

ADMINISTRATIVE & FACULTY SUMMIT

University of Rochester
May 2018



Executive Summary

Goal of the Summit

To foster productive conversation on major areas of interest for faculty and administration and utilize the discussion to tee up projects and focal points for the Faculty Senate and administration in the upcoming academic year.

Overview

On May 22, 2018, thirty-one faculty and administrative leads participated in a day-long, structured summit. Five topics of interest were selected jointly by Provost Rob Clark and Faculty Senate Co-Chairs MJ Curry and Kevin McFarland. The invited participants were also jointly selected. Each topic was assigned a faculty lead and administration lead. The co-led team prepared supporting documents in advance of the summit to aid group discussion. Each topic was allotted 60 minutes – 10 minutes for a brief introduction of the topic and 50 minutes for discussion. After the summit, a survey was distributed to participants to obtain feedback and suggestions on structure, format, timing, and topics. Overall, participants' feedback was positive. Of those that participated in the follow up survey, all found the summit favorable, useful, and effective in terms of experience, format, and structure. All were in favor of holding the summit again next year, either early in the fall semester or after Commencement in early summer.

Topics of Interest

- Topic 1 | Centralization vs. Decentralization
- Topic 2 | Engaging the Rochester community
- Topic 3 | Internationalization
- Topic 4 | Pressures facing higher education institutions
- Topic 5 | Shared governance

Participants

<i>Name</i>	<i>Title / Department</i>	<i>School Affiliation</i>
Andrew Ainslie	Dean	Simon Business School
Loisa Bennetto	Chair, Clinical and Social Sciences in Psychology	School of Arts and Sciences
Raffaella Borasi	Dean	Warner School of Education and Human Development
Patrick Brophy	Chair, Pediatrics	School of Medicine and Dentistry
Kate Cerulli	Director	Susan B. Anthony Center
Rob Clark	Provost and Sr. VP for Research	

continued...

Name	Title / Department	School Affiliation
Gloria Culver	Dean	School of Arts and Sciences
MJ Curry	Associate Professor, Teaching & Curriculum and Outgoing Faculty Senate Co-chair	Warner School of Education and Human Development
Diane Dalecki	Chair, Biomedical Engineering	Hajim School of Engineering and Applied Sciences
Eli Eliav	Director and Vice Dean for Oral Health	Eastman Institute for Oral Health School of Medicine and Dentistry
Tom Farrell	Sr. VP for Advancement	
Rich Feldman	President	
Chunkit Fung	Associate Professor, Medicine and Incoming Faculty Senate Co-chair	School of Medicine and Dentistry
Gerald Gamm	Professor, Political Science and Incoming Faculty Senate Co-chair	School of Arts and Sciences
Jane Gatewood	Vice Provost for Global Engagement	
John Givens	Associate Professor, Russian	School of Arts and Sciences
Donald Hall	Incoming Robert L. and Mary L. Sproull Dean of the Faculty	Arts, Sciences and Engineering
Wendi Heinzelman	Dean	Hajim School of Engineering and Applied Sciences
Betsy Marvin	Chair, Music Theory	Eastman School of Music
Kevin McFarland	Professor, Physics	School of Arts and Sciences
Lamar Murphy	General Secretary, Board of Trustees and Chief of Staff, Office of the President	
LaRon Nelson	Assistant Professor	School of Nursing
Kathy Rideout	Dean	School of Nursing
Peter Robinson	Chief Operating Officer, URMC and VP, Government and Community Relations	
Jamal Rossi	Dean	Eastman School of Music
Joan Saab	Vice Provost for Academic Affairs	
Michael Scott	Arthur Gould Yates Professor of Engineering, Computer Science	Hajim School of Engineering and Applied Sciences
Elizabeth Stauderman	VP for Communications	
Dena Swanson	Associate Professor, Counseling and Human Development	Warner School of Education and Human Development
Mark Taubman	Dean and Chief Executive Officer, URMC	School of Medicine and Dentistry
Rick Waugh	Vice Provost for Research Interim Dean of the Faculty	Arts, Sciences and Engineering

Topic 1: Balance between centralization and decentralization of the university. When do we hold schools to specific standards/requirements, and when do we afford schools latitude in management overall? How can we balance the desire for shared principles and values with the specific circumstances in each unit?

Key Discussion Points:

- Schools pay for central services and need to fund them so the quality of services are good. Having a university-wide “standard of service” is a good approach.
- Deans prefer decentralized options for funding because it fosters opportunities for collaboration as opposed to competition for resources.
 - However, the current budgetary model deserves more scrutiny as it seems to be a barrier to productive collaboration in some regards. Breaking down and understanding central costs and having more transparency against those costs would be helpful.
- Centralization should only be needed where there are substantial opportunities for efficiencies and cost savings that will ultimately benefit all.
 - It may be beneficial to have an in-depth review of a service and whether it ought to be provided centrally and supported by a tax or kept distributed as is.
 - What can we afford not to centralize? Recall the past when a department web page was created and run by a part-time graduate student and looked more like an art showcase than a web page. This was not ideal and the practice has since evolved to a central service. Perhaps we start with services related to faculty and students and move on from that point.
- Faculty and staff are not always aware of services that are centralized or locally provided by the school. There are situations where we have a central office without a centralized service. For example, Communications is a central office but schools have local communication operations without coordination centrally. The same setup exists for IT and data collection.
 - Examples of areas that may benefit from centralization: Admissions, Diversity and Equity, Communications, Transportation, and Internationalization.
- The U of R is essentially a small town. To be a good small town, we need a basic level of service and needs to be met. What is our hierarchy of needs in the community?
- Our headaches are not with each other but with processes. What can make our jobs and lives easier and the lives of our faculty and students better?

Topic 2: How do we engage the University community in visionary projects along the lines of the East High initiative that would address poverty and other social issues in Rochester?

Key Discussion Points:

- Current breadth of programs (tech commercialization, economic and community development, K-12 education, community health, wellness, and clinical interventions, workforce development, anti-poverty efforts) gives us a great running start.
- These efforts can continue if cultivated carefully. Central communication and support will be the key to the success of these efforts. Without central support, it can be difficult for faculty, staff, and students to navigate things like insurance, parking, or other logistical pieces. At the very least, efforts should be centrally recognized, communicated, and celebrated.
 - Consideration should be given to the creation of a central location or office that maintains information about all of the community-based initiatives, which could contribute to establishing a consortium of connected supports.
- The pursuit of Carnegie Classification can help as the underpinning of the engagement is with our academic programs. It is important to determine how we measure meaningful community-based work and to understand what the community actually wants us to do.
- Broaden our efforts; aim to expand our points of engagement with the community.
 - Without awareness of our investment in the community, we can be seen as transactional. There is opportunity to create and expand endeavors that reflect the whole effort of the University.
 - How do we reach out to the broader region (e.g. Southern Tier) and provide not only healthcare but also education? Looking toward the future, we have to be proactive in figuring out solutions for healthcare disparities.
 - The University needs to identify a ‘moon shot’ in line with current healthcare issues and coordinate all community-based resources on this topic after asking what the community wants.
 - We are not responsible for the economic development of the community but we have to work with the community to attract business and people to the area for longer-term growth. Our success is tied to the growth of the region.
- The question also needs to be asked should we be doing this at all? Do these efforts benefit us in competition with peer institutions? Is this the best marginal use of our dollars and time?

Topic 3: How do we leverage the internationalization of our University? In particular, how do we create opportunities and expectations for global citizenship within our University community?

Key Discussion Points:

- When we think about international student needs, it forces us to think about domestic student needs. Internationalization of community enriches the experience for all on campus and should be a formalized goal for the entire University.
- Traditionally we have relied on individual engagement to develop our global framework for the University. Without a broad, University-wide view, it sounds like we promote international engagement for students and faculty where they can find it on their own. We need to ensure collaborations, partnerships, etc. are being built at an institutional level.
 - For example, there is a major disconnect between undergraduate study programs and our current curriculum and faculty. A College-level initiative may help make some necessary connections.
 - Continue to develop and increase infrastructure and resources that will facilitate international communications and faculty-to-faculty exchanges, namely for ISO, the Office of Global Engagement, and Ed Abroad.
 - Continue to focus on immigration and visa compliance and support.
 - Consider forming a faculty-administrative advisory council for global engagement.
- Ensure the University has a diverse representation of international students studying here. But also consider how we can reflect more of the culture of the students that are here to make U of R a more cultural destination.
 - Encourage the faculty to engage students in the international content of their disciplines.
- There needs to be more support for international visitors on campus (i.e. go to this office for assistance with immigration, onboarding, housing, etc.) including cultural training and guidance.
- How do you assess the quality and quantity of collaborations? We could aggregate data from sources like faculty activity reports, origins of postdocs and scholars, student destinations, etc. and use that to characterize collaborations.
- Address the international rankings issue and other data access and usage issues. More institutions are in the game and they are getting better at representing international collaborations through data.

Topic 4: What pressures are facing higher education institutions, both financial, social and otherwise? How do we sustain the research university within this environment?Key Discussion Points:

- The public perception of the worth of higher education is a major issue. With changing needs in the future, we need to train our students to be “learners” in a way that prepares them to adapt to the next phases in their life and career. Other institutions have this approach and we need to distinguish ourselves.
- We need to develop a communication strategy that involves others who can communicate the value of a residential research institution on our behalf rather than us only talking about ourselves.
- If tuition increases, then so should financial aid. This requires an endowment to keep pace. If we can make more money available for financial aid that would be a game changer, but implications of doing so need to be considered.
- In most of our schools, we have a small student experience with big opportunities to get into the game. While this provides a wide breadth of experience to students, it is a labor intensive model that is costly and impacts our tuition price.
- Is a high tuition price the right tactical move?
 - The University needs to diversify its revenue streams. Tuition cannot be solely relied upon to support the academic mission.
 - Tuition reduction and different tuition models should be explored while keeping in mind the particular situations of each different school.
 - Pricing transparency and an excess supply of degree programs are also concerns and should be explored and addressed.
- How do we figure out what is needed now? Forecasting and extreme scenario planning seems necessary to get us to think about our priorities.
 - Perhaps a sub-committee, cabinet, or Provost’s team should be formed with faculty membership to address the concern.
- Is online learning a viable solution to tuition costs? On one hand, it counters to our research-based residential model. On the other hand, not all schools on campus have the same needs (for example, the School of Nursing is not a residential program).
 - Online and digital technology is an important communication tool and student satisfaction driver.
 - Online is not about replacing our educational offering, it is about enhancing our offering. If we’re going to use online learning, we need to demonstrate excellence across the institution.

Topic 5: What is the foundation for good shared governance? How can we best realize these principles in practice?Key Discussion Points:

- Standard practices of shared governance involve a board having ultimate authority, long term vision, and resource coverage of an institution. The board is not a monolithic body; it delegates the management of this authority to administration. The faculty are responsible for the curriculum and status of other faculty. Communication between these groups is essential for shared success.
 - These roles and responsibilities of the administration, faculty, and the Board need to be more clearly defined and communicated.
 - The U of R Board should have more representation of individuals with experience in higher education as well as student representation.
- We need to continue strengthening faculty involvement in the review of budgets, benefits, IT policies, and other administrative issues in Board committees as well as strengthening communication lines between faculty and the Board.
- In order to establish a foundation for good shared governance there needs to be a clear process for sharing information and a process for obtaining collective input as part of a decision-making process. The policy drafting practices used in this past year can provide a good model for future years.
 - Faculty and staff input should be sought regularly as it almost always seems to result in better decisions, increases buy-in, and builds a sense of community.
- There is an added complexity in applying policies university-wide as this incorporates the medical center. Approaching policy revisions with thoughtful consideration to these complexities and appropriately adapting policy language for the medical center is essential for university-wide adoption.
 - Is there a way to minimize differences between the schools so that policy revision and implementation is less difficult?
- The policy-making aspect has functioned well for faculty but the mechanism to respond to policy infractions or lack of policy implementation is not known.
 - It is suggested a small committee of administrators and faculty form to review each violation and write a letter (or letters) describing the situation to the administration and faculty.
 - Or, the governing body for the faculty can work to resolve the situation with administration first and then go to the Board, via the secretary to the Board, if needed.

Proposed Action Items for consideration of administration and Faculty Senate:

Topic 1 | Centralization vs. Decentralization

- Provide an overview of the current budgetary model to help the University community understand central costs and how they are appropriated.
- Centralize collection of admissions data, diversity and equity metrics, and internationalization.

Topic 2 | Engaging the Rochester community

- Pursue the Carnegie Classification, which will help serve as a foundation for engagement in our academic programs.
- Identify a 'moon shot' in line with current healthcare issues and coordinate all community-based resources on this.

Topic 3 | Internationalization

- Address the international rankings issue and other data access and usage issues.
- Continue to develop and increase infrastructure and resources that will facilitate international communications and faculty-to-faculty exchanges, namely for ISO, the Office of Global Engagement, and Ed Abroad.

Topic 4 | Pressures facing higher education institutions

- Explore the diversification of revenue streams for the University.
- Explore tuition reduction, different tuition models, and the supply vs. demand of degree programs.
- Conduct forecasting and extreme scenario planning. Suggested that a sub-committee, cabinet, or Provost's team be formed with faculty membership to address this action item.

Topic 5 | Shared governance

- More clearly define the roles and responsibilities of the administration, faculty, and the Board of Trustees.
- Define a clear process for sharing information and a process for obtaining faculty, staff, and student input as part of a decision-making process.
- Develop and codify a mechanism to respond to Faculty Handbook policy infractions.