

## Faculty Senate Report

The Faculty Senate believes that the most important challenges facing the next president of the University of Rochester are:

- strengthening and enhancing the national academic reputation of the institution, particularly the College.
- supporting and enhancing the intellectual creativity of faculty and students across the board.
- overall fund-raising and alumni relations/development.
- serving as a highly visible representative of the University on the local and national level.

All of these activities are synergistic. For example, success in the capital campaign of the College will be critical in providing necessary resources to build the academic reputation of the institution.

The Faculty Senate believes that the president who will be able to face these challenges must be someone

- with an outstanding academic reputation, preferably as a professor in the arts and sciences, who sees the College as the institution's center of gravity, who understands the unique culture of an academic institution, and who will work with faculty to improve the overall quality of the institution.
- who is comfortable dealing with and overseeing various professional schools, including a major medical center, and who will provide strong leadership for the central administration.
- who respects the institution's decentralized structure, including the autonomy of the College and each of the professional schools.
- who understands the value of regular and constructive interaction with faculty bodies, including the Faculty Senate, understands the need of faculty to be involved in decisions that affect their future and welfare, and recognizes the importance of faculty engagement in assessing the quality of leadership of the professional schools and the College.
- who is prepared to raise money in an aggressive fashion, including offering leadership to the College campaign, and will have a high visibility both within the institution, in the greater Rochester community, and in the nation.

## Faculty Senate Report

We have come to these conclusions based on our best understanding of the current state of the institution and its recent history, which will be briefly summarized in the remainder of this document.

The two most significant academic events at the University over the past decade have arguably been the Renaissance Plan and the Medical Center Strategic Initiative. The objective of the Renaissance Plan was to stem the decline in undergraduate student quality and increase net tuition from our undergraduate student population. Both of these objectives at the present time have been adjudged to have been quite successful. Student SAT test scores have increased and the tuition discount rate is now comparable to that at many of our peer institutions. It has decreased from a high of approximately 60% in 1994, to a current value of ~ 40%.

However, cutting certain graduate programs in the College to economize resources was also part of the Renaissance plan strategy. It can be argued that in retrospect this and other constraints on the resources available to support the mission of the College continue to cost the institution dearly in terms of academic reputation within the broader national academic community. This we conclude from an analysis of the university's standing in the US & News annual academic rankings over a 15-year period, which shows a continuing decline in the ranking of the institution (from 25<sup>th</sup> in 1990 to 35<sup>th</sup>-36<sup>th</sup> in 2004). Notwithstanding their imperfection as metrics, these survey results are widely used, perhaps most importantly, by prospective students. Summaries of some germane data, including comparisons with a reasonable set of peer institutions, are attached to this document.

The decrease in the overall ranking of the University over this time period has been ascribed to the decline in financial resources that resulted from the endowment under-performance in the 1970-1980's. This, it has been argued, has limited the institution's ability to buttress its declining academic standings with investment in faculty and new programs. If so, this points out the critical importance of retaining successful faculty at the institution and mounting a successful College capital campaign over the next 5 years. These, we would hope, would be major undertakings expected from the next president.

The re-organization of the development office of the College in recent years is seen by many as having been an important step after decades of neglect, which the administration admits has been costly to the institution. The annual Meliora events, recently instituted to renew and foster contact with our alumni body, have been extraordinarily well conceived and attended. We urge that these activities be continued and indeed expanded upon. Giving rates from our alumni remain amongst the lowest of our peer group (ranked 60 in the 2004 US & NEWS report) with an average of 21% of our alumni giving to the institution (cf 61% for Princeton). This remains a significant opportunity for the institution to improve its financial state and requires attention to its relationships with alumni.

**US & NEWS OVERALL REPUTATION RANKINGS 1990, 1995, 2000, 2004**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Case Western</b>	<b>Rochester</b>	<b>Wash. U</b>	<b>Tufts</b>	<b>Emory</b>
1990	>25	25	24	>25	>25
1995	35	29	20	25	17
2000	38	33	17	29	18
2004	37	35-36	9	27	18

**US & NEWS DETAILED RANKING CATEGORIES 1995**

<b>Ranking Categories</b>	<b>Case Western</b>	<b>Rochester</b>	<b>Wash. U</b>	<b>Tufts</b>	<b>Emory</b>
Overall Ranking	35	29	20	25	17
Academic Reputation	42	51	26	51	31
SAT 25 <sup>th</sup> – 75 <sup>th</sup> percentile.	1090-1380	1020-1260	1110-1330	1150-1330	1130-1310
Selectivity Rank	NA	NA	36	NA	24
Acceptance Rate	81%	63%	69%	47%	49%
Financial Resources Rank	NA	NA	3	NA	16
Avg. Alumni Giving Rate	29%	23%	31%	22%	28%
Faculty Resources Rank	NA	NA	30	NA	21

**US & NEWS DETAILED RANKING CATEGORIES 2004**

<b>Ranking Categories</b>	<b>Case Western</b>	<b>Rochester</b>	<b>Wash. U</b>	<b>Tufts</b>	<b>Emory</b>
Overall Ranking	37	35-36	9	27	18
Peer Assessment (5=highest)	3.5	3.4	4.2	3.7	4.1
SAT ('02) 25 <sup>th</sup> – 75 <sup>th</sup> percentile.	1220-1440	1210-1440	1310-1480	1250-1430	1300-1460
Selectivity Rank	40	31	9	28	15
Acceptance Rate	78%	56%	24%	27%	42%
Financial Resources Rank	22	15	3	35	14
Alumni Giving Rank	29	60	9	21	26
Avg. Alumni Giving Rate	27%	21%	39%	31%	28%
Faculty Resources Rank	38	25	11	22	8