

Dean's Address to the College faculty
Paul H. Benson, Dean
September 7, 2012 / 3:00 p.m. /Sears Recital Hall

Thinking, Slowly, About the College

Good afternoon. I am grateful for your presence today, as we continue to accelerate into the new academic year. I hope that the year has begun well for all of you and for your students. May this be a year of fruitful creativity, discovery, insight, and influence in your work as teachers and as scholars. I trust that the indicators thus far are sufficient to sustain this hope as a reasonable one.

I want to extend an especially warm welcome to our new faculty colleagues in the College. In new tenure-line appointments we are joined by: Joshua Ambrosius (Political Science), Alexandra Budabin (Political Science), Sam Dorf (Music), Z'etoile Immaⁱ (English), Xiaoli Li (English), Jusuf Salih (Religious Studies), Dan Thompson (Religious Studies), Renato Ventura (Languages), and Aimei Yang (Communication). In full-time lecturer or visiting positions, we welcome: Aili Bresnahan (Philosophy), Daniel Cheung (Philosophy), Tracy Collins (Biology), Marian Diaz (Religious Studies), Marianne Engle (Psychology), Bro. Tom Farnsworth (Psychology), Sarah Gothard (Computer Science), Tracey Jaffe (History), Barbara Kessler (Visual Arts), Dario Rodriguez (Psychology), Laura Sextro (History), Bobbi Sue Sutherland (History), Yvonne Teems Stephens (English), and Hsuan Tsen (Visual Arts). We are also joined by Andrea Chenoweth, an alumna and new artist-in-residence in voice, Jonterri Gadson, the Herbert Martin Fellow in Creative Writing, and Joel Pruce in a new post-doc position to support our research initiatives in human rights studies. Later in the semester, we will be making a formal announcement of a new endowed chair appointment as our next University Professor of Faith and Culture, succeeding Professor David O'Brien. This forthcoming appointment will elevate our work in systematic theology, our global and

intercultural research and teaching initiatives, our academic outreach to Latino/a communities, and our engagement with contemporary conversations about the place of Catholic faith commitment, social teaching, and theological discourse in American culture.

I am excited by the new capabilities, perspectives, and projects that each of our new faculty colleagues brings to our academic community in the College. I also am pleased for the continuing growth of our faculty. In last year's hiring, we added three brand-new tenure-line positions in the College, bringing the total to 247. This constitutes an increase of 21 tenure-line positions, or 9.3%, since I became Dean in 2007. Two of these new lines this fall replaced lecturer or visiting positions; one replaced a cluster of part-time adjunct appointments. In our hiring for this fall, the College also added six new full-time lecturer lines, in addition to lecturer or visiting appointments that replaced faculty members on leave. The new lecturer lines entailed reducing reliance on part-time adjuncts and gaining better-funded positions to aid in teaching courses for the Common Academic Program (CAP). In the approvals that we have received thus far for new faculty searches that we will conduct this fall, the College will add at least two more new tenure lines for 2013, in Mathematics and Religious Studies. We also will conduct faculty searches for continuing tenure-line positions in Biology, Communication, Computer Science, English, History, Mathematics, Physics, Psychology, and Visual Arts. At a time when tenure-line and full-time faculty strength is stagnating or diminishing at many colleges and universities, especially in disciplines outside of the sciences and professional programs, we should take pleasure in the continued advance of our college's faculty.

I am also grateful that, as we expand and renew the College's faculty positions, academic departments are taking seriously our communal commitment to advance our goals for diversity and inclusion, embracing more faculty of color, more faculty from outside the United States, and more faculty who bring new academic perspectives on their fields as scholars and teachers. Among our new full-time hires last year, we exceeded our goal of appointing at least 25% non-white and international faculty in our searches. In fact, of our

9 new tenure-line appointments, over half (5) are persons of color or international faculty. We also met our goal of appointing at least 60% women faculty members in these searches, hiring 13 women among our total of 21 new full-time faculty appointments. As I have emphasized each year in these addresses, the work of forming a more inclusive, intellectually vibrant, and interculturally dynamic academic community in the College is on-going and demands concerted attention in each and every faculty search we conduct. The success of this work depends on committed effort in each search committee and each departmental deliberation about faculty recruitment and hiring. We affirmed in the College's 2011 plan for inclusive excellence that the quality of our academic work and character as a college is not independent of the inclusive reach of the array of voices and scholarly perspectives expressed in the faculty and student bodies of the College.

Before I move to the primary subject of this address, I would like to touch upon just a few of the notable accomplishments that our faculty and staff have achieved in the past year. In calendar year 2011 College faculty members continued to realize notable achievements in research, scholarship, and artistic production. We received 106 national grant and fellowship awards, in addition to 41 University grants. We published 22 books, 38 book chapters, and 214 peer-reviewed journal articles; and we presented 100 artistic performances and 88 exhibitions. Special acknowledgement is due to our colleagues in the Department of Biology, who continue to lead University academic departments in competitive grant funding from traditional academic funding sources, especially the NSF and NIH. In the 2010 study by the National Research Council of graduate programs nationwide, our doctoral program in Biology was ranked sixth in the nation out of 76 Biology doctoral programs for the high citation rating of our faculty members' publications. Outside Biology, notable grants were received in every quarter of the College, from Umesh Haritashya's major grant from NASA of nearly \$400,000 to Jeremy Forbis' and Don Polzella's funded project for the National Endowment for the Arts. Major books, peer-reviewed journal articles, exhibitions and performances also have emanated from every division of the

College and are worth celebrating not only for the impact they will have in their respective academic fields but also for their influence upon others' recognition of UD's academic quality.

Also worth celebrating are those of our colleagues who received tenure or promotion last spring. Peggy DesAutels and Brad Kallenberg were promoted to the rank of Professor; and Pat Palermo, who retired in May, was promoted to Distinguished Service Professor. Receiving tenure was Sue Trollinger, who had already been promoted to the rank of Associate Professor. Receiving both tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor were Chris Agnew, Jana Bennett, Art Busch, Michael Carter, Myrna Gabbe, Bill Johnston, Suki Kwon, Tom Morgan, and Cyril Orji. As we continue to work on the advancement of women on our faculty, in part through our efforts in the NSF-ADVANCE-funded LEADER Consortium, we should take pride in the fact that we now have 57 tenured women Professors and Associate Professors, an increase of 39% from just 41 in 2007.

Finally, I would like to give special recognition to all of those faculty and staff persons in the Science Center who endured the dust, dirt, disruption, noise, and nuisance of extensive renovation work this summer and who eventually will have to brace for additional renovation in 2013. The cooperation and patience we received from science departments and programs this summer through the first phase of a very challenging renovation project were truly impressive. While our office worked extremely hard, especially through the tireless service of Mary Brown, to make this project as efficient and productive as it could be, I know that valuable time and effort of many faculty and staff was consumed by the construction. At a forum I will host later this fall for faculty in the science division, I will convey my special appreciation for the forbearance of our Science Center colleagues.

The title of my remarks this afternoon is "Thinking, Slowly, About the College." At this point, after having endured nearly fifteen minutes of the talk without reaching the primary subject that prompts this title, you may be wondering how slowly I intend to

proceed. The prospect of a gracious escape to Torch Lounge for some early refreshment before the lines for hors d'oeuvres or beverages get too long may have crossed your mind more than once by now. The more bureaucratically oriented among you may have realized—as perhaps you have done in each previous dean's address—that there is no College policy requiring that the dean give an annual faculty address anyway; nor is there a policy requiring that faculty attend, when the dean does offer a faculty talk. And, in light of the accelerating pace of academic activity in teaching, research, and professional service that has been required to realize the kinds of accomplishment that I have been acknowledging, don't our faculty members really have better things to do?

Before you answer that question, I want to assure you that I approach these occasions with some not inconsiderable temerity. Yet I manage each fall to overcome the anxiety about creating an additional imposition on your time and attention because I believe that it is important for us not merely as colleagues in the professoriate, but also as the embodiment of the core of the College's academic resources—the College's memory, imagination, will, deliberation, power, and vision—to spend at least a few moments at the beginning of the academic year examining together various facets of who we are, where we are situated, where we would like to head, and why. In a time of increasingly challenging, disruptive, fast-paced, even chaotic or crisis-inducing change in American higher education, it is especially valuable for us to reserve this time to gather for collective contemplation about some salient features of our context and academic commitments and also to frame the work we will carry out in this new academic year in relation to our longer-term purposes and promise—not simply for the sake of our individual careers and our individual students' flourishing, but also for the sake of the college of the liberal arts and sciences and the American, Catholic, and Marianist university whose head, hands, and heart we constitute. Little in the way of transformative education and scholarship—the jointly inspiring and deeply demanding theme of our Provost Joe Saliba's remarks last Friday—can be accomplished here or at any university without faculty vision, contemplation, dialogue,

passion, will, and action. As your dean, one of my primary tasks is to nurture, nourish, and persistently nudge all of us to take up the special responsibilities and special joys of becoming ever more inspired, focused, creative, resolute, and effective in advancing our shared purposes of academically first-rate, transformative teaching, scholarship, and artistic production, marked by the character of Catholic and Marianist intellectual and educational traditions.

As a few of you know, my own research in moral psychology is preoccupied, in many respects, with various internal divisions and conflicts that plague our identities, motivation, decision-making, and agency as persons. Study of such internal divisions and conflicts in our self-understanding is pervasive in the human sciences. I had the good fortune this summer to reacquaint myself with Nobel Laureate Daniel Kahneman's influential work on judgment under uncertainty by reading his recent book, *Thinking, Fast and Slow*.ⁱⁱ Among the many sources of potentially profound division in our mental lives that Kahneman examines is the distinction between two modes of thinking that he labels, for heuristic purposes only, as System 1 and System 2 (borrowing from the work of Keith Stanovich and Richard West). System 1 is composed of those modes of cognition that operate "automatically and quickly, with little or no effort and no sense of voluntary control" (*ibid.*, 20). By contrast, Kahneman writes, "System 2 allocates attention to the effortful mental activities that demand it including complex computations. The operations of System 2 are often associated with the subjective experience of agency, choice, and concentration" (*ibid.*, 21). While System 1 effortlessly generates impressions, feelings, and inclinations, System 2 encompasses the attentive, reasoning activities apparently involved in forming beliefs and making choices about what to do.

Activities of System 1 can reflect innate skills and tendencies or processes that have become quick and automatic through extended learning, practice, and association. For instance, Kahneman attributes the following activities to System 1: detecting that one object is more distant than another; orienting to the source of a sudden sound; making a

“disgust face” when shown a horrible picture; detecting hostility in a voice; giving the sum of 2+2; reading words on large billboards; driving a car on an empty road; recognizing simple occupational stereotypes; and so on (*ibid.*). The cognitive operations of System 2, by contrast, “require attention and are disrupted when attention is drawn away” (*ibid.*, 22). Kahneman provides examples of System 2 activities that include: focusing attention on the clowns in a circus; focusing on the voice of a particular person in a crowded room; searching memory to identify a surprising sound; maintaining a faster walking speed than is natural for you; monitoring the appropriateness of your behavior in a social situation; parking in an especially narrow space; filling out a tax form; and so on (*ibid.*).

One of Kahneman’s interests is to study the interaction of these two dimensions of our cognition and, especially, to identify where and how System 1 is guided by biases that yield systematic errors in specific circumstances that are difficult to defeat through the normal level of activity of System 2. For instance, in the Müller-Lyer optical illusion we continue to have the impression, formed automatically by System 1, that the two horizontal line segments are of different lengths even after acquiring the firm belief, through the activity of System 2, that the line segments are equal in length. A more intriguing illustration of one of the many tensions between the functioning of the two systems and the grip that System 1 can have on our thoughts, even in clear contradiction with reason, is the following. Experimental subjects were given the following description of Linda:

Linda is thirty-one years old, single, outspoken, and very bright. She majored in philosophy. As a student, she was deeply concerned with issues of discrimination and social justice, and also participated in antinuclear demonstrations. (*ibid.*, 156)

When asked to say which of two alternatives is more probable, that Linda is a bank teller, or that Linda is a bank teller and is active in the feminist movement, extremely high percentages of respondents would say that the second alternative is more probable, even though this is contrary to logic. Logically speaking, the first alternative, that Linda is a bank teller, cannot be less probable than that Linda is a bank teller and is active in the feminist movement, because the first alternative encompasses the second and more possibilities

besides. "About 85% to 90% of undergraduates at major universities chose the second option, contrary to logic" (*ibid.*, 158). Kahneman observes, "As in the Müller-Lyer illusion, the fallacy remains attractive even when you recognize it for what it is" (*ibid.*, 159). In cases such as this, System 1 forms our impressions on the basis of the representativeness of the alternative, or the plausibility of the story with which it is associated, and irrationally occludes System 2's judgment of probability, taking advantage of the latter system's laziness and limited fund of mental energy.

Why do I introduce Kahneman's distinction between these two modes of cognition—the automatic and fast, on the one hand, and the effortful, deliberative, lazy, and slow, on the other—in remarks about the College's context, direction, and vision? I would like to suggest that, on analogy with these distinct and sometimes competing cognitive capabilities, we commonly experience two competing tendencies in our own immediate reactions to and our formation of beliefs about the rapidly shifting landscape of American higher education, particularly with respect to the liberal arts and sciences. Our System 1-like reactions to the current state of American higher education frequently dominate our System 2-like capabilities for thinking attentively, deliberatively, and self-critically about our circumstances and direction. Consequently, I want to propose, we rarely and only with much difficulty engage our System 2 capacities in careful reflection upon our current challenges. And, even when we seek to do so, our System 1-like impressions continue to make themselves forcefully felt.

Of course, I am as much governed by the dominance of System 1-like reactions to the claims that I am about to describe as most other faculty members I know. I by no means intend to imply that, from the neutral, impartially detached, and coolly rational standpoint of O'Reilly Hall, I am able to think more reasonably about the current state of liberal education and academic life in the U.S. than are you, my colleagues. If anything, because I am more regularly exposed to sweeping statements about the challenges facing

liberal arts and sciences colleges, I may have a more difficult time directing System 2's attention to the issues and thinking slowly and carefully about them.

Which issues concerning American higher education do I have in mind? Some of the issues are neatly sketched in the opening sentences of an article in the August 31, 2012 Almanac issue of the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, entitled, "Presidents and Faculty Try to Keep Pace With Shifting Values":

Campus leaders and college professors encountered urgent calls for change in how they do business in 2011-12 as economic and technological forces continued to reshape campus workplaces and spurred vigorous debate about the future of teaching and learning. Lean budgets led administrators to close or consolidate academic programs and to rely increasingly on adjunct instructors, who now make up 70 percent of the professoriate. And the rise of new formats for universities and professors to offer free courses online to tens of thousands of students prompted leaders of the nation's top institutions to grapple with how they should best blend traditional models of brick-and-mortar classrooms with open-course endeavors.ⁱⁱⁱ

To expand on these "shifting values," recall that, in my address last fall, I cited a 2009 report, entitled "The College of 2020: Students,"^{iv} commissioned by *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, that called urgently for change in many of the ways in which the majority of American universities function, academically, pedagogically, and financially. The concluding section of this report offers the following assessment, from the perspective of its projections about what university students will expect and can afford in 2020:

Colleges have three basic business models for attracting and keeping students. Two will continue to work in the next decade, and one almost certainly will not.

The business model for the most elite colleges with sterling brand names, and for most flagship public universities, will continue to work for the foreseeable future. At those institutions, the demand for a brand-name degree and the traditional residential model will remain higher than the supply. They have weaknesses that other colleges can exploit, such as exorbitant cost and professors who spend little time with students. But, overall, the demand for their degrees will surely remain strong for the next decade.

The model for for-profit colleges and community colleges is also strong. They cater to older students who have no time for a traditional college "experience" but want and need courses that are available at times and in formats that fit their schedules. Again, there are weaknesses: Some community colleges are marked by large classes and an inability to provide enough courses in some subjects to satisfy their students. The for-profit colleges are costly, and students pile up much greater debt than students at other colleges.

And then there are the many colleges in the middle. They don't have well-known brand names and wide recognition that draw crowds. They have been able to maintain a steady supply of students because the population of 18-to-24-year-olds has been growing for decades. But over the next decade, that population overall will not increase. Many colleges that have focused on a residential, four-year model will find that they need to attract more adult students, more part-time students, and more students who will want all or many of their courses online.

Many of these colleges are historically and constitutionally unequipped for such a shift. [...] For too long, these colleges have stuck with the same business model. (*Ibid.*, 51-2)

In an academic visioning retreat that our Provost's Council held this past May, a summary report from which was released earlier today, the following trends were identified as being especially important for UD to be prepared to confront ten years from now, in 2022: Increasing demands for access and affordability; demographic shifts in the college-going population; the increasing need for universities to act through external partnerships; the expanding role of new technologies in student learning; the expansion of desired educational credentials (such as certificates and badges) beyond traditional degrees; and the growing breadth of curricular options, including a general trend away from degrees organized by traditional academic disciplines and toward programs that focus on solving problems that typically cut across academic divisions. (Consider, for example, UD's degree programs in Renewable and Clean Energy, Entrepreneurship, and Human Rights Studies.) Bear in mind that Provost's Council members focused on these trends as matters that may have especially pressing significance for UD when children who currently are eight years old are ready, in August 2022, to begin New Student Orientation as members of the UD Class of 2026.

Indeed, the ten-year trends identified in the Provost's Council retreat seem to be generally well supported by available evidence. For instance, community college enrollment nationwide has increased 22% since 2007. Likewise, nondegree credentials are proliferating. Certificates constitute 22% of the academic credentials awarded by colleges and universities in 2010, compared to only 6% in 1980. And approximately one-third of college students now switch institutions before graduating. More than half of the students

who transfer out of a four-year institution transfer to a community college.^v As stated in “The College of 2020” report,

Students’ convenience is the future. More students will attend classes online, study part time, take courses from multiple universities, and jump in and out of colleges. Students will demand more options for taking courses to make it easier for them to do what they want when they want to do it. And they will make those demands for economic reasons, too. (*Op. cit.*, 3)

Few of us who interact regularly with University of Dayton undergraduates would doubt the claim that students’ convenience is rising among the priorities that students now have when they come to university.

Of course, these claims reflect nationwide data collected from thousands of colleges and universities. One can cling to the belief that they will affect UD only peripherally. That conviction could be perilous, however, for this fluid and increasingly unpredictable context for our academic work and programs is likely to have disproportionate significance for colleges of the liberal arts and sciences, as the demand for professional education in most fields continues to increase steadily, along with demand for certain areas of science education (especially in the life and health sciences), while demand for academic programs in other areas of the arts and sciences remains flat or declines. The size of the College’s incoming class this year was nearly the same as it was in 2011; but the University’s total incoming class grew by almost 7%, with the schools of Engineering and Business Administration growing by double digit percentages (21.7% and 17.6%, respectively), while the size of the entering class in the School of Education declined by double digits (10.5%). The College’s share of entering, first-year students has declined gradually for each of the past four years, dropping from 45.6% in 2009 to 40.1% in 2012; and this gradual decline coincides with steady growth in a number of programs in the sciences, including Premedicine, Biology, Psychology, and Biochemistry. And, no, this is not because our admissions office promotes other schools more vigorously than it does the College. (Such suspicions are, in part, a reflection of how difficult a time we have thinking slowly about the trends we are experiencing.) In fact, I have for many years been giving the keynote

speeches at many of UD's largest admissions events for the past five years, and Enrollment Management produced what is perhaps its most creative admissions viewbook for the College three years ago. Actually, Enrollment Management has built-in incentives to increase enrollments in non-science areas of the College, as such students tend, as a group, to command lower merit scholarships and so contribute more to the University's net tuition revenue; the College's students also contribute substantially to the diversity of the UD student body.

The rapidly changing context for our work—indeed, the regularity of debates, both within and outside of the academy, about the primary purposes of college and how a college education should be structured—underscores the significance of the data that President Curran presented in his remarks at the general faculty meeting last week. The fact that UD's applicant pool has dramatically increased, now reaching 15,000, and has become more both more talented and more diverse, along with the good fortune we have enjoyed in the last admissions cycle in lowering our acceptance rate by 20 percentage points while increasing the yield rate on accepted students, indicate that UD may be poised to move closer toward that category of universities that the *Chronicle* describes as being able to maintain their current business models due to increasingly attractive brand name and high student demand, especially among students whose families are able to afford private university tuition and fees.

UD's standing among peer institutions appears to be less clear, however, when we consider UD's endowment, which was reported in the *Chronicle* last week to have increased 19.6% from 2010 to 2011, reaching \$414,503,615.^{vi} This places us #164 in the nation in university endowments, ahead of such prominent Catholic universities as Marquette, Loyola of Chicago, Loyola Marymount in Los Angeles, Creighton, the University of St. Thomas, Villanova, St. John's in New York City, DePaul University (the largest Catholic university in the U.S.), the University of San Diego, and Fairfield University. However, our endowment still lags far behind the elite Catholic universities, with Notre Dame's endowment reaching in

2011 \$6.26 billion, Boston College's reaching \$1.73 billion, Georgetown's reaching \$1.16 billion, and St. Louis University's reaching \$880,251,000 (over twice that of UD). The financial security and revenue-generating capacity afforded by a large endowment still place us outside the ranks of the most financially secure Catholic universities when considered from this perspective. Endowment size is especially important in relation to the student financial aid that universities are able to offer and so directly influences student access, retention and persistence to graduation, and diversity, among many other features of a university community.

To return to the analogy with Kahneman's two systems: I would suggest that our usual responses to these sorts of data, trend lines, and hypothetical projections about the coming decade in American higher education have a decidedly System 1-like quality. We react automatically and swiftly, refusing to believe that these trends are likely to have much effect on UD and our college. These trends don't seem to reflect a good deal of UD as we have known it for the past twenty-five years; hence, our System 1-dominated impressions tend to see these trends as unrepresentative of us and therefore improbable. Of course, we may indeed end up escaping many of these trends, but careful, System 2-like reflection would caution us against simply presuming this.

I should emphasize that, for many of us, first as students and now as faculty members, the fundamental character of and structures for American university education in the liberal arts and sciences have been so stable for so many decades that the associations that guide our immediate, System 1-like responses to scenarios of rapid, disruptive upheaval in higher education are quite resilient and make it difficult for System 2-like thinking to kick in and assert control of our belief-formation and planning. In my talk last year, after reviewing similar data about trends in the College's faculty hiring and student enrollments, I invited us to "write the College's story," to take our academic future in our hands, as it were, exercise our communal responsibility and imagination, and pursue a shared and compelling vision for the sort of educational and scholarly community we aspire

to be. I am repeating that call this afternoon, while also sounding a warning about how psychologically difficult it may be for us to do this, entranced as we are by the reassurances offered by our fast, nearly involuntary System 1-governed attitude that the future will mimic the recent past. Remember, System 2 tends to be lazy, and the effort required for System 2-like reflections on our college's future can easily be obstructed or redirected by other, more urgent claims upon our attention.

Notwithstanding this cautionary word, I remain hopeful that the College will continue to flourish in the face of these admittedly destabilizing trends. While this hope may simply be an expression of the seductive voice of my System 1-driven feelings, my System 2-like beliefs indicate that there may be good evidence that, with attentive care for and open conversation about our future, we can flourish. I offer a few brief illustrations to support this qualified hopefulness.

First, through the leadership of the College's faculty, we have charted an ambitious curricular and pedagogical course in the development, testing, and now the early phases of the implementation of the Common Academic Program. We have considered with particular creativity the educational needs of students across the University for life, work, civic engagement, and servant leadership in our own day, and we have opened up opportunities to soften the formerly hard boundaries between the requirements of academic majors and the requirements of General Education. Many dozens of faculty members in the College have designed and piloted unusually imaginative courses for the new English writing seminars, the Humanities Commons, the interdisciplinary social science component, the new oral communication component, the potential successor to the Integrated Natural Science Sequence, and various Crossing Boundaries components of CAP. Many of the early pilots over the past three years have elicited marked enthusiasm among both faculty and students. CAP offers us many intellectually intriguing possibilities for drawing students into

academic life and permitting them to construct more flexible, searching, and academically demanding journeys which do not merely follow static checklists of prescribed courses.

Yes, the design and gradual implementation of CAP require hard work. Yes, CAP will involve and affect different departments and different faculty members in varying ways. But we have been fortunate to benefit from the intellectual energy of Bill Trollinger and now Caroline Merithew as CAP humanities coordinators, Leslie Picca as the social sciences coordinator, and Al McGrew as the sciences coordinator, along with the constant vigilance and support of Associate Dean Don Pair. When teachers and scholars of such high caliber come forward to spearhead a university-wide curricular reform initiative, we can sustain hope and passion for the enterprise, even when thinking slowly and concentrating the efforts of our System 2 on the project's prospects. We also have been fortunate to benefit from hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of investment by the Provost's Office in special faculty development funding, not to mention many new faculty lines that have come the College's way to support design of the Common Academic Program.

While CAP does not, by itself, confront the challenges of the affordability of a UD education or guide our use of new learning technologies, I see in the Common Academic Program the possibility of exciting our students in new ways about the meanings of liberal education in the arts and sciences, framed by Catholic and Marianist traditions. CAP incentivizes us to refashion academic majors so as to incorporate concrete encounters with diversity and intercultural dialogue, community-building, the formation of practically wise judgment, and self-reflective, adaptive, civic engagement with our times that can re-energize students about the project of liberal education in an era oriented toward more narrowly professional problem-solving techniques and career advancement. It is important to appreciate that CAP represents much more than an abstract, conceptual commitment to certain pedagogical standpoints and goals for students' learning. CAP's aims also are reflected in the dreams and aspirations of many of the sorts of students who will be attracted to the University of Dayton and to the College in the future.

While on a short kayaking trip on the Mad River two weeks ago with Rivers Institute coordinator Leslie King and some of our River Stewards, one of the students described for me his academic journey thus far at UD. Entering as a prototypical Chemical Engineering major, he eventually moved to Biochemistry, while also pursuing a minor in Human Rights Studies and becoming a River Steward. He has worked hard to complement traditional research activities he must engage in as a Biochemistry major with broader exposure to global human rights issues and also to the forging of more robust communal ties in Dayton, in part around our water resources. He spoke with infectious passion about what Human Rights Week means to him and about the impact that the senior River Stewards' water bottle project for the incoming class could mean for these students' UD experience. This is the sort of bright, millennial-generation student for whom CAP holds out such great promise.

More generally, I sustain hope about the College's prospects in the coming decade because of the openness to serious faculty collaboration that is in evidence in every division of the College. From the cross-departmental collaborations in research and teaching that gave rise to the Human Rights Studies Program and now the Sustainability, Energy, and Environment minor, to the cross-unit research collaborations that continue to fuel the impressive publication and funding records of the TREND Center, led by Takis Tsonis in Biology; from the programmatic collaborations that have arisen over the past four years through the Arts Leadership Group among the UD Arts Series, ArtStreet, the Graul Chair, and our academic programs in visual arts, music, and theatre, to the strong, interdisciplinary faculty commitments to the International Studies Program and the Women's and Gender Studies Program; from the Department of Mathematics' willingness to create what is now a burgeoning Masters program in Financial Mathematics through cooperation with the School of Business Administration to the growing collaboration of our signature doctoral program in Theology with UD scholars from disciplines across the College—we enjoy one of the most precious resources for surveying and traversing

imaginatively the educational landscape of our times, namely, the palpable, living spirit of academic community that enables us to attract and retain such talented scholars and teachers. This very spirit of harmony can tempt us to succumb complacently to the uncritical promptings of our System 1-like intuitions; yet, harnessed properly to our academic vision and guided by some attentive and slow thinking, our collegial openness to work together in research, in curriculum development, and in community engagement and global learning will afford some of our greatest assets as we face the environmental factors that threaten to displace residential colleges devoted to liberal learning. This is a call for the openness, the vigorous, self-reflective conversation, and the attentive listening that are the prerequisites of any good course or research collaboration, and that also are prerequisites for Catholic and Marianist university education.

I invited our department chairs and program directors to collect some questions from College faculty to which I could respond this afternoon. Time does not permit me to address all of the questions I received. But I am always open to meet with any faculty group to listen to your concerns and share with you whatever I might know. I will host four faculty forums this term, one for each of the divisions of the College, for just such listening and conversation. Please look for the forthcoming announcement about the dates for these forums.

Question One: How can the admissions process be made more transparent, and how can departments, within reason, become more actively involved in the admissions process?

Both Sundar Kumarasamy, the Vice President for Enrollment Management and Marketing, and Kathy Harmon, the Dean of Admissions and Financial Aid, regularly make efforts now to meet with faculty to discuss UD's admissions processes. For instance, Sundar met with the Department of Music at their faculty retreat in August and shared some of the ways in which Enrollment Management identifies students for whom additional

communication and additional financial aid might make a difference in their final decision about where to attend university. Kathy Harmon is scheduled to meet with the College's department chairs and program directors on October 10 to answer questions about admissions and financial aid procedures. I encourage you to contact them with your questions.

I would add that the President's Council and Board of Trustees regularly examine UD's pricing and financial aid strategies, looking for ways to increase access and affordability without also reducing the net tuition revenue on which we are heavily dependent for faculty and staff salary raises and investments in new academic programs. Currently, we offer financial aid to well over 90% of the incoming class. This limits the maximum aid awards we can make. One question being studied is whether we should increase maximum aid awards and, consequently, target aid to a smaller proportion of the entering class.

I also might note that the Department of Visual Arts, among others, has worked especially hard over the past year to develop some beautiful new print materials for student recruitment and is also working to expand the types of resources available on their department web site. Departments that would like to refresh their admissions materials should begin by meeting with Carrie Dittman in Enrollment Management to discuss their objectives.

Question Two: What is the University doing to improve treatment of part-time adjunct faculty and to strengthen non-tenure-track Lecturer positions, especially given the important work of CAP curriculum development?

First, as observed earlier, the College continues to increase the number of tenure-line faculty positions we have. The three new positions we added for this fall involved either conversions of lecturer or visiting positions or consolidation of funds that had been spent on part-time adjuncts. This reflects the Provost's and my belief that, to the greatest extent we

can afford, our faculty should hold tenure-line appointments. Furthermore, given the expectations for delivering required General Education and now CAP courses, especially to first-year students, faculty with such teaching assignments should, as much as possible, hold full-time appointments. In most of our departments, from Physics to Philosophy and from English to Mathematics, tenure-line faculty routinely teach introductory courses for first-year students. While it is not possible for this to be a uniform practice in every single department, especially as undergraduate enrollments have grown in the University, it should be the norm that tenure-line faculty regularly teach first-year students.

Four years ago, the College made a significant increase in the minimum adjunct faculty salary that we pay; we also made a significant increase in salaries for those part-time faculty who had served the University for a substantial length of time. Since that point, we have, each term, increased adjunct salaries in accordance with full-time faculty salary increases.

Two years ago, we also received new base budget funds for travel support so that we could offer some more consistent support to non-tenure-track lecturers for professional travel. At the same time, we increased travel budgets for those College departments that had the least money budgeted per faculty member to devote to conference travel.

I am strongly committed to increasing faculty compensation, to the extent that we can garner the resources necessary for more significant raises. I would note that, in the five-year period from 2006 through 2011, faculty pay increases at all ranks across all doctoral universities nationwide averaged 0.0%. Moreover, average salaries of all full-time faculty nationwide have declined in each of the past three years: by 1.5% in 2009, by 0.1% in 2010, and by 1.2% in 2011-12.^{vii} In contrast, UD has had salary increases in each year since 2006. When the pool for faculty and staff raises was especially small in 2009-10, following the onset of the recession, the University gave the highest percentage raises to those faculty and staff with the lowest salaries, and the lowest percentage raises to those with the highest pay.

Am I content with faculty pay and benefits at all ranks? No. But we are continuing to make progress, even in a time of extremely constrained resources nationwide.

Question Three: What is the College doing to support our non-dominant students, both domestic and international? And what are we doing with our dominant white students to create a more inclusive campus environment for everyone?

Earlier I pointed out the advances we continue to make in recruiting and hiring faculty from populations underrepresented in academia as well as faculty members whose country of origin is not the U.S. The diversification of our faculty is an indispensable element in fashioning a more inclusive and supportive educational environment. Moreover, inclusive faculty recruitment and advancement has some of the most enduring, long-term effects on the character of our campus.

In addition, we have in CAP, for the first time, clearly articulated learning goals related to diversity and intercultural dialogue, ranging from the first-year Humanities Commons courses to the new Communication course and the new Diversity and Social Justice component. As with recruiting a more diverse faculty, university-wide curricular change with a new focus on student learning about diversity and inclusion is a long-term shift in our academic programs that should sustain long-term effects. We are supporting these curricular changes with new faculty development programs, including the Diversity Across the Curriculum workshop each fall and the Global Education Seminar facilitated by the Center for International Programs. The College helps to fund each of these programs.

The College also created four years ago a shared Student Success Specialist position to serve as a bridge between the dean's office and the Office of Multicultural Affairs (OMA) to extend greater academic support to students from underrepresented groups. Neither the College nor OMA received additional base budget support for this position; we simply decided to fund it through discretionary monies because of concerns we had about retention and persistence of students in underrepresented populations. Aaron Witherspoon now has

held this position for three years and has made substantial progress in outreach to students of color in the College. He has expanded College student participation in the STEM Summer Bridge Program and in the pre-orientation Transitions program. He also has expanded the network of upper-class peer mentors who work with incoming students of color. As one illustration of his activity, Aaron called this summer each incoming student of color in the College to answer their questions about registration and orientation, and to direct them to appropriate academic or non-academic support staff.

Do these measures afford improved academic support for students in underrepresented groups, and will they, over time, yield a more inclusive environment for undergraduate education? Yes. Do they ensure the prevention of microaggressions or systematic patterns of injustice motivated by race, ethnicity, or gender? No. However, any faculty member, staff person, or student who is treated in a demeaning, hostile, or threatening fashion, in violation of policies set out in the Student Handbook or in the Faculty or Staff Handbooks, should report those violations to Chris Schramm, the Dean of Students (where the perpetrator is a student), or to Pat Donnelly in the Provost's Office or Lee Morgan in Human Resources. While the College's primary resources for advancing just and respectful relations are, of necessity, academic, the University has policies for students and employees with more immediate efficacy, and those policies should be used as resources.

A variety of task forces have been working over the past two years to gain new resources and establish new processes for supporting international students. The Center for International Programs has increased its staff and has revised the curriculum of its Intensive English Program. The Learning Teaching Center has added more tutoring support for non-native English speakers. The TESOL initiative, led by the School of Education and Allied Professions in cooperation with the CIP and the Department of English, is putting in place academic programs to certify UD students and faculty in the Teaching of English to Speakers of Other Languages. However, I appreciate the additional work and the unique difficulties involved in teaching and advising international students when their abilities to

speaking English are not what we ordinarily would expect from our entering students. Our office encounters these difficulties every day. At this point, the College has not been given additional resources for the advising or learning support of international students. With all of you, we are eagerly awaiting new initiatives for supporting the academic orientation of international students to UD and English-language instruction.

Question Four: What opportunities might there be for the College in relation to the University of Dayton China Institute in Suzhou?

The initial opportunities that UDCI offers are for product development and professional development projects in partnership with some of the Fortune 500 companies that have facilities in the Suzhou Industrial Park. Currently, the School of Engineering's Innovation Center is working with Emerson Climate Technologies, Ethnicon Endo-Surgery (part of Johnson and Johnson), GE Aviation, Henny Penny, Eli Lilly, SAS Automation, and Delphi on product development and improvements in manufacturing processes. I anticipate that the College's role will develop slowly. We will have opportunities to offer courses and workshops, for instance in English and Communication, that will better prepare Chinese high school students to come to the U.S. for university study. We also will have the ability to offer professional development workshops for managerial employees in Suzhou Industrial Park, for instance in business communication. Technological support there for distance learning also would make it possible to offer some components of graduate certificates or programs to professionals in Suzhou.

However, UDCI is not a branch campus, and we cannot offer full degree programs there. The facility gives us a valuable presence in Suzhou Industrial Park that likely will benefit UD students and faculty far more than it initially benefits Chinese students and researchers there. The facilities are generally of high quality and will provide some exciting opportunities for students' education and research abroad. There is no scripted,

programmatic plan for UDCI; rather, it represents an opportunity to develop over time new collaborations with Chinese universities and with multinational companies.

I would emphasize that the Chinese have invested heavily in our presence in Suzhou Industrial Park. They renovated a five-story, 68,000 square-foot building for laboratories, classrooms, and project spaces. UD's rent has been waived for three years. Our total costs thus far have been approximately \$200,000. The Chinese have invested more than ten times that amount in readying the facility for us. And we join elite company in establishing a formal presence in Suzhou Industrial Park, as MIT, Yale, UC/Berkeley, and George Washington University are currently the other institutions that are developing facilities there.

I will be happy to discuss further these or other questions in the reception in Torch Lounge. Because everything that the College achieves is made possible through the talent, creativity, commitment, and sheer hard work of our faculty, I would like to close with a poem that reminds us of some of the risks associated with the passion for work and the introspective habit that so often drives writers and college professors, among others. The poem, entitled "A Sense of Place," is by Billy Collins, former Poet Laureate of the United States. It appeared in July, 2005 in the journal *Poetry*.^{viii}

A Sense of Place

If things had happened differently,
Maine or upper Michigan
might have given me a sense of place—

a topic that now consumes 87%
of all commentary on American literature.

I might have run naked by a bayou
or been beaten near a shrouded cove on a
coastline.

Arizona could have raised me.
Even New York's Westchester County
with its stone walls scurrying up into the woods
could have been the spot to drop a couple of roots.

But as it is, the only thing that gives me
a sense of place is this upholstered chair
with its dark brown covers,
angled into a room near a corner window.

I am the native son of only this wingback seat
standing dutifully on four squat legs,
its two arms open in welcome,

illuminated by a swan-neck lamp
and accompanied by a dog-like hassock,
the closest thing a chair has to a pet.

This is my landscape—
a tobacco-colored room,
the ceiling with its river-like crack,
the pond of a mirror on one wall
a pen and ink drawing of a snarling fish on
another.

And behind me, a long porch
from which the sky may be viewed,
sometimes tipped with high clouds,
and crossed now and then by a passing bird—
little courier with someplace to go—

other days crowded with thunderheads,
the light turning an alarming green,
the air stirred by the nostrils of apocalyptic horses,
and me slumped in my chair, my back to it all.

Collins' poem cautions us that our professorial efforts to think slowly, to contemplate the world thoughtfully and reasonably at a critical distance, also may isolate us from the world we seek to understand and illuminate. If we aim to engage our students' deepest capacities for learning, and so open the way for transformation in their lives, their communities, their future workplaces and homes, then so must we be open to engaging our own deepest capacities for learning and be open to our own transformation. I urge you to stand up from your upholstered chair, from time to time, go out on that long porch, and

immerse yourself in the splendor of the sky, reveling in the impressions that stimulate your automatic, fast-thinking System 1 responses. Only then will we be ready to return to our slow-thinking, effort-filled scholarly and artistic projects and delight equally in the splendor of new discovery, new invention, new interpretation and insight, as well as in the transformative possibilities of being a college in new and as-yet unimagined ways.

Thank you. Please join me in the reception in Torch Lounge in Kennedy Union.

ⁱ Dr. Imma received a postdoctoral fellowship for 2012-13 and has delayed her arrival at UD until August 2013.

ⁱⁱ New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2011.

ⁱⁱⁱ Sara Hebel, "Presidents and Faculty Try to Keep Pace With Shifting Values," *The Chronicle of Higher Education* LIX (1), August 31, 2012, 4.

^{iv} Martin Van Der Werf and Grant Sabatier, "The College of 2020: Students," Chronicle Research Services, June 2009. Available on-line at < http://www.collegeof2020-digital.com/collegeof2020/students/?sub_id=D0OsWZHFMYL2#pg1>.

^v Sara Lipka, "As Typical Student Changes, So Do Worries About Costs," *The Chronicle of Higher Education* LIX (1), August 31, 2012, 21.

^{vi} "Largest College Endowments, 2011," *The Chronicle of Higher Education* LIX (1), August 31, 2012, 40-1.

^{vii} *The Chronicle of Higher Education* LIX (1), August 31, 2012, 13.

^{viii} Available on-line at <<http://www.poetryfoundation.org/poetrymagazine/browse/186/4#20607068>>.