CHAPTER FOUR

Criterion IV: The Institution Can Continue to Accomplish Its Purposes and Strengthen Its Educational Effectiveness

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

During the past decade UT has adjusted to declining enrollments as well as reductions in the proportion of its total expenditures that are covered by state subsidy. It has increased tuition and fees to partially compensate for reductions in revenue and currently ranks sixth among Ohio’s 13 state-assisted universities in annualized costs to students. At the same time, over the past six years the institution has received in excess of $75 million in state funds for capital improvement. The budget is well under control as evidenced by external audits. Institutional fiscal health is adequate based on state-level assessments. Levels of support for academic initiatives from the UT Foundation have increased and the level of institutional indebtedness is manageable. Further, in spite of financial challenges, the institution is operating in a fiscally sound manner.

At the present time the number of faculty and staff at UT are adequate to support continuation of the institution's mission. In addition, physical resources in most areas are excellent. Many areas that are considered inadequate are currently scheduled for renovation.

In summer of 2001, UT began an extensive institution-wide strategic planning initiative that will involve participation by all University constituencies. When complete, that plan will reaffirm our mission and include a road map for the next decade, strategies for assessment of all University functions and mechanisms that will help UT adapt to intra- and extra-institutional challenges.

EVIDENCE SUPPORTING CRITERION FOUR

A. UT Has a Current Resource Base That Positions The Institution For the Future

During the past decade, UT has managed its financial, physical and human resources in a professional manner that supports and encourages institutional growth and quality improvement. Despite a long period of enrollment decline, budgetary challenges, reductions in human resources and a
multitude of administrative changes, the institution continues to be productive and position itself well for the future. The status of institutional resources is discussed in the sections that follow.

Financial Resources

Overview: From 1992 until 1998 the fiscal management of the University was the responsibility of the Vice President for Administrative Affairs, under the direction of the President and subject to authorization by the Board of Trustees. Since 1998, the division of Administrative Affairs has been reorganized and is currently configured as the Division of Finance and Administration. Fiscal management is now the responsibility of the Vice President of that division (See Chapter 2).

The primary sources of income for the University are state subsidy and student fees. In 1998, the University completed a major comprehensive capital campaign focused on providing additional levels of support for academic programs.

State Budget Process: The Ohio Board of Regents (OBOR) prepares the statewide biennial budget request for higher education. That request is presented to and considered by the legislature and the Governor. Once the higher education operating budget is approved, OBOR then allocates funds to the institutions. Subsidy provided to state universities and colleges is calculated by multiplying the number of full time equivalent (FTE) students (excluding undergraduates who are not Ohio residents) by legislated subsidy allowances that vary by program and course level. FTEs for an institution are calculated by dividing the sum of summer, fall and spring semester student credit hours completed by 30. To determine the actual amount of state funds allocated to the University, the numbers of subsidy-eligible students from the previous two and the previous five fiscal years are averaged; the higher of the two averages is then compared to current subsidy level. The highest of those two figures is the number of students for whom subsidy during the upcoming year will be paid. Thus, the current level of subsidy is guaranteed unless the two and five-year averages exceed it. Student fees, on the other hand, are determined by individual institutions. From 1996 until 2000 OBOR limited tuition increases to a maximum of 6%. However, that cap was removed fiscal year 2000. Most universities responded by increasing tuition by greater than 6%. The University of Toledo raised tuition for academic year 2001/2002 by 9%. The tuition increase for 2002/2003 has not been established.

University Budget Process: Each year the University budget is built following a process that includes input from faculty, students and administrators. The University adopts an operating budget for each fiscal year based on prior years’
budgets; budget requests submitted by each vice president or executive director based on strategic goals and objectives; reallocation from low priorities to higher priorities; guidelines developed collaboratively by the Office of Budget and Planning, the Fiscal Advisory Committee (FAC) and budget requests from the deans and directors. The Fiscal Advisory Committee (see discussion in Chapter 1) is chaired by the Provost. FAC is composed of a cross section of campus leaders including two faculty members, two deans, staff, students and administrators. After thorough review and deliberation, FAC submits a budget recommendation to the President. The President in turn conducts a final review, endorses or proposes modifications to the budget and forwards his recommendation to the Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees considers the level of State funding and other revenue sources within the context of the University's resource needs and responds to the President's recommendation.

Every other year, the University prepares and updates its six-year capital improvement program. Departmental and college building and renovation requests are reviewed or developed through collaboration with central offices in a process that leads to the Facilities Planning Council (FPC), which is responsible for prioritizing the University's capital needs. The resulting capital budget request that the University submits to the OBOR is prioritized by OBOR in relation to all requests from the state university system. OBOR submits its priorities to the State Legislature that may approve, modify or disapprove aspects of the capital requests submitted by OBOR.

**Operating Budget:** The State subsidy UT has received for operations during fiscal years 1996-2001 is summarized in Table 1 in the introductory section of this self-study. While the data presented therein indicate clear increases in subsidy payments to the University, it must be emphasized that these increases over the past five years represent progressively smaller proportions of total institutional expenditures. Changes in subsidy levels through the years and their potential impact on University operations are discussed in detail in the Introduction of this self-study. For fiscal year 2000, approximately 93% of the University’s undergraduate FTE enrollment was comprised of subsidy-eligible students.

The student fee component of UT’s operating budget includes revenues from instructional fees and surcharges assessed to non-resident students, as well as a general fee. A table of fees for students enrolled in Ohio's universities is presented in Table 4.1. The amounts described in this table are resident undergraduate instructional fees, or tuition and general fees based on 15 credit hours for two semesters or three quarters. Increases in these fees never produce sufficient revenues to fund corresponding increases in campus expenditures. This is because student fees, in general, finance less than 50% of the costs of campus instructional activities. State-support is intended to make up the remainder. When state subsidy support drops, student fees normally have to be
increased in direct proportion to accommodate the shortfall and at an even higher level to balance even modest inflation. In addition, some fee changes are one-time increases to help finance new student-supported initiatives, such as student unions or student health centers, or new student services, such as instructional technology services. Noteworthy is the fact that UT is ranked sixth among Ohio institutions in under-graduate tuition and fee costs for fiscal year 2002.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Annualized Full-time In-state Undergraduate Tuition &amp; Fees</th>
<th>Annual % Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 1999</td>
<td>FY 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Green State</td>
<td>$4,670</td>
<td>$4,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Central State University</td>
<td>$3,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cleveland State University</td>
<td>$3,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State University</td>
<td>$4,715</td>
<td>$5,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami University</td>
<td>$5,802</td>
<td>$6,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>$3,879</td>
<td>$4,110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The University divides its day-to-day operating budget into four funds: the general fund, the designated fund, the auxiliary fund and the restricted fund. The general fund budget, including expenditures supported by unrestricted funds, comprises instruction and research, library, general administration, general expense, plant operation and maintenance, scholarships, student activities, public service and reserves. The auxiliary fund budget includes expenditures supported by the student general fee and student user fee revenue including room and board, parking, bookstore, inter-collegiate athletic and related income. The restricted fund budget includes expenditures supported by restricted revenues from grants, contracts, gifts and donations.

At mid-year, the Board reviews expenditures and revenues for both the general fund and auxiliary fund budgets and, if appropriate, modifies the budgets to
reflect revised expenditure or revenue projections for the fiscal year. The Board also approves acceptance of all grants or contracts and gifts and donations to the University and thereby maintains a timely assessment of the restricted fund budget.

A summary of current funds, revenues, expenditures and mandatory transfers is presented in Appendix B. For fiscal year 2001, the Board of Trustees has approved a current expenditure budget of $236.4 million with projected revenues of $241.7 million. Included in that budget are education and general fund expenditures of $195.5 million and transfers of $18.4 million, with projected education and general fund revenues of $207.5 million (including $88.8 million from the State, $110.3 million in student fees, tuition and other charges and $8.4 million in other income). Also included are auxiliary expenditures of $40.9 million, with projected auxiliary revenues of $34.2 million from departmental sales and services, room and board and other income and net transfers of $5.1 million.

**Capital Improvements:** For the six fiscal years ending June 30, 2000, the University received State appropriations for capital improvements totaling approximately $75.4 million for land, buildings and renovations. The capital appropriations to the University for the 1999-2000 biennium, totaling over $23.4 million, included funds for renovation and rehabilitation of University Hall, Libbey Hall, Wolfe Hall, the Health and Human Services Building and the bioengineering laboratory. A chilled water plant to support air conditioning in many Bancroft campus buildings was also constructed. Capital improvements to the University for the 2001-2002 biennium, totaled $22.7 million. Funds were used for renovations in the Health and Human Services Building, the University Computer Center and Memorial Field House.

**Gifts and Endowments:** The University of Toledo Foundation is the official and designated fund-raising and gift-receiving agency through which contributions to the University can be made for current or endowment purposes. The Foundation will accept gifts and bequests of cash, securities, real estate, tangible and intangible property, life insurance and life income programs such as charitable remainder annuity trusts or charitable remainder unitrusts. The most recent fundraising campaign for the University ended June 30, 1998. The campaign’s goal was $40,000,000, but gifts and pledges actually totaled $50,950,666; $38,728,000 has been received to date. As of June 30, 2000, the assets of the Foundation not consolidated in the University’s financial statements were approximately $99.9 million. Table 4.2 shows levels of giving and bequests to the Foundation from individuals, businesses and other organizations for recent fiscal years.
Table 4.2 - Levels of Giving to the University of Toledo Foundation 1996-2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Current Use</th>
<th>Capital Gifts</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>$2,628,289</td>
<td>$6,122,348</td>
<td>$8,750,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>$4,025,108</td>
<td>$5,261,826</td>
<td>$9,286,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>$4,364,760</td>
<td>$3,767,080</td>
<td>$8,131,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>$2,330,151</td>
<td>$4,132,001</td>
<td>$6,462,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$3,877,000</td>
<td>$3,946,000</td>
<td>$7,823,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Noteworthy is the fact that during fiscal year 2000, the Foundation transferred approximately $5.7 million to the University in support of scholarships, academic programs, external relations and other programs.

Table 4.3 summarizes the market values of the Endowment Fund, which includes assets of The University of Toledo Foundation and the University, as of June 30 in recent fiscal years. It is important to point out that the market value of UT's endowments at the end of fiscal year 2000 exceeded by $22.3 million the goal established for that year in the 1992 NCA self-study report.

Table 4.3 - Market Values of the Endowment Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Market Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>$69,917,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>$97,786,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>$107,523,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$122,300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Noteworthy is the fact that during fiscal year 2000, the Foundation transferred approximately $5.7 million to the University in support of scholarships, academic programs, external relations and other programs.

Table 4.3 summarizes the market values of the Endowment Fund, which includes assets of The University of Toledo Foundation and the University, as of June 30 in recent fiscal years. It is important to point out that the market value of UT's endowments at the end of fiscal year 2000 exceeded by $22.3 million the goal established for that year in the 1992 NCA self-study report.

For information concerning the portion of the Endowment Fund representing assets of the University and the financial statements of the University, see information in the Resource Room. As of June 30, 2000, that Fund’s portfolio was comprised of approximately 80% in equity securities and 20% in fixed income securities.

**Indebtedness:** Assuming issuance of the Series 2001 Bonds on the principal amount of $35,000,000, upon delivery of the Series 2001 Bonds, the total outstanding principal amount of General Receipts Bonds of the University will be $114,460,000 and is summarized in Table 4.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Receipt bonds</th>
<th>Year Issued</th>
<th>Original Amount Issued</th>
<th>Principal Amount Outstanding</th>
<th>Final Maturity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series 1992A</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>$61,825,000</td>
<td>$52,755,000</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>$15,500,000</td>
<td>$14,175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to outstanding bonds, the University has obligations under lease-purchase and other agreements that are subject to appropriations being made by the University sufficient to pay amounts due under those agreements in each fiscal period. Assuming future appropriations are sufficient to renew all of these lease-purchase and other arrangements for all of the contemplated renewal terms, the principal component of all those arrangements totals $11,745,935 and the maximum future total annual obligation of the University is approximately $2,369,506, effective in 2001.

**Extra-Institutional Indices of Fiscal Health:** As discussed in the Introduction of this self-study and articulated by the OBOR, Senate Bill 6 of the 122nd General Assembly was enacted into law in 1997. It is designed to increase financial accountability of state colleges and universities by using a standard set of measures with which to monitor the fiscal health of campuses. Using the year-end audited financial statements submitted by each public institution, the Board of Regents annually applies these standards to monitor individual campus finances. In order to meet the legislative intent of Senate Bill 6, the Board of Regents computes three ratios from which four scores are generated. The data used to conduct the ratio analysis include:

- **Expendable Fund Balances** - The sum of all reported fund balances (positive and negative, restricted and unrestricted, allocated and unallocated) in the current funds, quasi-endowments, unexpended plant funds, funds for renewal and replacement and funds for the retirement of indebtedness;

- **Plant Debt** - All liabilities for which the corresponding asset is investment in plant, including bonds and notes payable and capital lease obligations;

- **Total Revenues** - Total current fund revenues, both restricted and unrestricted;

- **Total Current Fund Expenditures and Mandatory Transfers** - Total current fund expenditures (restricted and unrestricted) plus transfers in and out; and
- **Net Total Revenues** - Total current fund revenues (restricted and unrestricted) minus total current funds expenditures and mandatory transfers (restricted and unrestricted). Summaries of these data from all state universities for fiscal years 1998-2000 are available in the Resource Room.

As prescribed by Ohio Administrative Code rule 126:3, three ratios are used to calculate the composite institutional score. They include:

- **Viability Ratio** - Expendable fund balance divided by plant debt;

- **Primary Reserve Ratio** - Expendable fund balance divided by total current funds expenditures and mandatory transfers; and

- **Net Income Ratio** - Net total revenues divided by total revenues.

Based on these calculations, each ratio is assigned a score ranging from zero to five according to the criteria listed in Table 4.6 below. A score of 5 indicates the highest degree of fiscal strength in each category.

Based on these scores, a summary score termed the **Composite Score** is determined. It represents the primary indicator of fiscal health. The composite score is calculated using the values from Table 4.5 in one of two ways, depending upon an institution's plant debt: **Scenario 1** - Plant debt of $50,000 or more: The composite score equals the sum of the assigned viability score multiplied by 30%, the assigned primary reserve score multiplied by 50%, and the assigned net income score multiplied by 20%, or **Scenario 2** - Plant debt of less than $50,000: The viability ratio is not calculated. In this case, the primary reserve score is multiplied by 80% and the assigned net income score is multiplied by 20%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.5 - Ratio Scores For Fiscal Health Calculations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Viability Ratio</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;= -.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The two products are added together to obtain the composite score. A composite score of or less than 1.75 for two consecutive years would result in an institution being placed on fiscal watch. The highest composite score possible is 5.00. Table 4.6 contains the Institutional Ratios and Scores for Ohio's universities. The 2000 composite score for UT is 2.90 (identical to the score assigned in 1999 which was up from 2.30 in 1998) indicating that the institution's fiscal health is well above that required to place the institution on fiscal watch and comparable to that of other institutions with similar urban missions including Youngstown State, Cleveland State and the University of Akron. Of additional significance is the fact that the institutional ratios and scores presented here take into consideration the strengths of all components of the University's financial enterprise.

**Impending Financial Challenges:** In spite of the positive status of UT's financial base profiled in the foregoing sections, recent changes in funding at the state level represent challenges with the potential of slowing future growth and productivity. Specifically, effective during the fall of fiscal year 2001, a 6% across-the-board budget reduction was mandated by the state. This reduction was necessary to compensate for an estimated $1.5 billion state budget shortfall resulting from weakened economic activity prior to September 11 as well as the negative impact the events of that date have had on the state's economy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>2.336</th>
<th>4.00</th>
<th>0.053</th>
<th>5.00</th>
<th>0.282</th>
<th>4.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Green</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central State</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0.565</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland State</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.495</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>(0.034)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Col of Ohio</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>17.905</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami Univ.</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>2.867</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.438</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>2.008</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio University</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.031</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawnee State</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.541</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.435</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. Akron</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.632</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>(0.019)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. Cincinnati</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>0.8201</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.4696</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. Toledo</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.574</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.843</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The budget reductions that have been implemented will impact 49 agencies statewide and total $223 million. Higher education's share of the reduction is $121 million. In practical terms, a 6% budget cut will reduce the state's current allocation of $92,447,541 to UT's general fund by $5,530,825. The Board of Regents further reduced campus budgets by an additional 0.3% equaling $267,000 for UT. The combined general fund impact of the state budget reductions will be approximately $5.8 million. This represents roughly a 3% cut in the University’s general fund budget. In addition, the state's current allocation of $1,212,514 to UT's restricted funds will be reduced by $72,751. Of particular concern is the possibility that reductions will go beyond that level later in fiscal year 2002 and the almost absolute certainty that they will continue at least through fiscal year 2003. This budgetary challenge is a significant component in the planning initiatives described later in this chapter.

**Personnel Resources**

**Faculty:** As shown in Table 4.7, the number of full-time faculty members employed by UT has decreased by approximately 5% during the past decade. However, the number of FTE students served has decreased by approximately 16% during the same period, resulting in a slight improvement in the institution's student/faculty ratio in 2001. Although concerns exist regarding the proportion of non-tenure-track visiting faculty at the University during 2001, the institution has approved plans to replace 65 of the three-year full-time non-tenure-track faculty with tenure-track lines. Also noteworthy but not reflected in Table 4.7 is the fact that the number of part-time faculty employed by the University during the past decade has dropped from 239 to 213. This is important because prospective students view having full-time faculty teaching first year students as a measure of a university's commitment to helping beginning level student cohorts succeed with attention and instruction from teachers who are committed to University goals. At UT, OBOR data indicate that 64% of first year student credit hours are taught by full-time faculty. In fact, UT ranks among the top two state universities in Ohio in that regard. Finally, it is important to point out that from
conformed closely to the OBOR subsidy model that is based largely on FTE student enrollment and the subsidy levels assigned to classes in various areas. In summary, these data support the conclusion that UT's faculty is of adequate size to continue to support the institution’s mission.

Table 4.7 - Faculty/Student Ratios for 1992 and 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Full-time Faculty</th>
<th>Super-annuates</th>
<th>Total Faculty</th>
<th>Student FTEs</th>
<th>FTE Students/Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TenureTrack</td>
<td>Non-Tenure Track</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1992</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>63 (21)*</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>19,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Total</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2001</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>14 (7)**</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>16,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 Superannuate (Quarters) = .33 FTE **1 superannuate (Semesters)= .50 FTE

Staff: The most recent centrally collected data on non-faculty staffing levels and patterns at UT are compiled in The University of Toledo Institutional Data Report for 1999/2000. A copy of that compendium is available in the Resource Room. An analysis of the data presented therein reveals the following general trends:

- Since 1992 the number of general support staff positions as well as those in Student Services, Information Services and Finance has increased while those in the Library and various academic departments have decreased.
- Since 1992 the number of Physical Plant and Security positions have increased.
• When FTE student/staff ratios at Ohio's 11 major universities are compared, UT ranks 10th with a ratio of 10.6 (range = 5.3-12.6, mean = 7.6). While this value represents an improvement over that reported in 1992 (12.0), it does suggest that as UT's plant size has grown, the number of support staff positions may not have kept pace. These trends indicate that staffing in support areas at the University is adequate to support the institutional mission. This conclusion is strengthened by the fact that modest increases in the level of staffing in most areas have taken place in an environment where substantial decreases in enrollment have occurred.

Physical Resources

UT's physical resources are among its strongest attributes. They are profiled in Chapters 2 and 4 of this self-study. The number of net assignable square feet at UT increased steadily over the past decade from approximately 2,900,000 in 1992 to 3,322,575 in 1999. This is a clear indication that growth is occurring. The University owns 86 buildings with over 5 million gross square feet and an estimated replacement value of $684,941,000. As of fall 1999, 192 classrooms and 217 laboratories were available for instructional use. Peak scheduled utilization for classrooms is 69% during the day and 65% during evenings. These levels of utilization place UT slightly below the state average for days and considerably above the state average for evenings.

B. UT has Decision-Making Processes with Tested Capabilities of Responding Effectively to Anticipated and Unanticipated Challenges to the Institution

Over the past decade UT has developed great agility. External and internal change has prompted substantial revisions in the organization of the University as well as the way it responds to the needs of its constituencies. As emphasized and described in detail in Chapter 1 of this self-study, decision-making processes at The University of Toledo are defined by Board of Trustee-approved institutional policies and procedures, collective bargaining agreements with organizations that represent various campus constituencies and the actions of a wide array of committees. Challenges to the institution, anticipated or unanticipated, are addressed through these mechanisms. Specific instances of institutional respon-siveness in the areas of academic affairs, enrollment management, budget and finance and facilities management are described in the following sections. Examples are meant to be representative and not exhaustive.

Academic Affairs
University-Wide Academic Reorganization: In response to increasing levels of competition from area community colleges and a growing emphasis on health-related fields at the state and national levels, UT closed its Community and Technical College and created a new College of Health and Human Services (see discussion of this issue in the Introduction). Both of these actions followed a planning exercise that included a needs assessment, an examination of models used at other schools and planning for the organizational and programmatic structure of the new college. It culminated with final approval of the action by the University's Faculty Senate and Board of Trustees in April, 1999.

College Organization: Changing student needs during the latter part of the past decade have prompted administrative reorganizations within the colleges of Arts and Sciences, Business Administration and Education. All of these events utilized the governance structures in place within the colleges affected.

Enrollment Management

During the fall of 2000 following a decade of declining enrollments, Interim Provost Free empowered an Enrollment Management Task Force to develop strategies and action plans to enhance enrollment. As described in Chapter 2, that task force has six subcommittees that deal with student demographics, scholarships and financial aid, admissions policies, retention, scheduling and academic programs and international students. The Demographics subcommittee of that group has been instrumental in producing enrollment projections that have driven the University planning processes. The Scholarship subgroup has successfully reconfigured the University's scholarship program to better serve our students through a more efficient distribution of funds. Furthermore, in close collaboration with the Division of Enrollment Services, the Retention Subgroup has collaborated with constituencies from all divisions of the University to develop an institution-wide plan for student retention. The details of that plan and the processes through which it was crafted are described in the planning section below. Finally, the Scheduling and Academic Programs Subgroup has been instrumental in crafting strategies for more efficient classroom utilization, curriculum- and student need- driven time schedules and user-friendly schedules for the buses that transport students between classrooms and housing facilities. A major and important contribution of this task force has been to encourage collaboration among the functions of several administrative divisions of the University.

During Fall 2000, the Interim Vice President for Enrollment Services empowered the Executive Enrollment Management Council (EEMC). This high level group has members representing all areas of the University including the President, the Provost, three Vice Presidents, two deans, two faculty and members of other constituencies. Its charge was to address anticipated and unanticipated change that was impacting enrollment at UT. EEMC has been instrumental in approving plans for the development of the Student Success Center, a facility that provides academic
advising for undecided students; designing more effective strategies for serving adult/transfer students; crafting strategies; analyzing demographic patterns to facilitate recruitment; adjusting policies on student housing; and implementing scholarship policies.

Another important example of how UT has developed effective processes to respond to change in the area of enrollment management is the means by which the Division of Academic Affairs assists colleges in course scheduling. That process is managed by the Assistant to the Provost for Curriculum and Schedule Management who, through well-established lines of communication with the colleges and the Office of the Registrar, monitors enrollments and adjusts the availability of courses in response to student registration demand. A significant outcome of this process has been a substantial reduction in the number of students affected by cancelled classes and the unavailability of required courses.

Enrollment management has had a positive effect in the late-payment deregistration process. This is a mechanism through which course registrations are cancelled for students who have not paid fees prior to the beginning of an academic semester. Though it may be necessary, this is a process that discourages students with financial constraints from continuing their studies at the University. However, the deregistration process has been streamlined and better communicated to all University constituencies. Students whose account balances make them vulnerable to deregistration are notified by the colleges prior to the beginning of each semester so arrangements for payment of fees may be made in a timely manner. The development of this process has significantly reduced the rate at which students are deregistered and increased the rate at which those who are deregistered reapply for their classes.

In summary, changes in student enrollments at UT have prompted the development of new strategies for recruitment and retention. The strategies that have been formulated have been effective in responding to change. As a result of institutional responsiveness, UT has become more user-friendly. Enrollment is no longer in decline and an institution which now sees itself differently than it did a decade ago is re-assessing its mission.

**Budget and Finance**

During the past decade the greatest challenge facing UT has been that of preserving growth and program quality in an environment where the levels of fiscal resources are uncertain. As noted earlier, state budget shortfalls have caused a net 6% decrease in UT's general fund budget. Adjustments and reallocations within the institution have been necessary for UT to function within available funding. Making those adjustments and reallocations requires the University's Fiscal Advisory Committee (FAC) to act wisely. That group has been successful in helping the University to adapt to reductions in state revenues. FAC has also developed strategies to deal with future budget cuts should they occur.
Facilities Management

A continuing challenge during the past decade has been space allocation. For example, the number of classrooms and laboratories available at peak scheduling times is frequently inadequate. Academic support space is also at a premium as are laboratories and faculty offices. Addressing these needs is the responsibility of the Facilities Planning Council (FPC), a multifunctional team chaired by the Vice President for Finance and Administration and the Provost with broad representation from many areas of the University (see additional description of this function in Chapter 1). This Council has been effective in identifying space for new programmatic initiatives as well as developing priorities for space needs. A subgroup of the FPC has recently been charged with reviewing the status of classrooms and recommending improvement in scheduling, particularly with respect to scheduling around renovations that take classrooms off-line temporarily.

C. UT has Structured Assessment Processes that are Continuous, that Involve Many Institutional Constituencies and that Provide Useful Information for Planning and University-wide Program Improvement

The wide array of assessment activities carried out at UT is discussed in detail in Chapter 3 of this self-study. That section also profiles the current status of assessment on this campus and points out weaknesses that must be rectified in order for the institution to move into Level 3 of NCA's recommended schedule for the implementation of assessment plans. Therefore, in the section that follows, discussion will be limited to the outcomes of institution-wide assessment strategies that have been applied on a continuous basis over the past decade and how those outcomes have contributed to the strategic planning process.

Academic Program Review: Over the past decade 80 programs have been reviewed by the Academic Program Advisory Committee (APAC). The self-studies upon which these reviews were based as well as the committee recommendations are filed in the Resource Room. In many cases program review outcomes prompted the hiring of faculty and/or staff, facilities modifications that improved program quality and modifications in the implementation of programs that improved their viability, centrality and accessibility. The Academic Program Review process has historically been taken seriously by all academic constituencies at the University as well as the Board of Trustees. As discussed elsewhere in this self-study, the Academic Program Review Process was halted for two years during the Kapoor administration. However, new guidelines have been developed by APAC and the process is being reinstated.

Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI) and Institutional Priorities Survey (IPS): SSI and IPS instruments are products of Noel-Levitz, Inc. Both were administered for the first time at UT in the fall of 1995. For reasons that are not clear, the results of the 1995 survey were not widely circulated on campus. However, a cursory analysis
thereof shows that the sources of greatest dissatisfaction to our students included safety and security, registration conflicts, difficulties in obtaining answers to questions about campus processes, inadequacy of financial aid, billing policies, lack of well-defined channels for expressing complaints, perceived ineffective uses of student activity fees, availability of parking spaces, perceived lack of value of tuition investment, unavailability of classes required for timely degree completion and access to University offices in the evening. These outcomes served as drivers for modifications in the University's registration process, the establishment of a Student Advocacy position in the Division of Student Services, reviews of course scheduling practices, the establishment of a Provost's Assistant who is dedicated to curriculum and schedule management and the establishment of the Adult Student Assistance Center (ASAC) to provide essential services for students in the evenings. That facility has since been subsumed by the Student Success Center.

SSI and IPS were given again in the spring of 2001. Administration of the instruments was a collaborative effort between the administration, faculty, Faculty Senate and AAUP. Over 2600 students and 608 faculty, staff and administrators participated. Results were shared openly with most campus constituencies. Responses on UT surveys were compared to both a national group of over 200 four-year colleges and universities as well as a peer group of 20 metropolitan universities chosen on the basis of their similarities with UT. Outcomes indicate that students are generally more satisfied than dissatisfied with UT. However, they are less satisfied with the operation of their university than their counterparts at institutions in the national group and slightly less satisfied than their counterparts at institutions in the peer group. Average responses to items on the instruments range between neutral and somewhat satisfied. Again, areas causing the greatest levels of dissatisfaction to our students included registration conflicts, difficulties in obtaining answers to questions about campus processes, inadequacy of financial aid, billing policies, lack of well-defined channels for expressing complaints, perceived ineffective uses of student activity fees, availability of parking spaces and unavailability of classes required for timely degree completion. Additional items of dissatisfaction were in the areas of quality of instruction and availability of library facilities.

Outcomes of the 1995 and 2001 SSI and IPS surveys are filed in the Resource Room. Furthermore, they will be considered in the strategic planning process that is now underway at the University. These instruments will also be subjected to further analysis by the Office of Institutional Research.

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE): The NSSE instrument was administered at UT for the first time in the spring of 2001. It is designed to survey undergraduates at four-year colleges and universities to assess the extent to which they engage in a variety of good educational practices. The project is supported by a grant from the Pew Charitable Trusts and co-sponsored by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and the Pew Forum for Undergraduate Learning. In the NSSE final report, UT's outcomes were compared to those of other institutions
within the same Carnegie Classification as well as those comprising the entire NSSE sample. Outcomes from this survey are filed in the Resource Room. An analysis thereof indicates that more UT students believe that examinations challenge them to do their best work and more spend time caring for their dependents than do their counterparts at Carnegie benchmark institutions. Furthermore, more UT students work to pay off educational expenses than their counterparts at institutions comprising either benchmark. In addition, item scores for nine of 62 items (14.5%) generated by UT students were significantly below the mean scores generated by their counterparts at other Carnegie benchmark institutions and only 20 out of 62 (32.2%) were significantly below mean scores generated by institutions comprising the entire NSSE sample. These data are being analyzed and will be used to determine how student behavior or institutional practice can be modified to encourage student success. The NSSE survey will be conducted on an annual basis at UT.

**Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency:** As discussed in Chapter 3 of this self-study, in 1998 student learning in the courses comprising UT's core curriculum was assessed by means of ACT's CAAP. Students who had completed the General Education Core were identified through the Student Information Service and invited to take the test. One hundred thirty-one out of a pool of over two thousand students volunteered for the exam. The students achieved at a level above the national average for students at four-year public institutions. However, in the "scientific reasoning" portion of the test, students' scores fell below the national average by about five percentile points. The CAAP test will be administered again in 2002.

**Use of Consultants:** In addition to the assessment activities described above, during the last decade UT has used external consultants to assess its programs and functions. For example, in 1995 professional consultants conducted an extensive evaluation of advising on campus. Their report along with data from ACT showing that 40% of our students need help deciding on educational plans, as well as enrollment analyses indicating that more of our entering students choose "undecided" than any other single major subject field, led to the development of a plan for a student advising center for undecided students. The principal function of the Advising Center was to provide services for two major groups of students: those who have not yet declared a major, as well as those who plan to enter one of the baccalaureate colleges but do not meet admission requirements. That plan served as the basis for the Student Success Center that opened in March 2002.

In 1995 the Division of Student Services retained the services of three sitting vice presidents from major universities, as consultants who conducted a series of interviews with students, faculty, staff, alumni and members of the Board of Trustees to determine strengths and weaknesses of the Division. A follow-up review in 1999 focused primarily on staff realignment and budgetary control issues. The intent of both reviews was to achieve a more efficient and effective delivery of services to students (see consultant’s report for each unit in the Resource Room). The recommendations resulted in several major outcomes: the Division developed a
mission statement with student centeredness as its foundation and core, area responsibilities were reaffirmed and other areas of responsibility were added. Each functional area in the Division produced a five-year strategic plan. Space/office utilization studies were conducted. Student customer service surveys are now ongoing and each individual student service program will be subject to regular programmatic review.

Consultants have also been used recently to assess the operation of the Office of the Registrar, the ways in which the University handles adult and transfer students, student retention and student food services. The results of these studies and the recommendations are available in the Resource Room.

D. UT Has Plans As Well As Ongoing, Effective Planning Processes Necessary To The Institution's Continuance

Institution-wide Strategic Planning

Overview of Planning at UT: For the past decade, UT has used UT 2000 as its strategic plan. The origin and evolution of that plan are discussed extensively in Chapter 1 of this self-study. The strategic plan has academic goals that included intensifying emphasis on the quality of instruction; substantially increasing graduate enrollment and research stature; increasing the racial and ethnic diversity of students, faculty, staff and administrators; and enhancing the role of advising in the retention of students. To achieve these goals, the plan set four "resource enhancement" goals that included increasing state support; raising undergraduate, graduate and law instructional fees to meet OBOR fee assumptions; increasing compensation for faculty and members of the instructional and support staff; and providing new resources to meet teaching, research, equipment and infrastructure needs. The plan was developed by a strategic planning steering committee with the support of a number of subcommittees and task forces all of which are described in detail in the appendices of UT's 1992 NCA self-study report.

Within the goals of UT 2000 were a number of objectives to be attained in three consecutive three-year periods. The University has met a number of these objectives. For example, in terms of quality, the average ACT scores of students in Engineering and Pharmacy have risen dramatically. Articulation agreements with many institutions have been developed and the University has contributed to the success of the state's transfer module. The TOLEDO EXCEL and TECH/PREP programs flourish. A core curriculum has been implemented. In fact, substantial progress was made on the majority of the more than 100 objectives. Perhaps the greatest triumph was the success of a major fund-raising campaign.

In spite of its many positive outcomes, the 1991 plan had some serious flaws.
Specifically, it did not anticipate the effect of a shift to semesters, the growth in enrollment of two-year institutions and the extent to which changes in the state funding paradigms would bring advantage to the two-year institutions as they changed from technical to community colleges; the closing of the Community and Technical College and the creation of the College of Health and Human Services. Furthermore, it did not fully anticipate almost a decade of enrollment decline, the dramatic growth in distance learning, major changes in the philosophy underlying our scholarship programs and a very expensive Early Retirement Incentive Plan. Most importantly, UT 2000 did not adequately monitor intra- and extra-institutional challenges and modify its strategic objectives to meet them. In recognition of that problem, UT began a renewed strategic planning effort under the leadership of Interim President William Decatur. That initiative has continued with heightened commitment under President Daniel Johnson's administration.

**Current Process For Strategic Planning:** The strategic planning process currently in place at UT began in January 2001. It is based on a statement of five-year goals produced in March 2000 by the Board of Trustees after discussions with students, members of the Faculty Senate, the AAUP, the Professional Staff Council, the CWA and Police Patrolman’s Association. The goals included building a partnership model and spirit; focusing on the academic mission; building enrollment; enhancing the quality of student life; improving processes for counseling, advising and mentoring while supporting student success; developing and maintaining fiscal strength; and improving the management of institutional cultural changes, while communicating clearly and consistently what changes are occurring at UT.

The strategic planning process itself includes two phases. Phase I answered the question "Where are we now?" It was essentially a data-gathering phase. Phase II will answer the question, "Where do we want to be?" It is essentially a phase during which the plan will be generated. In addition to a steering committee, six subcommittees worked on Phase I: Academic Programs; Stakeholders; Technology; Fiscal Affairs; University Operations; and Strategic Planning Communications. The Steering Committee is chaired by the Provost. The composition of the steering committee and the six subcommittees is profiled in Appendix D. Each of the six subcommittees will perform the following functions: develop an overview of key areas of focus, opportunities, best practices and performance measures; collect existing relevant data; determine where the gaps are in the data; collect additional data to complete the picture; coordinate with other committees and provide on-going updates and final reports to the Steering Committee. Phase I was completed in January 2002.

For Phase II a new set of committees will be formed. They will use the data from Phase I committees to craft the actual strategic plan. Once Phase II has produced a strategic plan, the implementation will begin. It is anticipated that implementation will influence the annual budget development process, as well as the creation and execution of a new campus master plan. Many campuses report annually on progress
in fulfilling the strategic plan. No matter what occurs in the implementation phase, there is a firm resolve that this plan will become a vital, dynamic part of the University's future development.

An essential component of UT's strategic planning process is an honest appraisal of internal strengths and weaknesses and external opportunities and threats (increasingly referred to internally as a SWOT analysis). Strategic planning must be founded on a careful and candid analysis of strengths and weaknesses at the departmental or programmatic level, the college level and the University level. The University of Toledo "Functional Mission Statement" of December 8, 1993, spoke forcefully of University strengths in instruction, research and service. Instructional strengths, according to the statement, include instructional support for innovative programs, such as the Center for Teaching Excellence, internal program review, the Writing Center, the Center for Visual Arts, TOLEDO EXCEL, PREP/TECH and the Office of Accessibility. Research strengths include a number of centers and institutes and Service strengths include a number of centers and clinics. However, the Functional Mission Statement of 1993 said nothing about weaknesses, although it did analyze opportunities and threats. It saw opportunity in two major areas: cooperation in research and development efforts with local business and industry and cooperation with the Medical College of Ohio and Bowling Green State University. It saw threats in economic instability in the region and state and a declining population of direct from high school students.

**Institutional Data and Strategic Planning:** The new strategic planning process had access to data compiled by the Office of Institutional Research. For decades that office has produced institutional data books containing a wealth of information on headcount enrollment, FTE enrollment, student fees and income, faculty, faculty/staff positions and fiscal issues, the most recent of which covers the period from 1999-2000. Copies of those documents are filed in the Resource Room. Unfortunately, data on many important functions at UT are kept in a number of disparate databases and frequently reports based on these functions differ depending on the area in which they are being created. As a result, University personnel often lack reliable and readily accessible sources of data on even such "simple" information as student enrollment, retention and graduation rates. While valuable in day-to-day operations, the University’s "data warehouse" is not suited as a source of strategic data. Examination of University data over time (e.g. trends) is difficult and sometimes impossible due to the daily updating of the data in this resource. Occasionally when data are available they have not been appropriately analyzed. For example, the Office of Institutional Research provides raw or summarized data with little or no analysis of its contents. Finally, for a period of time in 1999-2000, University data were not broadly distributed within the University community.

Within the last year, the University has taken substantial steps to rectify this situation. Decision-makers at the highest level have begun an emphasis on "knowledge-based" decision-making processes. The University is devoting resources to the creation of an
"Institutional Analysis" database that will make time-series, strategic data readily available to University analysts. The Office of Institutional Research has hired a new director and an additional analyst. The Office as a whole is being re-oriented toward a more analytical work product. A renewed emphasis on information openness and availability is already having some effect.

Planning for Specific Institutional Functions

In addition to developing strategies for achieving long term institutional goals, UT uses planning processes to accomplish specific functions over the short term. The section that follows describes some of those processes.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Planning:** Planning for the General Education Program began with the development of a General Education Mission Statement by the Academic Regulations Committee of the Faculty Senate in 1986. Subsequently, the Academic Program Advisory Committee (APAC) formed a General Education Committee comprised of 28 faculty members whose charge was to define eight skills and modes of thinking as goals to be accomplished by general education and to recommend courses that might meet these goals. (See [http://www.utoledo.edu/campus-info/admissions/00-01catalog/general/gen-core.html](http://www.utoledo.edu/campus-info/admissions/00-01catalog/general/gen-core.html))

The initial draft of the Core Curriculum was integrated in a course proposal that was subsequently reviewed, revised and approved by the Faculty Senate. This process of review and revision exemplifies the emphasis on collaboration that has since characterized the development of the core. This spirited process also led to the addition of a multicultural component to the Core Curriculum. Further additions included articulated guidelines for the development of future courses to be included in the Core and the requirement of a minimum grade of a "C" average overall. In 1995, this Committee began planning the conversion of the core curriculum to a semester format. The Faculty Senate Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum continues to oversee the review and approval of course proposals for inclusion into the core curriculum. Further review of the core by faculty occurred in 2001 and recommendations have been adapted to develop a University-wide skill requirement for the core and to empower a committee with dedicated responsibilities for oversight and maintenance of the core.

**Enrollment Planning:** Because the Ohio Board of Regents has employed the enrollment-driven subsidy model in funding its state-assisted institutions and because population-normalized state subsidy for higher education in Ohio ranks among the lowest in the nation, the University must try to maximize enrollments at all levels. The effort is to achieve a size consistent with the physical size of the University; that is, to utilize all available space. Overhead costs are thus reduced somewhat on a per student basis as enrollment approaches that physical limit. Thus some benefits are
achieved as an economy of scale. In addition, tuition and student fees have become increasingly important as costs to run the institution increase at a greater pace than does the state subsidy. Enrollment planning at UT involves projecting enrollments and maximizing enrollments through recruitment and retention planning.

**Enrollment Projecting** at UT is carried out on an annual basis. With few exceptions these projections have been very accurate, usually falling within a 95% level of confidence. A University Demographics Committee, chaired by the Director of Institutional Research, is responsible for making enrollment projections. This committee uses a multiple regression-based enrollment projection model that considers several key factors including term enrollments by college and rank, employment/economic statistics, public high school 12th grade counts, international students, degrees earned, age categories for student populations and retention and progression rates. Additional information acquired from deans, enrollment services staff and graduate school staff as well as other professional sources is factored into the forecasts. These projections are used for preliminary budgetary planning purposes and to guide enrollment maximization efforts. A listing of enrollment, marketing and recruitment planning documents that have been produced over the years can be found in a document entitled "Enrollment Services Information Inventory, December 2000." It is filed in the Resource Room.

**Retention planning** is also a key component of enrollment planning. The University has studied retention carefully over the years. Various retention councils and taskforces were formed to produce retention plans and recommendations. The professional consultants from Noel-Levitz were brought to campus in the spring of 2001 to assist with the development of a retention plan. The listing of retention planning documents developed since 1990 can be found in a document entitled "The University of Toledo History of Retention Documents, 1990-2001." It is filed in the Resource Room.

**Facilities Planning:** Campus facilities planning has been a priority at The University of Toledo since it became a state university in 1967. UT's first campus master plan was completed in 1968. This plan provided a strong foundation and has been revised and updated prior to each biennial submission. The most current Campus Master Plan was completed in 1992 (See Resource Room). The 1992 plan was significantly but not completely implemented. A new Campus Master Plan will be crafted through the University's strategic planning process described earlier in this section.

All planning in the area of facilities must follow changes legislated in 1995 that shifted responsibility and control for facilities development from state agencies to the universities. The Board of Regents now appropriates funds to state higher education institutions based on a formula factoring FTEs, square footage and age of facilities. The University can expect to receive approximately $23 million each biennium in capital funding for capital improvement and basic renovation projects. The University now may locally administer its projects with budgets up to $4 million and with the
approval of the Office of the State Architect for projects over that amount. Local administration delivers capital projects that more closely meet the needs of the campus community.

The Division of Finance and Administration’s Office of Facilities Management is responsible for the planning, design, construction, maintenance and operation of campus facilities. Facilities Management includes the departments of Capital Projects and Campus Planning, Plant Operations and Environmental Health and Safety.

**Capital Projects and Campus Planning** groups are responsible for managing the University's facility planning, design and construction. The office facilitates the work of the Facilities Planning Council and provides facilities planning and construction management of all projects from design through construction completion. Construction projects are administered through a team approach and include all constituencies necessary to accomplish the projects to meet the users' needs. Program committees and building design committees are formed with this team approach in mind. Capital Projects' goal is to fulfill the users' needs and complete the projects within the established budget, schedule and quality parameters specified in The University of Toledo Construction Design Standards Manual. Additional responsibilities of Capital Projects and Campus Planning include assistance with real estate purchases, long-range planning and program development for capital projects, classroom furnishing, moving services and building security systems. The Facilities Planning Council (FPC), re-established in 2000, in conjunction with Capital Projects and Campus Planning, is responsible for developing the six-year biennium capital plans submitted to the University Board of Trustees and then to the Ohio Board of Regents to request state funding. The FPC’s charge was recently broadened to include recommendation of space allocation and master planning. Two subcommittees of the FPC were created to assess the special needs of classrooms and the campus environment.

**The Plant Operations Department** shares in campus planning and institutional use of the $3.5 million in basic renovation funds provided to UT by the state every two years for maintenance of the campus infrastructure and replacement of outdated systems. One of the most significant developments in campus infrastructure upgrading was the completion of the Chilled Water Plant project in 2001, yielding a first-year savings in utility costs of $150,000.

**The Environmental Health and Safety Unit (EHS)** has established a wide variety of programs and procedures designed to help ensure the safety and security of the entire campus community. Some examples of programs include Ohio Occupational Safety & Health Act compliance, asbestos management, ergonomics, laboratory safety and fire and life safety. More programs and procedures may be reviewed on the EHS web site. The Campus Safety Division of the National Safety Council selected the University’s EHS web site as one of the top five EHS web sites in the nation in both 1999 and 2000.
The Maintenance and Recycling Department is dedicated to energy saving planning measures. The University has taken advantage of Ohio law that allows state agencies to fund energy conservation measures through financing and paying the debt service through the savings realized over a ten-year period. The University realized an annual savings of $675,000 by taking advantage of this provision over the past five years. The savings pays for the cost of the retrofit of current lighting, heating and air conditioning units. In the long-term, savings will offset increases in utility costs. Recently approved projects anticipate approximately $350,000 savings in the first year alone. The University also initiated a recycling program about eight years ago. UT strives to increase the recycle-to-refuse ratio by bringing awareness of the importance of recycling to the campus community.

Planning for Emergencies: The University Emergency Preparedness Plan (EPP) was developed in 1998 to provide notification and emergency response procedures in the event of an emergency on campus. The Emergency Action team, comprised of representatives from key University departments and local emergency management agencies, is responsible for implementing procedures and coordinating resources. The Rapid Emergency Action Checklist (REACT) was distributed to the campus community to provide a quick reference guide for emergency response procedures.

Planning for Diversity: The Office of Affirmative Action (OAA) has helped the University meet many of the 1992 NCA recommended goals. These outcomes were accomplished by applying regulations from the Office of Federal Contract Compliance to strategic planning on an annual basis through a process that includes the President, deans and the Director of Affirmative Action. OAA performs analyses of demographics and policies to insure that diversity goals are met. Institutional and community needs are regularly reviewed by OAA to assure that UT’s policies are appropriate. The OAA focuses on accurate reporting of data concerning minorities and women at UT. It provides leadership in the establishment of affirmative action hiring goals as well as the development of positive employee attitudes about Affirmative Action.

The successes of the OAA have been based largely on the effectiveness of its training programs. These have included programs aimed at increasing sensitivity toward the need for institutional diversity in areas where there is significant under-representation of minorities and women. Specifically, the Communication Workers of America (CWA) are consulted in ways to encourage women applicants into the skilled crafts, natural sciences and engineering programs; search committees receive encouragement to identify female and minority candidates; University personnel in general are encouraged to participate in and support community organizations that directly or indirectly assist the University’s efforts to implement its Affirmative Action program. These include such organizations as the YMCA, Legal Aid Society and the United Way. In addition, each search committee that is appointed at the University receives training in appropriate hiring practices and diversity sensitivity
from the Director of Affirmative Action. The strategic planning process involving diversity is developed annually with the review of Affirmative Action goals and the input of each college’s strategic planning. This review and planning initiative is headed by the President, the Dean of each College and the Director of Affirmative Action.

It is important to point out that many of the strategic plans of individual colleges contain affirmative action initiatives and goals such as the use of scholarships and graduate assistantships to increase minority enrollments in the upper division and graduate school; action plans to work closely with at-risk students to increase retention; projects involving diverse populations surrounding our University community, such as the Toledo Public Schools and sports programs for inner city youths; distance learning offerings for adult learners and part-time students; and programs to assist under-prepared students.

**KEY STRENGTHS OF THE CRITERION**

1. The University of Toledo is fiscally sound despite state budgetary shortfalls that reduced the flow of revenue into the institution, a 9-year period of lowered student enrollment and the early retirement of over 100 faculty. The University has never failed to pay punctually and in full all amounts due for principal and interest on any indebtedness. Finances are stable, the endowment is strong and the University’s investment portfolio continues to grow.

2. During the past decade the planning for specific institutional functions at UT has been good. However, a major outcome of this self-study is the recognition that dis-continuities existed in the implementation and monitoring of UT's strategic plan during the past decade and that the recently revitalized planning process must contain safeguards to prevent that problem from occurring in the future.

3. During most of the past decade, the budget process as well as facilities planning at UT has used input from faculty, administrators, staff and students.

4. UT has implemented a number of effective continuing assessment activities including program review, student satisfaction surveys, surveys of student engagement as well as the more formally structured assessment activities of the professional colleges that have been evaluated in the context of their continuing accreditation. Outcomes from the implementation of student surveys and advice from professional consultants have driven program improvement.
MAJOR CHALLENGES OF THE CRITERION:

1. The single greatest challenge facing The University of Toledo is managing its human, fiscal and physical resources in a manner that allows the institution to achieve its mission in a continually changing state economy.

In this environment, there can be no assurances that State appropriated funds for operating or capital improvement purposes will be made available in the amounts required by the University. For example, State income and budget constraints may from time to time (as in the current biennium) lead to a reduction of the level of State assistance and support for higher education in general and the University in particular. In addition, budgeted appropriations may be reduced by the governor with the approval of the legislature, as in FY 1992 and 1993 and 2001 and 2002. A further challenge to all state universities is Ohio’s system of elementary and secondary school funding. Specifically, in early 1998 the Ohio Legislature increased the 1999 appropriation level for elementary and secondary education, partly at the expense of other institutions, including higher education. Finally, beginning with the 1997-98 capital appropriations biennium, the State also implemented a new system for funding capital projects that gives greater discretion, accountability and administration to the individual universities. However, institutional capital funding allocations are now to be based largely on student FTE’s rather than on the Ohio Board of Regents’ selection of projects submitted by each university. Universities may of course request projects outside their funding allocation. However, the differences in the cost of debt service incurred by the State to fund the appropriations between the allocated and ultimately approved funding will then be either carried forward for use in future capital cycles or deducted from the institution’s operating subsidy allocation.

An additional fiscal challenge to the University stems from the manner in which doctoral programs at state-supported universities are funded. Specifically, it has eliminated the caps that were formerly imposed on the number of subsidy-eligible FTE enrollments in doctoral programs and law schools. This new model sets aside a specific percentage of the instructional subsidy for doctoral programs (10.94% in Fiscal Year 2000) and distributes that amount to state universities in proportion to each university’s share of Carnegie Doctoral Research Extensive equivalent FTEs. This process disadvantages institutions such as UT with small doctoral programs.

Germene to this issue is the fact that the percentage of the state share
of instruction set aside for doctoral programs reflects a 1996 review of state-assisted doctoral and law programs by the Board of Regents that identified programs that were unnecessarily duplicative or of insufficient quality to merit continued State subsidy. The review also recommended that Ohio increase its investment in some doctoral fields, such as computer science. The University currently does not expect to terminate any doctoral programs in response to this review, but as part of its ongoing management plan, it will continue to review those programs periodically.

2. During the past decade institutional expenditures have increased at a faster rate than state subsidy. In effect, this has made tuition and student fees increasingly important components in the University's budget. A major challenge to UT during the upcoming decade will be to deliver quality services without decreasing student access because of increased fees.

3. UT's planning efforts during the past decade have been hampered by difficulties in obtaining reliable data from disparate databases in various areas, as well as by the lack of a centralized mechanism for data analysis and interpretation and poor record keeping practices in general.

4. In 1999 UT closed the Community and Technical College and moved the two-year associate's degree programs to appropriate colleges on the main campus. That move created in the community the perception that those programs were being abolished and, as a result, enrollments have suffered. Overcoming that perception is a challenge that must be addressed by the University.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The strategic planning initiatives being developed to guide UT through the next decade must include strategies for continuously monitoring the University's progress in accomplishing its mission, adjusting its strategic plan in response to intra- and extra-institutional challenges and assessment of student learning as well as all other institution functions. Planning must also consider the view that state funding will continue to decline relative to institutional expenses with the aim of enhancing the financial, physical and human resource base of the institution. Specifically, this will require UT to:

1. selectively replace lost positions in critical areas through the reallocation of resources,

2. enhance recruiting efforts needed to elevate enrollment to levels necessary to maintain or reduce student fees and tuition,

3. build non-tuition and subsidy income for the University,
4. increase the efficiency of spending at all levels,

5. continue cyclic program review, keyed to realistic recommendations for resource allocation,

6. initiate systematic record keeping practices in all offices across campus,

7. build a strategic plan for physical facilities and

8. improve the University's data collection and analysis processes by linking it to key institutional questions.