Chairs –

As most of you know by now, the report of the Budget Priorities Advisory Taskforce was released this past Friday. It was inevitable that some departments would take issue with the descriptions and rankings assigned them. Let me therefore strongly (re)emphasize a point that the Provost has made in earlier messages to you about the report – this is just one piece of information that will be used in formulating any decisions that are ultimately made regarding budget restructuring. Realistically, there are other levels of review to come that may reach different conclusions than those articulated in the committee’s report.

It is likely that there will be much discussion, and perhaps more accurately, rumor, about the impact of the committee’s report. Two points are worth emphasizing, and are ones that you should frequently repeat to your faculty: (1) the Provost intends to retain all current majors, though perhaps being administered in different arrangements than at present; and (2) there is an absolute commitment to protecting the lines of tenure and tenure-track faculty unless, of course, it is determined that we are facing financial exigency in which case we will follow procedures outlined in the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

That said, we want to provide you the opportunity to respond to the report, especially in a manner that provides any additional information not included in your earlier narrative to the committee. Please understand that you are not required to respond, but may do so if you wish. If so, I encourage you to avoid preparing a monograph-long response – concise and comprehensive is preferred. Also, you are urged to not waste your time and energy berating the committee that reviewed your department. Speaking only for myself, it is unseemly and inappropriate to attack those faculty colleagues who admirably agreed to undertake the extraordinarily difficult task of serving on the committee. If you believe the committee members made mistakes, this is your opportunity to offer counter evidence.

As advice, there’s no need to devote much space to pointing out the shortcomings of the Delaware Study. We’re well aware of them and are interpreting that data accordingly, and in fact will be using additional information that supplements the original data. However, here are some other suggestions, by no means inclusive, of information you might offer:

(1) Provide concrete evidence that corrects factual errors regarding the committee’s assessment of the department’s quality, demand, centrality, and viability. Note that the report has teaching effort data for all departments in both aggregated and standardized (per faculty member) form.

(2) Your department’s citation count, aggregated and per faculty member, over the past several years from the appropriate science, social science, or humanities citation index.

(3) The proportion of your faculty who, over the past several years, published in the discipline’s top 10 journals, as evidenced by reputational ratings (please include a citation to the publication that presents
the ratings). Alternatively, rankings by impact factor scores as per the Web of Science documentation could be used. For those disciplines that emphasize book publishing, a list of faculty publishing books in the past five from the most prestigious university or trade presses would be helpful. (Please provide any documentation you have that establishes the reputational positioning of those presses.)

(4) Your department’s ranking in some disciplinary or national study.

To reiterate, this is your opportunity to make us aware of any other information that should be taken into account in assessing the positioning of your department within the university and within your discipline. I leave it to your discretion as to how that might be accomplished.

Please submit anything that you wish by sending it to me (dsmith@acad.usf.edu) in electronic form by Friday, March 14.

Thanks, take care, and I look forward to hearing from those who choose to respond.

Dwayne Smith
Senior Vice Provost