for that. We have a lot of like, in other words, if you looked at our numbers across the board, you would see that things haven't changed that much. So we could say we could if we were cynical and sort of left-wing angry, especially during the pandemic, right, we could say it's fair, right? I'm not saying doesn't mean I'm not left-wing. Nothing, no, none of that stuff applies. The fact is, is that we could say nationally that the existing sort of politics of representation, when you go ahead down the list and you say, how many have a certain type of person you have, across an entire college of what 21, 22 departments, museums, etc, etc. You know, doing "one size fits all" has led to nationally, in all the schools (I was coming from Cal before coming here) is exactly the same. They actually said to the African-American faculty, there are 73 of you, this is UC Berkeley, some who will die. And we will hire a new. Okay, that was said to the Black faculty community. Okay, that's fine. You can run to the Vice Chancellor of UC system and say, "Utz McKnight said..." and I'll be like, "yeah." Okay. So nationally, that's what I'm talking about. Okay. So we know that existing way of doing things has not appreciably changed what? The dynamics in the departments. We are very, very good at best practices. We know, the pools are small, we have to pay more, all the different ways that people come up with reasons why they're doing a good enough job. Okay, so we know nationally, not just UA, nationally, we need to change several things.

And you can see it another way politically, I'm going to get to this. You can see it politically when all of a sudden CRT is raised as a flag. And a whole bunch of people run at the flag. And a lot of us are like wait, that's not, that's not a real thing. Right? We become vulnerable to that type of politics, because we don't have any solutions that are developing. We're using a bunch of old tools. And a lot

of us are kind of like, well, nothing, and I need you all to admit this, "Nothing can be done. We're doing everything right." Okay. We're not in a position as a country, in academics in the academy at large. We're not in a position, I think personally, it is my job also to say this, to say this is enough. Right?

I look at it this way: 59. That's my age of 59. My fourth institution was Alabama. Okay, I look at I was born in '62. So I have a unique problem here. Right? I'm that second generation, or third generation as an African-American academic. In a place like Alabama, you see all the stuff, you see the plaques, you see all this stuff. So we're ready to move in all this. But wait, who am I at The University of Alabama? I have a particular problem. That is, if the numbers don't increase, what have I done? In terms of change at Alabama, there are no Black faculty. In this room, there are three of us self-identified, at least that I can identify, that I can point out, all three of us have this problem. We're looking around and going like "what counts for progress?" The rest of you may have other ways of thinking about, right. The reason why this matters to us is "wait, why did I... Why didn't we push for integration?" If the numbers haven't changed 20, 30 years, right? We could say again, that things aren't working correctly, or something. How do we, in other words, how do we develop a sense of progress? There are plenty of people in this room who say like this, we don't need more Black faculty. Okay, what we need is "x." I'm looking for "x." Okay.

And I know where it has to start, especially during the pandemic. It has to start with undergrads. I can talk this way, the way I just talked about it like this 18, 20, 21 years, I think it is the number of years that the number of African American students of the undergraduate population has not changed. So some of you are brand new to UA go, oh, you UA you know, 11% African American students. That's so great. UC Berkeley's a 2.3. Right. So nationally, some of you are around with Judy Bonner was president. And Judy said I'll use her first name. There's no disrespect intended. We're good. Okay. Judy said like this to our faces, the collective Black faculty and staff association. She said "the numbers are good. We're getting out from under the Knight case." And we're like we had no counter argument, because the numbers were good. Up until four years ago, we were the second best in terms of proportion in terms of in bubbles. I don't want to repeat the word too much. Right. Okay, wait, we were the second-best terms of African-American faculty numbers in the entire country. So you see the numbers that the Dean puts up there, right? Academic analytics, we could have come up with the numbers and said, you know, we're number two, forget Harvard, these other people, Michigan, Oklahoma, were like second in the country. So that was used to kind of say, "that's the end of that logic." You understand what I mean by that? It's the end of the logic. Students 11%. If you point to that, to me to Roger, to Alexis, if you say, "our numbers are good, African American students," we go like this, "Yeah. They've been exactly flat." We have so many more. Yeah. Because the campus has grown in size, right? The enrollment. Right. So how do we solve the problem of breaking that threshold?

A lot of people feel that it's not a threshold problem. It's not, if you're 18%, you're successful. Right? I think most of you would agree that it's not a numbers issue. Right? Instead, it's what? It's the

department. It's how we teach, the type of environment, how we support students. And then you see that when you look at 54% of black male students will graduate from The University of Alabama 46% will not-- this is not just the College. Right? Are you guys fine? Most of you, liberals. Right? Most of you. Because you tilt that that number. 46%. Well, remember the student loan rate you can imagine, right? So 46% don't graduate? Where do they get jobs? The Black population nationally, that are relatively poor, right? I don't have to go into the numbers for you. You've all done that type of basic research. Okay. So 46%, if they're all leaning on Sallie Mae, and they're taking out those loans, right, and they don't get a BA. And you have costs, imagine they're out of state \$26,000 a year for Sallie Mae funding, and they drop out in the second year, they don't graduate. So they've got I know, some of you're better at math than me. Right? Let's say we add on everything they're sitting on maybe \$48, \$49, \$50,000, (I'm going a little low of debt). How do they pay that off? I know all of you, most of us, have absorbed our student loan debt. Long since mortgage paid. You know, we do all that. Right? Like this, right? But you're talking about someone who doesn't graduate who has no resources, who maybe comes from I don't know, outside of Selma, from a trailer park. The numbers would be different. They'd be in-state. You guys feel better? I'm teasing you a little bit.

This is my problem is that I have to take a relatively difficult... I have to take a structure that does not recognize it has a problem. And I have to have buy-in from all of you. Not the left. I have no idea what that means. Okay, I am from birth. I'm looking at you I have no idea. I am probably the only one in the house has been at parties at Angela Davis's house. I think, if you, you're welcome to join in solidarity with me. I'm just saying but wait, I'm joking about my own expense. What's the left mean? If in fact, we're sitting here in 46% of the Black men, you know, you have Black male students, right? If you look at them, and I have to say this to them. I do, first year, I say "one out of two of you will not graduate." That's a great feeling. Right. So I don't know what left- right means in this context, I gotta have all of you on board. So the way I've decided to do it, this will shift as our community shifts, and what I mean by community is you. So I spent the first few weeks some of you know this going into all the different departments that I could capture very quickly asking what the issues were. I did a lot of work with undergraduates, a lot grad students, etc. Like canvas, canvas, canvas. Okay. I'm not one of those people who says like "this is the honeymoon period. I need like two years to like, investigate." Okay, I have warned you in the in these meetings that I'm a doer. Right. So we're well on the way already in the spring. But we started already in the fall to do change the tutoring, and also tutoring process for undergraduates, a whole bunch of new resources. I have buy-in I hope, looking at some of the chairs here, right. I have buy-in, I forced them or ask them generously. You know, with Ray, for example, in the sciences, bringing some of those departments together because we have a problem. Where does the 46% occur? Now remember, this is just Black men. But one of the things we have to get past the old way of looking at it, I had somebody say to me, 'Well, if it's just Black men, that seems unfair.' But wait, you understand? I mean, you do, right? Let's push you out of your, your 20 years, maybe of academic work, or 30 years in this type of stuff, you understand that? You know, rising tide, lifts all boats. if we can do tutoring for what actually is just a certain number of students? Or maybe you think what that Black people don't have the skill set. I'm just kind of teasing you. You put the resources in front of these students, and they will succeed, right? So our problem is

actually this, that we're not as effective as we should be, in terms of not just creating the tutoring structure, right, but educating the students to show up. Right, like, everything is kind of in pieces, that is exacerbating and we all get a pass. I'm just talking about undergraduates. There's more stuff there, right, we all get a pass because of the pandemic. Everything collapsed. It really did. So I wanted to say to all of you because of the way this room is, I wanted to say to all of you, you do understand that this is probably and how many of you agree with me on this? Probably the hardest semester of my academic professional career. I'm fine. I got a book out last year, I'm great. But I'm not, right? It's been extremely difficult. The chairs in the room will definitely say this extremely difficult, right? But we're pretending that everything is fine. So, we get a pass. So out of this, out of this sort of inertia in this big, big structure, right, that we have to shift around. And we also have to come up with new ideas. We lead on these issues in the country. I know some of you come from like Michigan, it's arbitrary. Right? And you say like, is Alabama so backward? No, we're not. I promise you, I can find easily undergraduates will say like this to your face, they will say "anytime I have doubts, I just got asked grandma and she could show me the baton from the old sheriff. No, this guy from Birmingham, where he beat my grandmother. So, I never have doubts." That's not Berkeley or Michigan.

Okay, so we need to kind of upset that idea. We're extremely good at this. I know the other schools around the country are looking at us for this. So let's try and collectively create some change. Not everybody is left-wing in this room. But I mean, it's everybody. Okay. So, tutoring a cohort process means if a student has a BSC 113, Math 112, and let's say they're foolish enough to take chemistry also. Right? You know, put it up there, right like this. We can see tracking in terms of grades and stuff like this. Can we create student cohorts where we throw resources at Miss small groups? This is not Black men. But it is. Okay. So that would be a very big change in how we put students through the process. Right. So I talked to John Wingard earlier today, this is our second or third meeting about this. We have access for the first time in my 18 years to the data, we can see ACT score, race, gender, classes, too, we can see it for the first time, we have access to that data. So we're crunching the data to figure out where to put cohort resources. Right. Okay. This makes sense? But remember, you push back on me, you know this in terms of meeting with me. As I've been sitting there having lunches with assistant professors and chairs and doing all this type of stuff. I'm sitting there like this. And so we'll come back, we will shift collectively and build a better UA. Right? Okay, wait, and we actually will.

So I went to the grad school, I kept hearing from departments. When I was meeting the chairs, I kept hearing a problem. They said, "we've got a very good process for teaching at the grad level for substantive things that people need, for PhDs, for Masters etc. But we have a problem in terms of writing and time management." Like it kind of falls on those faculty who love doing that type of work. We're not talking about methods okay, but we're talking about are and you know, this don't look around the junior people. Okay? You know that there's always that, you know, charismatic, "I'll do it. Right. I'll teach them how to write, and read and like, get those essays in on time." But then we found over talking to the chairs, that there's a real problem across the college with this. It looks different,

research paper looks different in chemistry, right? Lab reports, grant writing, things like this (we're talking about grad students), okay, looks different than in English. We found there's a collective, the collective issue with this. So I went to the grad school, they said, "we've got this stuff already." And I was like, "okay, but that means it's not working." Right. So whenever I'm in the room, and you're like, "we've got it already, "I'm looking at you. And some of us chairs know this, right? I go like this. So that means that any failures they're built in, right?

So what we've decided to do, I had a great conversation with Dean Carvalho and a bunch of other people, right, and they're going to create some new initiatives for the spring already. But by the fall, we're gonna have three new things: we're gonna have a workshop, this is just for the College, we're gonna have a workshop for grad students who are what we think of as a terminal degree. Right? So not Master's, but an MFA, and then PhDs. So we're going to have a starting workshop. They come in, it's not mandatory, I would recommend you suggest you students go to it. It's going to be dedicated just for the College. And you know, what happens if we do it in the College, it spreads to the rest of the University, right? So the first thing is a new student comes in, and learns this is how you approach the research process. This is what it means to be in a seminar. And as Carvalho said, like this, we need to make them from undergrads to grad students. You understand this is extremely difficult. And personally, I would love to just push it on my new, you know, assistant professor, like Jared over there, and say, hey, you know, could you do this for us? Right? My 26 master's students, okay. But we're going to go ahead and have a seminar like that. We're gonna have a seminar that goes right before comps. So these are going to be parallel seminars right before comprehensive exams, just before they do a, let's say, a thesis proposal. That middle stage, two, three years in, we will track with you, we'll talk to each of the departments, we'll figure it out. The grad school, this is their investment. Right? Okay. The third thing will be end of process. Rather than, you know, we're running out of normative time that people like this, how do you finish your dissertation?

Okay, now, it does work. All of us who are here actually prove that it works, right. Okay. Without any of this stuff. However, with the pandemic, let's give all the students a little bit of a break. And at least try and see if this creates a more effective process. It does not cost College. Well, maybe. But the grad school has said, "Oh, you finally give it some mission. "Yes, right. I can be sarcastic, right? Because I am actually Arts and Sciences with you. Right? Okay. Let's change the relationship with grad school.

I want to do assistant professor accountability writing groups. I'm talking about this all semester. I've been trying to figure out how to do it, like actually how to do it. We have 180 assistant professors. If everybody says yes, I want to do this. Okay. Right, this is so what I'm trying to do is we'll talk about it and he really needed right like this, or you might need it. The person, the assistant professor who does not right, does not care. Really thank you for the job. But you know, I'm spending five years just kind of hanging out. Right, that person, they don't need a writing group. The other type of person is somebody who writes extremely quickly produces perfect network, but doesn't like people to read their stuff. Almost all the chairs are like that. Full professors, all of you the rest of you, I see you to

like "get your eyes off my work." No one can criticize me, everybody's a second reviewer, right like this, right? Those people also exist, they should not be pushed into the writing group. Okay. But there is a type of person I have at least one faculty member that's like this, let us use her, right? She loves people reading her work. She loves it she produces all the time. She ate four chapters, four book chapters, does not mind me talking, of course, right four book chapters and four single-authored articles this last year when she was on sabbatical. That's not her sabbatical work. You see what I'm saying? That was stuff she did before. Do you want to read my article like this? Those people are also listening That's who you want in your writing group, right? The fourth, fifth year, very successful, this is how it's done. Because you take your first year, assistant professor, they talk to that person. They're like, Oh, that's how you do it. Or let me say, like this without this writing group, you have to do that the, chairs and the fulls and Associates in the room, right? You're the one who has to, as you say, mentor, okay. So let's help out the mentoring process across the board. I'm thinking I'm going to have 10 of these writing groups. I'm actually going to send out an email to the chairs to send out to the writing to the assistant professors tomorrow, There'll be 10 of these things. They should be about five to seven I running out of time running out.

### **Messina**

That's like the longest one slide ever. But no, I don't want to lose people. Oh, really?

### **McKnight**

And then, did you guys know all this stuff anyway, right? Good. Bye

### **Lisa Pawloski**

If you have questions? Email me. we have an I--CUE, we're trying to expand the College: International careers, Community engagement, Undergraduate research and Experiential learning. We're going to be a resource hub for faculty and for students. And it is composed, we've got some directors who are helping with this. So Pam Derrick, is heading the experiential learning; Pamela Young, who is the director of community engagement and economic development; and we are hiring a coordinator for undergraduate research right now with the assure group is working. We've got a great committee, Tom Tobin is, is leading that right now. But we need more time for that. We want more students to be able to do undergraduate research and work with faculty. So if you know someone who might be interested in that position, let me know. And it's on the HR website. So this is launched this fall. And we have all these kinds of exciting things to support our faculty with helping students take picture, well, we have this online seminar, okay, well, it'll be online so you can get your pictures. But for students who want to do internships, sometimes there are challenges in how do you pay for it, there are compliance kinds of issues, helping transfer people who study away programs, so we can help you as faculty with that. And then we're also going to support our students, and we're trying to really ramp up the internship opportunities. We're working with all departments. We want some particularly programs, internships within Washington, DC, and Montgomery. And so, we're working to create new partnerships and internship programs for students in those in those areas. So, we will be supporting students with this and faculty, and also helping students determine if they want

credit, or not credit, and so forth. So be on the lookout for that, we're going to be redoing the website. So all of those resources are easily accessible and available. Okay.

### **Messina**

So, I'm gonna just say, so this is an example of investing in people. So, because Lisa, Pam, and Pamela, are all great, doing their own thing, they've all been working independently doing fabulous work the whole time. And so, but I feel like investing in them as a group, and then building out I-CUE as an option, as a resource for students is going to make a big, it'll be good. I think it's going to help more of our students be successful in the long run, because we already do experiential learning, we do these things better than a lot of our peers. And I think just the kind of we can coordinate this a little bit more and invest in a bit. I think we have a lot of possibility. I was just in Miami, the last couple of days fundraising and this I proposed funding it to the donor, and I think he's gonna so it'll be it'll be something

### **John Wingard**

You can see the new program that we have approved, I'm going to go quickly. Thank you for all the faculty that have led new programs. It's becoming a much more laborious process, something that's positive in terms of making sure you have strong program, meet the needs of the departments, meet the needs of students. It is something that... situations develop though in a process. So the Curriculum Committee of the College of Arts and Sciences is just the first layer of that process. Then you go on to the Undergraduate Council, then you have to see this process through, please talk to Richard Richards about how challenging it can be. It's wonderful.

The next slide. We are still working through, and thanks again for the departments that are ushering in neuroscience. Women's Gender and sexuality major in the department of gender and race. Ethics, medical ethics, in the department of philosophy. Chemistry minor, Water Sciences and sustainability minor, those were all through the College and going through the Undergraduate Council, curriculum committee for the chem process. We are here to support you at student services. So, if you're thinking about designing a new program, please meet with the college registrars, with myself. We'll go through the overview of what it looks like, the time, and all that good stuff. I have to get a lot of creditors and great programs that are coming through, you're really, really trying to meet the needs of students and supporting each other, and kind of pushing the envelope where the College is going. And that's attracting a lot of good students.

### **Messina**

So, before we move on to the last bit, I wanted to talk a little bit about the GET. So, the thing about the General Education Task Force and the change in the core curriculum, we know it will happen that the core will be smaller. I mean, that is a given, the core will be fewer hours in the future. All right. Now, we have to, we... knowing this, going if, we can't fight against that, that's a losing battle. But it's going to be smaller. And I think as a College, you know, our departments have to be prepared, potentially, with new programming, new offerings, all kinds of things so that we can

maintain our credit hours. Also recruit majors, it's a real opportunity for us as well, to increase the number of majors that we have, because there'll be more students who will be getting double, dual majors, things like that, that I think that's going to be a real opportunity for us. They'll be more opportunities for AMP students as well. I think there... we'll have more programming, more discussions in the spring about this, from the College, with all the chairs, so you can plan for that in the future. But it will be reduced, the core is going to be reduced. We are by far the largest the SEC. And but it is an opportunity for us as well.

Last thing I'm going to talk about briefly is the Capital Campaign. So, we have a Campaign Cabinet. We had our first major event at the Powell house, a beautiful event at the home of Holland and Carolyn Powell. We approved the priorities, I'm going to go through those really fast on that last slide. The next one. Case support actually it's not under revision I didn't edit that out. It's done. We are we've a personal goal, my personal goal that I tell the provost is \$10 million a year. So that's what I want the College to shoot for every year. I don't actually have a goal I there's not something that's imposed upon the College or me. We they did they did a simple regression, linear regression about what they thought our campaign total should be. And they came up with \$91,236,000. something like that, which is a terrible slogan, right? 91,000,200. So, I said, "we'll just change it to \$100 million," which sounds large, and it is large, but it's sounds better. So, but we hit \$10 million a year, we'll make it. So, we're about \$58 million right now. Soon, is we're going to be fine. Fundraising have been going pretty well this fall. So, but as of a month ago, we were at \$58 million. And so, I feel really good. Our development team does great work. We're able to get out on the road again, and do those things.

Briefly about what I'm fundraising for. Alright, so we have these are official priorities. But it really falls into a set of categories, right. And fundraising, we're fundraising for students: undergraduates and graduate students. Most donors like to give to undergraduates, they'd like to replicate-- they like to make their own life better if they were new students. And so that's why we see, we have 1000 undergraduate scholarships in some of these scholarships award 100 scholarships, you know, versions of it. So, it's, it's one of those things, we give out a lot of scholarships. But I'm trying to increase in our graduate student funding scholarships, as well. And some of those are coming, too. We're starting to see those, especially in the sciences, pretty successful. Music, of course, skip does a great job, fundraising and is broadly engaged all the time, but it's important that the chairs be involved in fundraising too, when you have the opportunities. I've never going to impose that it's not a requirement, you're not going to be evaluated on it, but it is it doesn't matter to the success of your department. So, scholarships again and accessibility, that's like the experiential learning piece. That's why that's in there. Improving quality of life is broad, that actually refers to things that are outside the university. Things like in CD, communicative disorders, the Hear Here bus, you know, that's something we go out to the communities, audiology testing, things like that. There's those kinds of things are important for improving quality of life. We do a lot of those. And that leading innovation and excellence in higher education are things that are included endowed professorships. We actually have very few, you know, across the college. We have some new ones coming in, which

is great. We have some expansions. But again, one of my goals is really to try to find ways to fund endowed professorships for the College is as widely as possible. One of the things that I've convinced the campaign cabinet is that we're creating endowed professorships that reside in the College with the different, what that provides is an opportunity for an allocation in departments where an endowed professorship might really make a difference for department in a particular point in time. So the professorship would revert to the College eventually, when the faculty member leaves, but it's a way for us to distribute these endowed professorships around to some of the departments, you know, that may not have access to those kinds of positions through the usual methods. But the majority are still the ones that come to the departments of science.

That is it about thank you for your patience, thank you for adjusting your schedule to walking across campus. So that you can be here. But of course, it's really great to see all of you. And we have a reception after, hope to see all of you there. We have a few minutes for questions for anybody.

### **Question**

One thing I saw in the budget that shocked me was \$20,000 of endowment money for the College. So that seems incredibly low.

### **Messina**

Yeah. So, there's different kinds of funding. So, part of that is how... where these all because of balance. I could go into more detail about that. It's not something that you shouldn't worry about that number. But you put it that way, because we have Dean's discretionary funds and things like that, that reside completely internally. So, it's not College the same way. I mean, the Loper chair returns \$100,000 a year by itself. You know, so it's really if you think about how much we're bringing in as a total, it's a lot, it's in the millions. So, I wouldn't worry about that one particular piece. It's like the health care piece in there. I wish they didn't put it in there. But that is how it's in there. All right. Well, thank you for your patience and hard work. And again, I look forward to seeing you over for the reception.