

Seattle University Academic Affairs Portfolio and Operations Review Spring 2016 Associate Provost Template

Area: APRGE

Date: June 8, 2016

Name of Primary Respondent: Dr. William J. Ehmann

Part A: Associate Provost Office Assessment

Key Activities

List the **key activities handled by your office**. Limit to 3-6 functions, plus “management/supervision” and “other.” The “other” category encompasses miscellaneous work like serving on committees and should not exceed 10% of your department’s time.

Activity (APRGE)

- 1 Oversight of the university’s research enterprise
- 2 Strengthening graduate education
- 3 Faculty affairs and faculty development
- 4 Student success
- 5 Management/supervision
- 6 Other

Analysis of Cost

Please refer to your departmental financial report from the University Budget Office to allocate FTEs and funding across each activity. This will produce a summary page you can append to this report.

1FTE; \$8100 annual base budget APRGE

Supplemental Funds: \$20K Rapid Response Funds for graduate recruitment; \$25K in FY16 for Ashoka U. initiative; \$10K gift account for faculty excellence awards

- 1 Oversight of the university’s research enterprise (.25 FTE; \$0 or 0% of budget authority)
- 2 Strengthening graduate education (.2 FTE; \$20K rapid response or 32% of budget authority)
- 3 Faculty affairs and faculty development (.15 FTE; \$10K awards or 16% of budget authority)
- 4 Student success (.15 FTE; \$25K Ashoka or 40% of budget authority)
- 5 Management/supervision (.15 FTE; \$8100 base or \$13% of budget authority)
- 6 Other (.10 FTE; \$0 or 0% of budget authority)

Opportunities for Change

What opportunities for change exist for your office?

In terms of budget, I believe there are opportunities to recapture some of the indirect cost recovery funds that currently are left to deans to allocate, and give the APRGE some discretionary dollars to enhance the research enterprise, most notably, allowing some rapid response supports and also some targeting of these externally generated dollars to faculty research, scholarship, and creative endeavors

in areas not typically funded at high levels by the government or other entities, such as performing and visual arts, writing, philosophy, leadership, and allied health fields such as exercise science. Currently 40% of indirect costs come to AA but are dispersed exclusively to deans (many who allocate the funds to instructional costs, not reinvestment in the research enterprise). We could use a portion of the 40% to set up an “innovation and scholarly equity” fund under the APRGE (1/3 of the 40% would be about \$100K/year). All of those dollars would still end up being spent within schools and colleges, but in a more integrated, strategic fashion. Deans would keep their discretion over the other 2/3 of the 40%. Dollars from the research enterprise can build our enterprise.

I have always reduced the APRGE budget at least as much as I have asked my directors to reduce their areas, and have not asked for an increase to my base APRGE budget to date. However, in response to this question in the AAPOR process, I would offer that the level is now so low that I have very little opportunity to support faculty, my center directors, colleagues, or graduate students coming to me with small requests within year. For the past two years, I have regularly supported my professional conference travel, food and rental car costs, on my own personal funds to conserve the APRGE budget. I can demonstrate impact across campus from the APRGE area with a base budget more appropriate to the campus-wide scope of my work, perhaps at a new level of \$20K/year (non-salary). These dollars go a long way in demonstrating responsiveness to mid-level managers and faculty, and build confidence that Seattle U encourages new ideas.

With the strengthening of the university-wide centers and institutes, my involvement with deans and faculty affairs, the soon to be formalized Ashoka U. changemaker initiative, and the MOU for health initiatives with PH&S, there could be a way to capture these endeavors in a revised title for the APRGE position that would be clearer to stakeholders, such as “Academic Affairs and Innovation”. I believe that the nature of the research enterprise is also highly significant and increasingly requires collaborations with VPs and AVPs of finance, facilities, counsel, and advancement. Perhaps these potentials can be considered by the incoming permanent provost, depending on their expertise and vision. When I was hired, I was told by Provost Crawford that there was consideration of Seattle U going to a graduate school model due to the efficiencies it would create, but that topic has not resurfaced. Again, this may be a matter for the permanent provost to evaluate.

Part B: Collective Assessment Associate Provost Area

Organizational Charts

Append an organizational chart for people and another for functions.

Attached to the end of this document.

Key Goals and Responsibilities

What are your area’s key goals and responsibilities?

1. Research Enterprise
2. Graduate Education
3. Faculty Development
4. Student Success
5. Management
6. Other

As detailed on our AAPOR resource summary document (Appendix 1 on T:), we are presently allocated 42% to student success, 23% to faculty development, and 20% to the research enterprise, with 9% going to “other”, 5% to items described by directors as “management”, and a small amount to graduate education. The dollars follow FTE allocations, as expected for mostly small units.

Our goals are appropriate to our area and we are comfortable with the proportionality. We are responsibly managing the resources we have as good companions and we commonly support each other (across units) with time, talent, and treasure.

Achievement

How successful is your area in collectively achieving its key goals and responsibilities? What evidence do you have of this? What is your own perspective and judgement?

We have formed a strong collective as never before through respectful dialogues with each other and building trust. We have adopted common themes for our work such as “Changemaking”, “Creating Wholeness”, and seeing the broad domains of faculty development and student success as areas we all contribute to. We routinely share vision, positions, budget, and programming.

Specifically, we aim to be connective tissue across the campus around faculty excellence and student success. We have collectively mapped an ecosystem (Appendix 2 on T:) that shows units in relation to each other, schools, colleges, and mission. This map is proving valuable in discussions with advancement officers and in the campaign, as well. We have completed succession planning for each unit, with an eye to establishing more career pathways to keep our best people with us. We manage our budgets within our allocations.

Specific achievements by leaders in my area:

- Our IRB, led by Dr. Michelle Du Bois and Prof. Andrea McDowell, which was in crisis during 2011-12, has now evolved into a model that has been presented to other institutions, including at the 2014 AAHRPP Conference. We have had zero problems rise to the senior level in two years.
- In anticipation of the Diversity Task Force report and recommendations, Dr. Jodi O’Brien led efforts to leverage our Wisner legacy into an office focused on Faculty Equity, Diversity, and Inclusive Excellence. Collaborating with the Center for Faculty Development, she placed Academic Affairs in a strong position to receive resources and act effectively on critical campus climate issues specifically involving faculty and the classroom environment. She is co-PI on a \$2.3M grant proposal to the National Science Foundation to benefit women diversifying our STEM fields.
- Intersections of race, gender, and power are being explored on- and off-campus through CSJS programming, especially via topics such as immigration, led by Dr. Gabriella Gutierrez y Muhs. Our director and CSJS affiliates are deeply involved with the Diversity Task Force, conversations about the future of Matteo Ricci College, and in our communities. Ties between Wisner and CSJS goals are strengthening.

- Our career team is nearly back to full-strength, after a year of significant staff turnover. Despite the disruptions, Executive Director Sarah Thomson and crew offered 169 workshops, presentations and events to 3,815 attendees, 90% of whom agreed or strongly agreed that their personal and career skills improved. Moving to an “industry cluster” engagement model, center staff held 1183 individualized advising conversations and set up six different mentoring communities that served 161 students in AY15. 6,290 job and internship positions were posted for students on the Red Hawk Network resulting in 26,255 network logins.
- The Center for Faculty Development, via Dr. David Green, developed and shared an innovative new “lifespan” model at an international conference in February 2016. Last year, CFD worked with 49% of all tenured, 75% of all tenure-track, and 34% of all NTT faculty at Seattle U, earning 95% satisfaction in regards to impact of the programming.
- Our grants office, led by Dr. Nalini Iyer, increased the value of our active portfolio by 67% from FY13 to FY16 (currently \$15M in spending authority). Faculty and staff we supported were awarded \$6.3M in FY16, up significantly from \$2.8M in FY15 and the three-average of \$3.7M. Deepening our relationships with faculty and staff investigators, the grants team is submitting an average of one full proposal every two work days and our quality assurance has resulted in no audit findings for our area.
- We hosted an external program review on student research by a representative of the Murdock Science Research Program and earned a commendation for progress made since review in 2011. This year, 117 undergraduates gained recognition for their research at SURA, NCUR, and disciplinary conferences. Nalini Iyer, Shawn Bell, Prof. Meena Rishi, and four faculty representatives led SUURA this year and collaborated with the Graduate Student Council to further develop a graduate research conference. External grants helped support a total of 120 undergraduate and graduate students working with faculty investigators. In collaboration with CAS and the English department, we have initiated an undergraduate student research journal SUURJ whose first issue is expected in Spring 2017. Dr. Iyer and University Librarian John Popko have worked hard to prepare Seattle U’s entry into a digital commons space that will serve all faculty and students in curating and sharing their creative work.
- ICTC has raised the stature of Seattle U in our communities and internationally by engaging the Catholic intellectual tradition with contemporary issues. Dr. Catherine Punsalan has supported 2-3 faculty fellows and 10 participants in the faculty study group each year and is in the process of more than doubling these numbers in AY16-17, hosted visiting faculty, and drawn 450 attendees to the Catholic Heritage Lecture series. In addition to many collaborations off campus, she has prepared the way for a new partnership that may bring an internationally-respected journal under ICTC auspices, and is active in planning around the 125th anniversary celebration.
- Under leadership of Kent Koth, CCE underwent a complete reorganization in FY15 and developed a strategic plan that aligns with specific university priorities. 4 out of 5 Seattle U undergraduates now take a course with a service learning component and CCE has over 70 community partners. CCE is partnering with UA and the President’s Office to pursue an ambitious \$30 million campaign goal (40% attained to date). In addition, CCE has begun to significantly expand campus partnerships in order to foster long-term sustainability of

community engagement. The credibility of CCE and SUYI allow us to leverage opportunities for grants in other areas. CCE work has strengthened our application for the Ashoka U consortium.

- CEJS is preparing for the second Seattle U-hosted international conference in “Just Sustainability” for fall 2016. Led by Dr. Phil Thompson, CEJS submitted \$930K in grant proposals this year, awarded 7 faculty and 5 student fellowships, and collaborated with five external partners. CEJS is presently submitting 1-2 grants each month. Improvements in outreach led to over 2000 attendees in 25 events.
- All directors have collaborated to build a database of all major faculty support programs (Appendix 3 on T:) that not only shows our collective impact on the careers of 155 faculty, but is giving us insight as to what services we provide are most valuable, and in what sequence. Colleagues engaging in three or more of our center- and institute-funded programs are widely-recognized as the superstars of the university (see “stars” tab on spreadsheet). This new resource will be a focus of our director’s retreat and our strategy for AY17.
- Finally, additional evidence of our effectiveness on behalf of the university comes engagement with colleagues beyond the APRGE area for our regular meetings. Because we value collaboration and hold space for others, we have seen regular engagement with colleagues from Mission and Ministry, University Advancement, Facilities Services, Alumni Relations, and Student Development at our meetings. By overcoming existing silos, we are finding opportunities to prepare new institutional grant requests (detailed below in “Opportunities for Change”). We have established standing check-in meetings with the Controller’s Office, the AVP of Finance, and MARCOM and convene advisory boards and community partners.

I believe we have the right people, a sense of common purpose, and very good results for the resource levels we have. Both ICTC and the research enterprise are showing signs of readiness for the next stage in organizational maturity. Most of our new academic programs have been graduate programs and our graduate audience is being included more in campus life and for campus services. Enrollments have turned the corner, supported from my area by workshops for program directors, a redesigned enrollment funnel, rapid response funds, and partnerships with deans.

Building “One University” is a presidential imperative and the people entrusted to me are well-placed to fulfill that imperative. While the critical work done in schools and colleges must continue, overarching efforts to support faculty and students across the lifespan are gaining traction through our centers and institutes. Over the next few years, we will be less a “best kept secret” or a “nice to have” and be seen more clearly as university engines of innovation, growth, and impact.

Analysis of Value

Analyze the return on investment of your area's services by placing them in the appropriate quadrant.

Cost →	<i>High cost/low impact (HCLI)</i>	<i>High cost/high impact (HCHI)</i> <i>CCE (most costs are supported by external \$)</i> <i>Wisner & CSJS (if funded at NFR levels)</i>
	<i>Low cost/low impact (LCLI)</i>	<i>Low cost/high impact (LCHI)</i> <i>ICTC</i> <i>CFD</i> <i>IRB</i> <i>ORSSP</i> <i>Career</i> <i>Ashoka U Initiative</i> <i>Faculty Excellence Awards</i> <i>APRGE Office</i>
	Impact →	

Note: I would rate CEJS as medium cost and medium impact to date and the Graduate Recruitment Rapid Response Fund as very low cost and very high impact (ROI of 20:1).

Opportunities for Change

Describe the effect should your area have significantly **more resources** than it does now. What more could you do to support the mission and strategic goals of the university? (Define "significantly" at a level that makes sense for you. If you are looking for guidance, think 20% more budget or time than you have now.) Particularly focus on the high impact activities.

The summary table below shows current and AAPOR-informed needs for areas reporting up through APRGE. Details are provided in Appendix 1 and tie to items specified in departmental reports. The last two columns of the table indicate how the APRGE team is proactively seeking external support for our areas of responsibility, beyond what the university may provide.

Area/Responsibility	Current FTE	Current \$ (all funds)	AAPOR-informed needs for FTE ("significantly more" scenario)	AAPOR-informed needs for \$ ("significantly more" scenario), includes salary and benefits, non-salary, and one-time	External funding my team is applying for in FY17	Notes
1. Research Enterprise	9.81	\$ 780,932	2	\$245,750	\$750,000	National Institutes of Health, US Department of Labor
2. Graduate Education	0.2	\$ 22,000	0	\$20,000		
3. Faculty Development	6.36	\$ 860,679	3	\$470,027	\$2,300,000	National Science Foundation ADVANCE
4. Student Success	14.64	\$ 1,595,878	10	\$576,500	\$1,800,000	Howard Hughes Medical Institute, Templeton Foundation
5. Management	2.67	\$ 204,117	0.9	\$34,400		
6. Other	3.85	\$ 359,061	0	\$0		
TOTAL	37.53	\$ 3,822,667	15.9	\$1,346,677	\$4,850,000	

Specific Opportunities for High Impact

1. The Diversity Task Force recommendations are great opportunities for change, and with Provost Crawford's encouragement, we built the Wismer Office of Faculty Equity and Inclusive Excellence, led by Dr. Jodi O'Brien and in partnership with the Center for Faculty Development. Our premise is that faculty will be best served by implementation plans that are designed and delivered by academic peers, especially since so many of the issues center on the classroom interactions among faculty and students. We envision, if a CDO is hired, that three campus audiences (faculty, staff, and student) will be coordinated by the CDO, and that the Director of the Wismer Office and other stakeholders would be part of the CDO's roundtable. This year, the Wismer Office was asked to submit an NFR for a two-year plan to implement existing recommendations of the DTF, and we delivered a plan that leveraged existing resources and existing faculty expertise with two new positions and limited consultant work (\$376K over two years total). We have been told to expect some university funds to be allocated to each division for FY17 and we ask that our plan be launched with those funds. While we appreciate that a few schools and colleges also are competing for funding from DTF, we recommend beginning with a coordinated response in the Provost's Office through Wismer, which can address specific needs of units while having the scope of the entire division. We are already seeing opportunities to more closely align work of diversity and social justice through managing networks and resources of CSJS and the Wismer legacy together that may result in a merger to achieve greater impact during FY17. Although not specified in the **University Strategic Plan**, this item is increasingly seen as an institutional imperative related to excellence.
2. **University Strategic Plan Goal 2** calls for substantially raising the levels of support for students discerning and achieving their career goals and leading meaningful lives. Alumni continue to report that the greatest gap areas between their needs and our delivery include career services, advising, and mentoring (three of the six largest reported gaps). Families, employers, and their elected representatives want to see practical outcomes for graduates that address return on investment. For these reasons, we have continued, with approval of the Provost, to submit NFRs that substantially increase our commitment to student and alumni career outcomes, and our most recent request is included in the AAPOR analysis.
3. Another important leadership element specifically cited in **Goal 2** ("promote a culture of student scholarship and research") is taking the next step to elevate the role of the Director of Research into a role such as Assistant Provost for Research Integrity (faculty member with 3-4 course releases), to develop strategies for faculty and student research, assessment and dissemination of university research, and ethical issues in the conduct of research. This position would collaborate with other professionals on matters of risk, safety, and compliance that intersect the research environment. We can do this now if we are authorized to back-fill the grants office with a FT, 12-month professional staff member overseeing ORSSP.

In this area, we also have a return on investment model for a third Sponsored Research Officer (SRO). Our success in working with faculty has nearly doubled our workload in four years but we did not increase our FTE. This spring we saw the consequences: one SRO specifically resigned from ORSSP due to work/life balance issues with our high workflow and lack of capacity to respond to emergency submissions. Subsequently, our second SRO, who regularly works evenings and weekends, tried to take up the slack and came down with pneumonia, dropping

our capacity to almost zero. First, we care for our colleagues and do not want to establish poor human resources practices. Second, rather than return to the high turnover and high consultant cost cycle we had in 2010-2012, we propose a third SRO be hired as soon as possible. We expect this position (\$70K + benefits) will allow us to receive \$1-1.5 M more in external grants within the same year as they are hired, which will result in faculty and staff salary relief for the university for people paid by grant work, as well as approximately \$100K of new indirect cost recovery that feeds the general operating fund and other functions in the division. A third SRO also helps us have the capacity to respond effectively to emergency requests from schools and colleges.

4. CEJS is going into its fifth year and has both significant challenges and opportunities. As the university's first Center of Excellence, CEJS is a grassroots-led manifestation of **University Strategic Plan Goal 1** for fostering "an outstanding learning environment" and deepening "student engagement with the world." Perhaps more of a pilot than a launch in 2011-12, we have not yet achieved focus or high impact. The lack of a firm financial foundation is limiting our planning and scope, as well as the interest among potential partners/investors who want to see the university's commitment first. We will also need to look at long-term space issues. We have proposed the following options, none of which has received broad institutional support to date (however, perhaps some can be revisited with the Interim Provost or permanent Provost):
 1. Prominently feature our first "Center of Excellence" CEJS (originally a \$6M endowment goal) in campaign vis-a-vis encyclical, Seattle, DARE branding, etc. \$6M would generate full funding for CEJS at \$300K/yr.
 2. Use a similar financial model that President Sundborg has outlined for SUYI (e.g., 1/3 Seattle U base funding, 1/3 grants, 1/3 from endowment). For CEJS, this would mean, at present, \$70K base funding, \$70K+ in grant awards, and \$70K from a \$1.4M endowment at 5% draw). We are presently submitting 1-2 new grant applications per month and we can meet this grant component.
 3. Subsidize CEJS with a portion of the institutional side of indirect costs recovery (the 60%)
 4. Subsidize CEJS with a portion of the academic side of indirect costs recovery (the 40%)
 5. Use new university course prefixes and offer tuition-based coursework in environmental science/studies/sustainability/GIS and capture the revenue
 6. Consolidate CEJS aims inside of CCE with focus on "urban sustainability", more efficient but still need budget (much more discussion would be needed)
 7. Consolidate CEJS aims inside of ICTC as linked to the Pope's encyclical, more efficient but still need budget (much more discussion would be needed)
 8. Use a voluntary campus sustainability fee shared between CEJS, facilities, and planning for new SI building
 9. Suspend CEJS until base and endowment funding is secured (the university would need to consider consequences for stakeholders at the time we have global interest in the papal encyclical and active student groups on campus)
 10. ? We are open to other suggestions, but these issues are becoming urgent.

5. ICTC is perhaps the ideal locus of **University Strategic Plan Goal 1** (“to promote the Jesuit Catholic character of the university, we will make strategic investments that advance the Jesuit mission, strengthen our understanding of the Catholic tradition and position the university as a leader in interreligious dialogue”). After three years of operation, ICTC is going into Phase II of development, and we have hired Greg Wolfe on as a Senior Fellow to assist Dr. Catherine Punsalan and other stakeholders, including Dr. Joe Orlando and Jen Tilghman-Havens, in conversations and planning. We have maximized impact from existing levels of support and now need to chart the next level of performance by developing goals, strategies, and a new organizational structure. Significant investments will be needed, but we have a track record of impact with the small investment made to date. Given a special centrality to who we are, ICTC could integrate areas within the APRGE portfolio and bring in others from parts of the former Mission and Ministry and perhaps even Global Engagement.
6. CFD has opportunities related to DTF and Wismer related to learning and teaching that respond to **University Strategic Plan Goal 1** (“attract and retain outstanding faculty by supporting them in their development as scholars and educators”). CFD is working with ICTC on programming that links Ignatian pedagogy to higher education research. Over the past several years, university leaders have pledged to develop additional programming for part-time or contingent faculty, but new resources have not been provided.
7. Not everyone knows how much of CCE and SUYI is dependent on soft money. While SUYI is a prominent component of the capital campaign, community-based and service learning is broader than SUYI. We have an opportunity to chart a plan that achieves the 1/3, 1/3, 1/3 financial model described previously, fulfilling the challenge of all three components of **University Strategic Plan Goal 1**.
8. Overall, we believe we have good proportional allocation of resources among our six areas/responsibilities, but we uniformly lack access to the levels of resources needed. While we are enthusiastic about seeking external supports, internally, we have estimated through the AAPOR process, that we need about 16 additional positions (10 would be allocated to student success including career services, 3 would address faculty development through Wismer & CSJS and CFD, and 2 would take our research capability to the next level of professionalization and service). We also estimate the need for \$384K of additional non-salary and one-time support. Even in a period of limited resources, both components seem achievable to us with commitment over 2-3 years.

Describe the effect should your area have significantly **fewer resources** than it does now. What would you choose to stop doing? How would this impact your ability to support the mission and strategic goals of the university? Particularly focus on the high cost/low impact activities. Are there are ways you can streamline your work?

We are already considering strategic consolidations of CSJS and Wismer, and could see several options for CEJS. If a dramatic immediate reduction was mandated, I would be looking at areas that do not, for whatever reasons, seem as strongly supported by the institution at this time, such as CEJS, and perhaps some elements of CCE only because they are the largest unit and have demonstrated strong ability to attract external funds.

Setting aside resources, what creative thinking can you share regarding how your area can become **better and more effective**, increasing impact? Are there ways to **redesign** the area such that it could better fulfill its role? Are there different ways of working with **other areas** that could improve the performance of the university more broadly?

I hope that the narrative above has already given the requested examples of creative thinking, redesign, and working with other areas. By the end of FY17, every one of the directors working with me will have reorganized their units, engaged in aligned strategic planning, and have earned new external accolades. Each unit is pursuing partnerships and their own external funding to accomplish our higher goals. I believe we have significant contributions to make to implementing the DTF, re-imagining the experimental college of Matteo Ricci, integrating advising, career services and alumni relations, strengthening diverse communities, advancing a vision for health fields, and raising the academic profile of Seattle U.

Intersections based on our mission and values created each of our centers, institutes, and offices. While our impact grows primarily through trust and care around faculty development and student success, resource levels will continue to influence the rate of delivering that impact.