**Faculty Senate Meeting**
Monday, February 27, 2017
3:30p.m. – 5:30p.m. – Toepfer Room, Adelbert Hall,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Approval of Minutes from the January 31, 2017, Faculty Senate Meeting, attachment</td>
<td>Peter Harte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:35 p.m.</td>
<td>President and Provost’s Announcements</td>
<td>Barbara Snyder, Bud Baeslack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:40 p.m.</td>
<td>Chair’s Announcements</td>
<td>Peter Harte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45 p.m.</td>
<td>Report from the Secretary of the Corporation</td>
<td>Arlishea Fulton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:50 p.m.</td>
<td>Report from the Executive Committee</td>
<td>Juscelino Colares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:55 p.m.</td>
<td>Dual Degree: MSM in Health Care/MS in Public Health, attachment</td>
<td>Mendel Singer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:05 p.m.</td>
<td>MA in Classical Studies, attachment</td>
<td>Paul Iversen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:15 p.m.</td>
<td>Diversity Report, attachment</td>
<td>Marilyn Mobley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Research Survey Results, attachment</td>
<td>Lee Hoffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:50 p.m.</td>
<td>Reception</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Call to Order
Professor Peter Harte, chair, Faculty Senate, called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

Approval of Minutes
The Senate reviewed the minutes from the January 31st, 2017 Faculty Senate meeting. A question arose about the Executive Committee report in the draft minutes. The question pertained to the SOM Petition for Anatomy and whether the Executive Committee had denied the Petition or whether it had declined to consider it. Professor Juscelino Colares, vice chair, responded that the minutes were correct in that the Executive Committee denied the Petition after considering the Senate By-Laws recommendation not to consider it. Attachment

President’s Announcements
The President reported that Ohio Governor John Kasich recently visited think[box] to promote the new Ohio Institute for Technology. $1 million from the state’s capital budget had been contributed for construction of think[box]. Governor Kasich met with a number of student entrepreneurs during his visit.

The new addition to the Linsalata Alumni Center is now complete. A dinner for the CWRU Board of Trustees was held in the new space during the February board weekend.

Beverly Daniel Tatum, a nationally recognized educator, race scholar and author, was the featured guest at the February 23rd Dialogue on Diversity event. The event included an onstage dialogue between Dr. Tatum and President Snyder.

A new executive order on immigration may be issued this week. The university is still advising students from those countries included in the original executive order not to travel outside of the US. A senator expressed concern about speakers and others coming to the university from other countries and how the university can help them if they are detained. President Snyder said that she would work with the Office of General Counsel to create a document with recommended resources for this situation.

Provost’s Announcements
The Provost reported that the CUE working groups are meeting.

Chair’s Announcements
Prof. Harte reported that the Office of Student Activities and Leadership has asked the Senate to participate in the Spring 2017 BlueCWRU Challenge by taking a photo of senators in CWRU
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gear. The President’s office agreed to purchase t-shirts for this purpose. The photo will be taken at the March 22nd Faculty Senate meeting.

Prof. Harte reminded all senators to complete Diversity 360 training by the end of the academic year. A senator asked that a schedule of trainings be emailed to the Senate. Another senator asked that the trainings be scheduled on different days and at different times so that the maximum number of faculty will be able to attend.

**Report from the Secretary of the Corporation**

Arlshea Fulton, senior counsel, reported on the February 17-18, 2017 CWRU Board of Trustees meeting. Among other items the Board approved the 2017-2022 Academic Calendar and a resolution to change the name of the CAS minor from Health Communication to Communication for Health Professionals. *Attachment*

**Report from the Executive Committee**

Prof. Colares reported on the following matters that were discussed at the February 13th meeting of the Executive Committee:

1. **Report on Bias Reporting System (BRS) from Faculty Personnel Committee:**

   - Jeremy Bendik-Keymer, chair of the Senate Committee on Faculty Personnel, presented recommendations from the Committee on the university's Bias Reporting System. Prof. Bendik-Keymer reported that while the Committee endorses the university's commitment to prohibit discrimination in the learning environment, it should not continue to use the concept of bias, which is vague, subjective and not legally prohibited, in any future reporting system.

   - The Personnel Committee recommended that the current BRS be deactivated and taken down, including all traces existing on the university server that are publicly accessible.

   - The Personnel Committee also recommended that any further reporting system developed by the Office of Student Affairs involve a designated person, such as an ombudsperson, for the intake of information, and that all stakeholders, including faculty, be given a chance for input prior to implementation of the system.

   - Currently the system provides for student anonymity but allows students to particularize information to an extent that faculty anonymity can be effectively eliminated. The system is also quite opaque in how it processes the information reported.

   - The Executive Committee voted not to send the recommendation to the full floor of the Senate until the Senate Chair has met with student representatives and others to discuss faculty
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concerns with the current system before recommending any further action.

2. **Approval of Faculty Senate Representative to University's Conflict of Interest:**
The Executive Committee approved the appointment of Professor Sudha Iyengar (SOM) to the university's Conflict of Interest Committee

3. **School Reports:**
   Prof. Kimberly Emmons (CAS) and Prof. Horst Von Recum (CSE) gave reports to the Executive Committee on matters of interest within their respective schools.

**Dual Degree: MSM in Health Care/MS in Public Health**
Professor Mendel Singer (SOM) presented a proposal for an MSM in Health Care/MS in Public Health dual degree. The proposal was approved by the Senate Committee on Graduate Studies. Students enrolled in the MPH program are often interested in management education and some of the students enrolled in the MSM in Health Care don’t have health care degrees. The dual degree program would satisfy the needs of both types of students and would take just 2 years for full-time students to complete both programs. The demand for health care managers is very strong. The Senate voted unanimously to approve the dual degree program.  
*Attachment*

**MA in Classical Studies**
Professor Paul Iversen presented a proposal for an MA in Classical Studies. The proposal was approved by the Senate Committee on Graduate Studies. The program is designed to give students further training in Greek and Latin. This can help students gain admittance into PhD programs in Classics and other Humanities disciplines or to further their credentials or other career goals. Research has shown that many high school Latin and Greek teachers will be interested in the degree program. Once the MA program is approved at all levels, including the state, a track in Classical and Medieval Studies will be added with collaboration from the Departments of History, Art History and Music. A PhD program may be added in the future. The Senate voted unanimously to approve the program.  
*Attachment*

**Diversity Report**
Marilyn Mobley, Vice President, OIDEO, gave an update on activities in the Office of Inclusion, Diversity and Equal Opportunity. She presented information on the vision and goals of the OIDEO office, signature programs, resources and awards. She also discussed the goals of the Diversity Strategic Action Plan (DSAP) and said that a second iteration of the plan will be forthcoming this spring. Data on numbers of underrepresented minority faculty at CWRU was presented. The numbers are fairly flat but this is not unique to CWRU. Ms. Mobley commented that she believes that the number of underrepresented minority candidates in
applicant pools for faculty positions is increasing. Faculty search committees should be as diverse as possible. Unconscious bias on search committees is a concern. A member of the Senate commented that there aren’t enough faculty mentors who are underrepresented minorities. Attachment

Research Survey Results
Professor Lee Hoffer, chair of the Senate Research Committee, presented comparative results from the 2015 and 2016 surveys conducted by the Research Committee. The 2015 survey timeframe was April 30-May 21, 2015. 393 faculty responded which was an 11% response rate. The 2016 survey timeframe was November 3- December 27, 2016. 604 faculty responded which was a 17% response rate.

The survey identified a number of areas for improvement:
1. Pre-award: Most faculty want support writing proposals and identifying opportunities
2. Post-award: The faculty want assistance with monitoring accounts, payment and invoicing, and hiring staff
3. The faculty want more access to both seed/pilot funding and bridge funding

The Research Committee made the following recommendations:
1. Administer the Faculty Research Survey to monitor progress over time (every two years)
2. Post-award: Review monitoring accounts issue and payment/invoicing
3. Pre-award: The Research Committee will develop a grant writing fellowship for faculty (from development to submission)

More details are contained in the report. Attachment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 pm. A reception sponsored by the President’s office took place after the meeting.
The full Board of Trustees met on February 17 and 18, 2017. Following is the report of key items approved by the Trustees.

The Trustees approved the establishment of 4 new endowments totaling $1.2 million of which $1.1 million is for scholarships in Engineering.

The Trustees approved 6 junior faculty appointments, 1 senior faculty appointments, 2 new professorship appointments (including one inaugural appointment), and 1 professorship reappointments.

Faculty appointments include:
- six junior faculty appointments: 1-Engineering, 4-Medicine, and 1-Nursing
- One senior faculty appointment: Mary Ann Horn to senior faculty
- Klara Papp to the inaugural appointment of the Graber Term Professorship
- Vikas Gulani to the Joseph Wearn Professorship
- Reappointment of Christopher Brandt to the Fratianne Professorship

The Trustees approved a resolution to change the name of a minor program in the CAS from Health Communication to Communication for Health Professionals.

The trustees approved the fiscal year 2016 Uniform Guidance Audit Report.

The five year 2017-2022 Academic Calendar was approved by the trustees, along with the 2017-2018 tuition, room and board rates.

The Trustees approved the construction and plan of finance for phase III of the Larry and Sally Zlotnick Sears Think[box].

The Trustees received a report from the ad hoc Bylaws Review Committee of the Board on the review of the University’s Bylaws, by which the Board governs itself and the University.

The next meeting of the Executive Committee is scheduled for March 21.

Report provided by Arlishea Fulton, senior counsel, Office of General Counsel
The Executive Committee met on February 13. Here are three items we deliberated on that do not appear in today's agenda due to the nature of their disposition by Ex-Comm.

1. **Report on Bias Reporting System (BRS) from Faculty Personnel Committee:**

   - Jeremy Bendik-Keymer, chair of the Senate Committee on Faculty Personnel, presented recommendations from the Committee on the university's Bias Reporting System. Prof. Bendik-Keymer reported that while the Committee endorses the university's commitment to prohibit discrimination in the learning environment, it should not continue to use the concept of bias, which is vague, subjective and not legally prohibited, in any future reporting system.
   - The Personnel Committee recommended that the current BRS be deactivated and taken down, including all traces existing on the university server that are publicly accessible.
   - The Personnel Committee also recommended that any further reporting system developed by the Office of Student Affairs involve a designated person, such as an ombudsperson, for the in-take of information, and that all stakeholders, including faculty, be given a chance for input prior to implementation of the system.
   - Currently the system provides for student anonymity but allows students to particularize information to an extent that faculty anonymity can be effectively eliminated. The system is also quite opaque in how it processes the information reported.
   - The Executive Committee voted not to send the recommendation to the full floor of the Senate until the Senate Chair has met with student representatives and others to discuss faculty concerns with the current system before recommending any further action.

2. **Approval of Faculty Senate Representative to University’s Conflict of Interest:**

   - The Executive Committee approved the appointment of Professor Sudha Iyengar (SOM) to the university’s Conflict of Interest Committee

3. **School Reports:**

   - Prof. Kimberly Emmons (CAS) and Prof. Horst Von Recum (CSE) gave reports to the Executive Committee on matters of interest within their respective schools

That's all we have.
Dual-Degree Proposal

Master of Science in Management—Health Care Master of Public Health

Mendel Singer, PhD MPH
Associate Professor and Vice Chair for Education
Dept. of Population and Quantitative Health Sciences
(formerly Epidemiology and Biostatistics)
Master of Public Health

- 42 Credits
- Terminal, professional degree
- Common complementary degree (11 Dual-degree programs)
  - SOM, Nursing, Dental, MSASS, Law, Management (MBA) and more
- MPH only - 2 years, many work 20 hours/week
- Dual-degree: MPH adds 1 year
- 5 majors, including:
  - Health Care Administration and Policy
Health Care Management

• Many MPH students major in Health Care Administration and Policy
• Pursuing careers in health management
• Many consider MBA-MPH, but few do it
  • MBA = 69 credits, MPH = 42 credits; MBA/MPH = 102 credits
  • Lot of credits and money for 2 Master’s degrees
• Major within MPH has limited amount of management courses
  • 3 major courses +/- 1 elective
• Students want to get a management degree at right cost in time/$
MS Management – Health Care

• 30 credits
• Marketed more towards health professionals
  • Already have health credentials
  • Others interested
• Untapped market of people aiming for health care management, but have no health degree
Dual-Degree

• Some students doing MPH decide they need a business background and would opt for this dual-degree
• Some students doing MSM-HC may not have health degree and would like to pursue MPH
• New market for people wanting both types of degrees
• Dual-degree = 63 credits (with 9 credits of double counting)
  • 6 credits less than an MBA, get a management and health master’s
  • Can be done in 2 full years: 2 Fall, 2 Spring, 2 Summer
  • Or at a slower pace
• Training people to be health care management leaders
• Demand for health care management is strong
  • Dual-degree graduates would be exceptionally competitive
Proposal for a Dual-Degree Program in
Masters of Science Management-Healthcare (MSM-HC) and Public Health

MSM-HC/MPH

Submitted by:
Mendel Singer, PhD MPH
Associate Professor and Vice Chair for Education
Dept. of Population and Quantitative Health Sciences (formerly Epidemiology and Biostatistics)
mendel@case.edu
368-1951
Proposal for a Dual-Degree Program in Masters of Science Management-Healthcare (MSM-HC) and Public Health (MPH)

Note: The department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics has had a name change approved to Population and Quantitative Health Sciences.

Background
The Master of Public Health program prepares students to address the broad mission of public health, defined as “enhancing health in human populations, through organized community effort,” utilizing education, research, and community service. Public health practitioners must be prepared to identify and assess health needs of different populations, and able to plan, implement and evaluate programs to respond to those needs. It is the task of the public health practitioner to prevent illness and to protect and promote the wellness of human-kind. A Master of Public Health degree provides education in public health basics, including biostatistics, epidemiology, environmental health sciences, health policy, and social and behavioral sciences. Individual interest, experience, and program resources guide emphasis for different students. The CWRU Master of Public Health degree yields a broad base of knowledge and skills necessary in various areas of public health. In addition to providing students with a broad foundation, the MPH program provides students with experience in the direct application of their new knowledge and skills to community health problems. The CWRU MPH Program has a particular emphasis on urban health and care of vulnerable populations.

The Weatherhead School is an international center of management scholarship, committed to preparing and enhancing organizational leadership. A dual degree with the MPH program would be congruent with the Weatherhead School’s commitment to developing innovative educational programs, to fostering strategic partnerships with students and organizations, and to providing services to multiple communities.

Because of the breadth and scope of the field of public health the CWRU MPH and MSM-HC programs are ideally suited to combine in a joint effort. The MPH/MSM-HC shared degree will enable students to obtain graduate preparation in both fields, contributing to public health practice, and increased availability of leadership and knowledge through public health organizations. It is anticipated that this collaboration will improve the management component of the public health educational experience for all students through closer collaboration between departments and through peer interactions of dual degree students and their colleagues. Furthermore, this will diversify the population the programs attract and create an attractive alternative option for students interested in pursuing a dual degree with management and public health but are not pursing the MBA/MPH currently offered at CWRU. The MSM-HC is a different degree than the MBA and the audience is expected to be different and bring more diversity to the program. We believe the program can thrive bi-directionally as people gravitate towards the MSM-HC are focused on a commitment to health and individuals who are seeking MPH programs might have an interest in management and understanding of health care systems.

Justification
Weatherhead emphasizes the assessment and development of management skills along with knowledge of the functional areas of business and offers a liberalizing experience through exploration of the diverse contexts of management. The MPH program, operates in the School of Medicine and degrees are conferred by the School of Graduate Studies. The MPH program prepares students for the broad mission of public health, defined as “enhancing health in human populations through organized community effort” utilizing education, research and community service. The dual degree program will mutually
enhance each degree and provide greater curriculum depth for graduates to participate in planning, organizing, delivering, and evaluating health-related organizations, systems and services.

The combination of approaches will allow graduates to engage in both contemplative analysis and application of knowledge in the creation of intervention programs, development and analysis of health care policy, management and strengthen students ability to identify relevant public health issues, and employ design thinking to create positive change. The MPH degree is a “terminal” degree and persons with the degree may pursue a variety of career paths. The MSM-HC is considered a supplementary degree in that it enhances careers in other fields – e.g., law, medicine, nursing, or in this case, public health. The MSM-HC/MPH dual-degree would fuel careers in every aspect of public health, including international and global health, public health preparedness and function, environmental health sciences, behavioral sciences, health education, health communications, and health policy and management.

The capacity to view the classical public health content areas through the lens of healthcare management will provide a clear advantage to the dual degree graduate and to the constituency served. These advantages apply to the manner in which public health is taught, research is conducted, community collaborations are framed, and particularly, the manner in which public health interventions are implemented. To the best of our knowledge, this dual program at CWRU will be a positive alternative route to the traditional MBA with a health concentration giving CWRU an advantage over many competitors and advance both marketing and recruiting efforts. We feel the dual degree in MSM-HC/MPH will open up a new market for both programs with applicants who may not have considered either option alone but with the advanced scheduling and appeal of multiple degrees this option may increase in popularity and open a new pool of applicants for both schools.

**Dual-Degree Program Objective**

The objectives of the MSM-HC/MPH Program are to:

- Analyze the sociocultural, biological, and psychological determinants of sickness and health within populations and its practical applications across the health care fields,
- Enhance the epidemiological and biostatistical skills of a health care focused managerial employee,
- Provide practical skills in analysis and evaluation of health service organizations, delivery and impact of healthcare and policy,
- To improve the capacity to utilize data in guiding health care solutions and informed decision making practices,
- To provide excellent education in health care management and public health to students and professionals in the School of Medicine and Weatherhead School of Management and throughout the University, and
- To provide a solid foundation in business fundamentals (accounting, finance, operations, management) with applications that address contemporary issues in healthcare management.

To provide the skills and knowledge necessary for those who wish to attain the following goals:

- A career managing programs in collaboration and with communities to improve the health of their members, by identifying and assessing the health needs of the population, and planning and implementing programs to meet those needs;
- Management leadership to ensure continued economic viability, human development and effective communication for the public health or health organization and communities in which they practice.
Administration

- Management liaison: Mark Votruba, Director, MSM-HC Program, Weatherhead School of Management
- Overseeing body
  - Simon Peck, Associate Dean of Graduate Programs, Weatherhead School of Management
- Advising group: faculty within the MSM-HC, Weatherhead School of Management
- Public health liaison: Scott Frank, Director, MPH Program, Department of Population and Quantitative Health Sciences (formerly Epidemiology & Biostatistics), School of Medicine
- Overseeing body:
  - Mendel Singer, Associate Professor & Vice Chair of Education. Department of Population and Quantitative Health Sciences, School of Medicine
- Advisory group: MPH Management Team

Stand-alone MPH students’ home department is Population and Quantitative Health Sciences (formerly Epidemiology & Biostatistics) in the School of Medicine and MSM-HC home "department" is the Weatherhead School of Management. Dual-degree MSM-HC/MPH students will be home-based in the Weatherhead School of Management. The tuition rate per credit hour is slightly less in WSOM and the cost of a dual-degree is high, so this small break is offered to the students. Having WSOM as the student’s "home" also reflects that for most of these dual-degree students, the MSM-H will be their primary program and management will ultimately be more of the defining influence in terms of their career. As such, WSOM recognizes that it will likely be the primary source of career advice for these students, though advisors from the MPH program will also play a key role. Dual-degree students should meet with their advisors from both programs every semester. It also follows that each student's MPH Capstone committee should reflect the dual-degree status and have membership from at least one WSOM faculty or health management professional.

The flow of tuition return is described using an example in Appendix 1. The University takes a small amount off the full tuition and sends the balance (usually about 97% of the full tuition paid) to the home School - which in this case is WSOM. WSOM then keeps 25% of this amount to cover the University head tax on students they will have to pay (as the home department) plus overhead. The remaining amount, the distributable tuition return is then shared between WSOM and the department of Population and Quantitative Health Sciences according based on the number of credits taken in each program. If in a given semester a dual-degree student takes all 9 credits in one program or the other, then that program would get the full distributable tuition return. If 9 of 15 credits were MPH courses and the other 6 were WSOM courses, then 60% (9 of 15) of this distributable tuition return would go to the Population and Quantitative Health Sciences department and WSOM would keep the remaining 40%.

Admission to Dual-Degree Program

The CWRU MPH and MSM-HC recruit students from international, national, local, and university sources, including the community’s public health workforce. The programs seek applicants with diverse cultural and experiential backgrounds, with the academic ability to succeed in the professional training offered by the dual-degree program, while contributing to the learning environment for all. Recruitment efforts embrace the university’s commitment to non-discrimination.

Prospective students applying to the School of Graduate Studies at CWRU and Weatherhead must complete applications for both the CWRU School of Graduate Studies and Weatherhead School of Management. Applicants must have a bachelor’s degree from an accredited institution, grade transcripts, standardized test scores (GRE scores are preferred) are usually required but sometimes waived, a written
statement of purpose, and three letters of recommendation. TOEFL scores are required from international applicants. A personal or telephone interview with a faculty member from the Weatherhead School of Management is required of all applicants.

Students must apply and be accepted to each program to qualify. Applicants may apply simultaneously to each of the two programs before entering either, or, alternatively, may initiate their studies in one program and later apply for the other. However, as the graduate programs are separated schools, the applicants will be advised that they need to communicate with each program to ensure that each program has its own set of application forms completed. Applications will be copied and shared between the two programs as needed. Independent admission reviews will be conducted in each department and applicants will be evaluated on the basis of academic merit, evidence of experience in or commitment to the fields, demonstration of strong communication skills, work experience, service activities, and references. Admission into one program is not a guarantee that the student will gain admission to the other or be accepted as a dual-degree student. Subsequently, the two programs will communicate about applicants that have been accepted separately into each program regarding admission into the dual-degree program in order to assure that applicants’ career goals and abilities are appropriate for the rigors and content of the dual-degree program.

In order for students to take advantage of the benefits of the dual-degree program over doing the degrees consecutively, they need to be enrolled in both programs simultaneously. Students who begin in one program or the other and then decide to do the dual-degree will need to be accepted into the other program and enroll in that second program prior to graduating from the first program. This will ensure they can do the double-counting of 9 credits, get advising appropriate for this career track and be able to pay the slightly lower per credit hour tuition rate at WSOM.

**Entry into the Dual-Degree After Starting in a Single Degree Program**

Students originally enrolled in either the MSM-HC or MPH programs can apply for the dual-degree program as long as they will matriculate into the additional program prior to graduation from the first program, i.e. they can’t start the 2nd degree program, as part of the dual-degree program, after graduating from the first program.

Since all dual-degree MSM-HC/MPH students will be home-based in WSOM, students who were originally enrolled in the MPH program alone and are accepted into the dual-degree program, will need to have the MPH Administrative Director work with Graduate Studies and the Registrar’s office to move their home program (“billing career”) to the management school.

**Awarding of the MSM-HC and MPH Degrees**

A dual-degree MSM-HC/MPH student may graduate with the MPH degree upon completion of the requirements for the MPH degree, even if they have not yet completed the requirements for the MSM-HC degree. However, Weatherhead policy is not to award their degree to a dual-degree student if that student will not be graduating from the MPH program until some time in the future. Thus, a dual-degree student who has completed requirements for the MSM-HC degree, cannot graduate with that degree unless they have either already graduated with their MPH or are graduating with their MPH simultaneously with the MSM-HC.

**Program Structure**

The Weatherhead School awards the MSM-HC degree in 30 credit hours taken part-time over 2 years. The School of Graduate Studies awards the MPH degree for 42 credit hours taken full-time over 2 years not including summer. The two years for the MSM-HC includes two summers. Because of the complementary...
nature of both degrees, students who integrate the MSM-HC/MPH course work to complete the dual-degree will be able to reduce the degree credits of the MPH by 6 credits and the MSM-HC by 3 credits, without compromising the integrity of either degree. Dual-degree candidates will count 9 credits toward their MSM-HC degree, replacing 6 MSM-HC curriculum credits and replacing the Action Learning Project (MGMT 497) with the practicum experience (MPHP 650). The total reduction of credit requirements for both degrees moves from 72 to 63 credits. The anticipated length of time to complete the dual degree is two years and one summer session in-between year one and two. Students completing the dual-degree on a part-time basis may complete dual-degree requirements in up to five years. There are alternative timelines and accepted students could elect to be full-time MPH students for one year and then elect to do the dual degree with MSM-HC or start as a MSM-HC dedicated student and apply to the dual degree program after they complete their first year of studies.

Students will develop planned programs of study (PPOS) with their advisors and may customize their approach and pace through the program. As identified above, each program has a set of core courses that must be completed; 21 core credits in MPH and 18 core credits in MSM-HC for a combined total of 39 required credit hours.

In addition to its 21 required credits, the stand-alone MPH program requires 9 concentration credits and 6 elective credits while the stand-alone MSM-HC program requires 9 credits taken from a list of approved elective courses. Dual-degree MSM-HC/MPH candidates will combine their 9 MSM-HC electives and 9 MPH concentration and 6 elective courses to complete a total of 24 credit hours of advanced electives.

Students will select electives in consultation with faculty advisors from both programs (see advising section below). A minimum 9 out of the 21 elective credits must be MPHP designated courses. The remaining 12 credits of electives must enhance an understanding of issues in the field of healthcare management and must be relevant to the student’s academic goals.

Registration for Courses:
There is no concern about being blocked out of courses due to timing of registration. MSM-HC students cannot be blocked out of their program’s courses (all required; no electives). MPH students cannot be blocked out of their required courses (including the required major course for these students).

MPH/MSM-HC Dual-Degree
Sample Course Sequence

Current credit requirements:
• MPH program: 42 credit hours, usually taken 12+12+9+9 over four full semesters.
• MSM-HC program: 30 credit hours, taken part-time in lock-step, with one course in each summer (6+6+3+6+6+3).

Dual-degree requirements:
• 63 credit hours (42+30-9)
• MGMT 497 (Action Learning project) will be omitted in lieu of the MPHP practicum
• Two HSMC courses will count towards both degrees.
*Appendix 2 depicts an example curriculum that would allow a full-time student to complete the requirements for the dual-degree in 2 years.
Capstone Experience
The proposed MSM-HC/MPH dual-degree is a “side-by-side” dual-degree program, composed of existing curricular elements of ongoing programs in Weatherhead and the School of Graduate Studies provided by faculty already engaged in these efforts. The key integrative experience which will succeed in making the interdisciplinary character of the program explicit is the capstone experience. The six credit hour capstone project must embrace both the domains of public health and healthcare management and approval of the capstone project will occur in consultation with a capstone advisory committee that must include members from both departments.

The capstone project places students in health-related settings to work on projects of mutual interest to the agency or organization and the student. The experience affords students the opportunity to apply the knowledge and skills they have acquired through their academic course work to a problem involving the health of the community and to complete a service-oriented project mutually beneficial to the student’s academic progress and the needs of the field placement site. Students learn to identify ethical, social, and cultural issues relating to public health policies, research and interventions, to identify the process by which decisions are made within the organization or agency, and to identify and coordinate the use of resources at the site.

The nature of the capstone project will be determined jointly by the student, the field site director, and the student’s capstone advisory committee. The student is required to produce a master’s degree essay (See Appendix 3 for master’s essay requirements) relating to the outcomes of the project and to take an organized, scholarly approach to the topic. The student will be guided and supported by his/her capstone advisory committee consisting of MPH and MSM-HC faculty as project advisors, a primary preceptor at the capstone site, and a content expert relevant to the project topic. Capstone advisors may or may not be the same as their chosen faculty advisors described in the following section. Capstone projects will be evaluated based on an assessment of performance in the context of the field placement, as well as preparation and presentation of the master’s essay. The capstone advisory committee will determine the grade collaboratively.

Student Advising Structure
Each dual-degree student will have a faculty advisor in the MPH program with a secondary advisor in Weatherhead. The advisor(s) will be responsible for the usual supervision and guidance of individual students, including development of and revisions to a Planned Program of Study (PPOS) for the student. Advisory sessions will take place with both MPH program and Weatherhead advisors present. It is recommended that students meet with their advisors at a least once a semester. Students will be assigned one MPH staff or faculty advisor and one Weatherhead faculty member as their advisors. In addition, there will be a Program Advisory Committee, consisting of the student’s individual advisors and program directors of each program.

Appendix 1: Tuition Revenue Sharing for the Dual MSM-HC/MPH Degree Program
Agreement between the Master of Public Health Program in the Department of Population and Quantitative Health Sciences in the School of Medicine and the Weatherhead School of Management
Graduate student tuition revenues generally filter back to the student’s home school (or department). Dual-degree MSM-HC/MPH students will be home-based in the School of Management. A student’s home base or billing career is defined as the department or management center from which the student registers and to which tuition revenues return after the university collects its agreed upon initial percentage. Since dual-degree MSM-HC/MPH students will be home-based in the School of Management, Weatherhead will reimburse the Department of Population and Quantitative Health Sciences in the School of Medicine for MPHP coded courses taken on a semester basis through a tuition revenue account provided by the School of Medicine’s Office of Finance and Planning. This will be done prior to the hard close in December and June of each year, but after the close of all registration activity for each semester (after the deadline for class withdrawal). An accounting of all MPHP coded courses taken by MSM-HC/MPH dual degree students will be conducted by a liaison in the Department of Population and Quantitative Health Sciences prior to the close of each semester. The School of Medicine will send the accounting in the form of an “invoice memo” to the School of Management. Weatherhead will do a journal for the amount of MPHP coded courses taken on a semesterly basis using the Weatherhead tuition rate for the total tally of MPHP courses. Refer to example below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example:</th>
<th>1 dual MSM-HC/MPH student for first semester student 2015-2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 total MSM-HC and MPH credit hours taken in the first semester as a full time student. MSM-HC/MPH coursework tuition billed out to student at $1633 per credit hour, but capped at full-time charge of 12 credits</td>
<td>$12 x $1633 = $19,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Tuition rate does not increase after 12 credits per semester in the School of Management.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University takes a small percentage off the total tuition for the student health services, 97% of the tuition can then be given to the home department for splitting revenue between the programs</td>
<td>$19,596 x 97% = $19,008.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% of the tuition revenue will be kept by the home school to cover indirect and administrative costs charged per student by the university</td>
<td>$19,008.12 x 25% = $4,752.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The remaining 75% of the tuition will be available to split between the schools to cover teaching costs</td>
<td>$19,008.12 - $4,752.03 = $14,256.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First semester MSM-HC/MPH student took total of 9 MPH credits and 6 MSM-HC credits. 60% (9/15) of course load in MPH program, so 60% of distributable tuition revenue is to be journaled from School of Management back to the Department of Population and Quantitative Health Sciences</td>
<td>$14,256.09 x 60% = $8,553.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 MSM-HC credits, 40% of course load, so 40% of distributable tuition revenue is kept by WSOM.</td>
<td>$14,256.09 x 40% = $5,702.44 (or $14,256.09 - $8,553.65 = $5,702.44)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This example is based on the first semester of the course sequence as seen page 7. It is a reflection that a full-time student pays up to 12 credits per semester within the School of Management, but may enroll in a limited number of additional credits without additional costs.*
### Appendix 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>MPH Credits</th>
<th>MSM-HC credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall, yr1</td>
<td>MPH 403</td>
<td>Research and Evaluation Methods</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MPH 411</td>
<td>Introduction to Health Behavior</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MPH 483</td>
<td>Intro. to Epidemiology for Public Health Practice</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACCT 401</td>
<td>Financial and Managerial Accountancy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HSMC 421</td>
<td>Health Economics and Strategy</td>
<td>(3) 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring, yr1</td>
<td>MPH 405</td>
<td>Statistical Methods in Public Health</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MPH 439 or MPH 456</td>
<td>Health Mgmt&amp;Policy/Health Policy&amp;Mgmt Decisions</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MPH 650 (practicum)</td>
<td>Public Health Practicum</td>
<td>3 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HSMC 420</td>
<td>Health Finance</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HSMC 457</td>
<td>Health Decision Making and Analytics</td>
<td>(3) 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer, yr1</td>
<td>MBAP 411</td>
<td>Identifying Design Opportunities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, yr2</td>
<td>MPH 652 (capstone, part 1)</td>
<td>Public Health Capstone</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MPH 406</td>
<td>History and Philosophy of Public Health</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MPH 468</td>
<td>Continual Improvement of Health Care</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBAP 407</td>
<td>Managerial Marketing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBAP 408</td>
<td>Operations Management*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring, yr2</td>
<td>MPH 652 (capstone, part 2)</td>
<td>Public Health Capstone Project</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MPH 429</td>
<td>Environmental Health</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MPH elective</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBAP 404</td>
<td>Managing People in Organizations</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HSMC 425</td>
<td>Dialogues in Healthcare Management</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>36 + (6) “double-counted” = 30</td>
<td>27 + (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>counted’ = 42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Capstone Essay Requirements

Each student will be required to develop a master’s essay based on his or her field experience. This master’s essay represents the culminating experience required for the MPH degree program. The student will write the essay based on the approved capstone proposal crafted in consultation with his or her capstone advisory committee. The capstone advisory committee is analogous to a thesis committee for a student in the M.S. or Ph.D. program. The student develops the proposal in collaboration with the committee during the semester prior to initiating the project. Structure of the capstone essay should generally follow the format listed below.

Following completion of the capstone project, on which the master’s essay is based, and the completion of the master’s essay, each student will be required to formally present his or her experience and/or his or her research findings. (Refer to capstone presentation guidelines worksheet). The essay is due to all members of the advisory committee at least 2 weeks prior to the presentation. Should the student’s capstone advisory committee request any changes to the essay, the modifications need to be incorporated into a final document to be submitted (to all previously named parties) prior to or at the time of the final presentation. The student will receive support and encouragement to publish peer-reviewed, scholarly work based on the master’s essay.

Samples of other students’ capstone essays are on file with the MPH office and available to reference upon request.

Students are responsible for arranging for their capstone advisory committee members to review and evaluate the essay. Students are also responsible for distributing essay evaluation forms to members of the capstone advisory committee, along with the essay, for performance assessment. Students should instruct committee members to complete and sign these forms and submit them to the MPH office so that a grade may be cast. Until all forms are signed off by each advisor, the student will not receive a passing grade.
January 19, 2017

Paul MacDonald
Chair, Graduate Studies Committee
c/o Rebecca Weiss, Secretary of the University Faculty

Dear Paul,

A proposal for a joint degree program in Masters of Science Management-Healthcare (MSM-HC) and Public Health was submitted for review and approval within the Weatherhead school. After review and discussion in both our Council and Assembly meetings, the faculty voted favorably, unanimously by those present during our Council meeting on May 4, 2016 and later during our Assembly meeting on October 27, 2016.

I concur with the Faculty of the Weatherhead School of Management and recommend approval of this joint degree program. The proposal is attached for your review.

Sincerely,

Robert E. Widing
April 8, 2016

Roy Ritzmann, PhD
Chair, Faculty Senate
c/o Rebecca Weiss, Secretary of the University Faculty
Adelbert Hall
7001

Dear Dr. Ritzmann:

As noted in the accompanying memo from Dr. Bill Schilling, Chair of the School of Medicine’s Faculty Council, the Faculty Council has recommended approval of a Dual-Degree Program in Masters of Science Management-Healthcare and Public Health offered through the Weatherhead School of Management and the Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics in the School of Medicine.

This program provides an opportunity to view and address public health concerns with the added knowledge of healthcare management. The departments and faculty have experience with the management and coordination necessary for successful dual degree programs.

The proposal approval process is outlined in Dr. Schilling’s memo. An ad hoc Committee was convened to review this new program and after revisions, the program was approved by the Faculty Council.

I concur with the Faculty of Medicine and recommend approval of this dual degree program.

Please submit the proposed dual degree program to the appropriate committees for their review at their earliest opportunity. I would be pleased to answer any questions that might arise during the review process.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Pamela B. Davis, MD, PhD

C: Dr. Bill Schilling, Chair, Faculty Council
    Nicole Deming, Assistant Dean for Faculty Affairs and Human Resources, SOM

enclosures
Memorandum

To: Pamela B. Davis, MD, PhD  
Dean, School of Medicine  
Case Western Reserve University

From: William Schilling, PhD  
Chair, Faculty Council

Re: Dual Degree Program

Date: April 6, 2016

At its March 21, 2016, meeting, the Faculty Council voted to recommend approval of a dual-degree program in Masters of Science Management-Healthcare and Public Health. The program is offered by the Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics in the School of Medicine and the Weatherhead School of Management.

In accordance with our SOM practices, an ad hoc committee composed of members of the Faculty Council Steering Committee, Graduate Directors, the SOM members of the Faculty Senate’s Committee on Graduate Programs, and the Associate Dean for Graduate Education was created to review the program proposal. The ad hoc committee was chaired by Nicholas Ziets and met with Mendel Singer, PhD, MPD, Associate Professor and Vice Chair for Education in the Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics. The ad hoc committee reviewed the document, discussed the proposal, and engaged with the program presenter. After the meeting was concluded a summary of changes was created. These changes were adopted and the revised proposal was circulated to the ad hoc committee for a vote. The ad hoc committee approved the amended proposal was sent to the Faculty Council.

Dr. Singer presented to Faculty Council and shared that the program will target those who already have a healthcare degree (management and health degree). This dual-degree program could be completed intensively in 2 years, including summers. It will be ideal for non-clinicians and those wanting to work with communities. A motion was made to approve and seconded. A vote was taken, all were in favor, none opposed. The motion passes.

After your review, I hope you will join me in recommending approval of the proposal for a Dual-Degree Program in Masters of Science Management-Healthcare and Public Health. Please let me know if I can provide any additional information. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

William P. Schilling, Ph.D.  
Faculty Council Chair  
Professor of Physiology and Biophysics  
Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine

cc: Nicole Deming, JD, MA
MA Program in Classical Studies
I. **Definition of the Focus of Initiative.** We will give MA students further training in Greek and Latin, and the guidance (advising) they need to gain admittance into PhD programs in Classics and other Humanities disciplines, or to further their credentials or other career goals. We will also give them a chance to travel abroad to Greece or Italy.

II. **Brief Description of Program and its disciplinary purpose and significance.** A two-year program of graduate study leading to an MA degree. With the Department’s current resources and staff, the program would be particularly attractive to students with interests in Greek and Roman literature, Greek and Roman art and archaeology, epigraphy, and the reception of classical literature from the Middle Ages to the present. We would also allow Integrated Graduate Studies students to participate in it.
III. Summary of Requirements for MA in Classical Studies:

A. Entry Requirements:
   1. GPA: 3.5 or higher recommended
   2. 2 Years of college-level Greek or Latin before entering program.

B. Program Requirements
   1. 15 credit hours (5 courses) of any combination of Greek or Latin at the 400-level.
   2. 3 credit hours Materials and Methods (CLSC 420).
   3. 6 credit hours (2 courses) of Classics courses at the 400-level.
   4. 6 credit hours, Thesis and presentation.
   5. Maintain a GPA of 3.0 or higher to have academic good standing, and graduate with a GPA of 3.0 or higher.
   6. Full-time students should complete in 2 years, part-time in 5 years.
• IV. Other Considerations

   A. The courses are all already in place
   B. The program requires no new funds
   C. The program will bring in some modest income

V. Future Plans

   A. When/if the MA Program is approved at all levels, including at the state level, we will immediately add a track in Classical and Medieval Studies with collaboration from the Departments of History, Art History and Music.

   B. Perhaps in five years or so we will add a PhD.
PROPOSAL:
MA IN CLASSICAL STUDIES

Paul Iversen and Peter Knox
December 2016
The Department of Classics proposes to use existing resources to initiate a new MA Program in Classical Studies. The Department recently initiated a one-year Graduate Certificate Program, which serves as a preparation for admission to an MA or a PhD program. In the course of developing the Certificate Program, the Department has reconfigured its course offerings to include a broad array of graduate courses, which are also suitable for MA students in Classical Studies, so only very minor adjustments in the curriculum would be necessary to initiate this MA program (and in fact, when the Graduate Certificate Program was created, it was envisioned that an MA program in Classics would evolve out of it).

I. Introduction

A. Proposed Titles & Degree Designations

1. The MA in Classical Studies

B. Anticipated Launch Date. Given that this proposal will need to be reviewed and approved by the Faculty Senate and the Regents’ Advisory Committee on Graduate Study (RACGS), we anticipate a launch date in the Fall of 2018, or the Fall of 2019 at the latest.

C. Definition of the Focus of Initiative. We will give MA students further training in Greek and Latin, and the guidance (advising) they need to gain admittance into PhD programs in Classics and other Humanities disciplines, or to further their credentials or other career goals. We will also give them a chance to travel abroad to Greece or Italy.

D. Brief Description of Program and its disciplinary purpose and significance. A two-year program of graduate study leading to an MA degree. With the Department’s current resources and staff, the program would be particularly attractive to students with interests in Greek and Roman literature, Greek and Roman art and archaeology, epigraphy, and the reception of classical literature from the Middle Ages to the present. We would also allow Integrated Graduate Studies students to participate in it.

II. Proposed Curriculum

A. Description of Program. The MA in Classical Studies will require 30 semester hours, which includes 6 credits hours for writing and presentation of a thesis. A unique feature of our program, which would distinguish it from our peers, is our plan to incorporate an optional international experience into the curriculum with summer study via our existing Archaeological Field School course (CLSC 418, currently being taught onsite by at the Lechaion Harbor and Settlement Project at Corinth, Greece), or at an overseas institution such as the American Academy in Rome or the American School of Classical Studies in Athens, or field work at some other archaeological survey or excavation, the cost of which we can provide significant financial support from existing endowments for students (however, students who receive scholarship support to go to other institutions or to work on projects that are not sponsored by CWRU and attached
to CLSC 418 or some other CWRU course will not receive CWRU academic credit). Students would be admitted under Plan A (Master’s Thesis) of the School of Graduate Study and would need to comply with all University and School of Graduate Study policies. Full-time students will be expected to complete the MA within two academic years, while part-time students would have 5 years to complete the program. Timing of the completion of the Master’s Thesis would be coordinated with the process of applying to PhD programs, so that a substantial portion of the thesis could serve as part of the candidate’s application dossier. This would make the program particularly attractive to students intending to pursue a further degree.

B. Outline of Requirements and Electives.

1. Proposed admissions requirements. A Bachelor’s degree. A strong academic record (GPA 3.5 or higher recommended) with at least two years of college-level Greek or Latin; students must be highly motivated and have a strong reason for mastering ancient languages as well as a realistic appreciation of the work involved.

2. Proposed requirements for awarding the MA in Classical Studies:

In accordance with industry standards, students must complete five 3-credit courses in any combination of Greek and Latin for a total of 15 credit hours. They will also be required to take an existing 3-credit materials and methods course (CLSC 420), as well as two 3-credit courses on Classics at the 400 level for a total of 9 more credits. Finally, they will need to write a substantial thesis and give an oral presentation (6 credit hours). Students must maintain a GPA of at least 3.0 to maintain their academic good standing, and their GPA in these courses must also be at least 3.0 to graduate. Full-time students should complete the requirements in two years from the start of study, while part-time students should complete them within five years.

3. Summary of Requirements for MA in Classical Studies:

a. Entry Requirements:
   i. GPA: 3.5 or higher recommended
   ii. 2 Years of college-level Greek or Latin before entering program.

b. Program Requirements
   i. 15 credit hours (5 courses) of any combination of Greek or Latin at the 400-level.
   ii. 3 credit hours Materials and Methods (CLSC 420).
   iii. 6 credit hours (2 courses) of Classics courses at the 400-level.
   iv. 6 credit hours, Thesis and presentation.
   v. Maintain a GPA of 3.0 or higher to have academic good standing, and graduate with a GPA of 3.0 or higher.
   vi. Full-time students should complete in 2 years, part-time in 5 years.
Courses already on the books that fulfill these requirements, include:

- GREK 405: Readings in Ancient Philosophy
- GREK 407: Readings in Greek History
- GREK 411: Readings in Homer
- GREK 480: Advanced Topics in Greek Lit.
- GREK 406: Greek Tragedy
- GREK 408: Greek Comedy
- GREK 470: Greek Prose Comp.
- GREK 495: Directed Readings
- LATN 405: Lit. of the Republic
- LATN 407: Livy
- LATN 409: Medieval Latin
- LATN 452: History
- LATN 454: Drama
- LATN 470: Latin Prose Composition
- LATN 408: Horace Odes & Epodes
- LATN 451: Latin Didactic Lit.
- LATN 453: Epic
- LATN 456: Elegiac Poetry
- LATN 480: Advanced Topics in Lat. Lit.
- CLSC 411: Rome City & Image
- CLSC 418: Archaeological Field School
- CLSC 422: Roman Drama & Theater
- CLSC 426: Rome On Site
- CLSC 430: Topics in Classical Tradition
- CLSC 433: Greek & Roman Painting
- CLSC 481: Graduate Level Special Stud.
- CLSC 416: Greek Tragedy in English
- CLSC 420: Material and Methods
- CLSC 424: The Sublime & Grotesque in Lit.
- CLSC 427: The Parthenon, Then & Now
- CLSC 432: Archaeology of Ancient Italy
- CLSC 434: Art & Archaeology of Greece

III. Faculty and Department Information

A. Faculty Sponsors and Department. Paul Iversen, Associate Professor of Classics, Chair of Classics. Peter Knox, Professor of Classics, Director of the Baker Nord Center for the Humanities.

B. Other CAS Departments, CWRU Schools or administrative offices involved. None.

C. Describe administrative arrangements for the initiative. The initiative would be administered by the Department of Classics, including the administrative assistants assigned to it. It would not require additional administrative support.

D. How is the proposed program important to CAS and the involved Department:

1. Rationale for CAS and University. This proposal is run entirely off the existing resources required to run an effective undergraduate program. As such, it costs no extra money (and actually will raise some modest money), it can help add students to our language classes in Greek and Latin (which have plenty of room for more students), and it will bring greater prestige to the College and University.

2. Rationale for sponsoring department. The Classics Department currently includes 7 full-time faculty (5 tenured/tenure-track, 2 instructors), with cooperating faculty in Art History and Religious Studies. An MA program will provide faculty members with a teaching experience that complements their scholarly activities and will enhance the unit’s profile nationally and internationally. An MA is also a key
component in our own Classics departmental strategic plan, since it sets us on the path to the future development of the PhD. As such it enjoys the unanimous support of the voting faculty in Classics. The MA in Classical Studies will enrich our classes by adding slightly older, more mature, and highly motivated people. This is a wonderful benefit to gain at NO EXPENSE and without any new curriculum or teaching staff. We suspect that language instructors will be inspired to greater rigor and discipline in the classroom, in the knowledge that their MA students need the most punctilious training.

E. What is the relationship between the proposed initiative and the Classics Department’s current programs? The Classics Department currently awards a BA in Classics (with three different concentrations in Philology, Classical Civilization and the Classical Tradition) and a post-baccalaureate certificate in Classics that is designed as a bridge to graduate study in Classics for those students who need more Greek and Latin. The MA program would offer another degree option, and add more students to our upper level Greek and Latin courses, which are vital to our program but underutilized.

The meshing of graduate students with our advanced undergraduate Classics majors (and graduate students in History, English, Art History, etc.) will also enrich the educational experience for undergraduate majors and aid in recruiting more undergraduates to the program. In addition, the Department has a few undergraduate courses with enrollments regularly above 25 and these would benefit from having a graduate Teaching Assistant.

IV. Evidence of need or market for the program? The program would be attractive to CWRU undergraduates, especially those who embarked on classical studies late in their undergraduate careers and are a part of our post-bac certificate program (which to date has seen one student graduate). In addition, the Department will market the program to students at four-year liberal arts colleges in the region and nationally. As the only such program in Cleveland, the MA in Classical Studies at CWRU would be attractive to students from institutions such as John Carroll University, Oberlin College, Kenyon College, Hiram College, Ohio University, to mention only a few with programs in Classics whose students wish to pursue further study in the field. The new MA program would complement our existing Latin Licensure track and thus would also be attractive to students considering a career in secondary school teaching. It would also appeal to local Greek and Latin teachers who occasionally must take graduate-level courses in order to maintain their certification, or perhaps aspire to add an MA to their credentials. Since most of these teachers are done with their teaching duties by 3:30 PM, we would be able to accommodate them during normal course times already available in the course time slot grid, such as MW 4:25-5:15 pm, or MW 4:50 – 6:05 pm, or TTh 4:00 – 5:15 pm, or TTh 5:30 – 6:45 pm (note we should have to offer only 1 or 2 of our courses every semester in the late afternoons to accommodate these students, not all our courses). We already offer some of our undergraduate courses cross-listed at the graduate level at these times, and we feel it would have no adverse effects on our undergraduate enrollments.

A. Are there similar programs in the state addressing this need and potential duplication of programs in the state and region?

In Ohio, there are MA programs in Classics at The Ohio State University and the
University of Cincinnati. Kent State does offer an MA in Latin, but not Classical Studies, which includes Greek as well as ancillary fields such as archaeology and history, and in any case it is too inconvenient for many who live in the Cleveland area. As such, CWRU would be the only private university in Ohio with a graduate program in Classics, and the only program in NE Ohio, where we believe there is enough interest in Classics to support the program. In addition, national trends show that students now typically complete at least one year, but increasingly two years of graduate study beyond the BA before matriculating in a PhD program.

We also conducted a poll of 47 Cleveland area HS Greek and Latin teachers and here is a sampling of questions and comments:

I). Would you be interested taking any further continuing education/certification courses at CWRU, and if so, what kind? Comments?

52% of those who responded to this question (12/23) said yes, and indicated they wanted continuing education courses in Greek, Latin, Classical Greece and Rome, philosophy, epigraphy, papyrology, archaeology, and instructional technology. Some indicated they are a bit frustrated that there are no such offerings available to them in the area.

II). Would you be interested in completing an MA in Classics at CWRU in the next 5 years? Comments?

Six answered “yes,” and 11 “no.” Six of the 11 that answered “no” indicated that they said “no” because they already have an MA or PhD in Classics. What this means, is that local HS teachers of Greek and Latin are strongly encouraged (or perhaps almost required to be competitive) to have an MA. The comments of a teacher from Saint Ignatius (see IIIa below) corroborates this.

III). Would you be willing to pay CWRU’s current graduate tuition rate of $1,174/credit hour ($5,142 for a typical three-credit course)? Comments?

Here is a sampling of some of the comments:

a). “All teachers at my school (St. Ignatius High School) are very strongly encouraged to obtain a master's degree, and the school pays for essentially all of it. Our Latin teachers, as there is no convenient MA program in Classics [in NE Ohio, including Kent State], typically pursue an ME instead; I'm sure they'd much rather pursue an MA in Classics. I hope you discover that this situation is typical for Latin teachers at other schools as well.”

b). “I teach high school Latin over at Hawken, and I want to thank you for reaching out and for thinking about us teachers. I would be very interested in such a program if the timing worked out in such a way that I could do classes in the evening, online, and/or in the summer. Cost may be a bit of a factor, too, as $5000/course for 9-10 courses might be a bit steep, but I believe that Hawken would pay 50%.”

c). “Being a current teacher, I could only do classes in the late afternoon or during the summer. Depending on support from my employer, the $5000/course may or may not be affordable. I would love to work toward an MA at CWRU.”
B. Employment Opportunities. Employment opportunities include teaching Latin (and possibly Greek) in high school, going on to graduate school to get a PhD, and becoming a professor. In addition, many MAs in Classics also go on to have successful legal, medical or business careers.

C. Are there competing programs, nationally, or internationally, and how will our program compare?

The Society for Classical Studies, the national association for scholars working in Greek and Roman antiquity, currently lists 74 universities with graduate programs in Classics in the United States (https://classicalstudies.org/list-graduate-programs-classics). Within this group, 61 offer MA programs, but only 19 offer the MA without a corresponding PhD program. Our peer group would thus consist of: the University of Arizona, Boston College, Brandeis University, Houston Baptist, Hunter College (City University of New York), University of Kansas, Kent State University, University of Maryland – College Park, University of Massachusetts – Boston, University of Nebraska – Lincoln, University of Notre Dame, University of Oregon, San Francisco State University, Texas Tech University, Tufts University, Tulane University, Vanderbilt University, Villanova University, and Wayne State. Within this cohort (that is universities offering only an MA without corresponding PhD), CWRU Classics will rank toward the top based on not only the faculty we have, but also on the material resources in Classical antiquity such as at the CMA and Ingalls Library that most of these institutions cannot match.

V. Projected Enrollment.

A. Define expected national and international enrollment targets over a five-year period. We expect stable enrollments of 1-3 students. Most of these will probably come from Cleveland area teachers or the University and be part-time students, but over time it is possible some will come from national or international sources, particularly if we are given graduate student stipends.

B. Describe special efforts to enroll and retain underrepresented groups in the given discipline. The Classics Department will aggressively promote the program through advertising in such venues as the Society for Classical Studies (the national association for classical scholars), the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, the Classical Association of New England, the Classical Association of the Atlantic States, the Archaeological Institute of America, The Classics Association of Canada, Classicists@ListServe, and various European societies such as the British Association of Classics or various European societies and listservs. These are mostly free and require no advertising budget. If we do decide to make posters, we will use our existing budget for the PostBac Program and advertise the two programs together. In all these we will mention that it is our goal to have underrepresented groups. In addition, we have some department fellowship money that is specifically targeted to women, and we also have other money that can be used to support under represented groups, particularly in travel to Greece or Italy. Finally, we will partner with CWRU’s office of Inclusion, Diversity and Equal Opportunity for ideas about recruitment.
VI. Resources required.

A. Describe the availability and adequacy of the faculty, staff, facilities, and other resources for the initiative. All of the courses that would count toward completion of the degree are currently being taught on a regular basis at the graduate level by existing faculty to students registered in the Graduate Certificate Program or in the World Literature Program in conjunction with corresponding undergraduate courses for majors, or in Art History. The additional teaching associated with independent study and completion of an MA thesis would be absorbed by currently rostered faculty.

More specifically, what are the projected needed near- and long-term resources and estimated costs for:

1. Faculty? Only existing.
2. Staff? Only existing.
3. Graduate student support? NONE (although we would like to get back the graduate support that previously went to WLIT)
4. Space (offices, research or instructional labs and/or equipment, if applicable) required for faculty or graduate students to carry out the program? NONE. Full-time students could share MH 314 – the office for the WLIT Graduate Student(s).
5. Impact on university resources, such as increased library needs? INVISIBLE

B. Describe the need for additional faculty, staff, facilities and other resources. None. The program is run along side the existing undergraduate Classics and WLIT programs.

VII. Expense and Revenue

A. What are the projected expenses necessary to mount the new program? There are no projected expenses to launch the program, as all the resources (faculty, staff, etc.) currently housed in Classics that are being used to field the undergraduate and WLIT program will be used to mount the new program. At this time, we also plan to advertise in free, online fora.

B. Provide evidence of institutional commitment and capacity to meet these expenses. We have an existing Department of Classics that fields undergraduate programs in Classics and World Literature and an MA in World Literature that the institution already supports. The GREK and LATN courses are in particular under utilized and we have plenty of capacity to add students there. There is also plenty of capacity in our other CLSC and WLIT courses to add students.

VIII. Other expense and revenue questions

A. Is the curricular initiative designed to be revenue generating? Yes, the program will generate a modest amount of revenue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2018-19</th>
<th>2019-20</th>
<th>2020-21</th>
<th>2021-22</th>
<th>2022-23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#FT/PT students</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>1-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since our program does not require additional expenses, there is no real rationale to project revenue. The important thing to keep in mind is that this initiative is run entirely on existing resources, so any students who enroll in it make extra money for the university. Below, we give a breakdown for each kind of student, full-time or part-time, for the course of their career.

### Full-Time Student (2 Years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester/Year</th>
<th>Fall 2018</th>
<th>Spring 2019</th>
<th>Summer 2019</th>
<th>Fall 2019</th>
<th>Spring 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Credits</td>
<td>GREK 4--(3)</td>
<td>GREK 4--(3)</td>
<td>CLSC 418 Arch. Field School (3)</td>
<td>GREK 4--(3)</td>
<td>CLSC 482 Thesis (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>$15,426</td>
<td>$10,284</td>
<td>$5,142</td>
<td>$10,284</td>
<td>$10,284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part-Time Student (5 Years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>2018-19</th>
<th>2019-20</th>
<th>2020-21</th>
<th>2021-22</th>
<th>2022-23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall Semester</td>
<td>CLSC 420 (3)</td>
<td>LATN 4--(3)</td>
<td>CLSC 4--(3)</td>
<td>LATN 4-(3)</td>
<td>CLSC 482 Thesis (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Semester</td>
<td>LATN 4--(3)</td>
<td>LATN 4-(3)</td>
<td>LATN 4-(3)</td>
<td>CLSC 482 Thesis (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Semester</td>
<td>CLSC 418 (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition per annum, $1714/hr</td>
<td>$10,284</td>
<td>$10,284</td>
<td>$10,284</td>
<td>$10,284</td>
<td>$10,284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A part-time student must average 2 courses per year to finish within 5 years. We normally also teach at least one Latin or Archaeology course in the summer, if funds are available, so there would also probably be opportunities to skip a fall or spring semester course and instead take a summer course.

**B. Describe the need and justification for tuition waivers or stipends.**

Obviously we are more likely to have more and better students if we offer support. In addition, Classics fields several popular courses for which we could really use teaching assistants. These include Ancient World (recent enrollments of 20-25), and especially Roman Civilization (recent enrollments of 45-50). There are several others with recent enrollments in the 15-20 range that would also be suitable (Greek Civilization, Classics in Film...). Giving students tuition waivers and/or stipends in return for being a teaching assistant is a win-win situation; it gives students other kinds of professional training and it provides assistance to faculty teaching courses with larger enrollments. Finally, local Latin teachers who want to earn an M.A. have indicated they are particularly sensitive to price, and to attract them in greater numbers, tuition discounts would help (note we would offer tuition waivers and graduate stipends only to full-time students,
not to gainfully employed teachers who are part-time students; we propose tuition discounts for the teachers).

B. Describe terms of expense or revenue sharing. Not applicable.

D. Identify likely sources...of raising funds to support the initiative. We already have several sources of fellowship money in place to provide modest support to students. These include The Samuel Ball Platner Scholarship for Classical Philology (current available balance of $63,720, and generating $375/month), and the Joseph J. Brady Endowment for students studying Classics (current available balance of $8,354 and generating $85/mo.). For summer travel (including taking our existing Archaeological Field School course in Corinth, CLSC 418, or attending the Summer Session of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens or similar programs), we would utilize the Florence Appelbaum-Greenbaum Endowment (current available balance of about $6,100 and generating about $75/month) and especially the Kathleen S. and Frederick C. Crawford fund, currently with an available balance of $17,500 and generating $1,821/month. At this time, these generate enough revenue to provide about $28,272/year in fellowship and travel support.

We cannot identify any new likely sources of support, but traditionally Classics has attracted support.

IX. Library Resources. All library resources are currently available at the Department’s library, KSL, Ohio-Link, Inter-Library loan, and various free internet sources (such as archive.org, which has many older but still relevant Classics titles now out of copyright).

X. Relationship of Proposal to Strategic Plans

A. How does the proposal relate to the priorities of the CAS strategic plan? It is CAS’s strategic goal to “develop ... and evaluate new ... strategic initiatives” that serve the College’s priority to “educate across the humanities...” An MA in Classical Studies will contribute to this priority. It is also a CAS priority to “Re-envision ... the future of graduate education ... that advance(s) our vision to be a national and international prime mover of discovery, innovation and creativity.” An MA in Classical Studies will also contribute to this priority. They will also help foster the kind of academic community that attracts the attention of scholars, teachers, researches and staff across the globe – another priority in the CAS strategic plan. Finally, we believe they will enhance the experience of our undergraduates who take Latin and Greek (see above under III, E), which is another strategic priority of the CAS.

B. How does the proposal relate to the priorities of the CWRU strategic plan? An MA in Classical Studies will support scholarship and creative endeavor, it will encourage learning that is active, creative and continuous, and we hope to use it to increase minority involvement in Classics and thus a culture of inclusion. All these are priorities in the CWRU strategic plan. In addition, Greek and Latin are foundational to various Humanities disciplines (such as philosophy, Medieval Studies, etc.) in addition to Classics, the oldest multicultural interdisciplinary area studies program in our Academy. The stimulating mixture of students, instructors, and disciplines is very much in keeping with our vision of CWRU as a crucible for dynamic learning and scholarship.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Senate Executive Committee

FROM: Cyrus Taylor, Dean

DATE: February 9, 2017

SUBJECT: MA Degree Program in Classical Studies

I am pleased to offer my strong support of the proposal for a new Master of Arts Degree Program in Classical Studies developed by Professors Paul Iversen and Peter Knox. I greatly appreciate the Faculty Senate’s review and consideration.

The MA Program in Classical Studies will give students further training in Greek and Latin and the guidance and advising they need to gain admittance into PhD programs in Classics and other humanities disciplines. The program also will give students a chance to travel abroad to Greece or Italy and will serve to further the credentials and career goals of local high school Latin teachers.

This program has been carefully developed in consultation with several departments in the College of Arts and Sciences (including History, Art History and Art, and Music), the School of Graduate Studies, and in response to feedback from the college’s Committee on Educational Programs, Graduate Committee, Budget Subcommittee, and the College Strategic Planning Steering Committee. I believe the proposal reflects close consideration and collaboration.

With the approval and recommendation of these committees, the college’s Executive Committee voted on October 14, 2016 to bring the proposal to the Faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences; the proposal received the approval of the faculty on October 28, 2016.

Professors Iversen and Knox presented the proposal and responded to questions from the Faculty Senate Committee on Graduate Studies (FSCGS) at a meeting held December 7, 2016. Professor Iversen followed with another appearance at an FSCGS meeting on February 1, 2017. I understand that he will be making a presentation to the Executive Committee on February 13, 2017. Please let me know if there is any additional information that I can provide. Thank you.
Update on Diversity and Inclusion

Marilyn Sanders Mobley, PhD
Faculty Senate Meeting
February 27, 2017
OIDEO Vision

Advancing diversity through inclusive thinking, mindful learning and transformative dialogue.
OIDEO Overview

Five Pillars of the Office for Inclusion, Diversity and Equal Opportunity

1. Research and Climate Assessment
2. Communication and Education
3. Programming and Resource Development
4. Compliance
5. Community Engagement and Outreach

Goals of the Diversity Strategic Action Plan

1. Enhanced Campus Climate (The Educational Rationale)
2. Increased Retention and Recruitment (The Business Case)
3. Resource Development for Diversity (The Economic Imperative)
Signature Programs

• Power of Diversity (Guest Keynotes, CWRU Faculty, Viewpoint Forums)
• Annual Diversity Award Luncheon
• Multicultural Receptions (Opening and End of the Semester)
• Train the Champion
• Sustained Dialogue
• Diversity Think Forums (Alumni Weekend)
• Diversity 360
• Customized Development Opportunities for Faculty, Staff and Students
Resources

- NCFDD
- SREB
- NADOHE
- Case-Fisk Partnership
- NOA-AGEP
- Commission on Economic Inclusion
- Supplier Diversity Initiative Council
- Ohio Diversity Officers Council
- Stokes Celebration
Diversity Awards

NOA-AGEP Award
### Diversity Data

#### Undergraduate Student Census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014 (%)</th>
<th>2015 (%)</th>
<th>2016 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-racial</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWRU Raw Total</td>
<td><strong>4,911</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,121</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,152</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Diversity Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014 (%)</th>
<th>2015 (%)</th>
<th>2016 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-racial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CWRU Raw Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,860</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,219</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,512</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Diversity Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014 (%)</th>
<th>2015 (%)</th>
<th>2016 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-racial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CWRU Raw Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,291</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,255</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,268</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Diversity Data

## Full Time Staff Census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014 (%)</th>
<th>2015 (%)</th>
<th>2016 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-racial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CWRU Raw Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,876</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,919</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,973</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Diversity Data

Full Time Faculty by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Diversity Data

Full Time Staff by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1144</td>
<td>1169</td>
<td>1194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1732</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>1779</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Diversity Data

Faculty Composition by School

- Nursing
- MSASS
- Medicine
- Management
- Law
- Engineering
- Dental Medicine
- Arts and Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Nursing</th>
<th>MSASS</th>
<th>Medicine</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>Dental Medicine</th>
<th>Arts and Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Diversity Data

Percentage of Women Faculty by School

- Arts and Sciences
- Dental Medicine
- Engineering
- Law
- Management
- Medicine
- MSASS
- Nursing

Legend:
- 2006-07
- 2007-08
- 2008-09
- 2009-10
- 2010-11
- 2011-12
- 2012-13
- 2013-14
- 2014-15
- 2016-17
Diversity Data

Percentage of Minority Faculty by School

Case Western Reserve University

think beyond the possible

15
Diversity Data

Percentage of Minority and Underrepresented Minority Faculty

- Minority Faculty Total
- Underrepresented Minority Total
New and Recent Diversity Initiatives

• Diversity Annual Fund

• Trailblazer Project

• Listening Tour (VP Mobley and VP Stark)
  • What constitutes an inclusive campus?
  • What are we doing well as it relates to inclusivity?
  • What do we need to do to improve our inclusivity?

• Diversity 360 Speaker Series, Lunch and Learns, Facilitator Trainings
Collaborators

Office of the President/Provost
Deans/Schools
Office of Student Affairs
Office of Multicultural Affairs
Office of International Affairs
Human Resources
Title IX Coordinator
Kelvin Smith Library

Diversity Leadership Council
Social Justice Institute
FSM Center for Women
LGBT Center
Staff Advisory Council
President’s Advisory Councils
Alumni Affairs and Affinity Groups
Baker-Nord Center for the Humanities
Important Dates

March 8 – Power of Diversity Lecture with Liz Roccoforte

March 28 – Power of Diversity Lecture with Dr. Laura Hengehold

April 9 – GospelFest at the Maltz Performing Arts Center

April 19 – Annual Diversity Awards Luncheon with Three New Awards
(Senior Leadership, Community Excellence and Diversity Collaboration Excellence)
Important Dates

DSAP 2.0 Forthcoming Spring 2017 with Diversity Town Hall

Food for Thought

“…the ABC’s of inclusive learning environments…[are]:

• A, for affirming identity;
• B, for building community; and
• C, for cultivating leadership.”

-- Dr. Beverly Daniel Tatum, Can We Talk about Race: And Other Conversations in an Era of School Resegregation
Thank you!
Thank you!
Thank you!
The Faculty Senate Committee on Research:

2015 & 2016 Faculty Research Survey

February 27, 2017
Lee D. Hoffer
Chair
Background

- Based on data from CWRU 2010 & 2014 Faculty Climate Surveys:
  
  1. Satisfaction about “research” was low among faculty &
  
  2. More dissatisfaction with research support compared to peer institutions
Background

• FSRC “Faculty Research Survey” (Faculty Senate Committee on Research & Office of Research Administration)
  • Josh Terchek (Associate Director, Institutional Research Office) &
  • Julia Knopes (Graduate Student / Anthropology)

• Objectives of the survey:
  1. Assess faculty satisfaction with research support services
  2. Identify priorities for improving research support
  3. Collect open-ended responses

• Outcomes:
  ✓ Identify specific areas for improvement
  ✓ Make recommendations
  ✓ Establish a framework to monitor progress
### Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015 Survey</th>
<th>2016 Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualtrics</td>
<td>Qualtrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response rate</td>
<td>11%  (N=3384)</td>
<td>Response rate 17%  (N=3470)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2015 & 2016 Faculty Research Survey

Quantitative Data
Sample:
Primary faculty appointment at CWRU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School of Medicine*</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences**</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weatherhead School of Management</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case School of Engineering</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances Payne Bolton School of Nursing</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Dental Medicine</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack, Joseph, and Morton Mandel School of Applied Social Sciences</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Law</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* SOM divided by Basic Science & Clinical Medicine
** CAS divided by Social Sciences, Arts & Humanities, & Physics / Natural Sciences
Sample:
Faculty rank/position

**2015**
- 42% Professor
- 25% Associate Professor
- 29% Assistant Professor
- 4% Other (please specify):

**2016**
- 36% Professor
- 27% Associate Professor
- 29% Assistant Professor
- 5% Instructor
- 2% Other*

**N=375**
- 54% Tenured
- 23% “Clinical faculty”
- 91% Main campus

**N=590**
- 50% Tenured
- 29% “Clinical faculty”
- 73% Main campus (UH 13%)
Sample:
How Frequently do you submit grants?

- I have never submitted a grant through CWRU: 15% (2015), 15% (2016)
- 1 time every 3-4 years: 15% (2015), 16% (2016)
- 2-3 times every 2 years: 12% (2015), 13% (2016)
- 1-2 times per year: 29% (2015), 28% (2016)
- 3 or more times per year: 29% (2015), 26% (2016)

2016 N=552
2015 N=373
Sample:
In 2015 – How would you rate your knowledge about various research resources & services?

Not knowledgeable
Somewhat knowledgeable
Knowledgeable
Very knowledgeable

N=351
Sample:

In 2016 – *In terms of preparing proposals for your research, scholarship or creative endeavors, how would you rate your knowledge of the following?*

1. Library (KSL)
2. Institutional Review Board (IRB)
3. Conflict of Interest Committee (COI)
4. UTech / ITS
5. Core Facilities
6. Office of Sponsored Projects Administration (non-SOM)
7. Office of Grants & Contracts (SOM only)
8. Office of Technology Transfer
9. Institutional Biosafety Committee (IBC)
10. Foundation Relations
11. Institutional Animal Care & Use Committee (IACUC)
12. Animal Research Facility (ARC)
13. Corporate Relations
In 2016 – In terms of preparing proposals for your research, scholarship or creative endeavors, how would you rate your knowledge of the following?

**Most knowledgeable about (+50%)**

- Library (KSL): 13% Not knowledgeable, 69% Some knowledge, 17% Not applicable
- Institutional Review Board (IRB): 19% Not knowledgeable, 67% Some knowledge, 13% Not applicable
- Conflict of Interest Committee (COI): 14% Not knowledgeable, 62% Some knowledge, 24% Not applicable
- UTech / ITS: 14% Not knowledgeable, 55% Some knowledge, 31% Not applicable
- Core Facilities: 14% Not knowledgeable, 55% Some knowledge, 31% Not applicable

N=509
Sample:

In 2016 – *In terms of preparing proposals for your research, scholarship or creative endeavors, how would you rate your knowledge of the following?*

*Some knowledgeable about (30-46%)*

![Bar chart showing the percentage of respondents knowledgeable about different offices in 2016.](chart.png)

- Office of Sponsored Projects Administration (non-SOM): 22% knowledgeable, 46% not knowledgeable, 32% not applicable.
- Office of Grants & Contracts (SOM only): 33% knowledgeable, 44% not knowledgeable, 23% not applicable.
- Office of Technology Transfer: 23% knowledgeable, 34% not knowledgeable, 43% not applicable.
- Institutional Biosafety Committee (IBC): 37% knowledgeable, 33% not knowledgeable, 30% not applicable.

N=509
Sample:
In 2016 – *In terms of preparing proposals for your research, scholarship or creative endeavors, how would you rate your knowledge of the following?*

**Least knowledgeable about (+50%)**

- **Corporate Relations**
  - Not knowledgeable: 56%
  - Some knowledge: 23%
  - Not applicable: 21%

- **Foundation Relations**
  - Not knowledgeable: 50%
  - Some knowledge: 18%
  - Not applicable: 32%

N=509
Sample:

In 2016 – *In terms of preparing proposals for your research, scholarship or creative endeavors, how would you rate your knowledge of the following?*

*Least applicable*
## 2015 How satisfied are you with assistance for pre-award activities

Sorted by “satisfied”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Not important / NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keeping up-to-date on research news and sponsor guidelines</td>
<td>24.19%</td>
<td>59.47%</td>
<td>16.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying Federal/State grant opportunities</td>
<td>30.32%</td>
<td>52.91%</td>
<td>16.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitting proposals</td>
<td>33.87%</td>
<td>52.58%</td>
<td>13.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding sponsor / agency guidelines</td>
<td>28.89%</td>
<td>52.27%</td>
<td>17.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing proposal budgets</td>
<td>37.42%</td>
<td>46.45%</td>
<td>16.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB submission / review processes</td>
<td>32.69%</td>
<td>35.60%</td>
<td>31.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying foundation support opportunities</td>
<td>43.22%</td>
<td>42.58%</td>
<td>14.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal writing</td>
<td>42.37%</td>
<td>31.72%</td>
<td>25.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiating contracts</td>
<td>34.09%</td>
<td>22.08%</td>
<td>43.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying industry support opportunities</td>
<td>47.25%</td>
<td>19.74%</td>
<td>33.01%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=306
# 2016 How satisfied are you with assistance for pre-award activities

## Sorted by “satisfied”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Not important / NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submitting proposals</td>
<td>24.42%</td>
<td>58.73%</td>
<td>16.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping up-to-date on research news, guidelines &amp; policies</td>
<td>25.43%</td>
<td>54.66%</td>
<td>19.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing proposal budgets</td>
<td>28.60%</td>
<td>51.48%</td>
<td>19.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding sponsor / agency guidelines</td>
<td>26.98%</td>
<td>50.32%</td>
<td>22.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying Federal/State grant opportunities</td>
<td>27.64%</td>
<td>49.15%</td>
<td>23.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying foundation support opportunities</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>42.16%</td>
<td>20.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB submission / review processes</td>
<td>24.21%</td>
<td>40.56%</td>
<td>35.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal writing</td>
<td>39.66%</td>
<td>30.27%</td>
<td>30.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiating contracts</td>
<td>30.85%</td>
<td>23.62%</td>
<td>45.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying industry support opportunities</td>
<td>42.92%</td>
<td>21.99%</td>
<td>35.09%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=472
2016 How satisfied are you with assistance for pre-award activities

N=472
### 2015 & 2016 How satisfied are you with assistance for pre-award activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submitting proposals</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing proposal budgets</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB submission / review processes</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying industry support opportunities</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiating contracts</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying foundation support opportunities</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal writing</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding sponsor / agency guidelines</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying Federal/State grant opportunities</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping up-to-date on research news, guidelines &amp; policies</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage “satisfied” compared

N=472
2016 & 2016 Which 3 pre-award activities if improved would most benefit your research agenda? (top 6)
2015 How satisfied are you with assistance for post-award activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Not important / NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting up research account(s) (a.k.a. &quot;speedtypes&quot;)</td>
<td>21.83%</td>
<td>54.93%</td>
<td>23.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project reporting</td>
<td>23.14%</td>
<td>50.89%</td>
<td>25.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project closeout activities</td>
<td>20.51%</td>
<td>47.48%</td>
<td>32.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing research equipment</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>36.79%</td>
<td>33.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating research staff</td>
<td>25.45%</td>
<td>35.13%</td>
<td>39.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting up/managing IT services for research</td>
<td>29.43%</td>
<td>31.92%</td>
<td>38.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB submission / review processes</td>
<td>27.04%</td>
<td>31.32%</td>
<td>41.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing and managing sub-awards</td>
<td>23.74%</td>
<td>29.14%</td>
<td>47.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring research staff</td>
<td>38.16%</td>
<td>26.50%</td>
<td>35.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment and invoicing issues</td>
<td>40.78%</td>
<td>34.76%</td>
<td>24.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring research accounts</td>
<td>42.30%</td>
<td>34.41%</td>
<td>23.30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*two activities “IACUC submission/review processes” & “IBC submission/review processes” are not included as +70% of faculty reported them as “not important / NA.” Both also garnered more satisfaction than dissatisfaction.

N=275-280
### 2016 How satisfied are you with assistance for post-award activities

**Sorted by “satisfied”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Not important or applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting up account(s) (a.k.a. &quot;speedtypes&quot;)</td>
<td>21.13%</td>
<td>63.69%</td>
<td>15.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project reporting</td>
<td>21.38%</td>
<td>56.93%</td>
<td>21.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project closeout activities</td>
<td>20.84%</td>
<td>51.96%</td>
<td>27.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment and invoicing issues</td>
<td>33.13%</td>
<td>50.75%</td>
<td>16.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring accounts</td>
<td>34.32%</td>
<td>50.60%</td>
<td>15.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing equipment</td>
<td>24.77%</td>
<td>47.46%</td>
<td>27.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting up/managing IT services</td>
<td>24.33%</td>
<td>47.15%</td>
<td>28.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB submission / review processes</td>
<td>21.15%</td>
<td>39.27%</td>
<td>39.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating staff</td>
<td>23.66%</td>
<td>37.73%</td>
<td>38.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing and managing sub-awards</td>
<td>22.29%</td>
<td>35.54%</td>
<td>42.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring staff</td>
<td>36.23%</td>
<td>27.85%</td>
<td>35.93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*two activities “IACUC submission/review processes” & “IBC submission/review processes” are not included as +60% of faculty reported them as “not important / NA.” Both also garnered more satisfaction than dissatisfaction.*
2015 & 2016 How satisfied are you with assistance for post-award activities

Percentage “satisfied” compared

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring accounts</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment and invoicing issues</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting up/managing IT services</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing equipment</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting up account(s) (a.k.a. &quot;speedtypes&quot;)</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB submission / review processes</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing and managing sub-awards</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project reporting</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project closeout activities</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating staff</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring staff</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*two activities “IACUC submission/review processes” & “IBC submission/review processes” are not included as +60% of faculty reported them as “not important / NA.” Both also garnered more satisfaction than dissatisfaction.
2015 & 2016 Which 3 post-award activities if improved would most benefit your research agenda? (top 6)
2015 In general, how satisfied are you with assistance provided by the university in the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridge funding</td>
<td>70.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant writing support</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Startup, seed, or pilot project funding</td>
<td>64.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Accounting / Budget support</td>
<td>60.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources (for research)</td>
<td>57.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help finding funding opportunities</td>
<td>54.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training on how to write a grant</td>
<td>52.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing/Procurement</td>
<td>51.44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2015 In general, how satisfied are you with assistance provided by the university in the following

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridge funding</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant writing support</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Accounting / Budget support</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources (for research)</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help finding funding opportunities</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training on how to write a grant</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing/Procurement</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Committee support (IRB, IACUC, IBC)</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentorship from senior faculty</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab/research space</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2015 In general, how satisfied are you with assistance provided by the university in the following

2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Startup, seed, or pilot project funding</td>
<td>64.23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Startup</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seed or pilot funding</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matching or cost sharing funding</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2015 How satisfied are you with the current assistance you receive in...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-award support from your department</td>
<td>41.45%</td>
<td>58.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-award support from your department</td>
<td>39.54%</td>
<td>60.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-award support from School / Management center / College</td>
<td>53.55%</td>
<td>46.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-award support from School / Management Center / College</td>
<td>53.06%</td>
<td>46.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-award support from Central / SOM</td>
<td>58.85%</td>
<td>41.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-award support from Central / SOM</td>
<td>58.72%</td>
<td>41.28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=263-235
2016 How satisfied are you with the current assistance you receive in...

**Pre-award satisfaction**
- Your Department: 72% Satisfied, 28% Dissatisfied
- Your School / Management center / College: 59% Satisfied, 41% Dissatisfied
- From Central / SOM: 50% Satisfied, 50% Dissatisfied

**Post-award satisfaction**
- Your Department: 76% Satisfied, 24% Dissatisfied
- Your School / Management center / College: 62% Satisfied, 38% Dissatisfied
- From Central / SOM: 49% Satisfied, 51% Dissatisfied

N=431
(New) 2016 In support of your research, how satisfied are you with the following...

- **Travel funds**
  - Dissatisfied: 62%
  - Satisfied: 21%
  - Not applicable: 17%

- **Book Buying fund**
  - Dissatisfied: 44%
  - Satisfied: 16%
  - Not applicable: 41%

- **Teaching release policy**
  - Dissatisfied: 36%
  - Satisfied: 31%
  - Not applicable: 31%

N=431
(New) 2016 In support of your research, how satisfied are you with the following...

- **Journal subscriptions**: 25% Dissatisfied, 62% Satisfied, 7% Not applicable
- **Sabbatical policy**: 21% Dissatisfied, 33% Satisfied, 46% Not applicable
- **Library Resources**: 16% Dissatisfied, 69% Satisfied, 5% Not applicable
- **Software library**: 16% Dissatisfied, 62% Satisfied, 22% Not applicable
- **On-line research databases**: 14% Dissatisfied, 68% Satisfied, 18% Not applicable

N=431
(New) 2016 How valued do you feel your research, scholarship, or creative endeavors are to...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Highly valued</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Under valued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The University</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your College</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Department</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=431
2015 & 2016 Faculty Research Survey

Qualitative Data
Summary

• The Faculty Research Survey asked two open-ended questions...

Q.17 What does CWRU do well?

Q.18 What can CWRU improve?
2015 What CWRU Does Well

What CWRU Does Well:
Overall Breakdown of (Positive) Responses: Q #17

- Collaboration: 13%
- Department Staff: 12%
- Perceived Flexibility: 5%
- ALL Other Responses (#17): 70%
2016 What CWRU Does Well

5 Items with Greatest Number of Positive Responses # OF POSITIVE RESPONSES

- Software/Facilities: 25%
- ADMIN - Univ/Central: 18%
- ADMIN - College/School: 18%
- ADMIN - Department: 17%
- Collaboration: 18%
2015 What CWRU Can Improve

What CWRU Can Improve On:
Overall Breakdown of (Negative) Responses: Q #18

- University Staff: 35%
- Internal Funding: 24%
- Grant Writing Support: 29%
- ALL Other Responses (#18): 12%

University Staff is the top concern, followed by Internal Funding, Grant Writing Support, and ALL Other Responses (#18).
2016 What CWRU Can Improve

5 Items with Greatest Number of Negative Responses # OF NEGATIVE RESPONSES

- ADMIN - Univ/Central: 32%
- Small/Internal Funding: 22%
- Career Support: 18%
- Software/Facilities: 17%
- ADMIN - College/School: 11%
Conclusions

The Faculty Research Survey (2015 & 2016) has identified a number of areas for improvement:

1. **Pre-award:** Most faculty want support **writing proposals & identifying** opportunities
2. **Post-award:** The faculty want assistance with **monitoring accounts, payment & invoicing, & hiring staff**
3. The faculty want more access to both **seed / pilot funding & bridge funding**
FSRC Recommendations

1. Administer the Faculty Research Survey to monitor progress over time (every two years)

2. (post-award) Review monitoring accounts issue & payment / invoicing

3. (pre-award) The FSRC will develop a grant writing fellowship for faculty (from development to submission)