



SHANE C. BURGESS

Vice President, Agriculture, Life and
Veterinary Sciences, and Cooperative Extension
Dean, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences
Interim Dean, School of Veterinary Medicine
Director, Arizona Experiment Station
Registered Lobbyist

Forbes Building, Room 306
1140 E. South Campus Dr.
PO Box 210036
Tucson, AZ 85721-0036
sburgess@cals.arizona.edu

Tel: 520-621-7621
Fax: 520-621-7196

cals.arizona.edu
vetmed.arizona.edu

December 14, 2016

Representatives of the Cardon Fellows and the Dean's Research Advisory Council recently generated these questions on topics ranging from Professors of Practice to investment in research vs. teaching. Please see my responses below. Thank you for taking the time to make these inquiries – and for all you do throughout the year to help this college community work towards optimal solutions. Wide and regular communication on all these issues is a critical part of making CALS “the most sought-after place to be a part of.” I welcome your questions on any topic.

With the increasing number of Professors of Practice (PoP) in some departments:

1. On what criteria does CALS decide to substitute a PoP for a tenure track professor?

CALS doesn't “decide,” per se. Unit heads work with the associate deans on needs. PoP and TT/CT faculty have different jobs and different expectations. I value and respect equally PoP and TT/CT faculty.

2. How does the promotion process and career stability of a PoP compare to a tenure track professor?

Professors of Practice are central to delivering our mission and I see no reason why they **shouldn't have career** progression and career stability. We are bound by UA rules and policies and nothing in CALS prohibits this. **The best way to ensure everyone's career stability is to support each other, no matter our job type, in delivering on our mission.**

The performance review and promotion processes are defined by Regents and UA policies. Professors of Practice means nontenured, nontenure-eligible employees whose Notice of Appointment incorporates the [ABOR Conditions of Faculty Service \(ABOR-PM 6-201, et seq.\)](#) who have established themselves by expertise, achievements, and reputation over a sustained period of time to be distinguished professionals in an area of practice or discipline. [ABOR 6-211](#) (Evaluation of Faculty) outlines the performance review process. [UHAP Chapter 3 and 4](#) define personnel policies and procedures for faculty.

Within CALS, [nontenure-eligible faculty have a promotion review process](#) which resembles that for tenure-eligible or tenured faculty. A new set of promotion guidelines was drafted and

submitted to the Office of General Counsel and the Office of the Provost in Fall 2015 and is now with the Cardon Fellows who are making revisions to the draft guidelines.

3. How is CALS prepared to recognize PoPs as equal colleagues with tenure track faculty in the academy?

As I said above, **I personally value everyone's contributions equally.** I am on record many times expressing my concerns that we do not have some kind of two-class society. Our great teachers are the primary reason the public believes we exist. These faculty subsidize our research mission, i.e., teaching supports research. My bottom line is that we have three, equally essential, mandated mission areas (Extension, teaching and research). Extension is funded by the legislature via a separate state line in the State General Fund because of its contribution to the **state's economy.**

In CALS we follow ABOR and UA policies on pay. I personally am committed to CALS being the most sought-after place to be a part of. I ask you to join me in this commitment. **As I've said** many times at State of the College Meetings and when meeting with the unit heads, I want us to be the most competitive among our peer universities when it comes to market-meeting compensation and recognizing truly meritorious performance. This is one of the reasons that I linked promotion increases to the Consumer Price Index (and not the Employment Cost Index as UA HR encouraged me to do).

Given the race of many departments to increase SCH due to RCM incentives:

4. What implications does this rush for new and larger undergraduate classes have on the quality of the product we are delivering to students?

I have never promoted a **"race to increase SCH" and I won't here.** I am committed to every unit continually improving our mission delivery so that CALS meets its share of the task for UA fulfilling its ABOR goals. Also of course, we must grow every year so that our budget can keep up and we, at the very least, **don't have to let people go.**

Regardless, by continually improving our mission delivery we will have quality programs that people want to be a part of. We cannot rush to develop classes that can be delivered to large numbers of students at the cost of a quality educational experience for those students. Having said this, quality and numbers are independent variables. It is very possible to deliver high quality programs on a large scale and low quality programs on a small scale. We have many examples of the former at the UA.

As a college, we want to be the most sought-after place to be a part of--as an employee, a student, a family member, an alumnus, a corporate partner or any other stakeholder. I am 100% in support of the Faculty Senate and ABOR initiatives to assure the quality of our academic programs. I am happy to be informed by shared governance and implement as appropriate.

I believe that one thing we cannot afford to do is rush to develop classes that can be delivered to large numbers of students but only at the expense of the quality educational experience for our students that is important to all of us. If technology is facilitatory and people are given the resources and support they need--so we can reach more people better--it makes sense to me to use it. This is the reason that developing a purpose statement and guiding principles, and

strategic planning in general, are important: **they all make us ask “is this what is really going to get us where we need to go?” There is nothing in our purpose statement or values or goals or plans that says anything like “our goal is to make more money.”**

5. What implications does this rush for new and larger undergraduate classes have on the quality and viability of our graduate programs in the college? and combined with a similar question from DRAC: How does CALS Admin view the priority of Graduate Education? In particular, how will CALS allocate resources to promote graduate education and support graduate students?

I am not supporting a **“rush for new and larger undergraduate classes.” I certainly hope that isn’t** the message from anyone. I am promoting increasing delivery on our mission areas. In teaching, this is because every single one of our degrees has high employability, can lift families out of poverty and has very clear quantitative societal benefits. If we believe we have something valuable to teach, then I think that as a public service entity **it’s** our duty to want to reach more people—so long as we can do so without compromised quality.

I don’t understand the implication of the link with quality and viability of graduate programs. I think that we have significant issues in the processes we have in CALS around graduate education in general, but not at the individual faculty level. I have been concerned about this since soon after I arrived and we have had some false starts. Associate Deans Parker Antin and Mike Staten are developing a plan to identify and resolve specific issues, especially at the PhD level. I have hired Dr. Kirsten Limesand as Graduate Education Advisor to come up with specific solutions that we must all decide how to implement. These will cost money and that money can only be spent once. I will consult with appointed leaders and use our shared governance mechanisms before distributing CALS’ scarce funds.

General Questions:

6. What is the vision for the impact of research that CALS Admin can communicate to internal and external stakeholders?

The [CALs research strategic plan](#) defines our research mission as advancing knowledge across the continuum of basic to applied research in the mission areas of the college, and conveying the products of our efforts to the citizens of Arizona, the U.S. and the world.

We achieve impact in research by accomplishing our mission through the following strategic goals: 1) increasing the size and improving the quality of our research workforce; 2) maximizing the ability of our research workforce to conduct research and our ability to measure its impact; and 3) by effectively communicating the products of our research to the world.

This strategic plan was developed almost five years ago by you. It’s our plan. I think the research mission statement works for us--if you disagree you should work through the DRAC and the Office of the Associate Dean for Research. If we believe it needs changing, I’m more than happy to change it.

7. The quality of physical space influences the quality of research as well as our ability to attract new faculty. What long-term plan does CALS Admin have to ensure that physical space issues do not impede progress?

This is an exceptional question. I think this a very big issue, and I empathize and share your frustration.

We are no more or less than tenants in university (ABOR, i.e., state) buildings. Under RCM I have no management mechanism or delegated authority or responsibility I can use to mitigate, let alone remedy, this tens-of-million-dollar problem.

The best we can do inside CALS is to use RCM revenue from teaching and research to invest tens of thousands of dollars into mitigation as best we can. Of course this is that same money that could go into mission delivery such as graduate student education and ensuring quality of online courses as two relevant examples.

The provost, CFO and senior vice president for research are aware of this issue.

8. How can CALS Admin facilitate the stabilization of ERE rates especially for graduate students?

These rates are outside of our control in CALS. The best we can do is use RCM revenue from teaching and research to mitigate these fluctuations as best we can centrally. This connects directly with the answer to question 5.

There is only one source of money for teaching and research: RCM revenue. All the things discussed above are competing for the same pot of money. The best solution is to offer quality **mission delivery that people want to “invest in” by paying tuition dollars or by funding grants**, contracts and fixed price agreements. The more we deliver on our mission, the more money we can reinvest. Shrinking, or even flat, mission delivery will mean less money.

9. How does CALS balance the investment in research compared to instruction (a higher revenue generating activity)?

It’s a complex process which requires having actual data, and then using the professional expertise of the unit heads and associate deans within our matrix structure. The associate deans for Career and Academic Services and for Research are charged with identifying how to get to the Pareto curve for mission delivery in teaching and research. This is an ongoing and iterative process throughout the year. Eventually there is either a consensus on the best option for optimal mission delivery or, more rarely, a majority or plurality opinion. I am charged with **“refereeing as needed.”**

Regardless, our reality is that for us to invest in new research FTE and start-up funding, or the changes we need to make in PhD student funding, we must bring in revenue above and beyond what we need to support our teaching costs (for example, so that those who teach can have optimal classrooms and technology and our students have access to optimal services, i.e., quality); we need to do this via excellent teaching mission delivery. This is how all land-grant universities are designed and operate, whether or not it is, or has been, transparent (incremental budgeting is generally not transparent; our RCM budget is more transparent). We notice it more today because the amount the state is investing is so much less from the general tax base (the State General Fund) than it was in the past.