

Brief Summary of Comments about the *Five Year Academic Action Plan* From the Chairs and Directors' Council

Where do the cuts come from?

Where does the \$30,000,000 come from? Which units? Through increased revenue? Cuts? What will be sacrificed?

Related - If we are to reallocate this large amount of money, we need to know where the pain is before moving forward.

Without knowing what might be lost and where it will come from, it is difficult to judge whether the investments are worth the trouble of going through a re-allocation process.

As a general comment, the goals are hard to argue with, but that excludes any broad view of the potential costs elsewhere.

\$30 million may be too much to try and swallow since it is nearly 10% of our budget.

Lack of Details or Clarity

Much confusion about whether the total operating reallocation over 5 years is 30,000,000 or not. Need clarity about this and the presentation should perhaps show cumulative totals instead of yearly totals.

Projected increases in several of the goals are not clearly stated. For example, does an increase in diversity indicate an increase in the total number of students enrolled or a change in the mix of students from various ethnic backgrounds with no increase in enrollment. Other items expressing an annual increase are similarly confusing or unclear.

Some budget numbers seem to underestimate the real costs. For example, increasing the number of students participating in research might be achievable in the first year given the budgeted amount, but if planning to increase by 1% every year, the total number of students involved in research quickly becomes large.

If the base line were included, the achievability of goals would be easier to judge.

Narrative needed to explain the budgeted items.

Is any of this one time money?

Affect on academic units

The details of the programs that will be established to help with retention, engagement, research, etc. are not provided. If the location of those programs is outside of the academic departments, it will not be useful to already overburdened faculty.

If it is not new money then we will bleed the academic units to build up the support units.

Establishing a council and creating more joint appointments is unlikely to solve our interdisciplinary problems.

There is no mention of increasing the number of faculty lines. This should be central to any plan.

Strategy

It is not strategic to re-allocate and capitalize on open faculty lines. We are already doing both strategic and un-strategic re-allocation and do not need more.

This appears to be a reversal of the process from two years ago which was -> find cuts then decide where to make strategic investments; now we define where we want investments and locate the cuts later.

What if we don't meet enrollment targets? Is there a safety mechanism in place? Which items will not be addressed if we don't have the money?

Don't spend money you don't have. Get the enrollment first.

Shouldn't this whole plan be reconsidered including the potential influence of the University System of Ohio?

We should approach this as a wish list and begin to prioritize the items that are most essential and see how far the money will take us.

Governance

Lines of shared governance appear to be circumvented by this process.

Concern that these forums and meetings will be construed as adequate consultation for a plan that is already a "done deal".

Detailed responses from one chair:

"Investment" implies an expected return. Where there is anticipated monetary return, it should be clearly laid out. That was done in V.5. Is there an anticipated increase in revenue due to increase enrollment? Increased research?

There needs to be a distinction between 1-time expenditures and ongoing expenses. If I spend \$100K to renovate one building this year, I can spend that same \$100K in next year's budget on another building. But if I am investing \$100K annually in new faculty, then I need \$100K this year, and \$200K total next year, and \$300K total the next year . . .

I.2.c. Please take advantage of existing outcomes assessment in programs that do it for accreditation. Do not make them write yet another report.

I.3.b. What are the implications of a joint appointment? Where is the P&T home of the faculty member? Who gets credit for what under RCB? We don't need another layer of bureaucracy to do this (Interdisciplinary Council). We need a short-lived task force that identifies barriers to joint appointments and has them removed. I am unable to guess at what this \$\$\$ is to be spent on.

II.1. How much of this \$\$\$ is actually to be invested in graduate students, and how much is being wasted on another layer of bureaucracy called a Graduate School? Torpedo the graduate school and spend the money within existing structures to recruit quality students and support them with tuition scholarships and internal grant programs.

III.1. I am VERY disturbed by the outcome "Decrease the acceptance rate" I assume this is being done because we want to score higher on the USNWR selectivity scale. Why not invest in finding people we have no intention of ever admitting, help them fill out the form, and waiving the application fee? Then we can reject them and make ourselves look great! Is this even what we want? If we had applications from a full freshman class of people with 32 ACTs and no one else, would we want to reject a lot of them? The other outcomes in this section look good and positive to me.

III.2. Interesting, the idea that we can increase faculty and staff diversity at no cost. I suppose, no cost visible to the Provost. But every time you advertise in a different place to try to increase the diversity of your applicant pool

Iv.7.a. I suggest that as a strategy we forbid scheduled training between 8:00 am and 4:00 pm. Costs nothing, and increases the access that student-athletes have to coursework and degree programs.

V. The IT investment is absolutely needed. How much of this is one-time? How much is a perpetual increase?

V.7.b What does "Apply percentage of carry forward to quasi endowments" mean?

V.8. Great idea. So why is most of the spending planned here on support services?

VI.2. Do we want more students, or better students? Some good programs are already near max in terms of numbers, although we might improve the mix of students they attract. Is more the only outcome of interest?

VI.4 Can someone tell me where I could get numbers for research expenditures? LEO only gives research awards.