

Dear TU faculty,

In her most recent email, Provost Levit announced a new position in her office that is to be filled by Tracy Manly, chair of the PPRC (2018-2019). This announcement raises many questions. In response, we ask the following:

- Why we need another vice provost. If so, why is Manly the best person for this job?
- What is the justification for this new position and what is the connection to the university's mission?
- What will this new provost be paid? Can the cost be justified in light of the oft alleged difficulties in balancing our budget?
- Which faculty position(s) is/are not being filled because of this new administrative position?
- Why is this newly created position more important than a tenure-track faculty position?
- What will Manly's new teaching load be?
- What will Richard Redner's teaching load be?
- Does Redner's diminished administrative position, now limited to faculty affairs, justify his salary (and reduced teaching load), especially when considering the greatly reduced number of faculty and anticipated cuts to academic programs?
- Are we hiring a new accounting professor to teach the courses needed in Manly's department, or were her courses not needed?
- Is Manly giving up her endowed chair to someone who will teach accounting full time, as the donor certainly intended? (And if that's not a rule, why isn't it?)
- Is Tracy Suter's administrative position (VP for strategic initiatives) no longer needed, now that Manly will oversee academic initiatives?
- Does a single administrator with the rank (and salary) of a VP need to serve on multiple university committees, such as the PPRC, the Tulsa Curriculum Review Committee, the University Council and the Staff advisory Council?
- Why can't Manly or Redner replace Suter on those committees (or better yet, an elected faculty representative could replace him) so that this VP position can be eliminated? Furthermore, why in the provost's email are faculty not presumed to care about students?
- Why is it presumed that the provost's office cares more about students than the faculty do? Where's the evidence that this is true? Why do the provost's emails suggest that faculty are unimportant, irrelevant, or are the lowest priority constituency at TU?
- Why wasn't the faculty senate consulted before handing down the decision to create this new administrative position? (We presume Senate President Holmstrom and Vice President Airey were informed before the announcement, but were not actually consulted. And, again, informing and consulting with the senate president and VP is not the same thing as informing and consulting with the full faculty senate.)
- Why are such decisions made and significant amounts of money committed without consulting the faculty?

- Why does the provost wonder that the faculty respond negatively when we are repeatedly dismissed, ignored, and treated as little more than underlings of limited competence rather than as colleagues who have a shared responsibility for the educational mission of TU?

The announcement of this new administrative position mirrors the top-down approach and exclusion of the faculty that led to the rollout of TC. We expect the top-down autocratic decision-making to end. Shared governance means that faculty have a real say in the governing of this university. The HLC requires it. We call on the administration and the board of trustees to do better than pay lip service to the HLC. Let's Save TU!

Respectfully,

The Concerned Faculty of TU (90 strong and growing)