

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
FACULTY SENATE
Minutes of the Senate Meeting of March 11, 2008
<http://www.facsenate.utoledo.edu>

Approved @FS mtg. 4/8/08

HIGHLIGHTS

TECHS Presentation
Chair of Faculty Affairs
Senior Vice President for Finance & Administration
Chair of Academic Programs
Chair of Undergraduate Curriculum

Note: The remarks of the Senators and others are summarized and not verbatim. The taped recording of this meeting is available in the Faculty Senate office or in the University Archives.

Chair Wilson called the meeting to order. **Alice Skeens, Executive Secretary** called the roll.

I. Roll Call –2007-2008 Senators:

Present: Ames, Barlowe, Barden, Barnes, Beatty-Medina (for Jakobson), Cluse-Tolar, Fink, Floyd, Evans (for Olson), Funk, Hamer, Horan, Hottell, Hudson, Johanson, Kennedy, Kistner, Lambert, LeBlanc, Lundquist, McInerney, Monsos, Morrissey, Peseckis, Piazza, Piotrowski, Relue, Skeens, Spongberg, Stierman, Tierney (for Klein), Teclehaimanot, Thompson-Casado, Wikander, Wolff,

Excused absence: Edwards (for Baines), Greninger, Hefzy, Lipscomb, Martin, Moorhead, Ventura,

Unexcused absence: Arris, Chen, Fournier, Fritz (for Humphrys), Le (for Zallocco), Schall, Sundar (for Pope), Wedding

II. Approval of Minutes:

Minutes of 2/19/08 were approved as distributed.

III. Executive Committee Report:

Chair Floyd: First, a few announcements. The Office of Service Learning and Community Engagement asked me to inform you that the deadline for service learning grant applications that was to be November 2007 has now been extended to March 28, 2008. Also, an email came out today regarding the Outstanding Research Awards, and you are encouraged to either nominate a colleague or submit your own materials for consideration. The deadline for this is March 31, 2008, and applications are to be submitted to the Research and Sponsored Programs Office in U. Hall.

There are some changes to today's agenda. An item that was tabled at the last Senate meeting will be discussed today, which is not listed on today's agenda. Holly Monsos will do an update on the Academic Programs based on comments made at the last Senate meeting. Around 4:00 p.m. Sr. V.P. for Finance and Administration, Scott Scarborough, will talk about the budget planning process. At the next Senate meeting, we will have Rosemary Haggett talking about the recent gender equity study. Also a report that the Women's Leadership Council prepared will be distributed with the agenda. President Jacobs will also be coming back on March 25 to answer questions that the Executive Committee has prepared. The questions cover strategic areas and

issues relating to the budget planning process. If any of you have specific questions you would like us to pose to the president, please send them to me prior to the next Senate meeting on March 25.

At yesterday's Board of Trustees meeting, the Board unanimously approved the new Constitution for a merged Faculty Senate. The process of writing the rules and appendices took some time because both Faculty Senates worked on it together and finding time to meet was difficult. It is disappointing that eight Senators chose not to vote at all on the rules and appendices, and this inaction does not serve your colleagues well. Those who voted "no" against the rules and appendices may have thought that a "no" vote would stop the merger process. But that decision to merge the two Senates was already agreed by an overwhelming vote of the faculty last May. What we were voting on instead was the manner in which the Senate would operate. If the rules and appendices were not approved, I am sure the Board of Trustees would have proceeded to tell us how the new Senates would operate. With the approval by the senates, the faculty have some control of their destiny. It is also important to remember that there was no possibility of retaining the old main campus Senate because two of our colleges were no longer a part of this body and we would have been a minority voice.

With the approval of the rules and appendices, the last thing that is left to do is the election of an entirely new senate. That process has already begun. All the ballots are prepared and in the Print Shop and will be distributed by the end of the week. There will be no continuing members of the Senate unless you are elected for a new term. The terms of the senators will be staggered from three years to one year, which will be determined by the number of votes received. The officers will be selected from that new senate. Anyone having any questions on the process can check the Constitution approved last May. Part of that constitution is a transitional section, and this section outlines the process by which the officers are elected. Since we will have a new Senate, I suggest that we forgo the last meeting scheduled for April 22 and instead have that meeting be the first meeting of the new Senate, for the purposes of electing new officers. In the past we had the old senate here as well as the newly elected members and the continuing members. The continuing members would vote on the election of officers. Since we don't have anything on the agenda for the April 22 meeting, I suggest that we devote that meeting to the new senate. Any objections to that? If there are no objections I will propose that to the HSC executive committee since we need their approval.

Senator Peseckis: What about approval of programs and courses?

Chair Floyd: We will bring this to the new senate.

Senator Barden: Are we planning on changing the date of the meetings from Tuesdays?

Chair Floyd: That is yet to be determined. That's one of the things that will be on the agenda for the April 22 meeting. The meeting time for the new Senate will be the 4-6 p.m. time period.

Senator Thompson-Casado: My understanding was that we are staying on Tuesday from 4-6.

Chair Floyd: Yes, it's Tuesday but 4-6 and not 3-5. Where, it is yet to be determined. I think that for this first meeting it might be a good idea to hold it at Scott Park Campus in the auditorium just because it is convenient to both campuses and it is neutral territory. I would like to personally thank the members of our executive committee who labored so long and hard to make this merger a reality. And those people include Carter Wilson, Walt Olson, Jamie Barlowe, Sharron Barnes, Alice Skeens, Nick Piazza and Harvey Wolff, all of whom gave many, many hours to make this happen, along with Bernie Bopp and Andy Jorgensen who were on last year's executive committee when this process actually began. A special thanks again to John Barrett from the College of Law, who assisted with the constitution and rules and appendices and helped us work out our compromises which at times seemed impossible to achieve. I'm going to see if I can get John to come to one of our last two senate meetings to receive appropriate thanks.

The executive committee is not naïve to believe that the first year of the new senate is going to be an easy one; it will certainly be a very difficult one. The executive committees have found during their past year of work that we have very different cultures and working to bring these cultures together will take far longer than it took to actually merge the senates. There will be disagreements and I'm sure there will be heated debates; as there have been among the executive committees during the time we have been working on these documents. I hope that we can eventually move beyond the outlook of "us" and "them" and instead move to a senate that speaks for all faculty of our university. I believe we will not have a weaker senate as a merged body, but rather a stronger one created by the diversity of voices. In many conversations that I've had with members of the Health Science Campus Senate over the past year, I believe that they are eager to participate in the kind of senate that we have on the main campus. I really believe that they are excited about the possibilities of having a voice that they have felt they have not always had. But I have to say, as someone whose job it is to preserve the institutions history, this is also kind of a sad day as it will be the end of this organization that has played a huge role in the shaping of our university. The Faculty Senate on this campus was founded back in 1966 on the eve of another merger, the merger of the university into the same state system of higher education. The senate has, I believe, served the faculty and institution well in its last 42 years, but I think that the new senate will serve the new university equally well, if not better.

One administrative matter that I need to inform you about as a result of the merger is that of the UCAP and USC elections. The UCAP elections are going to be carried out as they always have been among the colleges, and those ballots are being distributed in the very near future. The electorate for the UCAP and USC remains the same, it is only those faculty and colleges outlined in the AAUP contract who are eligible to serve on UCAP and UCS. It does not include colleges of the former MUO. However, the process for UCAP and UCS elections is actually different. This is not something the Senate did, but this is something the AAUP contract did. The UCAP elections occur within the colleges, so that is going to go forward. For the UCS elections, however, the nominating process happens within the college and the actual election of the UCS happens within the senate, so I'm suggesting that we hold off on that senate election until we have the new senators elected, if that is okay with you. Do you see any problems in just waiting until the new senate is elected to have the USC election? I don't think that any business of the sabbatical committee occurs over the summer. Again, the electors for the UCS will only be those senators who are from the colleges that are specified in the AAUP contract as being a part of the USC, which includes all the bargaining unit members, as well as the College of Law and some members from the HSHS from the old Main Campus. It gets a little confusing and let me tell you trying to get all these ballots straightened out has been a nightmare, but hopefully we've done so correctly. Does anybody have any questions about anything that is occurring or will be occurring in the future?

The first item on the agenda then is the presentation on the TECHS program.

Prof. Lettman: Good afternoon everybody, thank you for having us here this afternoon. My name is Dennis Lettman and in addition to being Interim Dean of University College I am also the university's liaison or coordinator for the Toledo Early College High School (TECHS). I wanted you to actually have some interaction with some folks from the high school. I brought the principal, a teacher and three students. The three students are a little bit nervous, so please go easy on them. I was going to show a short video but don't want to spend the time doing that right now. If any of you are interested in learning more about early colleges in general you can go to www.earlycollege.org to see this video and a lot of information about early colleges and the movement nation wide. Suffice it to say for this year there are 250 early colleges throughout the country working to improve the life for over 100,000 young people to give them an opportunity to complete a high school degree, and go to college and earn college credit. We are nearing completion of the third year for Toledo Early College High School which began in the academic year 2006 where we started with a group of freshman and in each subsequent year added a grade

level. We have freshman to junior this year, next year we will have a senior class which will complete the cycle of freshman to senior. This May we will have our first graduate from TECHS, one student will be graduating early from High school and will pursue a degree at The University of Toledo. Since this is the end of the third year, it gives us an opportunity to step back and reflect in terms of the model and approach that we are using, looking at the curriculum, the space and a number of other issues and we have made a commitment that The University will work with the Toledo Public Schools to put together a strategic plan for the future of the Toledo Early College High School which is going to involve a number of different areas as I mentioned before, the curriculum, planning, space, etc. The students are progressing very well for the most part. Every student has taken at least one college class, most students have taken several college classes at this point. Some of the faculty here may have had them in your classes. We don't make a point of announcing to faculty that those students are TECHS students. Our faculty have done a wonderful job in supporting these students in your classes and supporting the program outside the class. We have a governance board that is comprised of members of The University of Toledo, such as Vice Provost Carol Bresnahan, Prof. Andy Jorgensen, Prof. Harvey Wolff, and other individuals from the Toledo Public Schools as well. I would now like to introduce the principal of the Toledo Early College High School, Dr. Robin Wheatley and she will introduce the students and one of the teachers and they each will have a few words to say.

Dr. Robin Wheatley: Good afternoon everyone. Before I begin, I would like to introduce Mrs. Al-Hayani, a Social Studies Teacher and the three students. One of my primary roles is to build relationships that will help our school to grow and to sustain. One of those relationships is to strengthen the relationship that we have at the university and one of the ways that we have done that is to have open houses with each department specifically for our students working with the engineering department, with the pharmacy department, business and education. We have yet to schedule arts and sciences, we've done some things with Admissions and Financial Aid. We want to get with all those major areas so that they are familiar with our school and our students. We also want to promote the school to your students; if you have students that are high school age, to let you know that the school is open to your students coming to our school. It is not just the Toledo Public School; it is restricted to students in the state of Ohio. So if you live in Michigan you would have to pay for the student to come to our school, otherwise, the school is open to all students. Another thing we tried to do is to meet with department chairs so that they can have an idea who we are and we can have an idea who they are, and what some of our expectations are about our students. We actually want our students to be treated the same as all the other students and we have a very strenuous curriculum; it's a college prep curriculum and we want that to lead into the college curriculum here so that our students can be successful. We're trying to build more bridges here to make sure that our students are academically ready to be successful, not only here but after they graduate from college. We do want to start to look at some of the syllabi in advance to make sure that our students are on track and following through. Some of these students are only fourteen years old and whereas they may pass your tests, your composition and your math test, they do not always have the maturity level to go into those classes at that particular time, so we do work with them to tailor a schedule specifically for them. We work with our business partner and with different community groups as well. We are about building relationships with each other, with the community and within the college community. I'm going to let Mrs. Al-Hayani now talk to you about how our teachers work with each other, how they are selected and how they work with parents.

Mrs. Al-Hayani: Good afternoon. We are Toledo Public School but the union has worked with us and we do not get teachers based on seniority. Teachers have to go through a rigorous process to be selected for our school and a master's degree is preferred. Most of our teachers have a master's degree or are pursuing it and that helps a lot because we get high quality teachers who understand

that their duties go above and beyond the regular school day. Our parent-student teacher relationship is a partnership; without that partnership we would not be able to be successful. We are not traditional in any way. Our contacts with parents are on a weekly basis. We e-mail grade reports just like here at the university. Each parent has our e-mail, we get numerous phone calls; and without the partnership we would not have the support to allow this to work. Our students are also required to do rocket stages, which are things that will help promote social understanding, specific competence, and we try to bridge our students with the community and that is a goal of early college high school. Our selection process of students is also really rigorous. We take kids from all over the district. We try to make sure that they have A's B's and C's. We look at their discipline and their attendance. They have to take a writing test and a math test to get in so that is also a good screening process. Again, TECHS is a really unique school in the sense that we try to get these kids ready for university courses. Our curriculum is extremely demanding. If you don't earn a 75%, you do not pass at our school. Thank you, and Shantel Perkins, one of our juniors will talk to you about her experiences.

Shantel Perkins: I'm a junior at Toledo Early College and I tutor one other student on my own time, I do eight hours of an internship and I play sports year round, and take 15 hrs. at the college, and the biggest thing I've learned from this school is time management. I still have time to go out on the weekends and do things that normal kids do but still make the grades I'm supposed to and that is the biggest thing that I have learned from this school is time management.

Dr. Wheatley: Shantel is a really good student. She has over a 3.0 GPA and she does play sports year round, including basketball and volleyball. She's not sure what she wants to do, something in the medical field, and right now her internship is at The Toledo Hospital. She sometimes says that she wants to be a pediatric nurse, and other times she wants to be a doctor, but definitely want something in the medical field. Our next person is Christina Casano, she is a sophomore and she is valedictorian of her class.

Christina Casano: As Dr. Wheatley said, I am a sophomore and I have found that this year is probably one of the most difficult, because it is no longer transitioning from all high school classes to some college classes, now it's all high school and all college. A lot of that is difficult because we have a lot of projects that we do for our high school classes and along with college classes, it is a lot of papers and exams. A lot of it is just time management and how well you can figure out how much work you need to do at one time. This semester I have 6 college credit hours and cumulatively by the end of this semester I will have 21.

Alan Bower: My name is Alan Bower and as Dr. Wheatley said there are not a lot of boys at our school. It's really not that noticeable until it is brought up. Everybody gets along at the school so well that it doesn't really make a difference. When I found out I was coming to TECHS my expectations were that I was going to be learning from some of the best teachers at TPS and that I was going to be getting college credits that would put me ahead in life. As of right now TECHS has met my expectations very well. Right now I am taking 8 credit hours and by the end of the semester I will have 21 credit hours.

Dr. Wheatley: Do you have any questions for our students?

Senator Johanson: I noticed that there are no foreign language classes and are they done at the university level?

Dr. Wheatley: They are, we offer 2 years of English, up to 3 years of Science, up to 3 years of Math, 2 years of Social Studies, and everything else will be taken at the university level. Probably the most difficult is foreign language. Christina has taken a foreign language that she has done very well in, and Shantel has also taken a foreign language that she does very well in. Allen does not take a foreign language.

Senator Hamer: When this school started wasn't it for students whose parents had not been to college?

Dr. Wheatley: We still have the same criteria and that is, English as a second language, qualifying for free and/or reduced lunch, an ethnic minority, or you are a first generation college student. So your parents can have some college, but not be a college graduate. You could still be eligible for our school if your parent is a college graduate and you are an English language learner.

Senator Peseckis: How many students do you have and what is the size of your classes?

Dr. Wheatley: Right now we have 174 students and our class sizes are pretty small; an average of between 18 to 20.

Senator Horan: How many students are in each of the grade levels?

Dr. Wheatley: We have about 45 juniors, about 75 freshmen, and the rest would make up the sophomores, I think it is about 75.

Senator McInerney: Students can elect to complete college courses, which would then replace high school requirements, is that true?

Dr. Wheatley: Part of their high school requirements have to be met on a college level. For example in the social studies area, if the student in our school takes World Studies and American Studies, and then through university the student takes Government and the social studies elective to meet the high school requirement credits are dual credits.

Senator McInerney: You don't have to meet all the high school requirements at the high school level to do some college credit for high school credit.

Dr. Wheatley: Right, that's the only way they can graduate.

Dean Lettman: The decision as to when the student will take college classes, which classes, how many classes and so forth, there's a team approach. Ultimately the principal, the teachers, the high school teachers and the student themselves decide when the student is ready to take college classes and how many, they have to adhere to all the universities requirements and prerequisites; they have to take placement tests for English, math, science and then foreign language classes. They do have to follow universities etiquette and policies in regard to that. Every effort is attempted; there is a balance between trying to meet the goals of the program to get the students graduated from high school and earning, what they can, a maximum of 60 credits in college but also not setting them up for failure. There is a balance there which, in my mind, is the most critical part of the whole program to make sure that the students are ready and prepared to go out and take college classes and succeed.

Senator Barden: I noticed that the tuition is free for the students for these college credits, is this from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation that pays the tuition, or is it through the public school system?

Dr. Wheatley: Initially, it was through the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, but now it is through the State budget. We will allow students to earn up to 60 credits, and 21 at the end of your sophomore year. That is a considerable number because now we are talking about two students who will only need 39 credits over the course of two years. They are either going to graduate early or really slow down and pace themselves so that they don't have to do that. The only way that they will be able to do that is to take on a full time internship as well. Our students are expected to be full time college students their junior year and the senior year.

Senator Peseckis: Are all their classes on this campus?

Dr. Wheatley: They come to this campus, they go to the art museum and some of the courses are in fact on the Scott Park Campus. The students are having wonderful experiences. They had a really interesting experience in an art class when the model turned out to be nude, we didn't get any complaints from our parents, they fully understand that this is a college setting. The professor kind of figured out that some of these kids were a little young so she pulled them aside and said, "Do you want an alternate assignment?" They said, "no". I was just grateful that the model was a female.

Prof. Jorgensen: If I could speak in support of the program, I have been on the advisory board since it started as a faculty senate representative. These are wonderful teachers there, great connections with the teachers, the students and the parents. I went to the honors ceremony previously where it is just a great time for everybody at the end of the year. I have one of the students in my class right now, she sits in the front row of my General Chemistry II class; she is there every single day. For example, they don't have a chemistry teacher at TECHS, so all the chemistry is taken here at UT and they can only take Elementary Chemistry at UT if they have passed the placement test; the same placement test that everyone in Engineering and Pharmacy must take. If they pass Elementary Chemistry they can take General Chemistry, so I was very concerned in making sure they were prepared. It is the same for English, it is the same for Math and it is just a great combination. I view the Gates' money as a financial incentive to Toledo Public Schools saying we'll give you a couple hundred thousand dollars. You can't run a high school on that, but it is enough to get Toledo Public Schools to commit and the State legislature to commit for the rest of it. I think it has been a great partnership.

Dr. Wheatley: I think one of the areas that we have the most success with in terms of our teachers and professors is the science department, and Mr. Bollin is very actively involved with Dr. Jorgensen, and we are hoping to build those kind of relationships with different professors in departments and all our teachers.

Senator Beatty-Medina: I was wondering about some of mentoring programs.

Dr. Wheatley: That's one of the things we have been talking about with Dr. Lettman, working more with some of your grad level students to work with our students and so far it hasn't happened. What has happened is for our junior level students to really work well with our freshman and if they have a difficult time adjusting in class that we will get permission from the professor for an upper classman like Shantel and she may come to class from time to time, but there hasn't been anybody there for her grade level, and that is a void. Some of our students are a bit intimidated, when they get to the junior level we try to tell them not to rely on our teachers for tutoring but to rely on resources through the university, because next year we want them to rely even more. They are full time college students and we want them be able to have resources.

Senator Barnes: Are there any plans for more physical space and will you be staying at Scott Park?

Dr. Lettman: We don't have any definite plans for physical space other than a fact that we need more of it. We will be working on the Strategic Plan for the future for sustainability of early college high school and space and location will be a main component of that.

Senator McInerney: How many early college high schools are there in Ohio?

Dr. Lettman: In Ohio there are seven early college high schools and there are more coming in the future. This is the way of the future in education in looking at early enrollment, early admission. There are the Gates Foundation, the Ford Foundation, the Carnegie Foundation all other major foundations behind this kind of movement, as well as our own State legislatures. I think we are in a good position to move ahead and build on what we have right now.

Dr. Wheatley: If our school is working 100% efficiently and if we can get them to 60 college credits which will be the equivalent of two years towards a four year degree, that gets them over the point of not dropping out of college and gets them used to working with University resources. That's our ultimate goal.

Senator Barden: Dean Lettman and I have been working together with the Honors Program and we will be watching those ACT scores carefully as they come in, so this is the place we really want to be.

Dean Lettman: This week the sophomores are taking the OGT, and they will be doing this all week. Last year our Toledo Early College High School received an academic excellence rating from the State of Ohio, one of two in the Toledo Public School system to have received that rating. That's quite a remarkable achievement.

Chair Floyd: Thank you. We apologize that at the last Senate meeting there was a malfunction with the recording system and now the Senate Secretary has set up a back-up system to avoid similar problems in the future. Next on the agenda is the Faculty Affairs Committee Chair with an update.

Senator Cluse-Tolar: We added the addition of the comment from the minutes of 2/19/08 about the College of Law not having any departments, so if the department chair is teaching the class or in the case of colleges without departments then those textbooks would be approved by the college dean. Any other questions on this?

Chair Floyd: Are you presenting this in a form of a motion?

Senator Cluse-Tolar: Yes.

Chair Floyd: As a standing committee, the motion does not need a second. Any discussion on the subject?

Senator Evans: Do you need a letter from the department chair to get the okay?

Senator Cluse-Tolar: We are leaving it up to the department chairs. For each faculty member it would be in their best interest to have something in writing.

Vice Provost Bresnahan: I don't understand the first sentence in #2, it doesn't make any sense as it is written. It may be a grammar issue. "Textbook decisions made individually by a faculty member requiring students purchase textbooks authored by the faculty member, may be used." So we have "...textbook decisions.....may be used..." I think the intent is to say that the faculty member may individually require students to purchase a textbook that he or she wrote. If that's true than the royalties may not be donated. Is that correct?

Senator Cluse-Tolar: Yes.

Vice Provost Bresnahan: If this is going to be a University policy it needs to be changed.

Senator Hottell: I noticed that too and I was going to make a friendly amendment to read, "requiring that students purchase," or, "requiring students to purchase," or omit the words, "...may be...?"

Senator McInerney: "...May be made individually by faculty member, " or "...Faculty may require students to purchase individually authored textbooks."

Senator Cluse-Tolar: We stole the text from another university.

Senator Barnes: Basically what it says is that Senate will not have oversight of this, correct?

Senator Cluse-Tolar: It's an honor system.

Chair Floyd: Those in favor of calling the question, please say "aye". Opposed, "nay". We are now prepared to vote on this motion, all those in favor, please say, "aye." Opposed, "nay."

Motion approved.

Senator Monsos: Report on Academic Programs Committee update.

Academic Programs Report - 3/11/08

All new programs and program modifications are posted at
<http://curriculumtracking.utoledo.edu/>

Item 1 – Modification to Early Childhood Education

This proposal would add Early Childhood Special Ed as a new area of concentration option for the undergraduate Early Childhood Education program.

Item 2 – Modifications to English Major and Minor Concentrations

These modifications are for concentrations in the major and minor
English Major -- American Literature Concentration
English Major -- Creative Writing Concentration

English Major -- General Literature Concentration
English Major -- General Writing Concentration
English Minor Literature Concentration
English Minor Writing Concentration

Senator Monsos: All those in favor of the above modifications, please say “aye.” Opposed, “nay”.
Motion passed.

Senator Peseckis: Report on Undergraduate Curriculum Committee update which were emailed to you previously. Any questions? If not, all those in favor please say “aye”. Opposed, “nay.”
Motion passed.

Course Modifications and New Courses
Approved by the Faculty Senate
on March 11, 2008

College of Arts and Sciences

New Course

CHEM 4570 Biophysical Chemistry 4 ch

EEES 2200 Climate Change 3 ch

ENGL 3610 British Literary Traditions 3 ch

GEPL 2200 Climate Change 3 ch

PSC 2400 Topics in Political Science 3 ch

Course Modification

CHEM 3560 Biochemistry Laboratory 1 ch
Change course credit hours to “2”
Update catalog description

ENGL 3600 American Literary Masterpieces 3 ch
Change course title to “American Literary Traditions”
Update catalog description

ENGL 3790 Foundations of Literary Study 4 ch
Change credit hours to “3”
Update catalog description

ENGL 4890 Capstone: Senior Seminar in Writing 4 ch
Change credit hours to “3”

GEPL 3420 Quantitative Methods and Mapping 4 ch
Change course title to “Quantitative Methods in Geographic Research”
Change course number to “GEPL 4420”

Crosslist with GEPL 5420.

PSYC 3120 Understanding Psychological Research 4 ch
Change credit hours to “3”

REL 2070 Ancient Jewish History 3 ch
Change course title to “Early Judaism”

College of Education

New Course

EDU 1700 Introduction to Education 3 ch

College of Engineering

Course Modification (1)

CHEE 3030 Separations 3 ch
Change pre-requisites from “CHEE 2230” to “CHEE 2330”.

College of Health Science and Human Services

New Course

COUN 3220 Theories in Mental Health 3 ch

COUN 3230 Pathology in Mental Health 3 ch

Chair Floyd: The next speaker is Scott Scarborough, the new Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration and he will talk about the budget planning process for 2008-09.

Sr. V.P. Scarborough: Hello everyone. For those whom I haven’t met yet I came here about two months ago from DePaul University, prior to that I was at The University of Texas at Tyler, The University of Texas System for about ten years, and prior to that I was in public accounting and investment management. You have invited me to talk about the budget process and I will give you an overview. Why is the budgeting process important? Especially with you coming up with a new Strategic Plan and you have a strong desire to implement the Strategic Plan. Any good budget from year to year is going to have a strong linkage to the Strategic Plan. That is the number one priority going into the process. We want to make sure that we come out so that when we look back we can say we linked resource allocations to our Strategic Plan. This institution has been through a major merger and it has created a wonderful expectation in the market place, a window of opportunity. So many institutions now believe that it is not only just another opportunity to implement the Strategic Plan, but also it’s sort of a momentous time in this University’s history that you would not want to waste. It’s important, I have been told, that we have taken advantage of this window of opportunity to “transform the university.”

The Budget Office is the facilitator of this process. Budget will be developed for academic and the clinical process. Information is shared and feedback is solicited from two key standing University committees including Faculty Senate representation. There is the Finance and Strategy Committee which includes representatives from various constituencies. There is also the Strategic Planning Steering Committee. In the spirit of shared governance the budgeting process as recommended would be vetted with each one of those committees. This process will be a little different than in the past as the data will be aggregated to include academic and clinical areas of the institution. Especially carry forward balances will be handled differently. How new revenues and expenses will be consumed quite a bit by the projected increase in key expenses, salary increases, health care

benefits, utility expenses, deferred maintenance, many of the items that many universities struggle with, and much of the newly projected revenue from the tuition increase and increase in state funding will go towards those known increases in expenditures. Therefore, if we want to do something significantly different to implement the Strategic Plan we'll also need to look at the base budget, so as a result of that conversation we've begun talking about the opportunity to reallocate not only the existing resources but also to take the new resources that are projected and to try, if there are any remaining, to reallocate those towards the Strategic Plan. This is very hard. An institution this big, this complex, with this history, to look at a base budget is very difficult but it is important work and you want to move forward the Strategic Plan. So again, for those of you who may be familiar with this book, *Good to Great* by Jim Collins, who talks about good to great transformation, and really what you are talking about doing is taking two institutions that have very good reputations and hopefully doing something in implementing strategic plans and taking it to the next level that will elevate it in some way. So the principles of this book which apply to all types of organizations, I think are applicable. Again, this simply illustrates the strong desire to merge or link the strategic plan with resource allocation.

In the three circles on the slide, there are three key questions, according to the author, that should be asked when one is putting together a strategic plan. Again, ideally, the strategic plan would be the intersection of these three circles, or the answers to these three questions intersect. The first question is what is your organization deeply passionate about? The second question is, what can you be the best in the world at? Thirdly, what drives your economic integration strategic plan as the intersection? What is your organization passionate about, what can you be truly great at and what can be economically sustained over a period of time? Presumably, a strategic plan is that intersection and the operating budget is how one funds the strategic plan. This is a quote out of this particular gentleman's book.

After studying many organizations that have gone through transformational processes, he concludes that budgeting in these transformational exercises is a discipline to decide which areas should be fully funded and which areas should not be funded at all. In other words, the budgeting process is not about figuring out how much each activity gets, but about determining which activities best support the transformation and can be fully strengthened, and which should be eliminated entirely. Many of us have been a part of budget exercises in the past where we had to reallocate resources or where you had to reduce resources, not the case in this situation. Where someone has decided to take 3% from everyone and then either collect a pool to strengthen the finances or reinvest in strategic planning. We are not doing it this way, what we are trying to do is be consistent with the theme as outlined in this book. It creates conversations where we say what areas at the University need to be fully strengthened, where they are critical to the implementation of the Strategic Plan, and what at the University are now the lower priorities that are not as important as implementing the Strategic Plan in these other key areas. So there is no interest in weakening all of the areas and taking 3%, or 5%. It's all about funding many functions that can dramatically change entire work processes, or programs that haven't produced or programs that are not as high priority as programs outlined in the Strategic Plan.

So this is about taking resources from these few areas and moving them in large amounts to the Strategic Plan emphasis. At the end of this process we will see whether we generated those kind of conversations. When we went into this process, we knew we wanted something that would create those types of conversations. The key steps of the technique that we have employed to create these conversations were to think about having broad range conversations throughout the University that would occur in two phases. One, first phase a pre-hearing process. This is where department chairs and deans and vice presidents get together with provosts and have a conversation about moving resources from lower priorities to higher priorities. Most of us in this business have heard a

common technique employed by many organizations, other universities, governmental agencies, business enterprises where someone says, come to the budget hearing and let me know what you would do with 10% less money, 10% more money or no moving money at all. The one we are using is a variation of that, we have asked people what you would do if you were to reduce your base budget by 10% and reinvest it in your own area. Lower priorities to higher priorities and take the other half and take it to a central pool from which the Strategic Plan would be funded, and also generate a list in that strategic pool that would be important in advancing the strategic plan in your area. All for the purpose of creating conversations in moving base resources. The numbers are not that important but the conversations are important. Some have taken this formulating exercise and are missing the point of generating strategic conversations. Those conversations are at the Provost's level and are called pre-hearing, they are vetted, good ideas are continued, bad ideas are discarded.

The second phase is to have conversations with both the Provosts and the President and it would be suggested how they would move 5% of the base budget from a lower priority to a higher priority and how 5% of the base budget would go into a central pool, called the super pool. In the end we can see where we moved a \$750 million dollar budget you would hope that there would be some significant sum that had been moved from the institutional standpoint from lower priorities to strategic priorities. Once the budget balances and we have taken steps toward implementing the Strategic Plan that required additional funding, then the budget would be recommended to the Board of Trustees for approval. This is the timeline we are looking at. Budget instructions were issued in January, some additional assumptions about perimeters in the budget remain in February just to get the process started, in March these pre-hearings and hearings had begun. We have some good reports back from those conversations as well as not so good reports. When we hear that some of those conversations have not gone well we reinserted ourselves in the process to try to get people to think in terms of the strategic conversations. The bad conversations occur when people wanted it to be too mechanical. It's all about the numbers rather than the strategic idea and strategic reallocations of existing resources. In April we hope to have a draft budget that we can then present to the various committees for review and feedback and get the President's review. The Finance Committee will review in May so we will have a new budget for the fiscal year in July. I do have a handout for you that I gave to all vice presidents and deans, an outline of each step in the process, creating a check list.

FY 2009 Budgeting Process Checklist



How the Process Will Work

- Budget instructions / supplemental instructions issued.
- Budget Office delivers (1) listing of accounts, (2) preliminary base budget, (3) calculation of 10% target, (4) listing of filled and unfilled positions – budget and actual, (5) prior year revenues/expenditures for each account.
- Deans and VPs prepare budget proposals consistent with instructions: (1) base budget after 10% reduction and 5% reinvestment and (2) listing of prioritized requests from the 5% central pool linked to the strategic plan.
- Pre-hearings with the (1) President, (2) Provost – Main Campus, (3) Provost – Health Science Campus, or (4) Sr. VP for Finance and Administration.
- Budget hearing with the President, Provosts, and Sr. VP for Finance and Administration.
- Draft budget prepared by the Budget Office.
- Draft budget shared with the Strategic Planning Steering Committee for feedback and comment.
- Draft budget shared with the Finance and Strategy Committee for feedback and comment.
- Draft budget recommended to the President.
- President recommends budget to the Finance Committee of the Board of Trustees.
- Board of Trustees approves the budget.



What You (Deans and Vice Presidents) Need to Do

- ✓ Read budget/supplemental instructions.
- ✓ Obtain documents from the Budget Office: (1) listing of accounts, (2) preliminary base budget, (3) calculation of 10% target, (4) listing of filled and unfilled positions – budget and actual, (5) prior year revenues/expenditures for each account.
- ✓ Determine the data, time, and location of your pre-hearing and budget hearing.
- ✓ Determine your area's strategic priorities.
- ✓ Estimate the cost of fully funding your strategic priorities.
- ✓ Determine how you would reduce your budget by 10% and how you would reinvest 5% to fund your strategic priorities.
 - Use the Prioritization Report to inform your decisions.
 - If needed, ask for help from the Budget Office staff. Consulting services are available. Copy Sr. VP for Finance and Administration on requests for consulting services.
- ✓ Prepare a prioritized listing of funding requests from the 5% central strategic pool to fund strategic priorities in your area.
- ✓ Prepare your presentation for the pre-hearing. Save most of the assigned time for dialogue.
- ✓ Make changes to your budget proposals based on feedback at your pre-hearing.
- ✓ Prepare your presentation for your budget hearing. Save most of the assigned time for dialogue.
- ✓ Communicate changes to your budget and the university's budget to stakeholders in the context of reallocating and reinvesting to implement the strategic plan.

It explains how the process will work and what they need to do. How the 10% allocation was a conversation starter. In effect, this is the same presentation I am giving you that I gave to all the vice presidents and deans. From the very beginning we emphasized this as a conversation starter. The next couple of slides capture some of the comments that you would expect. The first human nature response would be this is impossible, we could never reallocate this type of money from base budget to strategic programs. We are not looking to reallocate any money, we simply are looking to create conversation to see if it is possible to move amounts of money to implement the strategic plan. These conversations are to encourage people to think outside of the box. Previous prioritization studies done on campuses should form these conversations and then ask for help if they are struggling. There are lots of people available on this campus who have been through this process elsewhere who can help you to brainstorm or just to assimilate, to analyze information where you may be spread too thin. That is common in higher education. To do more and more, to expand our scope, teaching and research in public service to the point to spread ourselves so thin we don't have resources to adequately support all that we are attempting to do.

So, in part in this process I periodically ask is to narrow our scope of it, so that we can concentrate resources to do what is most important and to fund it at sufficient levels. Let's see if any of these conversations can lead to any of those, and again, we say trust the conversations. Don't get so caught up in the process and the numbers that you lose the context of what we are trying to accomplish. We have also promised the deans and vice presidents to begin this process we will build on previous responsibility based budget, that we will look for ways of creating formula funding to support teaching and learning, research and community engagement. One reason we want to defer that conversation is because the State of Ohio is about to come out with new types of incentive formulas and we want to make sure what we create for colleges and schools are in line with what the State of Ohio is tying our funding to.

That was the initial presentation I made to the deans and vice presidents. Then we had a follow up meeting with the deans and vice presidents to reemphasize certain points, which are all about implementing the Strategic Plan. It's a reallocation and not a budget reduction. If you are in one of the unfortunate areas where your budget has been reduced in order to move resources to another part of the University to implement the Strategic Plan and fully fund it, with the understanding that it's a reduction to you but from the University stand point, this is not a budget reduction. This is a reallocation process. The 10-5-5 plan should not be pursued as a formula, but as a conversation starter. Trust the conversations, trust the shared governance, trust the maturity of the people that are a part of these conversations to know that this is just a part of shared governance. When you invite people into the conversation with certain levels of stress, certain levels of miscommunication that is to be expected in the name of believing that the overall good is best served. We want to try to move enough money to begin to implement the plan. That's the purpose of this exercise. But don't forget the 80-20 principle that if it's done right, 80% of the money that we will probably move to implement the Strategic Plan will come from a small percentage, 20% or less, from the University that represents lower priority. This is not an exercise to bleed the whole University by 2 and 3%. This is a fairly standard process. There are standard questions to ask as one goes through this process. The President has a term that he has taught me since I have been here called conduit leadership, and we don't want any vice president, dean or budget manager of any type simply relaying or passing along the responsibility for making important budget decisions to his or her subordinates. The responsibility for making strategic budget decisions belongs to the applicable dean or vice president and it cannot be passed along to others.

I heard a wonderful report from the provost that this process created great conversations with this particular dean, at least in this case it has gone well. Some of the conversations had to be supported and redirected in some ways. The conversations started in different places based on skills and

experience and the perspective of each individual. Hopefully this puts the process in perspective for you.

Senator McInerney: What's the composition of the Steering Committee that will be reviewing these reallocations?

Sr. V.P. Scarborough: I just joined the group myself.

Chair Floyd: I serve on this committee, also Kris Brickman, the two Provosts, Scott Scarborough, Tom Gutteridge, and Kay Patten Wallace.

Sr. V.P. Scarborough: That's the Strategic Planning Committee. Barb, can you help me with who is on it.

Chair Floyd: Matt Wikander, Alice Skeens, Dean Gutteridge, Dean Naganathan. Provost Haggett, Ken Long,

Senator Barlowe: Those particular committees that are part of a conversation are not the committees that will be making the final decisions, right? You are talking about two different things. You are talking about conversation, and about the final decision that will be made by a small group of people.

Sr. V.P. Scarborough: The way I would categorize it is, in the end, it's the President that will make the final decision. And all the people you mentioned will be a significant part of the conversations and recommendations. Department chairs, vice presidents, deans, provosts, all will be a part of developing the budget. In the end it will be the President that will take all the pieces and input from the Strategic Planning Committee and the Steering Committee.

Senator Barnes: I appreciate the standard thinking outside of the box type process, where we might make cuts, could you talk a little about other outside the box options you considered for funding the Strategic Plan? From my perspective cutting programs is the most historically standard generic, corporate response to how to fund a plan is to cut people. Did you consider other alternatives?

Sr. V.P. Scarborough: We believe the conversations would consider all that. The conversations that we worked so hard to create for me don't start until tomorrow. Up until this point it was about designing the process and encouraging conversations. I am actually not sitting on these conversations until tomorrow. However, investments are part of the equation. Investments that have revenue return associated with them are part of the conversation.

Senator Barnes: Is that going out to the people who are being encouraged to think about cuts?

Sr. V.P. Scarborough: Yes.

Senator Barnes: But departments do not have investments, do they?

Sr. V.P. Scarborough: That's true. Some departments do not.

Senator Wikander: The Foundation does.

Senator Barden: We went through a process just before you got here, we called it prioritization. It took a lot of resources, energy, money and thought, and one of the things that came out of it was the Barden principle, largely because I mentioned it so often – namely, the faculty will do it on the academic side if the administration does it in good faith on the administrative side. One of the things that sticks out right away when you apply the Barden principle to this 10%-5% conversation, is that we have two provosts. Why do we need two provosts? If we are asked to do the 5%, and 10% exercise and take it seriously, your side should do so, too, starting with that conversation.

Sr. V.P. Scarborough: Absolutely. In laying this out to everyone who is involved, we encourage people to use that report to inform them of these conversations, building on priority we made that point with everyone. We also made the point that the administration would lead this effort.

Senator Barden: So will we, the faculty, get to see how that goes on?

Sr. V.P. Scarborough: That process where the administration leads begins tomorrow. Everyone has been working at the departmental level to prepare for conversations that will begin with me tomorrow. I will be happy to come back and share with you the results of those conversations and I hope to have great news to report.

Senator Barden: This is basic human nature -- if you want the academic side to take this seriously and have conversations, then those conversations that happen on the administrative side need to be open so that we could see that it is going on a parallel track.

Sr. V.P. Scarborough: If you wanted me to invite you to my office where we will have tough and difficult conversations with everyone who reports to me, probably it would not be something that I would view in the best interest. However, at the end of that process I can fully share the results, positive outcomes, the changes that we will be making, I will be happy to do that.

Senator Barden: I am not being disingenuous here. There should be a way for the Executive Committee or somebody on that committee to be in that office hearing those tough conversations. If you really want to be transparent and genuine, then be transparent and genuine; don't just say those words and then go ahead and behave secretly and unilaterally.

Sr. V.P. Scarborough: You want to be transparent and there are ways of doing that. There are degrees of transparency and we are trying to find the right balance of shared governance and I struggle with that. For fifteen years I've been on both ends. But to the point that I think it best serves the University for me and those working directly for me, an opportunity to have very frank, direct, out of the box, I think it serves the university to have at least some part of the process that's not fully public. On the other end it is fully within the interest of the university to invite me back and ask me to share the results of that process.

Senator Cluse-Tolar: As a public university is it legal for those discussions to be held behind closed doors?

Sr. V.P. Scarborough: I believe we are, but we can ask our general counsel.

Senator Cluse-Tolar: On one of your slides it says if you can reduce your budget by 10%. 10% of college's budget digs into their personnel. And personnel here is what generates credit hours and tuition and State's subsidy. How can this be a possible thing for the academic side to even comprehend and move forward?

Sr. V.P. Scarborough: My experience has been that not all personnel generate credit hours to produce enough revenue to cover costs. So theoretically both of those scenarios could help contribute to strategic reallocation from lower priorities to higher priorities. It is theoretically possible for credit generating and non-credit generating personnel to contribute to strategic reallocation.

Senator Cluse-Tolar: Coming from Health Science & Human Services we are looking at \$1.2 million which would wipe out all the clerical staff that don't generate any FTE's, as well as our advising staff and you might get there. But beyond that it will be up to the instructional staff that does generate FTE's.

Senator Peseckis: You actually don't know how part of the university contribute to revenue, like managers how do they contribute to the overall budget. So in order to cut or minimize departments you don't know the financial implication to the whole institution. The faculty don't have access to the numbers.

Sr. V. P. Scarborough: Just because I don't know it doesn't mean the department chair doesn't have access. Or the dean, or the provost, the President might know. Presumably someone in the decision making process would know that. Both, the tangible and intangible. This is a process on how to advance the Strategic Plan, which is the '*Directions*' document that I was given when I joined the University two months ago.

Senator Thompson-Casado: I see on one of the slides that mentions elimination of departments, on a campus that is governed by collective bargaining agreement, how will you do that?

Sr. V.P. Scarborough: In the event that as a result of these conversations comes forth with a plan to eliminate departments, those conversations will be enriched by people who know the answer to that question.

Senator Thompson-Casado: Just give me a ball park idea because I know the contract.

Sr. V.P. Scarborough: You would know the contract better than I would, so for me when I begin these conversations tomorrow, and someone says 'I got a department that was created ten years ago

and we thought that it would produce this kind of revenue, this kind of results but no longer produces these results, however it employs ten people then we will have a conversation about it. What are the skills sets of these people, can people get reallocated from this particular program to another program, and the answer to this question is 'no' then the next person I will call is Bill Logie, Vice President for Human Resource, he will see what other possibilities there are. If at the end of these conversations there are no give anywhere, and we will look for opportunity and move on.

Senator Thompson-Casado: When you look at year's budget cuts that we have suffered at this University, it took two sentences to realize that this is Personnel, and I assumed the administration had these conversations.

Sr. V.P. Scarborough: Just beginning the budget process. I have gone as far as asking if Bill would be available when anyone comes forward and needs to vet their ideas. He said, "Absolutely, that's my job."

Senator Hottell: I want to go back to the issue of academics. I don't see it anywhere in your charts, we do hear from all our administrator and our peers. I have been hearing and we do have a responsibility to remain a University. We look at the College of Arts & Sciences for example, look at what we don't have in History, in English in Foreign Languages or in Music, we are losing ground immensely with other universities. We are about to look like a technical school and I'm concerned that I don't hear from the academic responsibility for strong academics in any of these issues. I hope you will be bringing that to the table.

Sr. V.P. Scarborough: This whole exercise is about advancing the core academic mission of this University. It is my understanding this strategic plan having been a part of the conversations, the plan is the Academic Strategic Plan. All that is being done in the name of budgeting is done in the name of advancing the core mission of the University which includes teaching, research and public service. We are a University. The mission is to make this a better University than what it is.

Senator Hottell: A lot of that strategic plan that was brought out before does not talk about core. The only time it talks about core is how you can infuse Science, Technology and Math into what is the core. It does not talk about strengthening the core. As we begin having discussions, the core is getting weaker. And I am very concerned by that.

Senator Hudson: The strategic reallocation was tried a number of times before. The ideas on paper may seem logical to a select few people because I'm very passionate about my program and I think it has a chance to be world class and it's almost self supporting, so there is no money for reallocation. In principle, it sounds like a wonderful idea. In practice it never works very well and you only make decisions about a few very obvious things. So I think we have to have this reasonably transparent process and try to do the best you can do. This reallocation means no new money coming in. In order to increase over here, you have to decrease over there. You have to try to make it happen to the extent that the University is fully proficiently dealing with pushing things we can be good at, and be good at some things. That money has to come from somewhere. We have to stop thinking what catastrophes may follow because what will happen at the end after the discussions, very few things will change initially. Most universities will take one or two or three or maybe four different areas. We're going to be really good at these areas. We've never done this; we've never done this very well. Some are good at a few things and it is because all the money goes into those areas that can be identified. Everyone else has to fend for themselves, so if you don't have a program that is on top then you have to figure out a way to keep it going, if you love doing it then you make some contributions to real world operations. I think a lot of the discussion we are having here we have to do this, we have to think about it again, and we will have to make some cautious decisions. I don't think anything big is going to happen and I think it is because the Strategic Plan is relatively vague at this stage and to make decisions based on a relative and vague document, I just don't see us doing that.

Sr. V. P. Scarborough: I don't disagree with anything you said; in fact I agree with a whole lot of what you said and wish I could have said it as well as you said it. I will say this though, I agree

with the part that it may not be a whole lot of changes. I have, I think just by virtue by the kinds of institutions I have gone to in the past, have seen it work. In some cases I have seen it work just exactly as you described it, which is moving somebody from the administrative area to the academic area but I still feel as you do, it is good to have the conversation because it may build on itself over time so I am finding myself agreeing with what you said.

Senator Monsos: I'm not clear yet, you keep referring to this as a budget exercise and conversations and yet in my college all searches have been frozen so it looks like this is already being enacted.

Sr. V.P. Scarborough: I can not speak for that and have not heard about that. So it is hard for me to speak

Senator Monsos: On the day that we interviewed our third candidate and were preparing our final report we were told that the search was frozen

Sr. V.P. Scarborough: I certainly understand some level of frustration you might have.

Senator Monsos: Frustration would be a mild way of putting it.

Sr. V.P. Scarborough: We talked to vice presidents and deans about this being an exercise.

Senator Monsos: Clearly that has been very effective.

Sr. V.P. Scarborough: We wanted the process to generate conversations. On the other hand I suppose I can understand the natural reaction to that.

Senator Monsos: It has now been two weeks since the search was frozen, the three candidates that we have so far are still available but will not be available I'm sure any moment now; we'll have a failed search as a result of this exercise.

Sr. V.P. Scarborough: Without knowing anything more on this, it may have been that a conversation that did occur with several people that led to where we have to hold off in your area on anything of this nature.

Senator Monsos: No, it's the entire college; all searches in the college have been frozen.

Sr. V.P. Scarborough: If you are in that college I will simply find a way to encourage the decision maker to check and once again make sure that he or she understands the expectation of the provost in this particular area and just make sure that it is not a misunderstanding that is leading to that decision.

Senator Skeens: I do not think that there is a misunderstanding at all. We keep hearing that but it is not a misunderstanding, it is happening.

Senator Fink: I have two questions. The first question is when you are starting your conversations in your unit on how to achieve some or all of the objectives you are shooting towards the strategic plan, how do you know how to budget when the bargaining agreement hasn't been reached? I know you put down that we expected 2% increase in salaries and certain amount of benefits but these negotiations are on-going. If it turns out that salaries or benefits turn out greater than expected, does that mean that a second round of conversations will be occurring?

Sr. V.P. Scarborough: Well, the answer is probably so. Budgeting is a dynamic process, it is a fluid process, it's not just the union contract, utility rates and state level of funding and capital for operating, there are many moving parts. There are literally hundreds of variables that go into a budget so the day after you pass the budget there is some variable that needs adjusting so we're certainly well aware of where the conversations are in regard to collective bargaining. If things get wrapped up then we can include the final package in the budget.

Senator Fink: Here is my second question. Right now you are pursuing increased budgeting to support the Strategic Plan and enhance certain areas to go from good to great. How long do you believe it will be before these new great areas will be able to support their own increases? That is, I assume after a while, these targeted areas will attract a greater number of students and/or produce more patents and increased business relationships and/or increases in grants funding so eventually some of the money diverted to growing these areas could potentially be then redirected back to other areas we would also like to make great.

Sr. V.P. Scarborough: Unfortunately I have to answer in such a broad and theoretical level since I wasn't a part of deciding what levels of signature areas and I will probably not be a part of the conversations regarding which areas on the academic side will be fully funded, so I can answer that on a very theoretical level but I doubt that would satisfy you.

Senator Fink: As part of the conversation you will have with the President and other areas, you talked about aggressively moving towards the plan, as part of that conversation when you categorize aggressive, does that mean that I want to be great within three years within five years, within two years and how quickly you will have to shift the money?

Sr. V.P. Scarborough: There is no expectation in a certain period of time. What has been said is with the end of this budget process we want to look back and say it's clear that we took a first step towards the implementation of the plan, a meaningful step. There is even some level of conversation about what that means for a \$750 million budget. In the end, these are "what if" type conversations. At the end of the budget process itself we will have more informed conversations. Hopefully, we can say that moving a million dollars is just what you need to fund the important core function at the University, that was a significant step.

Senator Fink: But at the end of the day since conversations eventually have to get formalized into formal budgets, eventually your group will have to identify how much money is going to be moved.

Sr. V.P. Scarborough: The President asked us to keep a tally of how much is being moved in the name of advancing the Strategic Plan. So we will be able to give you that number and I will be able to give the qualitative and quantitative numbers at the end of the process.

Senator Hudson: The sheer magnitude of the problem is the recent merger. We have recently come together, two major universities as one. There is some duplication and when you look at the idea of strategic reallocation associated with numbers as high as 10% it puts a lot of pressure on individual units. Some years back when Frank Horton was the President he initiated a strategic reallocation associated with a budget and he said he wanted all the units to give back 2% and ask for 4% and may not take any of the 2% but we may give you 2% or the 4% in which case you have your net increase but don't put anything on the list you are not prepared to lose. So a certain number of us who were here during that and remember it well, it creates certain fear and expectation. 10% is a very big number.

Sr. V.P. Scarborough: One, there is no one that has an expectation that you will be moved. Two, for the purpose of the exercise there was a decision to choose a very aggressive large number simply to force thinking beyond incremental things forced thinking beyond fundamental change. It's possible that it is good, fruitful and beneficial and consistent with the Strategic Plan. I don't know whether I can see the downside picking an aggressive number, I can also see the upside of picking an aggressive number. At the end of this process I will be able to share a collection of stories as evidence of the positive side of the aggressive number and the downside. The Provost on the HSC said, "At least I got one good example of where this process created one more strategic conversation, one success story."

Senator Hudson: My attitude is great when I'm thinking of the 10% upside budget. But the 10% downside budget, my psychological make up has to change a lot.

Senator Relue: 97% of my department's budget is salaries. So if we will eliminate faculty, it's hard to see an upside of this and how is that going to benefit programs in a positive way.

Sr. V.P. Scarborough: You have to trust the people with whom you are having conversations. This is an editorial comment, you don't really have shared governance until you get to trust. I have a choice to think the worst, and until I see the worst opportunity as you will to correct bad decision making until we see that I'm going to trust shared governance for what it is, an opportunity for good ideas and bad ideas.

Senator Barnes: This is informational for you but also I want to check in with the other senators in terms of when I participated (and I had a very minor role in the strategic plan) all the faculty were reassured that there would be no blood bath as a consequence of dreaming, which is how it was presented to me. There was this constant overt reassurance that this is about dreams and best

case scenarios and nobody is going to lose their job and protecting the broad interest of the University. So it feels like that strategic plan is now being used as a bludgeon, in exactly the way it was promised to us that it wouldn't, which speaks of your issue of trust.

Chair Floyd: I would like to add what I see happening in these "conversations" that are occurring. Within those colleges and departments that are STEM related, there are discussions taking place about weak programs that may be eliminated and other programs that may be strengthened, but in the Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences, you could have a program which is doing outstandingly well where faculty are doing exactly what they are supposed to be doing, faculty are growing the programs and they were encouraged to grow them in the past, and now they are suddenly told that their programs are irrelevant to this new strategic plan. We are not eliminating the weak programs, we are eliminating many strong programs because somebody judges that they don't fit with the Strategic Plan. That is something that really concerns me. Faculty work their entire careers to build a program only to be told today that it may not continue at this institution.

Sr. V. P. Scarborough: I can understand that, and the only thing that comes to mind as I listen is that it could be the case. It could be that we are not talking about weak programs. We are talking about programs that now for whatever reason have someone made the decision that the institution would be stronger if it moved in this direction. Those collections of decisions and thoughts and perspectives can support the Strategic Plan. The downside is I've been at two institutions in the past - DePaul University and the University of Texas and I know that some of those universities got in trouble because they continued what was good and not pursued aggressively what was strategic. And if you pursue what's good but not strategic you will find yourself doing good things which no one is willing to fund or to enroll in, and all of a sudden everyone's jobs and programs are now in jeopardy. So the hard reality of this process is, and I don't know if I can ever promise you that as long as I am here, that no one will ever lose their job. What I can promise you is, I will facilitate conversations and processes that will lead us to strategic decisions that will make the University stronger, better, more respected, more academically and financially strong so that all of us can enjoy this enterprise called The University of Toledo. But I can't guarantee this place is going to be here ten years from now. Every conversation I have personally been involved with where difficult decisions have been made they ended up going to a place where their program is strategically important and valuable and they were better off being there than where they were before.

Senator Barlowe: You are asking us to trust you and to trust the conversation. Dr. Haggett is asking us to trust her, as have Jeff Gold, Dr. Jacobs, and all the new people who have come to this institution in the past 18 months. We are being asked to trust a group of people who do not have the experience, the expertise and the investment in this institution that the people in this room have. It is very difficult for us to sit here after we have been through president after president, provost after provost and dean after dean and many people in your job as well, and be asked to do the same process over and over again to no end that is any better than with previous administrations. You have a really tough audience here. We are in a space where our institution as we have known it is dynamically shifting and not always to an end that we can see as for the good of the institution. You said that the end justifies the means. As a group of academics that is a very uncomfortable and problematic idea. You also asked that we just sit back and trust that you have the best interest of this institution in mind. I don't know how you could because you haven't been here long enough.

Sr. V.P. Scarborough: To make it clear, I did not say trust me, I said trust the conversations of which you are already a part of. There are many people and I also said trust the process not the ends.

Senator Cluse-Tolar: We are using this hedgehog concept to do the reallocation based on this *Good to Great* concept, are we also looking at placing the right people in the right seats on the bus and the other concepts from this model?

Sr. V.P. Scarborough: Since this was my presentation I was the one that picked from the book. To answer questions, yes, since this is my area of responsibility for the whole program. But this is

no way to imply this book is applied to the old institution. It's simply an interesting quote and diagram out of the book. It makes the point about budgeting.

Senator Cluse-Tolar: It doesn't do us any good unless you use the whole model.

Sr. V.P. Scarborough: That's the reason I included the hedgehog concept. It's a great book. Thank you.

Chair Floyd: Just a reminder that the hard hat tour of the Field House is this Friday at 10:00 a.m. Can we have a motion to adjourn? Motion was made and seconded.

V. *Calendar Questions:*

Log item 0708-6, Faculty Authored Textbook Policy

VI. *Other Business:*

Old business: None

New business: None

VII. *Adjournment:* Meeting was adjourned at 5:00.

Respectfully submitted,

Alice Skeens
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Kathy Grabel
Faculty Senate Office Admin. Secretary