

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of November 30, 2010
FACULTY SENATE

<http://www.utoledo.edu/facsenate>

Approved @FS mtg. on 1-18-2011

HIGHLIGHTS

President Lloyd Jacobs
Provost William McMillen
Dr. Celia Regimbal- Faculty Senate Academic Programs

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.
President Mary Powers called the meeting to order, **Karen Hoblet**, Executive Secretary, called the roll.

I. Roll Call: 2010-2011 Senators:

Present: Anderson, Atwood, Barnes, Barrett, Batten, Baumgartner, Benjamin, Brickman, Caruso, Cluse-Tolar, Crist, Dowd, Fink, Franchetti, Funk, Gibbons, Giovannucci, Hammersley, Hoblet, Horan, Hornbeck, Humphrys, Jorgensen, Kistner, Laux, LeBlanc, Lee, Lundquist, Molitor, Moore, Moynihan, Ohlinger, Olson, Piazza, Plentefisch, Powers, Randolph, Regimbal, Rouillard, Sawicki, Sheldon, Solocha, Stepkowski, Teclehaimanot, Thompson-Casado, Wedding, Weldy, White,

Excused absences: Barlowe, Chiarelott Carr, Dismukes, Gardner, Malhotra, Piazza, Shriner, Wilson, Yonker,

Unexcused absences: Eastop, Fournier, Nandkeolyar, Shriner, Skeel, Tinkel,

II. Approval of Minutes: Minutes of 11/16/2010 were not yet ready for approval.

III. Executive Committee Report:

President Powers: I am calling the meeting to order. Welcome all to the seventh Faculty Senate meeting of the academic year 2010-2011.

To start the meeting, I request Secretary Hoblet to call the roll.

Senator Olson: Do we have a quorum?

Group of Senators: We do not have a quorum.

President Powers: May I give my executive committee report without a quorum?

Group of Senators: Sure.

President Powers: At our November 2nd Faculty Senate meeting, Dr. Jacobs met with the Senate; however, during the first question, an emergency came up. I am glad that President Jacobs can join us again today and we anticipate he will arrive at approximately 4:30 this afternoon.

We have two reports scheduled before President Jacobs arrives today and the Executive Committee report will be brief. First, I'd like to point out an e-mail that I received on 11/22 soliciting feedback, from Charlie Blatz:

Subj: Continue Accreditation: UT's Mission and Integrity. Need Your Input!

“Dear Members of the Staff, Faculty and Administrative Corps:

The University of Toledo is engaged in self-study and application for continued accreditation by the Higher Learning Commission. This survey is part of that process and relates to aspects of the integrity of the university's functioning and organization: do understanding and support for the mission pervade the university; do the governance and administrative structures engender leadership and collaboration furthering the mission; and does the university uphold and protect its integrity. Please click on the link below and take just a few minutes for this important survey. Your participation is completely voluntary and all responses will be kept confidential.”

I want to encourage everyone to respond.

Next, I sent some information to senators about an invitation I received to attend a meeting to review proposals that are expected to be submitted by AlixPartners [<http://www.alixpartners.com/en/>] and The Boston Consulting Group [<http://www.bcg.com/>]. These two consulting groups were asked to provide "a proposal that would address a concise and limited portion of our reorganization." The meeting is scheduled for tomorrow morning and I will update the Senate with more information as it becomes available. Also, the Faculty Senate has been gathering talking points about the reorganization and last week sent the talking points to all faculty and requested their comments. Additional comments were gathered as a result of this request and may become part of our discussion later in this meeting. That concludes the Executive Committee report.

Now, I ask Dr. Celia Regimbal to come forward for the Faculty Senate Academic Programs committee report.

Senator Regimbal: I believe you received via email the Academic Programs Report and I would like to bring that forward as a consent item.

Academic Programs Committee Report November 30, 2010

The Academic Programs Committee met and reviewed program requests. Further information was requested which was provided and reviewed by committee members.
The vote was taken via email.

The following request was Approved:

Program requirement revision from the **EDU, Curriculum & Instruction, Adolescent and Young Adult Integrated Social Studies** program.

1. Require enrollment in a common core of history courses

HIST 1050 World History to 1500
HIST 1060 World History from 1500
HIST 2000 Methods in Historical Study
HIST 2010 America to 1865
HIST 2020 America from 1865

Rationale:

Changes will improve alignment with National Council of the Social Studies Themes
Changes are aligned with Praxis II content
The history Dept has been decreased in size and many of the courses listed as possible choice to meet current requirements for licensure is no longer available

The Program Committee has documentation that the request for changes are supported by the Department of History

The following request was Approved:

Program requirement revision from **HSHS, HRS, Speech-Language Pathology** undergraduate program.

Add pre-requisites for the following:

Course Pre-requisite

SLP 3010	SLP 3150
SLP 3020	KINE 2560 and 2460
SLP 3030	SLP 2460
SLP 3140	SLP 3030
SLP 3250	SLP 3020
SLP 3170	SLP 3150 and SLP 3020
SLP 3200	SLP3010
SLP 3300	SLP 3140
SLP 3400	SLP 3170
SLP 3800	SLP 3200 and SLP 3300 and 3.25 grade point in the major

APC questioned the logic of the number sequence of the classes and the pre-requisites and were given the following rationale:

Courses generally follow a logical sequence

Due to faculty teaching graduate courses that must follow a certain sequence it was necessary to switch semesters of an academic year in which undergraduate courses are offered

On the recommendation of a faculty member who specializes in one of the areas SLP 3150 should be taken before SLP 3010

Students have been taking courses out of sequence and are not prepared properly to enter the clinical sequence.

Many of these students self advise and find themselves in precarious positions as they apply to Speech-Language Pathology graduate programs therefore the pre-requisites will help guide students and improve opportunity for success.

APC requests that the program revision requested by **PHM, Doctor of Pharmacy Program** be removed from the curriculum tracking system.

In 2008 a request was entered in the system to add a required experiential course to the first professional year curriculum and therefore increase the number of credit hours in the Doctor of Pharmacy program by one (1) credit hour.

After investigation into the request the APC received the following response from Dr. Steven Peseckis, Chair of the Curriculum Committee:

The modification I believe that you are inquiring about was entered into the tracking system on March 21, 2008 by Jessica Shimman. Ultimately, it was not approved by the College of Pharmacy because we filed a program change on April 2, 2008 under Bachelor of Science in Pharmaceutical Sciences (its under my name) which included the course name Introductory Pharmacy Practice Experience for PHPR 3920 and PHPR 4920. This latter Program change was modified again by Bachelor of Science in Pharmaceutical Sciences BSPS 2009 which was approved last year. This last program change revised our Pharm.D. curriculum completely and that is what is in effect.

I am not aware of any other filings for BSPS level courses from Pharmacy.

Hence, we do not need any program modification approvals at this time.

Respectfully submitted,

Celia Regimbal,

Chair, Faculty Senate Academic Programs Committee

Senator Regimbal: I would like to make a couple of comments here, within this consent agenda I am asking your approval to make a change on the request that comes from Health and Human Services. On their document it says HHS and it has been pointed out that it should be HSHS; the adjustment would be a part of the agenda. The other has to do with housekeeping: we have had a request from Pharmacy on the Curriculum Tracking System to okay a course. Conversations went back and forth and the course was never approved. Pharmacy came forth with a new program, that course is no longer needed, so there really isn't any action needed from us, Faculty Senate. This information is reflected in the report. I asked that the request from the Pharmacy be removed from the tracking system and that action would be part of the consent agenda. Are there any questions? If not, I am asking for your vote of approval. ***Motion Approved***

President Powers: Thank you Dr. Regimbal. Since we now have a quorum I would like to go back and ask for approval of the minutes for the November 2nd meeting that were sent to you for your review. They were sent out today. Can I have a motion to approve these minutes? ***Motion approved.***

Let the record show that the minutes of November 2nd have been approved.

The next report will be from Provost McMillen about the reorganization planning.

Provost McMillen: This is a follow up of two weeks ago, I was not able to answer a couple of questions and I said I would come back in two weeks and talk about some of where we are as far as thinking ahead about how courses are going to be arranged and numbered etc. Marcia has joined me and basically we are going to talk about definitions to remind everybody where we are at. We are going to answer questions and Marcia may have some comments. I don't mean to bore you or take time and just as a caveat all of the questions are not answered yet, but we are working on it. The newly defined colleges are major units where tenure other faculty may have another department or a home in which students have identified. They have budgetary authority led by a dean. The new school concept is across disciplinary unit which may exist within a single college or across two or more colleges. They can borrow faculty whose home is in the sponsoring college not have budgetary authority. They are led by a director. A department, a disciplinary defined unit is always within a college and perhaps within a school where faculty may have a tenure home and students may identify. Usually they are without budgetary authority and are led by a chair person. New programs of study and the new courses will be associated with a college which has budgetary authority, new programs of study and courses may be created by colleges, schools and or departments of any combination, but will be associated with the college. New program of study may consist of courses created by a college, school, department, or by any combination. I have been re-reading the Faculty Senate rules and regulations. I have been re-acquainting myself with the committees that have been established, the ones that deal with courses. I am sensitive to where all of you are coming from. For new courses, course

modification, new programs, and program modification, we will utilize the Faculty Senate curriculum processes.

The Faculty Senate will be asked to review current membership on the three Faculty Senate committees to ensure representation; this is of course a part of the system that is in place recognizing the transition period as we move to expanding colleges and how to handle them. Deans will be charged to establish Curriculum Committees within the New college structure. Existing programs and Study courses will move with the departments within the new college structure. The structure, you all know the colleges are going to be done all over again, but we do have the issue of the main changes that have to retain their own college code.

Assist. Vice Provost Marcia King-Blandford: It's the existing college, if they got a new name will still maintain their existing college code. It will be the new colleges that will receive a new college code.

Provost McMillen: With Banner 8 going live at the end of December, the new function will help to support the reorganization at the University which was a question from two weeks ago and Marcia can expand on it. The Banner task force will begin working this week to ensure a smooth transition process. And of course students will be harmless through this transition period. As I already said the Provosts' staff will be working to keep this going.

Assist. Vice Provost Marcia King-Blandford: Some of you are aware that other institutions are going through semester conversion and as they go through this process it will involve 12-implementation days. The four institutions are Cincinnati, Ohio State, Wright State and OU are in the process of putting in the four-year operating manual together which the State never had, the State always had a two-year operating manual, and in doing this they are re-defining definitions, what it means for contact hours, what it means for credit hours. This information is available on the Provost's website under the undergraduate curriculum and it has been shared with the committee members. So this will be a part of the conversations that will take place as we move forward with the new colleges and programs and new courses to make sure that we as an institution are aligned with where the State is going for the fall 2012 conversion into semesters for the entire State. There are seventeen postsecondary institutions involved in the process that Andy knows very well. Banner 8 goes live at the end of this month, it will be a three day conversion process and with Banner 8 there will be new functionality. I think we all went through some growing pains with bringing Banner on board and as we move to Banner 8, what we are seeing is new options in that system that can support this new transition into colleges and hopefully can give us some other features that we were lacking with our first transition from Banner 7. Any other questions I can answer?

Senator Dowd: I'm in the Department of Economics in the College of Arts & Sciences. On January 1st will Banner have me listed in the Department of Economics and in the College of Language, Literature, and Social Sciences?

Assist. Vice-Provost Marcia King- Blandford: Yes.

Senator Dowd: Will there be a corresponding change for all the students majoring in Economics?

Assist. Vice-Provost Marcia King-Blandford: Will stay major in Economics in their program.

Senator Dowd: What about the students who are registered to take economics classes? Will their courses be automatically converted?

Assist. Vice-Provost Marcia King-Blandford: Right, your Economic classes anything with an Alpha code Econ is going to convert to your department with you, it's going to move with you to your college.

Senator Olson: You mentioned that colleges are responsible for new programs; I assume you are still using the Faculty Senate rules for the establishment and review of new programs?

Provost McMillen: Yes.

Senator Olson: I just want to clarify that because you said that for departments, but you didn't say that for colleges.

Provost McMillen: I don't quite understand your comment.

Senator Olson: There is a difference between courses and programs. You made the distinction for courses, but you didn't make the distinction for programs.

Senator Anderson: I think that I heard you say that the new deans will have authority to promote curriculum committees.

Assist. Vice-Provost Marcia King-Blandford: We would anticipate that the new colleges would want to create curriculum in the departments, college level curriculum committees just like the existing colleges have.

Senator Anderson: In the old days that was not the dean's purview; that was in the council purview. I don't know if you meant as the College gets off the ground kind of thing, until councils are established.

Senator Dowd: Perhaps John Barrett can best answer this question. The Faculty Senate Constitution states that each college must establish its own council who will then establish their own curriculum committees. Instead of the deans' offices, curriculum would be operating through college councils. Is that correct, John?

Senator Barrett: To be honest I don't remember whether the college governance structure in the Constitution specifically mentions Curriculum Committee or not, it does charge each college with forming a governance committee and that committee is then supposed to be involved in governance in the college, but I will have to look it up whether it specifically mentions Curriculum Committee.

Senator Olson: It does not mention the Curriculum Committee

Senator Rouillard: So this will be a change in the procedure to have the dean name a curriculum committee.

Assist. Vice-Provost Marcia King-Blandford: First of all that's my error. I was trying to insure that the new colleges would have a curriculum process and that curriculum process would follow the Faculty Senate rules. It's my mistake in how I wordsmith; there was no intention to change any kind of policy. I want to ensure everyone that the Faculty Senate curriculum process is followed and we recognize that it has to be established in the new colleges very quickly for the new courses and new program of studies to move forward.

Senator Hoblet: I just want to clarify, I think about two years ago when the entire senior leadership met and we confirmed a shared governance stance for that leadership team including the Faculty Senate Executive team. Although, it is not specified that a curriculum committee will be formed in each college, it was clearly articulated in that statement that was actually read and developed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, it was read by Jamie Barlowe at the time, that curriculum fell under the distinct purview of the faculty within each college, so how that college governance structure is formed within each college needs to be very clearly defined.

Senator Jorgensen: I would like to ask, what was behind your thinking to reverse the decision on the College of Adult and Lifelong Learning that was a college for a while, then a school, now it's back to a college; it gives us fourteen colleges and it has no faculty. What was the reason for deciding that it was a college?

Provost McMillen: There were a number of factors that came into play; perhaps in some ways the most important was I had a sitting dean at that point. Another reason was that the alumni of University College wanted to have retained a college status for what was the next generation of the University College. It just seemed more consistent.

Senator Jorgensen: Does it have any faculty?

Provost McMillen: It doesn't have any faculty as faculty is sometimes defined. Here is my dilemma on that, I know it was an odd statement, but I went to the College of Adult and Lifelong Learning orientation and I sat down and there was no faculty and then there was a room full of people who taught classes; that looked a lot like a faculty and included at least one person that is here.

Senator Barnes: I was there, but apparently I wasn't invited and I just didn't know I wasn't invited.

Provost McMillen: It was much confusion. So I don't know, if you are raising technical points. They said that there were people who taught full loads, who taught in a college and then in the college of Adult and Lifelong Learning. There were a lot of people and to me that's the faculty.

Senator Jorgensen: My question has to do with things like tenure decisions, merit decisions, promotions, and hiring.

Senator Barnes: And professional excellence in their area. I think that you have a lot of folks who are trained through experience but who are not trained in the academic areas.

Senator Jorgensen: That wasn't my question. My question is does the dean have authority, like deans in other colleges such as making tenure decisions? There are no any faculty who are tenured through that college, correct?

Provost McMillen: They aren't tenure track faculty yet.

Senator Jorgensen: That's what I am asking.

Provost McMillen: I understood the timing with tenure track faculty so that the dean wouldn't have that procedure.

Senator Olson: Let me clarify the previous remark that I made that the curriculum is not mentioned in the college governance document. First of all the college governance is not in the main Constitution, it is in the Appendix to the Constitution. Secondly, it reads, "All colleges shall institute a faculty body of the whole or an elected representational body of its faculty to participate in shared governance of the College. The purpose of this body may include: consideration of academic regulations and policies, curriculum, programs, and other issues of concern to the faculty of the college and its dean, and, coordination of evaluations of all academic administrators in their college under the level of dean..." So it may include it, it's not a mandatory requirement.

Dr. Smith, (Linda): I just want to clarify whether December graduates would graduate from their previous college or under the name of the new colleges?

Provost McMillen: I am not for certain of the answer.

Assist. Vice-Provost Marcia King-Blandford: The December graduations will be under their colleges as the structure exists now.

Senator Dowd: Has there been any discussion regarding establishing the budgets for the three colleges from Arts and Sciences and the combination of Education and HSHS? What can you tell us at this stage?

Provost McMillen: We had this discussion within the Provost office. I had not had those types of discussions in a meaningful moving ahead type of way yet, because I specifically want to wait for the deans. I think that it is only fair to the deans, then we would go from there.

Senator Dowd: What about the staff in each of these colleges? Has there been any discussion on which staff members will be re-assigned? Will the three colleges from Arts & Sciences each get separate Student Services office? Will they each have different Computer Services? Will

they each have a Budget Director? Will they each have a Development Director? And for the colleges that are formed from Education and HSHS, has there been any discussion on either moving some of those staff members to the new colleges? Or making any other changes from/to the new super college?

Provost McMillen: Bev Schmoll and I have met a number of times on that very issue. That's going to take some transition in that college because of the size now and because of some of the things that are in place. The student services question is a crucial question because we need to retain student services and make sure the students will feel comfortable especially at the time of the transition and that they are not being ignored etc. This is going to be an issue with each of the new deans and I'm talking to them individually and it's going to be pretty intense within the next couple of weeks, I assure you. It would be logical and I have no reason not to believe this except for the fact what we are going to be face with the budget that is coming up, that pertaining to the logic we now have three colleges from one college and we could divide the staff up in three ways. Unfortunately, they are not necessarily broken up that way. There may be some cross sharing of services especially in areas like Budget and I.T., but that is part of what the Provost office is there for. Brenda Grant and I have talked about this and helping out for the business functions as it gets sorted out, but we essentially are creating three new colleges and by creating three new colleges we're creating three new sets of staff members to keep things operating, especially Student Services.

Senator Dowd: That's what I'm asking: are there going to be three new sets of staff members or are you going to retain only the current staff in Arts and Sciences?

Provost McMillen: Yes.

Senator Dowd: And just have them serve as three colleges?

Provost McMillen: I think that we will have three different locations.

Senator Dowd: I know.

Provost McMillen: So we are going to work on those three location, I mean that is the value of having three locations, then you have a focus on whose there, the dean and the dean's staff.

Senator Dowd: I apologize, I am not being clear. Let's focus just on Student Services.

Provost McMillen: Okay.

Senator Dowd: There is going to be a college office in University Hall, the Museum, and in Wolff Hall. Are there going to be three Student Services offices? Or are the current Arts & Science Student Services going to handle all of the students from the three colleges?

Provost McMillen: I don't mean to hedge on the question, I think that's a transition question. I think January 10th, January 20th, and February 4th there may be still one Student Service, but I think the goal will be to establish in each of the colleges a complete set of what currently exists.

The first day of January there isn't going to be brand new names, for example "John Smith" will suddenly appear as a business person.

Senator Dowd: There's been such a rush to get this done --- to get new deans and to establish new colleges. I am trying to find out whether there has been any thoughtful discussion on actually making these things happen. In reality colleges do not consist of deans. Instead they consist of students which are served by the faculty and dean.

Provost McMillen: Right.

Senator Dowd: The focus so far has been on naming the administrator instead of focusing on servicing and helping our students. I am afraid that our students are going to get hurt by this rush to form new colleges.

Provost McMillen: There's been no break-up of the services; no one has gone in and told any number of people from the college of Arts & Sciences they are all out of here and get up and leave.

So, there will be retention and a transition of that service.

Senator Dowd: This means that there will be one assistant dean and advisors answering to three college deans. This begs the question as to which dean is going to win when time and resources become more scarce?

Provost McMillen: Let's hope that it will be a cooperative and not a combative type of situation.

Senator Dowd: I'm just concern about our students.

Senator Rouillard: Part of the problem coming up is the fact that the office has had losses that have not been replaced. So they are already at a disadvantage and now their lives are going to be that much more complicated; and it's going to make it that much harder to take care of the students.

Provost McMillen: Yes, I understand.

Senator Rouillard: Even before the transitions.

Senator Anderson: I understand the goal of having a separate system for each college and I think that is important because of the student needs from each college are going to be different. However, I am a little concerned about the Arts because all of the Art students have to be on the Main campus at one time to another; so they could do their Student Services on the Main Campus; whereas if the Arts College office is in the CVA building, the music and drama students will rarely go there, so that's going to be a little bit complicated.

Provost McMillen: Yes, although it is still a two building situation. That is probably a good idea, we will establish a satellite office in some place in the Music, Theatre, and Film building, but I don't see that as a huge issue to overcome. One of the discussions that we recently had was regarding what we needed to do for the students in each of the offices to find somebody from the existing staff and put a big sign up and it will state "Student help, student transition" and place it out in the front; of course put it in the Collegian also. So, if anybody that comes in and has an issue or a question will know where to get help. That is just a logical thing to do, it is a transitional thing.

Senator Barnes: Put it on facebook.

Senator Olson: Right now I am reviewing graduate plans of study and they are being prepared for submission during next semester. What about the three new colleges, how are they going to be able to handle graduate plans of studies and be able to coordinate those into graduate school and the manner of the graduate school wants those?

Provost McMillen: I can answer that in a couple of ways; from the quality of the candidates that we will have some people who are experienced in that area. Secondly, Patsy Komuniecki is a Dean of the Graduate School and a Vice Provost and she has been involved in all of our conversations regarding this matter and I will refer to her current expertise.

Senator Dowd: Senator Olson, a Plan of Study will be reviewed when a graduate student applies for graduation.

Senator Olson: But there's a requirement in our book that says that it has to be in the second semester.

Senator Dowd: But Plans of Studies are not reviewed until graduate students apply for graduation. Hopefully by that time Vice-Provost King-Blandford will have the Banner system ready.

Senator Olson: But what it does, it does establish what courses a student takes.

Senator Dowd: That's true, but the Alpha codes do not change with this Banner upgrade. So the review does not actually take place until after a student applies for graduation.

Senator Olson: Well, let me ask you this question then; The way our plans of studies work is students normally take a large part of their courses within their own department and I assume that it is the same for Arts and Sciences, but there are some courses that they are taking from other departments and now there may be in other colleges.

Senator Dowd: But the Alpha codes are not changing. That's one of the messages from Vice-Provost King-Blandford. All I am saying is we have a window of time between a student's second semester and when that student finishes their thesis or dissertation. The promise is that this will be implemented in the Banner system by the time Karen Mockensturm in the Graduate

College reviews the Plans of Study and that will occur when the student's application for graduation is submitted.

Senator Olson: I understand that review will take place in February and March with a new group of students.

Senator Dowd: They are filed at that time.

Senator Olson: I'm talking about students that are graduating and are going to finish up in May; they will be going through this process in February or March.

Senator Dowd: But the Alpha codes will be there.

Assist. Vice-Provost Marcia King-Blandford: The schedule for spring will be available as it always has been.

Senator Dowd: That's a good point. Thank you.

President Powers: Thank you Provost McMillen. Now, I welcome President Jacobs. Thank you Dr. Jacobs for joining us today. As you are aware of some of the talking points that we have talked about, would you want to address them?

President Jacobs: Let me make a few comments and we will see where we go. Thank you very much and I thank you for inviting me back, I am honored. I apologize for rushing out in a middle of a sentence the last time that I was with you. I will just report that everybody is well, but we are down to one automobile. At the time that I received the call and ran out the occupants were still pinned in the car, they didn't get out and they didn't know what was going on, so I felt a need to rush out. By the time that I got to Cleveland they didn't need me at all, they were sitting in the lobby of the Clarion Hotel enjoying themselves. That was some sort of a long drive, a long run for a short slide as they say. Thank you for your understanding, thank you for letting me run out, and thank you for inviting me back. Michael Dowd I want to commend you for the constructive way you were working through some of these issues. It takes a long time to sort through one which stays in place, that which will still work, and that which needs revision. Marcia's inputs and you collecting the facts and sort of marching them, it seems to me to be exemplary. I was just reminded on something that I wanted to speak of a little bit and also I heard some of you speaking of it just a few minutes ago. The most recent leadership meeting where Penny Poplin-Gosetti spoke of her concern about the Higher Learning Commission and their evaluation of our assessment process and you spoke up and said "I think the Faculty Senate can help with that" and I very much appreciate that. I think that this is the second time that I have mentioned that to you; that was extremely helpful and I want to let you know of my gratitude. I was in a middle of a sentence as I say when I ran out the last time I was with you. That sentence went something like this "I believe that we have a vision statement in which we all can support and I personally strive to a vision that this University having great impact on the world and not taking a second or third tier seat to any other universities. I believe that we are in pursuit of that together and I think that we are on the road to that sort of great impact." There are those of you who have responded that I may be suffering from delusions of grandeur and I

suppose that I can grant the possibility. However, this University is as important as any other institution in the world. I believe that it has the potential of having an impact and be as great as those universities that are two, three, or four times larger than we are and I was sort of in the middle of that sentence when I ran off, so I want to start back there to repeat to you what I think. I think that we have accomplished much together, we can accomplish much in the future together that a grand vision, if you can grant me the possibility that we even in fact have a grand vision that we share that a grand vision should not be derailed by some of the barriers, difficulties encounters, or complexities in which we have been discussing these last twenty or thirty minute. Nor can I add, I hope it won't be derailed and it shouldn't be derailed by the budgetary stringiest that we have in front of us. We have at least three sizable issues in front of us. First in which we have been speaking of for some months now that fiscal year 2012 looks to be difficult; in just a minute I'll try to make that just a little more concrete because now it has been in sort of a negative stage, a horrific of a scenario that is out there and I think that it is starting to take shape a little bit more clearly. Secondly, the Strategic Plan and documents are near completion and I think it will be ready to go to the Board of Trustees, Ad Hoc Committee on strategic planning hopefully before the end of the calendar year. And shortly, and I think perhaps already it has happened the draft documents will be up on the web and I will urge all of you look them up on the web. If they are not on the web today then they will be on the web by the end of this week and everyone I hope will read those draft documents. As I have mentioned to you many times, I think the mission of the university I do not think that it requires change. I think that it remains the same vision statement and it has not changed in these draft documents except for a comma in one of the places. I think that it is a re-collaboration aimed at responding to the external world; responding to the dramatic changes in the economy and the government in the manufacturing rates, the economic rates of our community, the needs of our students that have progressed to recalibrate the strategic plan of our institution, to agree to it which we have accomplished that. To agree that has been accomplished is for you to judge, at least in a significant part. Therefore, I say and I urge you take a look at the drafts of the Strategic Plan on the web shortly. I want to take a minute to talk about slightly more concrete terms the outlook fiscal for year 2012. The current is still not certain and is still a huge amount of moving around in Congress. The Governor elect has not appointed a Budget Director as we did on a couple of budgetary issues or issues that have to do with the State budget and he is not behind at least any place that I can see, about the value and lack thereof for higher education and how he would prioritize it. But it appears that people are discussing it. There are two scenarios; one is the 25% reduction in State share of instruction and the State support of higher education and the new sayers that are speaking of a 50% reduction. Those are horrific numbers as you implied by the shaking of the heads I see around the room. To translate that, that's on the denominator of about \$150,000,000, translate that into the denominator of our entire enterprise, or a chunk of our enterprise, an academic side of our enterprise is a sum a little bit shorter than \$600,000,000. So that translate into something that is in the range of a 15% to 20% budge reduction scenario. For the past several years we used a budget formulation process that we have now become accustomed to painfully, nobody likes it, but one that we became accustomed to creating budget scenarios and it's kind of fun to create a plus 5% scenario, and it is not much fun to create a minus 5% scenario, but that is a way to begin the conversation that we have said now for several budget cycles. I am going to have to ask and I have already begun to ask at the institutional level that we create a minus 20% scenario. There is a lot of discussion and I am interested in your input either directly now or to the Finance Committee about how far that should be driven now. Whatever

the number is if you drive that down to a college level it tends to treat every college equally. If you drive that to the department level or the division level it becomes more and more like an across the board cut. The further you drive down that budgetary scenario requirement the less strategic those ultimate budget decisions become. So as I said I am interested in your input, but I am not yet at any place where I know how far we should drive this down in reorganization. You of course know for the past several years we have asked everyone to do a 5% scenario plus or minus or even a 10% scenario. But driving that down to the unit level, whatever that unit level might be, tends to make it less and less strategic, and as I said I am interested in your input. I believe that we can't do this the way we have done it. The magnitude has changed too large and I don't believe that we can seek out 5% from every college or every department. I think that we are going to have to approach this in a slightly different way. I think that we are going to have to make some serious decisions about priorities; for those of you are a part of that history that I recently dusted off the five year old prior to reorganization schema, Mike I think that you were one that worked hard on that among others. I tried to look at it as a beginning step to something that we can build to think about prioritization across the institution. However, it seems to me that those now five year old documents will need a lot of work and a lot of updating if they are to be used at all; it may be just as wise to start over from scratch in that kind of a process. I think that we need to be thinking about that and in fact I have asked a half dozen people to come out tomorrow morning at 9:00 am., Mary Powers would be among them to begin thinking about how we will drive a minus 20% budget scenario. It is my further hope that we don't need 20%, if we can get away with 12%, 0%, 5% or 14% that will be wonderful, but I think that we need to go through the exercise to try to build a minus 20% scenario. I mentioned strategic planning and I mentioned the budget scenario that is in front of us. All of you have asked Provost McMillen a sizable number of questions about reorganization and I don't need to go there because I think Provost McMillen has answered your questions adequately.

I was asked to participate as a team member at the Higher Learning Commission visit at Indiana State University a couple of weeks ago. I think all of you may be able to guess that I was there as an apprentice; I learned a fair amount, I didn't contribute too much, but I did learn some stuff. I was there as a designee, impressed to watch how the team worked. First of all I was impressed about what they were doing; Indiana State University is about half our size and is a vibrant interesting place. The second point that I left with, we are generally in very good shape by doing the things that need to be done and working well along the way and the leadership from Thomas Sharkey, Thea Sawicki, Penny and others, I think we are well positioned. I think there are some hints perhaps that we can gain and I hope that my observations are valid about organization of those good things. Interestingly enough while Indiana State University was given good remarks and tenure accreditation, the team didn't like their self study document very much. The thing that worried me the most and it related to the point that I just made about Penny's concern and Senator Dowd's good reaction to consider and to be a little bit concerned about assessments. If we have the same reviewer for the assessment area, we will probably have at least a recommendation, we may have a return visit; how we know that because Penny and Thea have been telling us that. But the good news is I think that we have a year to put it in place. We have a lot of data we just haven't gotten it organized, brought together, and pulled together. There are still some units that still have not completely responded to Penny's inquiries etc. I wanted to just put that out there to say that it would be great and I think that we are well positioned and entirely focused. There are no reports, no recommendations, and I think that we can do that and I would

love to do that and I suspect you would. However, it will take a fare amount of work and the area of assessment is a particular vulnerability. I probably shouldn't say this and it is probably against the rules, but Indiana State University will get a required report and it is a major focus of the Higher Learning Commission. Those are some of the things that I wanted to share with you, but I have one more thing that I want to mention because there is not a lot of news regarding the topic at point; the search for a Provost still proceeds. I have had at least twenty nominations sent to me and which I have forward it on to Dr. Naganathan. The search firm is indicating that they have announced an equal number of applicants, of nominations of candidates but those two lists have not yet been put together side by side; at least by the last time that I have spoken to Dr. Naganathan. But that should happen very shortly so we will be able to look at a list of candidates next week or two, I am hoping by the end of the calendar year.

Senator Piazza: A question on that 20% potential reduction; how much of that do you think we will be able to cover with increases in tuition?

President Jacobs: Great question and you know my answer, I don't know. My guess is and I am going to guess for you, but my guess is there will be a tuition cap legislated and my guess is that it will be at higher education inflation rate which is about 2.5%. Now I have not done the arithmetic to figure out how much that will cover, however somebody can do that arithmetic for me please. What is 3.5% of 300,000,000?

Senator Wedding: 10,000,000 (ten million)

President Jacobs: 10,000,000 is a rough figure. Please understand that is a quick calculation and understand that is a guess about the Higher Education inflation rate and what the rules will be we could cover a chunk of it. If my guess and Senator Wedding quick calculation is all correct that would roughly cover maybe a quarter of the shortfall.

Senator Barrett: This may be impolitic, but you know that doesn't stop me.

President Jacobs: I noticed that about you and I like it.

Senator Barrett: When I came here about fifteen years ago my recollection in broad figures is that State subsidies were over 70% of our budget and we are down somewhere in the 30% range. If we take a 50% hit or even a 25% hit, at some point, since the State imposes a lot burdens, a lot of caps, a lot of regulations, a lot of compliance rules and they are not giving us very much in return, are we starting to think about privatization or other models departing from our traditional structure? Is there some threshold at which we would start to pursue those alternatives more aggressively?

President Jacobs: I think that is a great question. You are correct it is a little bit in politics so I will answer it carefully. There are a number of issues there and the first is the State ownership of all of the hard assets, the land, the buildings, and all of the rest of it, that's an issue. Generally speaking the threshold even if it were to be cut half from its current \$100,000,000 (roughly) to let's say \$70,000,000 which I hope that it is not going to happen, but if it were to happen, \$70,000,000 is still not peanuts, it is still worth having and I wouldn't walk away from it yet.

Exactly where the inflation point will be and if it will continue, I don't know. I think that it is something that we all need to think about and discuss and I am glad that you are bringing it up.

Senator LeBlanc: The 20% number, it seems like even in the worst case scenario you said that it only amounts to about 12.5%.

President Jacobs: That's true but on the other hand our expense base is outpacing the inflation rate. So if you take the "X%" (the 12% or 14%) that the State will short us, we will also have to look at other expense growth and we will look at that very carefully.

Senator Dowd: I have a comment and a question. The comment is regard to prioritization. In Spring of 2006, which was prior to the merger, you met with the leadership team about the prioritization plan.

President Jacobs: I remember.

Senator Dowd: The discussion was whether to go forward with prioritization, but this is the part that you may not remember: I resigned from the leadership team of that project after speaking with the person that actually devised the prioritization system. He said that it could work quite well at the department level and perhaps at a college level, but it really could not be implemented at the university level. The others on the leadership team wanted to push it forward to the university level. I remember you met with the leadership group and also questioned whether it could be implemented at the university level. After that meeting I resigned when the others wanted to move forward with that plan.

President Jacobs: You and I were aligned at that point I think. I agree with you and there were a number of reasons that played into that decision, I think that you are correct, I didn't remember that you resigned but I do know that we all kind of walked away from it including myself. One of the reasons were a certain number of colleges didn't participate or haven't participated and the question that arose was what do we do with the newly joined colleges that which was MCO, and there were a long list of issues.

Senator Dowd: At best it was incomplete. And it did not cover all of the colleges.

President Jacobs: That's true.

Senator Dowd: The question I have deals with the budget cuts. At the Finance and Strategy Committee there has been discussion of the potential cuts but no real details were provided. I have talked to a number of people that said that it used to be the case that approximately 90% of a college's budget was faculty and staff budgeted lines. I was then told that today we are looking at only 70% of a college's budget being faculty and staff lines. That is, we now have approximately 30% of college budgets not associated with either faculty or staff lines. If there are significant budget cuts, can we look at cutting that 30% area before considering cutting staff or instructional lines?

President Jacobs: Yes, we certainly can do that and I think that you are right we probably should. It is hard to reconcile your observation with the moving of money from the back row functions to the research enterprise. We can start there and that's a good place to start and I would agree with that. President Powers asked me if I was going to comment on shared governance and I think that I am going to do that now. I would like to see the conversation change and focus far more on the joint unified undertaking to seek excellence, pursuit of excellence, and a much more assertive and constructive approach to faculty input into the budgeting process. If you would like to start with the percentage of total money that is going to staff, that's a great place to start. There are pros and cons and controversies as always I would say there's not everybody that would have an agreement, but if you would like to start at the diminishing a number of dollars going in to the actual teaching staff, I am happy to start there. I think that we can do that if we can all seek the same goal with building a better, stronger, greater institution.

Senator Dowd: I'd like to return to something you said a few minutes ago regarding strategic spending or a strategic investment. The University is engaged in a number of enterprises outside of academics, such as UTIE. Will these activities be included in the discussions when we have to decide how to handle either bad financial news or really terrible financial news that may be coming? Will everything be on the table?

President Jacobs: Everything will be on the table including Economic Development, Health Issues, and including outreach issues. If you may imagine you and I may disagree about the value of some of these things, but that's okay and that's not a problem because everything will be on the table.

Senator Humphrys: When we talk about saving money at the departmental level or about eliminating departments, it seems like that implies terminating faculty. My departmental budget is primarily faculty salaries. Do you foresee faculty terminations happening? Are there other ways of cutting departmental budgets without eliminating faculty?

President Jacobs: That's a good question and the answer is not what you want to hear I expect. Institutions like this is over 80% of spending shares meaning what we spend is on wages and benefits. I don't have it on the tip of my tongue about what percent is faculty and what percent is not faculty, but institutions like this is made up for the most part wages and benefits of people. So we talk about cost reductions we are almost invariably talking about impact on individual people. However, having said that faculty are the primary way business is done they are our core business. We have core business strategy, protecting the core of our business. Now the core of the business is carried out by faculty members they transmit the knowledge that is our mission to transmit, they create new knowledge what they do in research labs and they apply that in various places like clinics, etc. We cannot cut your core away. On the other side, we are a lot better off than Illinois and other places, but we have to try to attempt to continue to engage in a core business strategy and protect that core function that is carried out only by faculty. It's not carried out by administrators, not carried out by most good PSA members; it's carried out by faculty.

Senator Anderson: I am encouraged to hear talk about a strategic approach to this problem and that we're not just cutting 20% all the way down. I am sure that there are plenty of ideas even in

this room about things that could be temporarily cut assuming the situation will get better in five years. I am really encouraged by your request to have a comprehensive discussion about this. I think that it is that conversation that we will do and it will be better for it as a result. I hope that we can put everybody in the same room somehow and ration out some things.

President Jacobs: I hear you and what I just said to Senator Dowd I agree. The creation of scenarios once again whatever level that is, it has to be seen as a conversation to start with if is merely everybody has to cough up 10% we have not done that; we have always asked people to create scenarios as an attempt to look at them as a strategic guide. Please do not misunderstand, but we may ask that this be driven down to a college or department level again this year although I must say that it is beginning to look every year like an across the board cut because you get into a habit doing that if you will. I see your point. This is an important moment it seems to me because we have so much at stake and so many major issues which is good because it builds a vibrant institution. But this is a moment in my mind that we hang together or we hang separately. It's an important moment.

Senator Olson: Up until 2008 there was a thing called the Blue Book that was located in the library where any faculty member could look at the budget and the expenses of the University and because of that single document it allowed the faculty to believe that there was a transparent budget process. Since 2008 we have not had access to that document and as a result most faculty I feel are ignorant of what's in the budget and it is not by their own fault; they want to know. Secondly, they are not able to find the information that they need. It is possible to find it through the Banner system if you have the passwords and if you know how to attack all of the codes, but most faculty do not have that access. The faculty needs this document that they can look at.

President Jacobs: It could be on the web. I think that you are right and I think most of that data is on the web.

Senator Olson: It could be a big PDF file; I really don't care about that.

President Jacobs: Maybe we can get it to be that you and I don't disagree on that.

Senator Thompson-Casado: As we are talking about where we are going to be making these changes in the budget, we have talked about including the faculty I would like to ask if the students will be included in a systematic coherent fashion. I think as an administration you do not hear on a daily basis what we hear in our classrooms that are important to the students. They tell us that they are here to study, they are not here for a lot of extracurricular activities, and they are not here for things that costs a lot of money; I think that the administration needs to understand why the students are here and they need to be considered in this discussion as well.

President Jacobs: Yes, I think particularly their needs. I do actually here from a number of students, but if you agree you can help represent their views.

Senator Thompson-Casado: Not on a one-on-one basis, but what I'm saying is in a coherent and systematic fashion because there are few students that will speak up, but they need to participate in this as well. The day that we had all of the parking lot closures for a football game

my students were over the wall. I don't think that they knew that it was coming, I don't think that they were consulted, and I don't know if administration knew how to put out the word for things like this. So, if they start closing programs, taking away courses, and departments, these are the people who brings the money here and that's why we are here, we are here for them and if we lose them then we are empty.

President Jacobs: You couldn't be more correct about that.

Senator Barrett: I'll continue my role of being impolitic. You mentioned that we are facing a serious deficit, you mentioned that we're largely a personnel driven budget, which is obviously the case. Given those two factors it seems highly improbable that we are going to be refilling a lot of vacated spots. We have departments that are thin to the bone, if not cut into the bone; we probably do not have money to build new buildings even if we can get more students that want to come; are we also looking, thinking about looking, or talking about any kind of joint venturing, partnering, or even merging with an Owens, with a Bowling Green etc.? Just cutting two athletics departments into one will create huge savings. We could be teaching on each campus. I know that this isn't politic, but you are not going to give us the faculty lines back if we don't have the money.

President Jacobs: You are correct; no institution that claim to be sustainable if you spend more than your revenue on a continuing basis, not if you're Ireland, not if you're Portugal, not if you're Toledo Public schools, not if you're University of Toledo, you can't do it; you know that and I am stating the obvious and forgive me for doing so. Having said that the answer to your question, I have worked long and hard to try to pull something together in Northwest Ohio among the institutions of higher education and failed this far; I will try again, I will try continually. It seems to be a little bit more interest in consolidating back room functions at this present time. The thought of consolidating athletics programs frankly gives me a pain in the chest.

Senator Regimbal: Along those same lines, do you think at the State level that there will be conversations about closing some institutions or saying that there is going to be a State system?

President Jacobs: Yes, I think there will be and I think the pressure to conform to the State's idea of the Legislature State's money. If you think that the student's do not have a voice in my office then you ought to hear the Governor's office. I think that it is grave danger and frankly I think the State will be pushing very hard on some of the issues. Now it is easier for them because if they want to all they have to do is just push the pen and send us less money and they may do that, but I believe that they will actually put a lot of pressure on mergers on shared services; I believe that is already happening.

Senator Wedding: You said 80% of our budget, did you say people or did you mean that it was Professors because I am not quite clear?

President Jacobs: I said that it was wages and benefits, I.E. people; I said I do not have it at the top of my head what the percentage of that is faculty.

Senator Wedding: Let's say that you have seven hundred faculty members on this campus and I think that's a high number.

President Jacobs: It's close.

Senator Wedding: If you gave each one of those faculty members with benefits \$100,000 per year on average you will get \$70,000,000 and you will be below \$100,000,000. I think that the faculty salary and benefits represent a small fraction of the total budget of the University. Although we don't have one in the Library to refer to we can do the numbers ourselves.

President Jacobs: I will do the arithmetic; I think that your figures are low. Actually, that's not true I will get Scott Scarbough to do it for me.

Senator Wedding: I will like to have those numbers.

President Jacobs: All of those numbers are open to you.

Senator Jorgensen: At this stage is the Board of Regents going to get serious, perhaps doing things that are going to make the education in Ohio more efficient? For an example, I would imagine a high fraction of the advertisement dollars by most of the Sstate's university's go to competing to get a student to go to UT and Bowling Green instead of Ohio State. It seems to be incredibly inefficient that every one of these schools in the state has significant advertisement dollars and we are just recruiting for the same students; it's something like that.

President Jacobs: I believe the State will get serious. The problem is or at least I perceive the problem to be is that we love our economy as all the State institutions and to a degree, in which they put curves on our budget, you may spend it for this or you may spend it for that generally doesn't feel good to us. To my mind this is going to end up a centralization verses decentralization discussion at the State level. I'm not sure exactly where to come down on that. I know that you do not always perceive it, but I am actually in favor of decentralization even within our own University, but hard times always cause a tendency to centralize. A difficult tight budget time invariably causes a centralization of control and I aspect to see a significant centralization control for the next couple of years at the State level

Senator Anderson: Why don't you bring that to the curriculum? Maybe Marcia can help answer this question, but what I heard was that the State is considering a revision of the transfer module. For example, coalescing requirements so that two science courses will be become one.

Senator Barnes: What do you mean they will stop requiring?

Senator Anderson: I don't know what that means.

President Jacobs: Do you know Marcia?

Assist. Vice Provost King-Blandford: There has been a lot of discussion and the creation of this manual by institutions and the way that the State is changing their funding model into moving away from the fifteen day head count into moving to course completion then to degree completion. As you do know that they change the taxonomy model of subsidy so that courses in the general Education curriculum have a low subsidy level. So it's not so much of your fourteen day head count institutionalize, it will be your course enrollments based on the subsidy level. So courses in the General Education curriculum will receive a G-Level subsidy which will be the lowest subsidy. So courses that support degree completion are associated with what they refer to as a B-Level. Within these four classifications they now have subject codes that are tied to the zip code and those are STEM, Business, Education and Social Science, and, Arts and Humanities; so now all of the courses carry this new taxonomy. So the funding formula has changed dramatically and this is something that we are looking at very seriously and hope to come back and have conversations about it because this is where your conversation is going. Universities do not want a lot of G-Level courses, so the conversation about transfer and articulation in the State is about establishing through this operating manual a minimum number of credit hours in the General Education curriculum and this is being driven by these four institutions who are writing the four year operating manual. To get to your point, yes there are very serious conversations going on at the state level about having a minimum number of classes in General Ed and that will be one Math, one Science, one English, and one Social Science. This is the minimum and you can have more, but keep in mind that those classes in the core will be set at the lowest subsidy levels.

President Jacobs: So that by way of saying I think we are going to be seeing a lot more of centralization in every aspect.

Senator Dowd: This is a different topic. I understand that the Senior Leadership is meeting with two outside groups tomorrow. I heard a description regarding the purpose of those discussions, but I want to ask you what the motivation is for bringing these outside groups to campus?

President Jacobs: The people that will be there is Bill McMillen, Jeff Gold, Tom Beverge, Mary Powers, Jamie Barlowe, John Barrett, David Dalphany and Mike Touncil and that is the same group that assembled at the Stranhaim Arboretum some weeks ago to make some final inputs and adjustments to the reorganization plan. So, in a sense this is a beginning to think about a final stage of the reorganization plan. I'm sure that you probably read this long letter that I sent out to the world a while back and one of the late paragraphs in that letter states "and step five will be sorting through the hundred departments to look for alignments, redundancies etc." I think that this is to begin thinking about when, how, and where we might undertake that step five. At this point I am not sure that we need an outside consultant. I have purposely invited the current Faculty Senate President and the two past Presidents to be in that conversation and we will see where that goes, it is highly preliminary at this point.

Senator Dowd: I am glad to hear that it will be a preliminary conversation, but honestly it sort of hurts our feelings. I really hope that you know that you always have the opportunity to turn to Faculty Senate to address such issues. And because of that I don't understand the need for outside consultants.

President Jacobs: Well, outside brains never hurts for heaven sake and I have invited your President and two past Presidents into this discussion. I can't tell you Senator Dowd how much it bothers me to have hurt your feelings again; I am not joking I am serious. It seems to me that the inspection point, the moment in time, the moment in history where we find ourselves is that this is a moment to change the conversation. Every time I got visited at your request at the Faculty Senate the conversation has turned generally to your prerogatives and my short comings in which there are many, but what I want to talk to you about and your engaging in that conversation is our pursuit of excellence and how we do this better together. So if you were to put together a group and come and say look here's a way to do that step five that is cheaper, better, faster, more alfacasious, and student centered no one would be happier than me and I would be delighted. Thank you.

President Powers: Thank you President. Jacobs. The next order of business is some old business which was discussed at our last meeting. We mentioned Senator Piazza's participation and how faculty council the Ohio Board of Regents. Senator Piazza was not able to be with us at the last meeting and I would now like to ask Senator Piazza to come forward and provide us his report from that meeting.

Senator Piazza: Thank you and I apologize that I wasn't able to be here at our last meeting to deliver this report. This is basically a report of my notes on the last meeting that was held on Friday November 12, 2010.

The OFC as well as a number of guests from the Ohio Education Association and the Ohio AAUP met with OBOR Chancellor Eric Fingerhut to discuss future plans for higher education in light of the recent election outcomes. Chancellor Fingerhut stated that he wanted to address three issues.

First, Chancellor Fingerhut stated that higher education needs to be central to Ohio's economic development and he intends to make the case for the role of higher education in Ohio's future prosperity. He stated that he was unaware of any jobs program proposal that does not include education. The Chancellor pointed to the earnings gap between people with a college education and those without a college degree. The Chancellor noted that recent data show that a college education doubles your income potential. He also noted that nationally, unemployment for people with a high school degree or less is around 20%, while unemployment for the college educated is only around 4%. Chancellor Fingerhut stated that we need to demonstrate to the legislature that increasing Ohio's college educated workforce increases tax revenues without increasing taxes because we have more people working and for higher wages.

Second, Chancellor Fingerhut was optimistic about getting bi-partisan support for a higher education budget. He noted that every budget for the past three years has been bi-partisan. He stated that his highest priority will be to protect the State Share of Instruction (SSI). SSI is about \$2 billion of the \$2.5 billion higher education budget. (As an aside, I might note that the rumor mill is already generating scenarios where SSI is cut anywhere from 25% to 50%.)

Third, Chancellor Fingerhut addressed the issue of tuition caps. The Chancellor stated that he did not favor a single across the board tuition caps. He stated that he favored a process where we

look at caps as a function of the role of the institution. For example, he stated that for community colleges it may be important to set lower caps in order to keep costs down and keep tuition affordable. He also favored allowing main campuses to have higher caps to help cover their higher costs. Consequently, community colleges may get more SSI, but have tougher tuition increase caps placed on them; main campus universities may get less SSI, but have greater latitude in raising tuition.

During the Q and A that followed Chancellor Fingerhut's presentation, he was asked about expanding the role of universities into job creation. Chancellor Fingerhut stated that the primary function of higher education has traditionally been to create a trained workforce that will attract jobs and employers to Ohio. He also stated that he felt it was appropriate, even desirable, that universities divert funding from academics to enterprise activities if it will create new businesses or new jobs. One could conclude that the mission of the "new" university will be expanding from that of workforce preparation to also include workforce creation.

After Chancellor Fingerhut finished his presentation and left the meeting, most items of business were informational. The only action item was a vote on a resolution to support House Bill 365 (the bill grants to part-time faculty and graduate assistants the right to collective bargaining as well as other rights). The resolution was adopted by a vote of 5 in favor, 4 opposed, and 4 abstaining. Many of those who voted against the resolution supported it for instructional personnel, however, opposed the resolution because it included graduate assistants. The opposition's position was that GAs are students who receive assistance from the university and not employees of the university. This includes my report from the Ohio Faculty Council and I will be glad to answer any questions or address any comments.

Senator Cluse-Tolar: Isn't Fingerhut's appointment a political appointment? So how likely is it that in January he is still going to be there?

Senator Piazza: Fingerhut was appointed by Governor Strickland to a five year term; he has a little over one year left on that term. That is an interesting question because it is a Cabinet appointment. The real question is going to be will Kasich want to keep Fingerhut in the Cabinet. I really don't know what his viability in that position is going to be and I think people are too polite to bring it up.

Senator Cluse-Tolar: Yeah, that's the elephant in the living room; he's on the left side of the party.

Senator Piazza: On the other hand, and this is a personal opinion, I never heard Kasich express much of a position on higher education. It could be that what Fingerhut is doing is not that out of line with what Kasich would like to see done over the next year before he can decide on who he would like to appoint.

Senator Fink: If Kasich has not expressed any real opinions on higher education, where are the estimates of the 20% cuts coming from?

Senator Piazza: Well those are the rumor mills at full speed. No one really knows where that is coming from and I think a lot of that is talk that is coming from the State Legislature. At this point I really think that it is probably premature to consider what the percentages might be because these new representatives have yet to be seated; we don't know who for an example is going to chair those committees that have oversight over the education budget and what kind of authority and power they are going to have in determining budgeted policy.

Senator Rouillard: You are saying that it is going to be 20%, but what you heard the 20% cuts are a rumor.

Senator Piazza: At this point there is no substance to them.

Senator Rouillard: Substance is a very good talking point to use if one wants to start talking about program cuts; it's severe.

Senator Piazza: It is certainly worst case scenario; it is not out of the realm of possibility. I would agree with President Jacobs, I don't think that you want to plan for a 10% cut, but get hit with a 20% cut.

Senator Rouillard: No.

Senator Piazza: You are much better off planning for the 20% cut and getting hit with a 10% cut. In addition, from what Chancellor Fingerhut told us it may be an average of a 25% in cuts to S.S.I, but we may experience a greater cut and be allowed to take a greater increase in tuition. On the other hand, Owens may experience less of a cut to S.S.I., but be capped a 2.5% tuition increase.

Senator Rouillard: This is not directed at you and I think that Provost McMillen just left, but my question is universities are more and more hiring lobbyist and we have government relation offices; where are these people in discussions with our State Legislature representing our interest as universities.

Senator Piazza: Actually Provost McMillen would have been the person to answer that, I really don't know.

Senator Rouillard: I have a feeling that people who are paid to represent us are simply sitting in a room and taking notes but not engaging our Legislatures on our behalf and explaining to them what our missions are at universities. It's becoming very troubling and again this is not directed at you.

Senator Piazza: No, I'm taking it personal.

Senator Rouillard: I asking that as a general question and perhaps we can come back to that when there is a Provost forum.

Senator Piazza: I can't address that, but I will say this that the Ohio Faculty Council does enjoy direct access to people. We meet in the office of the Ohio Board of Regents and we have talked to the Chancellor and to the Vice Chancellors, so if there are items that you would want brought to the attention to the Ohio Board of Regents, I will be glad to bring them. In fact we had a recent issue that came up that I brought to the attention of the chair of the Ohio Faculty Council and depending on the result of those discussions that may become a huge agenda item at some point unless we find out that there has been a resolution and a understanding that have been achieved. Part of my problem is that this is my first term on the Ohio Faculty Council, so I don't know what they have decided in the past.

Senator Rouillard: And I will. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank you for asking the faculty what we want conveyed in Columbus and to also have represented part-time instructors on this issue. I am very grateful to you because I think that is an important step in terms of improving the human condition position that we are arguing for.

Senator Piazza: Thank you and I appreciate it.

Senator Hoblet: Isn't it true the information that comes now from the legislature that the new representatives that will be seated in January, it specifically says in the news that they believe their mandate called up on by the voters is to decrease the deficit and get the budget in control.

Senator Piazza: What people are saying now and what they do and say after they get seated are two entirely different things.

Senator Hoblet: But that information is coming is out of legislators offices

Senator Piazza: Right. A lot of what is getting said is getting said at the federal level, people who are going to get seated at the house of representatives or the U.S. Congress; things are not quite as obvious I think when you start talking about your State Senator or your State Legislator and what they intend to do or what their positions are going to be. We are talking about people who send their kids to College in Ohio too and pay tuition in Ohio too, so what they are going to do after they get seated and what they say and how they vote maybe two different things. At this point I just really would hate to speculate on anything; as much as I like to render my opinion on everything. Thank you for your time.

President Powers: Thank you Senator Piazza. That includes the executive business from the meeting, is there any other business from the floor?

Senator Wedding: I want to address this to President Jacobs, Kasich has said that he is going to take over the Ohio Development and the Third Frontier, that money has been used primarily by the university for U.T....got \$25,000,000 out of that to do center work which all turned out to be a big nothing, but they got \$25,000,000. Kasich feels a lot of money has been wasted on research at the university by way of the Ohio department of Development and the Third Frontier; he said that during his campaign and I think that he will go through with it. I think that there will be a cut for the university, but it might be through Economic Development money and the Third Frontier.

Senator Thompson-Casado: With regard to the letter that went out to the outside consultants for program and departmental review and the ex-College of Arts and Sciences, President Jacobs said that he would welcome an alternative to that; did we not in the Faculty Senate have a process for a departmental program review that is already established, we have been doing this for years. Can we not do this? Would the Executive Committee consider that? We have been doing this for years; this is what we do in the Faculty Senate.

Senator Dowd: Are you referring to the Academic Programs Committee?

Senator Thompson-Casado: Yes. I only been here for seventeen years and sometimes this stuff get confused in my head, but in foreign languages we have been under the axe several times and I know that we have gone through program review and this was guided by the Faculty Senate. Can we not do this again for the entire College?

Senator Dowd: What I remember about this is from many years ago. So if anybody can clarify this issue please do so. The last time program review occurred on the Main Campus was in 1998. Under that process Faculty Senate would look at undergraduate programs and the Graduate Council would look at Graduate Program.

Senator Thompson-Casado: Right.

Senator Dowd: That was full blown program review and in that sense I agree with you. But we have to be careful because the type of program review that you and I experienced back then may not be what is being discussed now. That is, I don't think that is the same type of program review that the President is talking about.

Senator Anderson: He is looking to merge them.

Senator Dowd: Based on statements made, I believe he is looking to merge or eliminate a number of programs as oppose to the old program review which was to identify weaknesses within a program in order to make it a stronger program.

Senator Thompson-Casado: One of the things that we have done in program review is to let everyone understand that even cutting courses and professors did not result in substantial economic savings and that was the point that came out of the review. From my understanding, this program review is dealing with the economic issues of trying to cut from the budget. We have done this in foreign languages and we have shown that when you cut our faculty and staff economically this does not give you savings, you lose income.

Senator Rouillard: You cut revenue.

Senator Thompson-Casado: Right. So what I am asking, cannot the Faculty Senate do the program review because President Jacobs said that he was open for options instead of having outsiders do this.

Senator Dowd: Are you presenting a log item to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to look into the formation of such a group? President Powers, is Senator Thompson-Casado's request acceptable as a log item?

President Powers: Yes.

Senator Lundquist: I read that letter that came from the President regarding outside consultants, I do not remember it saying that it is going to focus on the College that use to be Arts and Sciences; did it?

Group of Senators: No.

Senator Lundquist: President Jacobs did say one hundred departments were being opened.

Group of Senators: That's what he said.

Senator Lundquist: But the tricky part is that it said very "specific and limited beginnings."

Senator Wedding: I don't think that there are a hundred departments on this campus. I think there are less medical students from a large number.

Senator Barrett: It's close to a hundred.

Senator Wedding: The last time that I saw it was before the merger and it was around fifty, so we picked up more I guess.

Senator Cluse-Tolar: President Powers when you and the others go to the meeting tomorrow, can you find out how much this is going to cost for the outside consultants.

President Powers: Yes. Are there any other questions or concerns that the Senate would like for me to take to the meeting tomorrow?

Senator Jorgensen: First I want to reply to the question about review. The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee looks at the curriculum changes and then brings them to us and so that's not Program Review. As Mike said we have not had program review in a very long time and frankly we do need Program Review and it does need to be more critical than it has been in the past. Of course there's a role for the Senate in this and as the suggestion being made, how Senate would be involved in this is one of the issues to discuss with this group because that was in a letter that you shared, it was asking how the groups would work with faculty to do it. The Senate just has to be there to make sure that there's a role and input, but we do have to do it; we just can't say it that there is going to be no review, tight finances are the reality.

Senator Anderson: Two elements that need to be asked at the meeting tomorrow and maybe we both can ask it. Why these particular consultants; who have no record of academic standing and academic review? So how are they possibly going to know about reviewing departments and

programs? Except from a financial point of view and they might do very well. The other question that I want to ask is how we can combine this with the HLC program review.

Senator Sawicki: There really isn't a HLC Program Review standard.

Senator Anderson: Okay.

Senator Sawicki: Higher Learning Commissions expects programs to undergo a review periodically, but they don't set anything as far as timing or the standards to use, as oppose to the requirements of the Board of Regents of the state of Ohio. I can tell you that the state of Ohio expects PhD programs to be reviewed at least once every eight years UT has not reviewed its PhD programs since 1998 or so, and thus for more than ten years.

Senator Anderson: What is the measure of the validity of a particular program: whether it's producing a stream of students, and/or whether two programs might merge?

Senator Sawicki: That's a different aspect of program review. Part of the Higher Learning Commission Self Study is to look at assessment processes to ensure all of the programs have objectives for student learning, that those are actually evaluated and that changes are made to the curriculum to enhance student learning and outcomes (how well students are learning) etc.. Finding that programs are doing assessment of student learning is a component of Program Review. Program Review would check that programs have an assessment process in place and then it would monitor categories such as enrollment, application numbers, academic strength of the applicant pool, which students are admitted and matriculate, time to degree, numbers of graduates, job placement, employer satisfaction with graduates etc. This last year there's been a lot of movement on getting university assessment activity to the program level in each of the colleges and to have a process for each of the supporting units. The Self Study group is grateful to Steve LeBlanc's committee for their work to begin an assessment process for the Core Curriculum. Also, the University Assessment Committee has been working to set up a new process that is easier for assessment liaison and faculty use that will have a common form (matrix) and common assessment elements about student learning for each program to focus on in their annual reports. I think the University of Toledo is taking big steps on assessment processes this past year. Program Review is something that is in earlier stages and hasn't started yet. We hope to see program review roll out soon for both undergraduate and graduate programs.

Senator Jorgensen: But the letter does talk about some changes in three or four months.

Senator Anderson: That's right.

Senator Jorgensen: So that seems to be a view to make a decision before the Program Review process is completed.

Senator Horan: This afternoon at a town meeting Jim Nemeth asked President Jacobs about consulting consultants and the President said "the one consulting firm that was requested to submit a proposal is one that has offices in Los Angeles and Boston and that they certainly had a

pretty good size record in education.” I wasn’t sure about the President’s knowledge about the Detroit firm, Alix Partners, though he did say much smaller than the other firm.

Senator Anderson: I looked on their website and it’s not there.

Senator Horan: They are handling bankruptcies.

President Powers: Any other questions or concerns?

May I have a motion for adjournment?

Meeting adjourned at 5:57 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Hoblet
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard
Faculty Senate Office Administrative
Secretary