

Assurance Argument
University of Toledo - OH

3/15/2016

5 - Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness

The institution's resources, structures, and processes are sufficient to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and opportunities. The institution plans for the future.

5.A - Core Component 5.A

The institution's resource base supports its current educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future.

1. The institution has the fiscal and human resources and physical and technological infrastructure sufficient to support its operations wherever and however programs are delivered.
2. The institution's resource allocation process ensures that its educational purposes are not adversely affected by elective resource allocations to other areas or disbursement of revenue to a superordinate entity.
3. The goals incorporated into mission statements or elaborations of mission statements are realistic in light of the institution's organization, resources, and opportunities.
4. The institution's staff in all areas are appropriately qualified and trained.
5. The institution has a well-developed process in place for budgeting and for monitoring expense.

Argument

UT has the resources, structures and processes required to fulfill its mission, support its core values and continuously focus on its vision of continuous improvement and academic excellence and student learning. The faculty, staff and administration are committed to embrace and enhance the University's learning environment daily. UT purposefully employs effective administrative policies and practices to tailor its resources to respond and meet current and anticipated future challenges.

1. The institution has the fiscal and human resources and physical and technological infrastructure sufficient to support its operations wherever and however programs are delivered.

The University of Toledo's resource base is evidenced by the most recent state of Ohio's resource analysis. UT's 2014 composite score of financial health is 3.8. This ratio is the result of strategic financial management that resulted in increases from 2013 (3.5) and 2012 (3.3). Results of the primary reserve, net income, and viability ratios are communicated to the UT Board of Trustees (BOT).

UT's overall fiscal picture is summarized in the [Annual Financial Report](#), which indicates UT has a sound financial base. UT relies on three main sources of revenue – state aid, federal grants and tuition. UT has worked to maximize net tuition and fees since 2012, while also minimizing the net financial burden to students. The fall 2015 enrollment was 20,381 (16,848 FTE) as compared to 20,626 (17,237 FTE) in fall 2014. Plans for enhanced enrollment planning are discussed in criterion 5.C.5. From FY2012-15 tuition revenues have remained constant, with students funding a greater percentage of the total operating budget (from 31.5% to 40.5%). Federal grant revenues rose slightly but state aid's

relative share of revenues declined. State aid accounts for 27.9% of revenues, while federal source account for 25.1% of revenues. The [University of Toledo Foundation](#) is a legally separate, tax-exempt entity acting primarily as a fundraising organization to supplement the resources available in support of UT programs and has [provided over \\$52M](#) in support since 2012. UT also is in compliance with federal mandates: The [2015 external audit report](#) indicated "In our opinion, the University of Toledo complied, in all material respects, with the types of compliance requirements referred to above that could have a direct and material effect on each of its major federal programs for the year ended June 30, 2015."

The University planned for a 2% increase in enrollment for AY 2015-16, which did not materialize. To compensate for the loss, a budget reduction was implemented in spring 2015 (1.5% of operating budgets remaining) and for next year (3% of total budget) for each college and unit. The University has engaged of Ruffalo Noel Levitz to assist in the development and implementation of a strategic enrollment plan to cure declining enrollment.

UT is a leading Ohio research institution, with 1,487 instructional faculty members, 3,115 staff members and 999 research/graduate assistants in [fall 2015](#). UT is well positioned with appropriate faculty and staff to carry out its mission and vision (see criterion 3.C.1). A discussion of faculty and staff training and education/professional development appears in criterion 5.A.4 and criterion 3.C.

The University, located on ~900 [acres](#), comprises Main and Health Science campuses, and service and/or educational facilities at Scott Park campus, Lake Erie Center, Arboretum, and Toledo Museum of Art. In total, there are 120 (102 major) [buildings](#), with [7,866,507 gross sq ft](#) of space, including 229 classrooms, and 137 class labs used for instruction by UT. Specialized facilities include the Immersive Interprofessional Simulation Center, Collier Clinical Skills Center, Neff Trading Floor, Nitschke Technology Commercialization Complex and Launchpad Incubator, recital and performance halls for the arts, UT Online Center, University Computer Center, Wolfe Green House, Larimer Athletic Center, basketball and football stadia, Student Health Centers, University Medical Center, Libraries (Canaday Center, Carlson and Mulford libraries, Engineering Library, LaValley Law library), Carver Resource Center curriculum collection (J. H. College of Education), Student Union and Student Recreation Center.

UT's commitment to the advancement of knowledge through excellence in learning, discovery and engagement requires continuous improvement and upgrades in its technological infrastructure, software, networks, facilities and delivery systems. [Evidence of this commitment](#) begins with noting the ~\$3 million infrastructure upgrade in 2014-15 to continue to achieve its mission and vision; an additional \$8 million is being invested during AY16. UT continually looks for opportunities to expand online education as well as use of technology to create simulation or emulation. For example, UT created the \$34 million [Lloyd A. Jacobs Interprofessional Immersive Simulation Center](#), a facility to enhance education of health care students and professionals, which opened in 2014. The Center for Creative Instruction along with the UT Simulation and Game Studio provides capability to build simulation and game applications for academic programs. And, the [Maker Society](#) is a student-run organization created to start a makerspace for students to have the resources to create their own projects, and build a community of diversely skilled, creative individuals. The National Science Foundation awarded UT one of 50 "iCorps" sites, enabling students to create prototypes for their classroom experience.

2. The institution's resource allocation process ensures that its educational purposes are not adversely affected by elective resource allocations to other areas or disbursement of revenue to a superordinate entity.

UT's BOT is responsible for oversight of academic programs, budgets, general administration and employment of faculty and staff and ensures that educational purposes are not adversely affected by any elective resource allocations. UT's resource allocation begins with BOT approval of current and unrestricted budgets. All expenditures are budgeted each fiscal year prior to being spent. The BOT [Finance and Audit Committee](#) receives the recommended budget from administration, recommends actions and provides oversight of all revenue and expenses. By reviewing financial statements, the Finance and Audit Committee monitors revenue and expenses against the annual budget and strives to advance areas of the UT Strategic Plan.

Management level and senior leadership within each administrative office or college department is responsible for oversight of their respective budgets. Specific directives of the BOT along with strict adherence to state and federal statutes, regulations and policies and review by the provost/dean/finance operations help to ensure funds are allocated to support educational goals. Any individual requests that are not budgeted for and that are presented to the Board after the Annual Budget is approved require BOT approval. To ensure appropriate departmental funding is available, monthly reconciliation is required by the 15th of each month by business managers and department staff. This information along with frequently asked questions related to [budget controls](#) is on the Controller's Office website. The Office of Financial Planning and Budget also meets quarterly with business managers and department staff to review actual results in comparison with their approved budget and recommend budget adjustments.

UT's [audited financial statements](#) reflect all assets, deferred inflows/outflows, liabilities and net position of the University and UT Foundation. An internal challenge UT is facing based on a changing environment is depreciation of current structures. Evidence to support the argument UT is strategically managing this challenge is demonstrated by a review of the resource allocation appearing in UT's [quarterly financial statements](#), presented by source of funds, which includes deferred maintenance for sustainability of educational facilities and technology upgrades.

As concern for aging buildings and depreciation continues to be in the forefront, a [supplemental capital budget request](#) was [proposed at the BOT Finance and Audit Committee and subsequently approved](#) by the full BOT to address these needs. Additional recent strategies to achieve sustainability within the organization include an [affiliation agreement with ProMedica Health Systems](#), whereby an investment of \$250M in capital will go to College of Medicine and Life Sciences facilities and \$50M/year for 50 years will support education and clinical training or \$2.75B total, plus inflationary increases.

The decision process for resource allocation is summarized annually in the [President's Recommended Budget](#). The process used to develop the academic budget is highly participatory over several months of budget meetings and campus conversations. These discussions are highly transparent. The process includes active participation by division leaders, the [President's Advisory Council](#) and its [Finance and Strategy Committee](#), which includes representation from Faculty Senate, the deans, faculty and senior administrators. In the annual operating budget process, individual units develop detailed budget plans, which are reviewed, approved and prioritized by their leaders. Leaders also identify areas of potential budget reductions/disinvestments. The discussions continue through June; although changes to specific line items might occur, the net result remains intact.

UT assures resources are allocated true to its core mission through a very collaborative and participative process. Decisions on resource allocation follow two key criteria:

- Centrality to core activities of research, instruction and patient care while adhering to the University's mission.

- Excellence: Each division's plan is reviewed and an allocation of resources is determined with an understanding of the key assumptions used to develop the overall budget (enrollment, student retention, state-imposed tuition caps, fee revenue, state subsidy, discount rate, faculty workload). The allocation of resources make optimal use of the University's total resources in a manner that strengthens UT's commitment to advance knowledge through excellence in learning, discovery and engagement.

The University's [2015 Annual Independent Audit](#) found no discrepancies (see criterion 5.A.1). Internal financial controls monitor and review all expenditures through the Accounts Payable office and monitor overall budget activity through the Office of Financial Planning, Analysis and Budget, both part of the Office of Finance. The Office of Financial Planning, Analysis and Budget also undertakes periodic reviews with all business managers during the year to discuss revenues and expenditures. The associate vice president for finance prepares an institutional overview of the annual expenditures and comparison to the Board-approved budget quarterly and presents it to the BOT and Senior Leadership. The report monitors overall revenues, with a focus on cash flow and maintenance of cash reserves, measured against projections. UT's Annual Independent Audit Report is presented at a public BOT meeting and maintained on the Office of Finance website.

3. The goals incorporated into mission statements or elaborations of mission statements are realistic in light of the institution's organization, resources, and opportunities.

The mission and strategic plan [goals](#) are realistic for an institution of higher education whose breadth of colleges (from the arts to law, pharmacy, medicine, business and engineering, etc.) and programs is matched by fewer than 30 other institutions in the country. The goals have a learner-driven focus "to ensure a personally satisfying, professionally relevant and affordable education" as well as a focus on quality for the professional, graduate and undergraduate education and patient care delivered. They reflect the commitment to retain a clinical enterprise as an integral part of UT's academic mission and community engagement, and to participate in revitalization of the region's economic, educational, health, cultural, environmental and civic quality of life. The latter is realistic given UT's efforts in outreach and engagement (see Criterion 1). A focus on research is realistic given UT's recognition as a metropolitan research institution, its level of external research funding and the national/international reputation of many of its faculty (e.g. [Timothy Fisher](#), geology chair). Thus, UT's mission goals are foundational to its core values, organizational commitment of resources and programmatic development and offerings. The [committee structure](#) of the Board of Trustees is evidence of the strategic reality of mission guidance at the governance level. The University's [key strategic initiatives](#) for AY 2014-2015, many [met](#), were guided by its mission goals and core values. These initiatives developed by the interim President and senior leadership team, and vetted by UT faculty and staff provided tactical guidance for [budget development](#) and resource utilization.

4. The institution's staff in all areas is appropriately qualified and trained.

UT has a comprehensive process that identifies [appropriate qualifications](#) and training for all faculty and staff (see criterion 3.C). Embedded in the processes discussed below is an overarching program of diversity education and training, utilized when organizing search committees and other regular University activities. The resulting functions and outcomes are documented in the most recent employee [Climate Survey](#), where results indicate employees consider themselves well-trained for their duties. Although training is typically administered and funded at the department level, employees believe opportunities exist for leadership skills development that can be administered at the University level. One example is the University Teaching Center, which provides training in educational methods, in assessment of student learning (see Criterion 4) and a workshop series for chairs. Another example is the [Culture Building Institute](#), available to all faculty and staff for free.

A full discussion of faculty qualifications is in criterion 3.C.2. It is expected that UT faculty possess the credentials required by the [Ohio Board of Regents Guidelines and Procedures](#) for instructors of higher education. Audits of transcripts and CVs ensure faculty qualifications and provide evidence that UT faculty are well qualified, with many nationally recognized for their research, teaching and service. As of February 2016, 16 faculty/staff are certified Quality Matters peer reviewers, with three also certified as Master Peer Reviewers. As demonstrated by annual commendations by students and colleagues, UT [recognizes](#) the outstanding quality of the faculty it has attracted to the institution. A discussion of faculty development is in criterion 3.C.4. The University provides [training](#) in Clery Act, ALiCE and Title IX regulations and procedures.

[Campus Security Authorities](#) (CSAs) have been identified at every level of UT from our President down to student staff; they are mandated to report crimes, of which they are made aware, to either the police or via the CSA report web form. Since September 2015, UT has identified approximately 1500 CSAs and initial and ongoing training is provided to them.

Staff qualifications are discussed in criterion 3.C.3. UT's Human Resources and Talent Development (HRTD) office offers a [manager's toolkit](#) that provides information on hiring best practices. Resources include a [pre-employment screening tool](#) to recruit qualified candidates and a post-employment screening tool to assess skill sets and competencies to determine training needs. As indicated in [Licensure Verification Policy 3364-25-09](#), HRTD verifies new employees hold appropriate licensure, certification or registration, and conducts [criminal background checks](#) on all final candidates hired or rehired for a position, as required by policy and law.

HRTD is committed to fostering professional development for staff by offering [manager and supervisor training programs](#). Sessions include [core and skills basics](#) such as customer service and motivation, offering individual programs for development. When planning annual budgets, departments consider staff development training costs such as seminars and conferences. See also Criterion 3.C.6.

In addition to continuing professional education, funded and supported by UT operating units, the Office of Quality and Continuous Learning offers employees professional development courses, many of which qualify for UT college credit. The [Professional Staff Council](#) (PSA) seeks professional development by working with HRTD to coordinate training programs. Staff development is supported by the Testing Services department, which offers career certifications in areas such as IT and trade certification exams. Staff receives up to 8 credit hours of free UT tuition and fees per semester. The University provides [training](#) in Clery Act, ALiCE and Title IX regulations and procedures.

5. The institution has a well-developed process in place for budgeting and for monitoring expense.

UT's annual budget development process is coordinated by the Office of Financial Planning, Analysis and Budget (discussed in Criterion 5.C). The budget process typically begins mid-December and ends in May. Budget development guidelines are sent to each vice president (vp) in January prior to the start of a new fiscal year.

The recommended annual budget is presented to senior leadership and the [Finance and Strategy Committee](#) for review, mailed to Board members for review and considered for [approval at the June BOT meeting](#). The following constituency groups comprise the Finance and Strategy Committee: faculty; Faculty Senate; deans; provost and executive vp for academic affairs; interim senior vp of finance and administration; vp of corporate relations; and a vice-provost. This process is described in

greater detail in Criterion 5.C.1.

UT has a [budget control procedure](#) (see Criterion 5.A.2) addressing management of budget authority for departments that indicates all expenditures of funds received by and deposited with the University shall be expended in accordance with applicable state and federal statutes, regulation, policy and specific directives of the BOT. If budget transfers are necessary, funding can be moved from one index/account code to another by the business/unit administrator who submits an electronic form. The forms are sent to the [Office of Financial Planning, Analysis and Budget](#) for review and implementation. The budget transfers do not change the BOT approved total net income; they are transfers within operating expenditures or revenues.

Amendments to the budget may be necessary due to unforeseen circumstances. A budget amendment process is used for budget changes, either changing total revenue and/or expenditure lines, or when additional expenditure authority is being requested from central contingencies. Again, budget amendments do not change the BOT-approved total net income; they are transfers within operating expenditures or revenues.

Student government plays a significant role in budget processes. A General Fee Committee led by student representatives allocates general fees annually through a formalized process. The end product of the committee's work is to recommend distribution to eligible auxiliary departments and student organizations of student fees, based on forecasted enrollment. A [summary of actions](#) illustrates their role in the overall budget process.

Additional information regarding institutional allocation of resources is in Criterion 5.C.1.

In summary, The University's resource base supports its current educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future. Financial resources are allocated through a highly participative process guided by UT's mission and various realities, including student enrollment and retention, and the levels of state and federal funding. The annual President's Recommended Budget is developed to include the input of academic departments, student constituencies, staff and administrators, and ultimately formally approval by the BOT. The general fees collected each semester are allocated at the direction of a committee with significant student representation. An extensive list of infrastructure improvements, information system improvements, and collaborations/partnerships have been implemented by UT since 2012; the ~\$34 million Interprofessional Immersive Simulation Center and the College of Medicine strategic partnership with ProMedica Corporation are just two recent examples of student-centered investments that improve the educational experience. UT's solid financial position is due largely to a strong level of reserves and return on investments; however, operating losses in recent years required UT to reconsider its previous approaches to funding depreciation, managing deferred maintenance, engaging in an in-depth financial review of its numerous academic programs, and engaging Ruffalo Noel Levitz to assist in development and implementation of a strategic enrollment plan to cure declining enrollment.

Sources

- 2015 Facts at a Glance
- Academic Budget Procedures
- Acreage of Campuses 02-22-2016
- Awards - Faculty and Staff Recognition
- BOT Bylaw 3364-01-03 Committees of the Board
- BOT Bylaw 3364-01-03 Committees of the Board (page number 2)

- BOT Minutes 6-15-2015 budget approval
- BOT Minutes 6-15-2015 budget approval (page number 2)
- BOT Minutes 6-15-2015 budget approval (page number 7)
- BOT Minutes Finance Audit Committee 12-15-14 and Consent Agenda approval 02-09-2015
- Building Inventory 02-04-2016
- Building Inventory 02-04-2016 (page number 15)
- Buildings - Number 02-22-2016
- Campus Climate Survey 2014
- Campus Climate Survey 2014 Results
- Campus Climate Survey 2014 Results (page number 28)
- Campus Security Authorities CSAs
- Classroom Facilities Summary 2015
- Culture Building Institute
- Directions 2011 Institutional Goals
- Finance and Strategy Committee
- Finance and Strategy Meeting Minutes 12-11-15
- Fisher Article - UT News
- General Fee Process
- Independent Audit Report by Plante & Moran 2014
- Information Technology Capital Plan
- Interprofessional Immersive Simulation Center IISC
- Key Strategic Initiatives for AY 2014-2015
- Manager training-MC schedule 2015
- Managers-Core Basics
- OBOR Academic-Program-Review-Guidelines_FINAL_042915
- Office of Financial Planning, Analysis and Budget with Academic Finance and 2014 Academic Budget
- Preemployment Screening
- President's Advisory Council PAC
- Professional Staff Association
- Quarterly Financial Statement - Q1 FY16
- Recommended Budget FY16-Budget Book
- Recommended Budget FY16-Budget Book (page number 3)
- Strategically Aligned Budget
- Student General Fee Committee
- Supplemental Capital Budget Request 12-15-2014
- Training Sessions-Clery Act.ALiCE.Title IX
- UT Annual Financial Report 2015
- UT Annual Financial Report 2015 (page number 69)
- UT Board of Trustees Audit Report 2015AY
- UT Foundation Annual Report 2015
- UT Foundation Annual Report 2015 (page number 12)
- UT Foundation Annual Report 2015 (page number 15)
- UT Maker Society
- UT Policy no 3364-25-09 Licensure Verification
- UT Policy no. 3364-25-47 Criminal Background Check
- UT Policy no. 3364-72-11 University Evaluation of Faculty Qualifications DRAFT
- UT-Promedica Affiliation Agreement final

5.B - Core Component 5.B

The institution's governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the institution to fulfill its mission.

1. The governing board is knowledgeable about the institution; it provides oversight of the institution's financial and academic policies and practices and meets its legal and fiduciary responsibilities.
2. The institution has and employs policies and procedures to engage its internal constituencies—including its governing board, administration, faculty, staff, and students—in the institution's governance.
3. Administration, faculty, staff, and students are involved in setting academic requirements, policy, and processes through effective structures for contribution and collaborative effort.

Argument

1. The governing board is knowledgeable about the institution; it provides oversight for the institution's financial and academic policies and practices and meets its legal and fiduciary responsibilities.

Chapter 3364 of the Ohio Revised Code, the enabling statute of UT, establishes UT BOT as governing authority of the University. This is discussed in more detail in Criterion 2.A. The governor appoints trustees, who serve without compensation, for nine-year terms. The UT BOT bylaws describe in detail how the Board is chosen and roles of members not appointed by the Ohio governor, such as community members. All Board meetings are public. The President is required at the beginning of each academic year to make a report to the BOT reviewing the administration's prior year goals and objectives, proposing new ones for the upcoming year and discussing "the University's well being and challenges."

The BOT approves tuition and fees; ratifies strategic plans and substantive curricular matters; approves the final budget and audited financial statements; confers undergraduate, graduate and professional degrees; confers promotion and tenure on faculty members; approves appointments to the medical staff of the UT Medical Center; and authorizes the appointments of new faculty members, administrators and other employees. The minutes of Board meetings are posted publicly on UT's website. The Board's awareness of its responsibilities is formalized via a published code of ethics and a statement of comportment and bylaws. The BOT has the [authority to hire the President](#), as it did with President Gaber in 2015.

UT's body of policies and procedures provide guidance to, and engage, all constituents in the governance structure. All University policies are stored on a [central website](#).

2. The institution has and employs policies and procedures to engage its internal constituencies, including its governing board, administration, faculty, staff and students, in the institution's governance.

UT is part of the University System of Ohio and one of 14 four-year, state-supported public

universities in Ohio. The Ohio Department of Higher Education (ODHE) (formerly the Ohio Board of Regents) is the coordinating authority for higher education in Ohio.

UT employs policies and procedures to engage its internal constituencies – including its governing board, administration, faculty, staff and students – in the institution’s governance. UT’s [policy development and vetting process](#) is publicly posted and includes a 30-day solicitation of feedback from all stakeholders, including senior leadership, deans, faculty, students and staff. The policies are posted as final once approved and signed.

Evidence that the structure is working includes that, since FY2012, UT has not been cited for any significant regulatory or policy violations by federal or state authorities or by its independent auditors or internal auditors. When a need to reassess and improve Title IX campus safety practices was identified in a 2014 internal audit (see criterion 5.D.2), UT implemented a plan working with external consultants to enhance due process at each step and create objective, fair and timely processes. Other examples of stakeholder involvement in governance are:

- In the interest of transparency, UT also accepts requests from the general public regarding its internal operations. The process for handling public records requests is documented in UT [Public Records Policy 3364-10-02](#). A list of requests from 2013-15 is [here](#).
- Opportunities exist for faculty, staff and students to participate in governance through membership on the BOT and/or UT committees. The governor appoints non-voting student members to the Board using a procedure [specific to student members](#). Faculty members serve as members of Board committees but do not serve on the full Board.
- [Student Government](#) consists of elected members of the undergraduate student body and has both a Student Senate (four committees including the Student Affairs Committee that presides over all things relating to the student academic experience, student life, and student services that support safety, health and education) and a Student Judicial Council. The [Graduate Student Association](#) president is a non-voting member of Graduate Council and has responsibility to participate in decisions affecting graduate programs and graduate policies/procedures.
- Students and faculty serve on curriculum committees for colleges, one example being the [College of Medicine and Life Sciences](#).
- Article II of the [Constitution of the Faculty Senate](#) provides for the Senate to consider any subject pertaining to UT and to make recommendations to the administration and to exercise responsibility for academic affairs of the University, subject to the BOT.
- The [Graduate Council Constitution](#) outlines the responsibilities of the graduate faculty, among which is serving as the representative body of the graduate faculty and legislating for them.
- The Collective Bargaining Agreements for [tenure faculty](#) and [lecturers](#), and the [Rules and Regulations](#) (bylaws of the non-union faculty) provide for faculty roles in decision making and governance of academic affairs such as instruction, learning assessment, research, granting of degrees, honors and awards, and academic standards within that college consistent with the governance structure of that college. The [UT AAUP Executive Committee](#) and the [Faculty Committee on Rules and Regulations](#) review and make recommendations on policies and procedures governing faculty, such as appointment, promotion, tenure, faculty leaves and dismissal.
- Faculty and administrators share leadership on University-wide governance bodies such as the [Research Council](#) as well as regulatory committees such as the [Institutional Review Board](#) and the [Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee](#).

The following are also vital to UT’s successes in sharing governance:

- An engaged, committed Faculty Senate, Graduate Council and [President’s Advisory Council](#),

which replaced the University Council in summer 2015;

- UT Finance Department involvement in key resource planning and allocation decision;
- A strong infrastructure of institution-wide policies and procedures acted on and audited;
- Input from all campuses on changes in policy and strategic direction;
- Partnerships and collaborations with faculty and staff labor unions on campus.

3. Administration, faculty, staff, and students are involved in setting academic requirements, policy, and processes through effective structures for contribution and collaborative effort.

Below are UT's structures for contribution and collaborative effort. Faculty, staff, administrators and students are involved and engaged in setting academic requirements, policy and processes. This was previously discussed in Criterion 5.B.2. Evidence the structures are working is found in results of the most recent employee [Climate Survey](#), suggesting employees are engaged at the highest levels since this survey was first conducted. The Climate Survey utilizes Likert scales, multiple choice and fill-in selections covering areas such as perception of overall climate, acceptance, diversity-related services, courses, programs and/or organizations, attitudes and feelings toward others, discrimination and harassment, and awareness. Task forces are created through the [Culture Ambassadors](#) each year the survey is administered. Those task forces are charged with identifying issues to be addressed as well as successes to be celebrated.

Additional sources of evidence are the Faculty Senate and Graduate Council reports delivered at each Academic and Student Affairs Board Committee meeting. These reports are posted publicly in meeting minutes on the BOT website; they are summations of the more detailed [Faculty Senate](#) and [Graduate Council](#) meeting minutes published on their websites. The [2015 Mission and Integrity Survey](#) results report a greater feeling of engagement from Faculty Senate in recent years, especially beginning in FY2015.

The 64-member [Faculty Senate](#) is responsible for oversight of undergraduate academic programs and policies, and the 29 voting-member [Graduate Council](#) for oversight of graduate programs. The delegated responsibility of the Faculty Senate for undergraduate academic affairs is published in the [Faculty Senate Constitution](#). Faculty Senate and Graduate Council are elected bodies with membership proportionate to the size of the colleges represented.

Most [full-time tenured and tenure-track](#) UT faculty on the main campus are subject to a collective bargaining agreement between UT and its chapter of the American Association of University Professors ([UT-AAUP](#)). A separate AAUP collective bargaining agreement exists [for lecturers](#). While most UT faculty are governed by the AAUP agreement, all administrators, College of Law, College of Medicine and Life Sciences, part-time faculty, visiting faculty, and portions of the College of Health Sciences faculty are "nonunion" and not covered by a collective bargaining agreement. However, College of Law faculty adhere to the CBA and nonunion colleges of Medicine and Health Sciences faculty are represented by the [Rules and Regulations](#) bylaws, participating in UT's governance process to the same degree as their union counterparts and receiving the same general employee benefits and other consideration.

As required by the Faculty Senate Constitution, colleges have governing councils, either of the whole or elected, constitutions and bylaws, serving as a faculty voice and providing oversight of programs, curricula and other college-specific issues. [Article 13 of the Faculty Senate Constitution](#) describes this process.

Faculty, deans, chairs and administrators serve on Finance and Strategy Committee, Senior Leadership Team, President's Advisory Council, and the Office of the Provost's Academic Leadership Team and allow for their contribution and collaboration.

Classified employees on both the Main Campus ([CWA](#)) and the Health Science Campus ([AFSCME](#)) also play an important role in University governance through negotiated collective bargaining agreements that outline issues such as working conditions, salaries and benefits, management rights, non-discrimination, leaves, grievance procedures and employee conduct.

Non-faculty administrative personnel and professional staff (PSA) are employed on annual at-will contracts. The [PSA](#), formed in 1992 as a vehicle for communication between staff members and senior administrators, provides feedback about issues affecting UT, particularly those impacting its non-unionized, non-academic, salaried management employees.

Undergraduate and graduate students serve as representatives on decision-making bodies and hold leadership positions with responsibilities in areas of student organizations and activities.

[Student Government](#) and the [Graduate Student Association](#) (GSA) represent the needs and concerns of undergraduate and graduate students, respectively, working with administrators to address issues that involve education and student welfare. Each organization has elected officers who represent and provide input and feedback on student issues and concerns on various University committees. The undergraduate-elected Student Government consists of a president, vice president, a Student Senate and a Student Judiciary Council. Student Government works closely with faculty and administrators on [issues raised by students](#). The GSA president and vice president are voting members of Graduate Council, and the GSA president is a voting member of the Graduate Council executive committee. In addition to the elected student leaders, two non-voting students serve on the BOT for two-year terms. The student members are appointed by the governor, with the advice and consent of the Ohio Senate, from a group of six candidates selected pursuant to a procedure adopted by UT's Student Government and approved by the BOT.

Students often participate on standing college committees and search committees, reviewing applications, interviewing applicants and making recommendations. For example, students served on search committees for the Honors College dean, the dean of the College of Law and the [provost and executive vice president for academic affairs](#). Student Government is also included in the budget process and in the recent presidential search. A number of colleges and departments have student councils that address student concerns and are linked to national and international organizations that provide additional opportunities for student leadership and recognition.

In summary, the University's administrative and governance structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the University to fulfill its mission. UT is governed by a strong set of policies and procedures that are reviewed, updated and audited regularly, with oversight from the Board, the University's independent accountants, and various federal and state regulating bodies. The President's Advisory Council, Faculty Senate, Graduate Council, Student Government and Graduate Student Association are among several other organizational bodies that provide administration, faculty, staff and students the ability to set academic requirements, policy and processes through effective structures for collaborative effort and contribution; these bodies have reported a stronger level of collaboration with University administration over time.

Sources

- AFSCME Contract 2014-2017
- BOT Agendas and Minutes website
- BOT Bylaw 3364_1_01 Appointment, powers and authority
- BOT Bylaw 3364_1_04 Authority, terms and selection of student members of the board
- BOT Bylaws
- BOT Minutes 3-12-2015 Hiring President Gaber
- BOT Statement of Board Comportment 5-14-2012
- Campus Climate Survey 2014
- Collective Bargaining Agreement CBA-Lecturers
- Collective Bargaining Agreement CBA-Tenured Tenure Track
- Culture Ambassadors
- CWA Contract 2014-2016
- Faculty Committee on Rules Regulations Membership 2016
- Faculty Rules and Regulations for Faculty not bound by a Collective Bargaining Agreement
- Faculty Senate Constitution
- Faculty Senate Constitution (page number 7)
- Faculty Senate Roster AY2015-2016
- Faculty Senate Website
- Graduate Council Bylaws 4-7-15
- Graduate Council Roster 2015-2016
- Graduate Council Website
- IACUC
- Institutional Review Boards
- Mission-Integrity Survey Results 11-6-2015
- Ohio Revised Code 3364.01
- Policies posted for comment
- President's Advisory Council PAC
- Professional Staff Association
- Provost Search Committee
- Public Records Requests 2013-15
- Resolution No. 09-08-18, University Governance UT Board of Trustees
- University Research Council
- UT AAUP Constitution
- UT AAUP Constitution (page number 2)
- UT Board of Trustees Code of Ethics
- UT Graduate Student Association
- UT Graduate Student Association Constitution
- UT Policy no. 3364-10-02 Public Records Policy
- UT Policy no. 3364-81-04-012-01 Curriculum governance-COM
- UT Policy Website
- UT Student Government
- UT Student Government (page number 3)
- UT Student Government Constitution and Bylaws

5.C - Core Component 5.C

The institution engages in systematic and integrated planning.

1. The institution allocates its resources in alignment with its mission and priorities.
2. The institution links its processes for assessment of student learning, evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting.
3. The planning process encompasses the institution as a whole and considers the perspectives of internal and external constituent groups.
4. The institution plans on the basis of a sound understanding of its current capacity. Institutional plans anticipate the possible impact of fluctuations in the institution's sources of revenue, such as enrollment, the economy, and state support.
5. Institutional planning anticipates emerging factors, such as technology, demographic shifts, and globalization.

Argument

1. The institution allocates its resources in alignment with its mission and priorities.

UT employs an integrated planning and resource allocation model as the basis for long-range strategic planning, division and unit planning, and continuous improvement. This model is UT's means of enacting its mission, vision and core values and achieving the intended outcomes of its systems, processes and improvement goals in an intentional, sustained way.

Key points of the resource allocation model are:

- UT's vision and mission drive all resource allocations, decided through a planning process that focuses on creating intentional, practical improvements in instructional programs/departments, services and student activities and that support infrastructure needed to effectively meet stakeholder needs and demands. UT utilizes a number of tools to inform decision makers. For enrollment planning, the offices of Enrollment, Institutional Research and Financial Planning are creating a data-informed 5-year planning model. UT's Financial Planning Group currently utilizes a robust MS Access database to develop the annual budget and Excel to model and forecast a long range-planning model. The Finance Planning Group implemented a long range Axiom planning tool starting January 2016 to help inform decisions on budget planning, cash flow planning, and capital planning; the Axiom tool allows all forecasting to be performed on one platform. A new [enrollment-forecasting tool](#) (see criterion 5.C.5) will be utilized in parallel with the Axiom tool in the FY2017 budget process. A contribution margin report by college and program assists in making informed decisions by academic leaders.
- The model's three integrated components are evaluation/measurement/analysis, planning for improvement, and resource allocation.
- The model enables UT to take a systematic, holistic approach to continuous improvement of the institution – at the strategic, division and unit levels and in both short-term and long-range planning cycles.
- UT continuously improves its performance relative to defined intended outcomes related to its four enduring strategic priorities.
- Improvements could be achieved by introduction of new programs and services or new ways of doing things.

- Resources could be allocated to improvement goals and mission-critical operations through disinvestments or restructuring.

UT is successfully concluding the Directions 2011 strategic plan, the first plan developed through the resource allocation process. As reported in various presentations to the UT BOT, all projects are proceeding as outlined.

To improve effectiveness and efficiency, changes since the last HLC visit include:

- Additional investments in UT's Human Resources and Talent Development (HRTD) have enabled improvements to managing employee benefits, greater operational efficiency, and a more robust training and development program. HRTD increased its staff budget by \$1,065,331 plus fringes, increased its operating budget by \$301,340 for training, computers, Banner upgrades and the PeopleAdmin contract, among others. Total increase to HRTD was \$1,704,483. The staff budget investment was to hire HR professionals uniquely skilled in specific HR initiatives who will lead the cost saving efforts and efficiency improvements. As the cost of health care continues to increase, having experts who are skilled in the health care field is crucial for UT to remain fiscally responsible. The expected return on investment (ROI) is less than one year.
- Additional funding for compliance resources across the University has been approved and is aiding in monitoring compliance with the many regulations UT is subject to. The Jeanne Clery Act requires all colleges and universities who receive federal funding to share information about crime on, in and around campus, and efforts to improve campus safety. This information is made publicly accessible through the University's [annual security report](#). Department of Internal Audit and Compliance received \$56,000 plus fringes for a new [Clery Act compliance officer](#) and \$50,000 plus fringes for a new [athletics compliance officer](#). An additional \$38,034 was for salary increases for other employees who are assuming greater responsibilities and expanding their roles; \$16,000 plus fringes for new student employees and increases of \$18,041 in operating budget for seminars, training, etc. Total increase to Internal Audit equaled \$224,486.
- Finally, the institution is focusing on decreasing the disparity between capital budgeting and depreciation (repairs, renovations, replacements), allowing funding for projects to maintain infrastructure. From FY2012 through FY2015, UT has averaged [\\$65.0 million](#) in new asset purchases, [\\$58,500,000](#) of which is capital spending managed by UT Facilities. With declining enrollment and reduced subsidies, a full match is difficult for all of higher education. A [six-year history of funding depreciation](#) is provided by the UT finance department (note that all dollar amounts are measured in thousands). It shows that between FY2012 and FY2015, new asset purchases totaled 119% of depreciation expense. However, in FY2014 and FY 2015, new asset purchases totaled 90% of depreciation. The University takes seriously its need to fully fund depreciation, and it working to raise that amount through its strategic budget planning process.

2. The institution links its processes for assessment of student learning, evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting.

As described in Criterion 4.B.1, the [University Assessment Committee](#) (UAC) collaborates with appropriate internal (e.g. Institutional Research, provost, staff) and external (e.g. nationally-known assessment experts Dr. Barbara Walvoord, Dr. Marcia Ditmyer, Linda Suskie) resources to provide leadership on assessment processes and resources. Links between assessment of student learning and changes in academic programs and resources for teaching and learning are captured in the annual assessment reports. Some of these improvements are associated with resource allocation.

In addition, the UAC reviews assessment data at a macro level to highlight identified themes throughout various data points from across campus. Starting fall 2015, UAC undertook a [new charge](#) to analyze institutional data from various sources as part of its macro-level approach and is developing a more comprehensive data review process. The Committee summarizes the data from a variety of sources and brings forward [recommendations to the provost](#) for consideration.

Units across the institution evaluate their operations and utilize data to inform planning and budgeting. For example, as described in Criterion 4.C, the institution gathers and analyzes data related to persistence and completion, using the data to make decisions regarding existing programs and to plan and fund the creation of new initiatives. Institutional examples of how data has informed decision-making and budgeting are [here](#).

UT utilizes planning to ensure campus constituencies are included in the development of policy, resource allocation, establishing priorities, program design and development, curriculum review and continuous improvement that enhance high quality offerings to its students. In its commitment to quality, UT understands that the very nature of planning provides many lessons to improve operational effectiveness. In effect, the development of a set strategic plan, a long-time practice at UT, has evolved into an ongoing process of evaluation, planning and action, one in which lessons learned from effective planning are applied toward improvement.

3. The planning process encompasses the institution as a whole and considers the perspectives of internal and external constituent groups.

The annual budget planning process is a broad-based exercise, evolving long term through open meetings among numerous internal campus constituencies. The [Finance and Strategy Committee](#) plays a key role in budget development, incorporating the input from faculty, deans, and senior administration members. Likewise, the budget for the clinical enterprise is also broad-based through open meetings that include senior leadership and physicians. The annual [budget development process](#) includes the full engagement of the BOT in understanding and approving the Annual Budget, as well as its Finance and Audit Committee in understanding and approving the key budget assumptions utilized in the Annual Budget (i.e. enrollment projections, tuition rates, retention rates, scholarships, wage increases, inflation rates). The BOT includes external community constituencies.

The UT planning process includes both [financial](#) and strategic planning as well as employee development, and addresses effectiveness and efficiency of operations, reliability of financial reporting, and compliance with applicable laws and regulations. These processes consider the perspectives of numerous internal (faculty, staff, leadership), BOT and external (state, federal, community and alumni) constituent groups. Invitations for public comment on the most significant deliverables of the planning process (the strategic plan and the President's Recommended Budget) are solicited via Board meetings, electronic mail solicitations, "town hall" meetings, and UT website. UT [maintains formal feedback from stakeholders](#), including Faculty Senate, recording how feedback has been addressed in the planning process.

Constituent input into planning processes also include committees (Strategic Enrollment Planning (SEP) Council, SEP Steering Team) set up to discuss needs and policies for strategic enrollment management composed of senior leadership, faculty, staff and students (see Criterion 5.C.5). Criterion 1.A.1 discusses involvement of many constituencies in development of the University's strategic plan.

4. The institution plans on the basis of a sound understanding of its institutional capacity.

Institutional plans anticipate the possible impact of fluctuations in the institution's sources of revenue, such as enrollment, the economy, and state support.

The University plans on the basis of a strong understanding of its capacity. A five-year budget plan has been developed and [presented to the BOT](#), using conservative assumptions while conceding challenges facing the institution. Key to the challenges facing UT are means to increase enrollment, retention and graduation rates; attracting and retaining talented faculty and staff; becoming more efficient in operations by changing procedures, increasing technological support and allocating resources more strategically; and bolstering UT's overall financial profile.

The university is currently working with a nationally-known planning firm (SmithGroupJJR) to develop a [multiple campus master plan](#) -- the first comprehensive master plan since the merger of MUO and UT in 2006. It includes all campuses, and includes all components of the institution's operations: instruction, research, student life (housing, dining, recreation, athletics), patient-care, administration, and support. Underpinning the master plan is a rigorous analysis of the existing campus facilities, and how well they are currently utilized. This includes an investigation of the physical condition of facilities, the level of utilization of classrooms and instructional laboratories (weekly room hours and student station occupancy), the educational adequacy of instructional spaces, the utilization of research space (area per principal investigator and external funding productivity), the adequacy of recreation space (indoor and outdoor), and the adequacy of on-campus student housing (number of beds and mix of room-types). The plan will develop various planning scenarios responding to the university's enrollment projections and other variables; it will be realistic, in that it will have a capital plan based on the university's ability to fund capital projects; it will be flexible, allowing for phased implementation and opportunistic responses to changing circumstances, both internal and external. A focus of the master plan is making sure UT is using its facilities efficiently, especially considering the cost to operate and maintain a physical plant of approximately 8 million gross square feet. Facilities that are not needed - or not suited to their current or proposed use - will be candidates for removal from the campus inventory. A summary of the analysis done to date in the master plan is available in the [presentations to the campus community](#) in February 2016.

5. Institutional planning anticipates emerging factors, such as technology, demographic shifts and globalization.

The strategic plan, as initially crafted to address significant local, national and global economic factors in 2008, was improved/reorganized/restructured under [Directions 2011](#) in consideration of continued economic lethargy and the state strategic plan for higher education. Enhancements in the 2011 strategic plan involved implementation strategies and measurable data in tracking the plan's progress. In 2015, the interim President developed a [list of 30 initiatives](#) during a retreat with vice presidents, other senior staff and faculty. These initiatives, addressing University-wide concerns, core values and designated activities, served as a strategic bridge during the 2014-15 academic year in anticipation of a new presidential appointment in 2015. Updates on each initiative were provided over the course of the academic year, with [a summary to the BOT](#) in June 2015.

To ensure UT has a technological infrastructure that is up to date and meets University educational, research and service missions, visions and goals, the Information Technology Department strategically plans for all aspects of instructional, research, and administrative computing. [Over \\$11M](#) in funding has been provided to support this planning in the last two years (see also Criterion 5.A.1). UT's technology enhancement efforts are supported by a [strategic plan](#) that includes clearly defined goals.

In response to HLC's 2012 assurance report call for institutional attention to enrollment planning, UT

is engaged in a strategic enrollment planning process to effectively and efficiently fulfill its mission. Strategic planning will ensure a strong, sustainable, fiscally sound institution that can better project and thrive in an ever-changing environment that includes changes in the demographics of traditional-age and adult students, economies that affect adult student enrollment, academic and co-curricular interests of prospective students, occupation demands, teaching-learning technology, competitor programs, prices and procedures, and directions from state and federal governments agencies. In order to analyze and project all of these potential changes, future UT enrollment planning, along with its fiscal, facilities and technology planning, will be dependent on continuous analyses and projections of all of these potential changes and more. Starting in 2012, UT hired a vp for enrollment and consulted with Ruffalo Noel Levitz on scholarship levels and development of an enrollment plan. In 2015, realizing the need to enhance these efforts, President Gaber sought advice from experts in enrollment planning processes to set up a continuous strategic enrollment planning process.

[Dr. James Mager](#), who has over 20 years of experience in assisting higher education institutions with enrollment planning processes and was a consultant with Ruffalo Noel Levitz, was asked to assume the position of interim vp for enrollment management in October 2015. Dr. Karen Bjorkman, dean of the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics, and Dr. Mager co-chair the working groups for UT's strategic enrollment planning (SEP) process. The [SEP Steering Team](#) is led by President Gaber and composed of the interim provost, vp for advancement, chief of staff, vp for student affairs, interim vp for enrollment, and the director, financial planning, analysis and budget. The [SEP Council](#) includes steering team members and other faculty, staff and students. The working groups focus on undergraduate marketing and recruitment, academic programs, undergraduate students, graduate and professional students, international students, adult transfer, online and military students, and finance and financial aid. The working groups are supported by on-campus resources in the areas of institutional research, information technology, facilities and communications. They are engaged in developing a [comprehensive, multi-year enrollment plan](#) that looks at what UT is doing well, how UT intersects with what students and the job market want, and how UT intersects with unoccupied market positions that could differentiate it. The UT SEP data checklist and planning charts are [here](#). Planning will be informed by data collection and will be strategic, aligning the organization with its environment to promote stability, sustainability, growth and excellence. Dr. Mager will be one of the leaders in the search process for a permanent vice-president of enrollment management, anticipated to be completed summer 2016. UT is fully committed to this effort and to realigning its enrollment practices.

The trend of globalization permeates UT's values and strategic directions. Students today live and work in an increasingly global environment, a trend clearly recognized in UT's planning. UT core values include phrases such as "global resource" and "around the world," while the Vision Statement pictures UT as a "transformative force for the world." These concepts are translated in the strategic plan, where initiatives focus on providing a "relevant education," "strengthening relationships with global institutions," "real world experiences," and "global engagement."

Over the last four years UT has seen an increase in international student [numbers](#), with a slight downturn this past year. UT has taken actions to enhance international student admission through strategic partnerships and exchanges, including:

- [UT-Community College Internationalization Consortium](#), a bridge program allowing students to begin their education at home and finish it at UT.
- The [competitive awards initiative](#) has the ability to increase the prestige of UT programs, thereby assisting globalization efforts. Efforts are in place to enhance [numbers of faculty and students](#) who are Fulbright, Gilman, Truman, Boren, Rhodes or other scholars and to showcase UT's programs and colleges worldwide.

- The [American Language Institute](#) (ALI) is seeking accreditation with the Commission on English Language Program Accreditation (CEA) and University and College Intensive English Programs (UCIEP), which will enhance its competitive position among other language programs and allow government-sponsored programs like the Saudi Arabian Cultural Mission to continue to send students to UT, with the objective that more of them matriculate as full-time students at UT.
- Endeavoring to build UT connections beyond graduation, an international job locator will support our international students in gaining employment and serve to attract and retain students. A strategic fundraising plan under development will provide meaningful scholarships and internationally focused lectures and events for the campus community and region at large.

In summary, The University engages in integrated and systematic planning. Each year, the University regularly evaluates its operation relative to the Directions 2011 strategic plan. The areas of focus stated in Directions 2011 progressed via numerous aggressive tactical plans responsive to emerging factors such as demographic shifts, globalization and technology. These plans allowed the ideals of Directions 2011 to be customized to the present day. UT's institutional planning processes are highly participatory, leveraging "top-down" and "bottom-up" participation from the broad UT community (faculty, staff, administrators, students, trustees) and members of the Toledo community. This broad participation will continue with President Gaber's plan to begin a new strategic planning process once a new provost is in place.

Sources

- Academic Budget Procedures
- American Language Institute
- Axiom tool
- BOT Minutes 02-09-2015 budget presentation
- BOT Minutes 02-09-2015 budget presentation (page number 4)
- BOT Minutes 6-15-2015 budget approval
- BOT Minutes 6-15-2015 budget approval (page number 2)
- BOT Minutes-Finance Committee and Full Board Financial Planning Example
- Capital Spending Summary FY12-16
- CISP-Competitive Awards Initiative
- Clery Act compliance officer - UT News article
- Compliance - Associate AD
- Depreciation Funding - B. Dadey Memo
- Directions 2011
- Finance and Strategy Committee
- Finance and Strategy Committee minutes 4-24-15
- Information Technologies IT Strategic Plan 2014-2015
- Information Technology Capital Plan
- Institutional examples - data informed decisions
- International Student Enrollment
- Key Strategic Initiatives for AY 2014-2015
- List of Current Awardees - Fulbright etc
- Mager James Bio
- Strategic Enrollment Plan SEP Update 01-14-2016
- Strategic Enrollment Planning presentation 11-4-15
- Strategic Enrollment Plan-Visit One Report

- Strategic Enrollment Plan-Visit One Report (page number 7)
- Strategic Enrollment Plan-Visit One Report (page number 10)
- Strategically Aligned Budget
- UAC Recommendations to Provost 03-07-2016
- University Assessment Committee
- University Assessment Committee UAC Annual Report 2012-13
- University Assessment Plan 2015
- UT Annual Security Report 2014 2015
- UT Facilities - Campus Master Plan update
- UT Facilities - Master Plan Presentation
- UT Facilities and Constuction
- UT-Community College Internationalization Consortium

5.D - Core Component 5.D

The institution works systematically to improve its performance.

1. The institution develops and documents evidence of performance in its operations.
2. The institution learns from its operational experience and applies that learning to improve its institutional effectiveness, capabilities, and sustainability, overall and in its component parts.

Argument

1. The institution develops and documents evidence of performance in its operations.

UT measures its performance through feedback from various surveys. The majority of the “externally-facing” surveys are [administered by the Office of Institutional Research](#). All institutional-wide survey requests are sent to the Office of Institutional Research (IR), which coordinates the timing so students do not receive multiple surveys at the same time. IR also provides survey services using Qualtrics, whose security features keep the confidentiality and privacy of survey respondents. One recent example is the campus master plan survey. The survey window was adjusted from mid-September to early October to coordinate with the timing of freshman survey. Surveys throughout the organization are comprehensive in that they reach students, faculty, staff and the community.

The [Student-Centeredness Survey](#), designed by the Division of Student Affairs and Office of Institutional Research in 2007, collects college students’ feedback regarding services provided by UT. Survey results are used to make improvements within UT in three main areas: academics, support services and learning environment/facilities. The [Senior Leadership Project list](#) includes among others the Advising Coaches Retention Project, developed in response to survey results and an illustration of how surveys are used to identify strengths and opportunities to increase enrollment.

Sent to first-year and senior students (most recently in 2015), the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) assesses the extent to which [students engage](#) in a variety of academic activities and campus life. The NSSE survey is administered to a random sample of 5,000 freshmen and seniors during the spring of all odd-numbered calendar years. Evaluating how students spend their time in and out of the classroom assists in decision making for UT. NSSE data is included in the University Assessment Committee's annual review of institutional data. (Also discussed in Criterion 4.C.)

It should be noted that the “[You spoke, we listened](#)” initiative, and other similar initiatives, resulted in numerous improvements in a response to input from the Student-Centeredness and NSSE surveys. These improvement initiatives are described in detail in Criterion 5.D.2.

The [Office of Assessment, Accreditation and Program Review](#) supports and advances UT’s mission by providing leadership and resources for accreditation, periodic academic program review, and student learning outcomes assessment across the University. The [University Assessment Committee](#) (UAC) leads the continued development of learning assessment policies. Through college, academic support units, Division of Student Affairs, and core curriculum liaisons, the UAC monitors assessment of student learning at the program level and reviews and provides feedback on the annual reports. The UAC collaborates with the appropriate internal and external resources to provide leadership for the professional development of faculty, administration and staff on assessment processes and resources.

The [Campus Climate Survey](#), developed by the Office of Institutional Research and led by the division of Equity, Diversity and Community Engagement, encompasses students, faculty and staff to get an overall sense of the UT climate with the goal of improving the culture of the UT community. The survey covers areas such as perception of acceptance, diversity-related services, courses, programs and/or organizations, attitudes and feelings toward others, discrimination and harassment, and awareness.

Employee satisfaction is measured through the [Professional Staff Association \(PSA\) Satisfaction Survey](#). Responses from the survey offer valuable information that impacts decisions on improvement efforts. Based on the last PSA survey, the area with the highest degree of dissatisfaction was related to total compensation (base pay plus benefits). Recent actions to respond to this with positive results were:

- As part of budget adjustments for FY2015, all eligible employees received a lump sum payment and a 2% increase in salaries and wages.
- All employees are now afforded access to recreation centers on both Main Campus and Health Science Campus, free of charge.
- Revised performance evaluation processes were implemented.
- Employee [service recognition](#) ceremonies were reinstated.

Another measure to determine performance is through various evaluation processes, with plans to standardize these across all colleges and campuses. Examples are:

- The Judith Herb College of Education collects data and measures outcomes for students. As part of CAEP accreditation, the College's [Selected Improvement Plan](#) focused on enriching the culture of evidence.
- The College of Nursing has developed a [master plan](#) for evaluation of 2014-19 Bachelor of Science in Nursing, Master of Science in Nursing and Doctor of Nursing Practice programs to align with UT'S mission and assess/evaluate progress towards its goals and objectives. Staff and faculty are involved in the governance of the program with the overall goal of improving program quality.

As discussed in Criterion 4.A.6, some academic program graduates must take a licensure exam before they can receive permission to practice in Ohio or another state. License examination [passage rates](#) are often posted on department websites.

Surveys and evaluations, when used effectively, provide feedback necessary to guide the framework to improve performance continually and to support the University's goals and mission. Additional improvement efforts are carried out by the UAC's leadership role in review, evaluation and continuous improvement of assessment plans.

The [General Education Assessment Planning Committee Report](#) for fall 2014 responds to the general assessment needs addressed in the 2012-13 [University of Toledo Academic Program and Service Unit Assessment Institution-wide Summary](#) prepared by the Office of Assessment, Accreditation and Program Review. It addresses the structure on the general education assessment reporting process.

Additional measures to improve performance are detailed in the [University Completion Plan](#) adopted on June 16, 2014. The University of Toledo Completion Plan Working Group, committed to UT student success, has established four completion goals for 2014-16:

- Strengthen relationships with feeder high schools (actual improvement: 5% increase in number

of feeder high schools with whom UT has a relationship).

- Increase course success rate of students in introductory writing by 5% and success in introductory mathematics courses by 3% the next two years over fall 2013/spring 2014 completion rates (actual improvement: 6% increase in success in introductory writing, 4% increase in introductory mathematics).
- Increase the number of associate/baccalaureate degrees awarded by 1% annually for the next two years (actual improvement: 2% increase in associate/baccalaureate degrees).
- Strengthen relationships with employers in the northwestern Ohio region (actual improvement: 5% increase in number of employers with whom UT has an active relationship).

As indicated in these measurements, UT is making strong progress toward the above goals.

2. The institution learns from its operational experience and applies that learning to improve its institutional effectiveness, capabilities, and sustainability, overall and in its component parts.

In 2015, UT embarked on an organized effort to develop a system of [key performance indicators](#) (metrics) for the academic and clinical enterprises. These metrics, primarily intended for internal management/planning purposes, are refreshed monthly and distributed to the senior executive team and President's Advisory Council. A [summarized view](#) of these performance indicators was recently developed and shared for the first time with the BOT at its September 2015 meeting, where it was well received.

A new free speech policy was created in response to protests in Doermann Theatre the evening Mr. Karl Rove was to speak as an invited lecturer in the University's Distinguished Lecture Series. [Policy 3364-5-14](#) states the right of free speech and appropriate conduct in such situations.

Over time, issues requiring the most attention revolve around enrollment, retention, student experience, campus safety, employee development and online learning. Action plans discussed below illustrate how UT learns and how it applies the knowledge it gains.

- Continued enrollment efforts are demonstrated in the September [enrollment update](#) to University Council (now the President's Advisory Council) and the 2014-15 Enrollment Management Initiative. In November 2015, [James Mager](#) was appointed interim vice-president for enrollment management and is co-chairing a [new enrollment planning process](#) (see criterion 5.C.5).
- [Living-Learning Communities](#) offer opportunities for educational and personal growth to improve effectiveness and sustainability by providing housing for students of like interests.
- In 2014, the new vice president of human resources and talent development and the interim President requested an internal comprehensive evaluation of Title IX processes and outcomes. The internal audit findings, combined with recommendations from Title IX experts at Ballard Spahr, LLP, a national law firm, led to a restructuring of the Title IX Office that now includes a Title IX coordinator (interviews are in process) and three deputy coordinators (one each for students, faculty and staff); the [Title IX website](#) was revised; new support tools for victims were made available; and a sexual assault coordinator was hired in the University Counseling Center. Adjudication panels, reconfigured as faculty only, were provided additional training by Ballard Spahr lawyers, who also provided mandatory training of all faculty and of staff dealing with Title IX issues. The State of Ohio Attorney General's Office trained all students, staff and faculty working in Athletics. New policies and procedures were developed to allow due process at each step and create objective, fair and timely processes. [Effective March 1, 2016](#), permanent responsibility for Title IX compliance has been assigned to the Department of Internal Audit and Compliance. This move will result in multiple efficiencies, including the

management of the related compliance with the Clery Act under one organizational umbrella, as well as a more direct reporting line to the BOT.

- Retention efforts were enhanced by the creation of the Success Coach Program and investment in [Starfish EARLY ALERT™](#), a case management system; creation of a new vice provost position focused on retention and undergraduate studies; a University bike program; a new summer bridge program to enhance retention; and by UT's acceptance into HLC's Persistence and Completion Academy (first workshop is in March 2016).
- An [expanded role for the UAC](#) in bringing together outcomes from assessment of student learning in academic programs and other University-wide data/surveys as recommendations for senior leadership to be used in resource planning and allocation.
- The Division of Student Affairs implemented several initiatives in recent years to improve retention. The senior vice president for student affairs collaborated with the director of internal audit and chief compliance officer, who is experienced in Six Sigma organizational process improvements to redesign processes and implement best practices relating to student service initiatives. These individuals presented UT's service transformations at the [National Association of Student Personnel Administrators in 2012](#) and the [Southwestern Ohio Council for Higher Education in 2013](#).

As also discussed in Core Component 4C, UT recognizes that the student experience relies upon many services, including units outside the senior vice president's authority. To address this, UT created the Advising and [Success Coach Program](#) in August 2013. Success coaches are intended to serve as personal and professional advisers. They are assigned to students during their freshman year and follow them throughout their academic career.

Another recent initiative implemented by the Office for the Student Experience is "Ask Rocky." Students needing quick answers to general questions can instant message, email, call or visit in person to get the information they need.

Additional efforts to improve student retention include a new [two-year housing policy](#) and the [Sexual Assault Education and Prevention Program](#) (SAEPP). Highlights of recent initiatives can be accessed from the Student Affairs website by reviewing the [2014 annual report](#).

The 2012 HLC evaluation recommended, in the Advancement section, a formal external program review of UT administrative structure and function. In light of recent leadership changes, a decision was made not to conduct a formal outside program review at this time. Instead, the new senior leaders were empowered to make leadership and administrative structural changes in the spirit of the above HLC recommendation. These are reflected in the various academic and staff organization charts across the University. In addition, following are among numerous other action items taken in the spirit of this recommendation:

- External consultants were hired to address specific topics (e.g. Title IX consultant; Barbara Walvoord engaged to provide support for assessment processes).
- UT promotes training for new leaders and professional development of existing leaders (e.g., President Gaber attended training at Harvard University specifically for university presidents; department chair training has been reimplemented).

Departments within the organization such as [Institutional Research](#), providing objective and insightful analysis, and [Department of Internal Audit and Compliance](#), evaluating effectiveness of operations and financial reporting to keep the campus safe, contribute to the performance of the organization.

Several efforts during the past four years addressed challenges identified in student surveys and

feedback from the 2012 HLC visit that recommended UT leadership provide attention to [Rocket Solution Central](#), especially customer service, so students know UT is working to address the challenges identified in student surveys. These efforts include the Staff Ambassador Program and an improved Orientation Program as well as changes made to Rocket Solutions Central (RSC); together they were instrumental in creating a positive student experience. Changes to RSC since the last HLC visit are [here](#).

Sources

- 2-year housing policy email 11-06-2015
- CAEP Addendum
- CAEP Addendum (page number 46)
- Campus Climate Survey 2014
- College of Nursing Master Plan
- Enrollment update 9-26-14
- General Education Assessment Planning Committee Fall 2014 Report
- Institutional Research-website
- Internal Audit and Compliance-website
- License examination passage rates
- Living Learning and Special Interest Communities
- Mager James Bio
- NASPA Presentation 2012
- NSSE Engagement Indicators 2015
- Office of Assessment, Accreditation and Program Review website
- PSA Survey Results 2012
- Rocket Solutions Central
- Rocket Solutions Central Changes since 2012
- Senior Leadership Project List summary table july 29
- Service Awards
- Sexual Assault Education and Prevention Program SAEPP
- SOCHE Presentation 2013
- Starfish website
- Strategic Enrollment Plan-Visit One Report
- Student Affairs Annual Report 2014
- Student Centeredness Survey 2014
- Success Coaching site
- Success Coach-Position Description
- Surveys supported by IR
- Title IX Staff Update - UT News
- Title IX website
- University Assessment Committee
- University Assessment Committee UAC Annual Report 2012-13
- University Assessment Plan 2015
- University Key Performance Indicators Index
- University of Toledo Dashboard trustee-level summary view
- UT Policy no. 3364-5-14 Expression on campus
- UT University Completion Plan 2014
- You Spoke We Listened

5.S - Criterion 5 - Summary

The institution's resources, structures, and processes are sufficient to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and opportunities. The institution plans for the future.

Summary

In summary, UT is a mission-driven research university that strategically utilizes its resources in maximizing its ability to improve its academic environment for student learning. As demonstrated by the decisions by the faculty, UT administrative leadership and BOT, a culture of continuous improvement has been evolving. Evidence provided demonstrates UT is intentional in its planning to meet current fiscal challenges while positioning itself to respond to anticipated future requirements of technology and the physical campus. The merger of the Medical University of Ohio with The University of Toledo was a calculated decision to create a stronger postsecondary institution of higher education committed to excellence. The University of Toledo emerged from this merger as a strong institution with the resources, structures and processes that enables it "... to improve the human condition; to advance knowledge through excellence in learning, discovery and engagement; and to serve as a diverse, student-centered public metropolitan research university."

Sources

There are no sources.