

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
FACULTY SENATE

Apprv'd @ FS mtg 8/13/05

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

Minutes of the Senate Meeting of Aug. 30, 2005

HIGHLIGHTS

President Johnson

University Prioritization Committee

Log Item 0506-01 Motion-Awarding of Degrees

FS Elections

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

Chair Jorgensen called the meeting to order. **Executive Secretary Stoudt** called the roll.

I. Roll Call –2005-2006 Senators

Present: Barden, Barlowe, Barnes, Barrett, Bischoff, Bopp, Bowyer, Bresnahan, Cluse-Tolar, Floyd, Fournier, Fridman, Hoover, Hottell, Hudson, Humphrys, Jorgensen, King, Komuniecki, Kozlowski, Kunnathur, Lambert, Lipman, Lipscomb, Lundquist, Martin, Morrissey, Piazza, Pope, N. Reid, Ritchie, Schultz, Sherman, Skeens, Sponberg, Stoudt, Suter, Teclehaimanot, Thompson-Casado, Traband, Tramer, Wilson, Wolff (43)

Excused: Kennedy, Olson, Poling, Sullivan, Templin (5)

Unexcused: Niamat, D. Reid (2)

A quorum was present.

II. Approval of Minutes–Minutes of the April 26, 2005 meeting were approved as distributed.

III. Executive Committee Report by Chair, Senator Andy Jorgensen:

I would like to begin my report by introducing the members of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee along with their specific Executive Committee positions. Walter Olson is the Vice Chair of Faculty Senate and unable to attend today's meeting due to a prior business commitment. Other Executive Committee members are Debra Stoudt, Executive Secretary, Barbara Floyd, Member-at-Large, Joel Lipman, Member-at-Large, Carter Wilson, Faculty Senate Representative to the Board of Trustees, Alice Skeens, Alternate Rep. to the Board of Trustees and Michael Dowd, ad hoc member and past Faculty Senate Chair.

Over the past summer we have met with various groups including President Johnson and Provost Goodridge, as well as representing you to many, many committees including the Board of Trustees.

Many of you have volunteered to serve on committees and we are still in the process of putting together some committee structures as well as identifying chairs for the various Faculty Senate standing committees. If you have not yet responded to requests to serve on a committee, please reply to Betsy, the Faculty Senate Secretary at extension

2112, with the committee you would like to serve on. I would like to remind you that chairs of committees must be senators unless the Faculty Senate votes otherwise and we have a request for such a vote now.

Steve Peseckis, Professor of Pharmacy, although not a senator, has agreed to again serve as chair of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee this year. This is a committee that needs to keep experience. Because his appointment would be an exception to our By-Laws, we need to vote on this appointment.

I now accept a motion to appoint Steve Peseckis as Chair of the FS Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. Senator Carter Wilson moved and Senator Tom Barden seconded the motion.

Motion approved by voice vote.

Other highlights of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) meetings held over the summer include:

- We have welcomed 60 plus new faculty to the University this fall, bringing our numbers to over 700 faculty. We represent those faculty within the academic mission of the university.
- You will notice a change in the seating in the room this year. This change was suggested by the Student Senate, which meets later today, so their members can face each other. The FSEC worked with the Student Senate to come up the current arrangement as you now see it. I would also like to introduce to you Adam Kopchian, who will be attending the Faculty Senate meetings as the Student Government representative.
- Agenda items we will be looking at over the year are:
 1. A review of the University Committee structure is just beginning, including our individual committee structure base, structure of the student committees, structure of the administration and faculty committees. We will keep you informed on this as it progresses.
 2. Student Centeredness. We will be looking at our academic policies in terms of student centeredness.
 3. The agenda material will be posted on the web ahead of the Faculty Senate meetings for you.
 4. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee structure will be looked at, particularly the chair selection. As you know, at the very last meeting of the year we elect our FSEC as well as our chair. The executive committee meets over the summer, so when the academic year begins, we have served 1/3 of our term already. We are one of the few universities in the state that does not have a progression for the FSEC chair.

Lastly, because we are representing the university faculty in so many things- curriculum, policies and the like - I urge you to attempt to stay until 5 p.m. We were in real danger last year of not having a quorum to make valid judgments on important items at a couple of meetings with people leaving the meetings early. If you have any questions for the Executive Committee, please feel free to communicate with me or any member at any time.

IV. Reports Chair Jorgensen: Today we are privileged to have many speakers, the first of whom is our University President and professor of sociology, Dr. Dan Johnson.

President Johnson: Thank you very much, Dr. Jorgensen. I appreciate this opportunity to speak to the Faculty Senate and always welcome your invitation. I think we are off to a good start this year in many, many ways, and have set some very ambitious goals for ourselves. If time permits, I would be glad to review those with you. I think we have numerous opportunities that have afforded themselves to us to move ahead this year and continue to improve the University of Toledo.

We also have some major challenges, including the usual ones given the state's fiscal situation, and the declining support for higher education in Ohio. We are moving forward with that fact of life. In addition, we have a challenge of addressing the budget implications of the enrollment shortfall that we are experiencing.

I continue however, to be very optimistic about this university and its enormous strengths. Sometimes we are so close to these strengths that we fail to see them and begin to take certain things for granted as a part of our everyday experience and do not see them for the special things they are. We need to remind ourselves of these strengths and build upon them. I am also very optimistic about the direction we are headed particularly the payoff we are beginning to see from the implementation of our strategic planning, as well as other initiatives we are pursuing.

In my comments today I would like to first reflect on my experience and what I learned during my recent trip to China, as well as what it could mean for the University of Toledo. Secondly, I would like to offer a few observations on our efforts to identify our institutional priorities, and third I would like to comment on enrollment this fall as well as in the future.

China Trip

I appreciate the University making the opportunity available to me, to travel to China. I have been to Asia, on occasion to Seoul, and to Hong Kong but never to China proper, to Beijing, Shanghai or other cities. So this was a first for me as I represented you and the University in a number of settings.

There were several purposes for the trip to China. First and foremost was to increase our efforts to recruit both graduate and undergraduate students. We were there to sign an inter-institutional agreement with Yanshan University in China. This is a university located in Qinhuangdao, a sister city of Toledo, that has many similarities to us, except that they are doubling about every five years, building campus after campus. Another purpose of our trip was to reinforce the sister city relationship. I have invited the president of Yanshan University to come in July of next year and I do expect he will accept this invitation.

We have hosted several other Chinese universities on our campus this spring that expressed an interest in The University of Toledo. We also met with the American Embassy Council General relative to the visa challenges that Chinese students face. The policy that the U.S. has now is forcing tens of thousands of international students from China, India, and other parts of the world, to go to their second or third choice university in Canada, Australia, the United Kingdom, France or New Zealand, because the United States is shutting these students off at the visa office because of a lack of documentation

stating that they will return to their country of origin. Our meeting went very well and we will do everything we can to help remove that visa obstacle.

We were also there to meet with our alumni. Believe it or not, we had two alumni meetings in Shanghai, China consisting of sixty University of Toledo alums. This was a very special experience and a wonderful evening. The Shanghai Chinese alums have voted to form the first Chinese chapter of our University of Toledo Alumni Association. We also met with alums in Beijing and they, too, will be moving to form an alumni chapter within the next few years.

Our final purpose was to help revitalize our sister city relationship between Toledo and Qinhuangdao. We also met with Toledo based corporations in Shanghai: Owens Corning, The Dana Corporation, Jeep and others. The outcomes were fairly tangible in many respects, but in other ways somewhat intangible. There are a number of areas where joint research and joint ventures with UT can be pursued and I am hopeful we will be able to pursue some of those. And finally, we decided to come back from our visit by way of Malaysia and thus we were able to see a demonstration and testing of a people-mover system that is being developed there. A web site where the people mover can be viewed is at metrail.com. This is the type of people-mover we are looking for to link the Bancroft campus with the Scott Park campus.

I was also impressed with the pace at which China has developed its Technology Park in the last five years compared to our development. I am hoping that during the year we can talk about the technology corridor and share this with faculty in a systematic way. It was four years ago that Yanshan University decided to build a Science and Technology park. That is about the time we started talking about our Science and Technology Corridor. China now has their park consisting of twenty-four buildings and over 1,000 employees working in conjunction with the colleges at Yanshan University. I believe there is tremendous importance for us to have a presence in China. How we do this is unclear. I would welcome your thoughts on this. I will be asking a few of our colleagues to go back to China this year and pursue these conversations and move us in a direction toward solidifying the type of relationship we want with that major country.

Institutional Priorities

We are making progress in addressing the issues related to prioritization. Faculty close to this issue are making progress and we as an institution are making progress both in our thinking and our actions. The University Prioritization Committee (UPC) has worked very hard throughout the summer, and I would like to express my appreciation to all that they have done, especially to the co-chairs here today, Dr. Mike Dowd, Dr. Nagi Naganathan, and Dr. Jamie Barlowe. Thank you for your leadership on the UPC. On campus including the faculty, staff, students, the administration, as well as the Trustees, now recognize, given the climate we have in Ohio and what we aspire to as a university, in the words of a colleague; the status quo is not acceptable. We are learning that the success of prioritization probably lies in having a practical, straight forward methodology, simple enough to be carried out in a reasonable timeframe, as well as fair, so the desired results can be reached. It will be up to the UPC to determine if our present methodology should be or needs to be adjusted. We must find the methodology that works for the University of Toledo. If a new methodology is considered, it must enable the University to identify our core strengths and priority programs in both the

administrative and support services as well as academic programs. Likewise the methodology must allow for a timely completion of this effort. We have set a date of May 2006 to report on prioritization and I will help in any way I can to assure we achieve this objective.

At the August 24 Board of Trustees (BOT) meeting, the Board approved the institutional goals for this year. Identifying UT's core strengths, including prioritization, was approved as one of this year's major goals for the institution adopted by the Board. Again I want to thank the UPC for its leadership, and the Faculty Senate for making this a faculty-led process. Not only are we on this campus watching this process, but the Ohio Board of Regents, The Inter-University Council (IUC), and a number of legislatures are watching our efforts. Many see it as a developing model for other Ohio universities. I believe this could be the type of exercise that could be the subject of an important monograph, widely shared throughout the state and country. For anyone inclined, this could be a great case study on what to do and what not to do, as we try to lead the way and help other institutions in setting the pace in developing priorities, a task that literally most of our universities will have to face in the years to come.

Enrollment

Enrollment is another of our major university goals for this year. Last year we had a significant dip in enrollment partly due to a very large graduating class the previous year. Other factors affecting our enrollment last year were the increasing tuition rates; significantly increased competition locally, state-wide, and nationally; the loss of international students due to 9-11, particularly graduate students; all of which we thought we could recover in one year. This is a thought I will take responsibility for.

Last year we began an aggressive campaign to recruit an extra 880 students to recover that loss. In hindsight, we now know we were overly optimistic. Our enrollment is nearly flat from last year, down about .4% from last year. Our budget was built on the assumption we would recapture those 880 students lost the year before. Therein lies the problem. Regretfully, we now have some belt tightening to do on this year's budget. The Fiscal Advisory Committee, the Cabinet and others will be addressing this important task over the next week or so. While it is early to know how much we have to adjust, it will be significant. Bill Decatur, Chief Financial Officer, his staff, and others, will keep you informed about this as we go through the process.

There is some good news, however, and that is that the quality of our students has increased as measured by the American College Test (ACT) scores. We must not underestimate the fact that we did attract a better prepared student class this year. I am really proud of that fact, and hope that we continue this momentum toward meeting our enrollment targets. We need to continue this is a two fold process, to increase the number of students as well as the percentage of better prepared students.

Many of you in this room, as well as many across campus, have worked with admissions to help us recruit students. I am going to use a phrase Bill Decatur once used regarding retention: "retention is everybody's business". I will say this as a matter of policy, hopefully practice now, student recruitment is everybody's business. You play a role in recruitment, whether talking to students in your office or meeting with families, we do need faculty to help achieve our recruitment goals. Please make this a topic, Dr. Jorgensen, if you will, during a Senate meeting sometime during the year, on how faculty

can taking a more active role that they view is appropriate to help us achieve our enrollment goal. Working together, we can achieve our enrollment goal.

In closing, I would like to remind you that we have spent quite a bit of time and effort building what I hope will be one of the finest meeting places on campus, Libbey Hall. I encourage all of you to have a cup of coffee or lunch with a colleague there. It is such a beautiful asset; please remember to patronize this lovely facility. With that said, I would now invite any questions you may have.

Questions/Comments

Senator Stoudt: I was interested in your comments about the sister cities because they are not a UT initiative, but rather a city of Toledo initiative. Have you discussed this with Toledo's mayor, or did you have any kind of a mandate since city support for the sister city mandate has not been very strong?

President Johnson: It is amazing how the sister city relationship affected the tone of our visit to Qinhuangdao; we were treated very officially. We were invited to a special dinner with the person in charge, the Secretary General also invited us to dinner, all fashioned around the notion of strengthening the sister-city relationship. We have decided as a matter of policy to extend in-states tuition rates to students from our sister city. Anything you or anyone can do to strengthen this sister-city relationship would be in the interest of everyone.

Senator Stoudt: We are always looking to bring in international students to our university, yet our students have limited opportunities to study abroad. Could we see this as a possible direction that we will be pursuing in the coming years to strengthen our opportunities for UT students abroad?

President Johnson: Absolutely. This is one of the areas where there is an open door where they would gladly welcome American students. The agreement we signed with Yanshan University basically is a faculty/student exchange agreement with China. Anyone interested, please let yourselves be known to the Provost or others. So many of our students have not had the opportunity to travel internationally. If we can give them that opportunity, they will have a great experience. Camp Adventure is another great opportunity for our students.

Senator Fournier: Having heard almost the same conversation last year, I am curious as to what steps are being taken to solve our low enrollment issue.

President Johnson: There is a lot of introspection going on as well as systematic review of this and if you look at the enrollment reports that we receive regularly, you can see where special attention needs to be given. I would invite Provost Goodridge to give us his thoughts on that question.

Provost Goodridge: We were successful in raising the average ACT scores of our incoming students. So even though we were overly optimistic in our recruitment efforts, a number of aspects of our plan of action were effective.

Senator Bowyer: People seek out lower prices and every year we worry about enrollment increases, yet every year we increase tuition by the maximum amount. I have a number of students that, in looking at their schedules, are only taking nine hours and are not full-time students. I am told they are taking nine more hours at Owens. The students are splitting between the two campuses purely as a function of cost.

President Johnson: It is not just a matter of setting the price to attract students. We have fixed costs we have to cover such as contract with faculty, as well as others. The cost of natural gas is increasing along with the cost of other utilities. All of these costs have to be covered and with the state cutting our resources through State Subsidy (SSI), there is only one other way to meet these costs and that is by increasing tuition. We are not the most expensive institution in the state, but have succeeded in staying in the middle of the pack.

Chair Jorgensen: I have copies of the University's goals for the year as presented by the President to The Board of Trustees last week and you are welcome to take one.

University Prioritization Committee

Chair Jorgensen: We will move now to the subject of University Prioritization as presented by the three co-chairs of the University Prioritization Committee (UPC): Dr. Michael Dowd, Economics; Dr. Jamie Barlowe, Women and Gender Studies; and Dr. Nagi Naganathan, from the College of Engineering.

Senator Barlowe: This report is divided into three parts to give you a sense of what has happened over the summer months as well as update you on prioritization. I will speak on the structure of the UPC, Dr. Naganathan will speak on the committee's work and Dr. Dowd will speak on the process itself.

Structure of UPC

Senator Barlowe, UPC Co-chair: Let me start by reiterating what President Johnson said, to thank all of the people who worked so incredibly hard over the summer on the UPC and especially the College Prioritization Committee (CPC) members for the work they have done under tremendous time restrictions. All of the CPC's turned in their preliminary plans by July 29 even though they did not begin until mid June. The Committee of Prioritization of Non-Academic Programs (CPNAP) also spent a tremendous amount of time on the non-academic and services side of prioritization.

Because of the large number of members in the UPC, forty total, we divided into sub-committees, Alpha, Beta, Gamma, Delta and Epsilon. The *Alpha sub-committee* is chaired by Nick Piazza from the College of Health and Human Services, is charged with investigating methodology and criteria that will enable us to do cross-college comparison.

Beta sub-committee is chaired by Dale Snauwaert, from the College of Education and its charge is also to investigate criteria and methodology for prioritization but ones that will allow comparisons between colleges and the non-academic or the administrative services side of the university.

The Gamma sub-committee, which is chaired by Walter Olson from the College of Engineering, is charged with reviewing the prioritization of non-academic programs.

The Committee of Prioritization of Non-Academic Programs is doing the actual prioritization of non-academic programs. The CPNAP is reviewing methodology and criteria for this, having identified some 2400 units to prioritize. The members of the CPNAP, with two exceptions, were chosen by the administration. The two faculty members who sit on this committee come from the Gamma sub-committee, Walt Olson and Barbara Floyd.

The Delta sub-committee is chaired by Jim LeSage from the College of Arts and Sciences. It is charged with working with institutional research to generate data that will be relevant for the prioritization process.

The Epsilon sub-committee, which is chaired by the three co-chairs of the UPC - Mike Dowd, Nagi Naganathan, and myself - functions as a steering committee of the whole. This committee is made up of all of the chairs of committees, Marietta Morrissey, Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, and John Nutter, director of Institutional Research.

The Non-College Academic Program Prioritization Committee (NCAPPC) was formed during the summer and consists of all of the units that report to the Provost's office. An example on the academic side would be The Honors Programs. The NCAPPC is currently organizing in order to review the various units and decide which ones will be reviewed by CPNAP and which will be reviewed by NCAPPC.

Committee results

Dr. Naganathan, UPC CO-chair: With few exceptions, the full UPC met regularly during the summer. In addition to UPC meetings, several sub-committee meetings took place at least once or twice. We will not go into detail as to what each sub-committee did because there are minutes available for many of these meetings.

Briefly, the Alpha sub-committee looked at what else has happened on other campuses. Dr. Nick Piazza has within his personal web page, a list of the various activities along with links to various prioritization efforts elsewhere in the country.

The Beta sub-committee has looked at charts, balloon diagrams, and many other renditions of how to the results could possibly be rendered in the end.

The Gamma sub-committee is charged with the review of non-academic programs, while Delta sub-committee has looked at what type of data would be appropriate.

Many of you have served on the Collage Prioritization Committees and I want to compliment you on all of the very good proposals that have been submitted. The CPCs were given a deadline of July 29, and all of the college committees did turn in their reports close to that date if not by July 29th. They are now being discussed by the Alpha sub-committee and they will be forwarding a report to the UPC later this week. Right now, we want to stress those preliminary plans are not the actual prioritizations, but simply a means by which the various colleges are proposing to go about conducting prioritization. The CPNAP, the committee looking at the non-academic programs, started later in the summer. The Gamma sub-committee has now received their report and is now reviewing it. A web site is under development and should be launched shortly so you can see what is going on with the prioritization process.

Challenges

Dr. Dowd, UPC Co-chair: As we discussed this process, we said over and over again that we probably would not discover the hard problems until we began the prioritization process. This past summer, not to anyone's surprise, we became aware of certain challenges. One of the issues was the difficulty of obtaining usable data. Pulling people off their regular duties to collect or generate data is a significant resource issue for the administration. To accomplish the results we need 5 -7 years of data. Two years is

certainly not acceptable; so we have been working with the administration to address this issue.

The biggest challenge that we have come across, which Jamie alluded to, was realized when creating the committee to address the programs that report to the Provost and the enormity of the task. That is, there are approximately 600 academic programs and 2400 non-academic programs that are to be prioritized over the course of two semesters.

There is another issue that was raised and that is the notion of opportunity cost or, what you give up in order to get something. What we are giving up is an enormous amount of time and energy. These issues were brought to the Board of Trustees (BOT) by Jamie, Nagi and myself. We wanted to convey this to the BOT that this will involve an enormous devotion of time and energy by faculty. This of course will reduce the time available for teaching and research activity; it is also an enormous draw on the resource of the administration and the staff of this university.

The Board was very, very receptive to these issues, listening intently to the structure, the work conducted over the summer, and the challenges we are facing. In response, The Board has asked us to look at perhaps, reexamine the timeline we have adopted, the methods, and asked a series of relevant questions regarding potential results from this process. They want to know if the results will be useful. That is, can the results be implemented? Are the methods being discussed operational at the university level? These issues will be brought to the UPC and discussed at our meeting this Friday, Sept. 2. All in all, we expressed the difficulties we are facing and the response from The Board was rather encouraging.

The issues we brought to The Board were only possible due to all of the hard work that had been done by the College Prioritization Committees. The UPC will be reporting to the Faculty Senate at every meeting with continual updates. At this time I would like to say to anyone not a member of a CPC or CPNAP, that you are welcome to attend these meetings.

Questions

Senator Fournier: Is there any movement on coming up with some sort of a standard method by which the colleges evaluate themselves? I know President Johnson had mentioned dollars at an earlier meeting. Is there a dollar amount that the colleges are supposed to come up with?

UPC Co-Chair Dowd: Right now we are not considering monetary targets.

Senator Fournier: The colleges submitted their plans almost a month ago, with very little guidance. It is very hard to project when there is no information from the UPC. What do we do next?

UPC Co-Chair Barlowe: This structure was put in place in the way that it was because this is a faculty driven process. We wanted to keep it process oriented. We did not want to set up a top-down, imposed set of criteria but wanted the criteria to come from the committees from the bottom to the top. In so doing, we became aware of the challenges that Dr. Dowd talked about. Had we set up very specific criteria in the beginning from the UPC, we never would have been able to continue the iterative process that we have or the kind of relations that allow us to reexamine our criteria and methods. At this point we are still in that discovery phase, not doing prioritization. We are figuring how to do prioritization at this point.

UPC Co-chair Dowd: Let me reiterate, this is going to continue to be a faculty driven process. We are learning, and if we have to change directions, that will come from the colleges. Some would prefer that the UPC respond quicker to the colleges, but the truth is that we have to take this time to consider the direction to move towards.

Senator Fournier: Where we going with this?

UPC Co-chair Naganathan: I understand your frustration in terms of not having a clear goal established, but that is essentially what the Alpha sub-committee is looking at in the various proposals from the different colleges. With respect to the dollar cost, the administration has made it very clear that this is not a budget cutting process.

UPC Co-Chair Barlowe: Another part of Alpha's work is to see what the commonalities are among the CPC plans. How do these plans merge, how do they diverge? This takes time. We want what Alpha produces to be able to give you feedback just as the CPC preliminary plans have given feedback to Alpha and the UPC.

UPC Co-Chair Dowd: There will continue to be communications between the UPC and the CPCs.

Senator Stoudt: It sounds like the college reports were a first pass to see what people would submit. Then the UPC will tweak it and maybe send guidelines back to provide more guidance. I heard you say, Jamie, that these reports would serve as the plan. I am wondering if you aren't expecting the reports to be revised.

UPC Co-Chair Barlowe: These were called preliminary plans and were in no way involved in any kind of prioritization. The plans were to identify criteria and concepts by which the colleges could carry out prioritization and in some cases, the colleges also articulated some sort of method that they planned to use. There will be constant interaction between Alpha, the UPC and the CPCs.

Senator Stoudt: So these were just methodologies themselves specific to any given college and did not talk about any specific programs or department within a college. My question then is: are these reports available?

UPC Co-Chair Naganathan: I believe they are available on Dr. Nick Piazza's web site.

UPC Co-Chair Dowd: A word of caution, these reports have always been structured to go back and forth for revision between the CPCs and the UPC, so when you read these reports, please keep in mind they are draft or preliminary reports. In no sense are they to be considered as final versions.

Senator Stoudt: Have only the colleges submitted reports or have the non-administrative units also forwarded reports?

UPC Co-Chair Barlowe: Also non-administrative, but the preliminary plan for the programs that report to the Provost is not finished since the NCAPP is still being organized.

Senator Boyer: Did the colleges distribute these reports to their faculty? I did not receive anything from the College of Business.

Senator Komunecki: At the chairs' retreat for the College of Arts and Sciences, we were given a draft of the report that I then shared with the Biosciences faculty at our retreat.

UPC Co-Chair Barlowe: Premature distribution would in many cases intrude into the initial interaction between the UPC and CPCs; remember, these are drafts and some are very rough drafts.

UPC Co-Chair Dowd: Also some of the colleges want a little more direction from the UPC before distributing the report. This was the first opportunity for the CPCs to get that direction.

Senator Floyd: We heard the President say this is one of the goals for the university for this year. Do the co-chairs think that the May deadline is reasonable?

UPC Co-Chair Dowd: I think the May deadline is certain. Whether or not complete reports on the prioritization of all academic and all non-academic groups is generated by that date is being discussed, as well as an interim report of the progress made throughout this year. Like many people, I believe a substantial amount of work can be accomplished by that date.

UPC Co-Chair Barlowe: Are you asking when we will be finished? If this process works, hopefully then we can talk about inclusion, having something like this as a part of what will do on an on-going basis, not just a one shot deal, but build this into our structure. How do we systematize it? That is part of what we will consider next.

UPC Co-Chair Naganathan: We will identify the scope of prioritization. That is the direction we are going right now. We can definitely have something accomplished this academic year.

Senator Lipman: As chair of the Arts & Sciences CPC, I sent forward a draft proposal. Given the iterative nature of this process, I don't think a draft is necessarily the form of the proposal that everyone would start wanting to get involved with. We were around the table two mornings a week all summer to come up with our plan. We had no guidance initially as to whether it should go to Arts & Sciences Council after it leaves that committee's hands. So, there were unknowns at every step that are beginning to be clarified as the process advances. Of course the document did go to the chairs' retreat and I know my departmental chair passed it out to every faculty member in the department at our departmental retreat.

The other thing that strikes me as interesting today is last year when we started talking about this, the rhetorical name was program prioritization. I have not heard that term today. I heard President Johnson speak about efforts to identify university priorities, and I heard institutional priorities. So that is already an evolution from the idea of program priorities. I hope that everybody will talk to their college CPC members and try to have those conversations. We will try to keep the lines of communication open since it is an evolving process.

UPC Co-Chair Barlowe: The UPC is in the process of setting up a web site, which would include all of the documents that come out of the UPC including minutes. Anyone will be able to access this information

Senator Hudson: It looks as though there is a strong emphasis on very long term planning. You are talking about seven years to make these decisions, five committees, 2400 non-academic programs to find out that a significant portion of them still exist, let alone who is running them. You are organizing very carefully and methodically for the long term. In the meantime there are decreasing resources and we need to make decisions, not necessarily on a daily basis, or monthly, but on a semi-annual basis. People will have to make decisions about where to cut, where to add, what to emphasize and so forth. So it seems to me that you haven't talked about the short term view.

UPC Co-Chair Dowd: In case I was not clear, when I said 5-7 years, I was referring to institutional data back to, say, 1998 rather than two years of spreadsheets. I was not

projecting out to the future. With regard to short term versus long term, we are starting the conversations of what can we do in the short term. Program prioritization whether a short term process, can this evolve into a systematic program of continued improvement. That is, something systematic within the University that is not a one shot deal. We don't have all of the answers regarding long term issues.

Senator Hudson: I think the long term prospect or view is an important one, but one does have to decide what the road is you are going down and where the objectives are. If you are not sure about the road you are going down - you know the old Nigerian saying – if you don't know where you're going, any road will get you there.

UPS Co-Chair Barlowe: We are beginning to discover that road after an immense amount of work by a lot of people. No one has done this. There is no set of guidelines out there that we can all find on the web. Again, we want this to be something that comes out of our faculty, staff and administration.

At this point we are being as specific as we can be. We are at a very critical point in this process because if we do need to rethink some of these criteria or methodology or some of the ideas about long term involvement, then this is the moment we need to do it.

Senator Bowyer: Have the units that report to the Provost been notified that they are supposed to submit a report for prioritization?

UPS Co-Chair Dowd: The UPC for the last two weeks has not been able to meet as the faculty needed that time to prepare for the fall semester. It is not the fault of the Provost.

Senator Bowyer: So eventually the units will be notified that they need to put something together?

UPS Co-Chair Dowd: There is another issue. There are some groups that are clearly academic, some clearly administration, but there are some groups that have both academic and administrative services components. Part of the conversation that needs to take place between the UPC and Provost's office is to try to decide where these groups fall.

UPS Co-Chair Barlowe: The timeline will not be the same for these groups as they have to be identified first.

Senator Kathleen Thompson-Casado: In looking at the strengths and weaknesses of programs, there are probably some things we do not want to get out to the public. Secondly, who is going to be responsible for developing the balance between communicating and confidentiality? Who will be making final decisions about data?

UPS Co-Chair Naganathan: As far as data is concerned, the Delta sub-committee is charged with authenticating the data. Where Institutional Research can pull up information, then that set of data will be provided to the various committees. I don't think the colleges can expect to get all of their data from the Institutional Research office, for example, faculty publications. I respect your view on the confidentiality issue; part of it is how we handle the information that is coming our way.

UPS Co-Chair Dowd: If you have an issue with confidentiality, then please come see me. This is an issue that should come before the UPC.

Senator Lipscomb: Is there a better vision of what the final process will be? Is it going to be just a collection of data? Is there going to be an analysis of those data? Is it going to be analyzing the data and making recommendation, if so, what type of recommendations will the UPC make?

UPC Co-Chair Barlowe: All of the above will be done. We have talked about quantitative and qualitative analysis and we have to be very careful about how that analysis occurs.

Chair Jorgensen: Faculty Senate and Graduate Council passed a plan. From what you are saying, do you envision a significant change in process such as a new or modified plan going back to the Senate and Graduate Council for approval at some time?

UPC Co-Chair Dowd: If the plan changes we of course will take it to both bodies. While this is a Presidential Committee, we report to Senate and Graduate Council.

Chair Jorgensen: I remind everyone that the plan includes a reporting back to the Senate and Graduate Council not only on a regular basis, but on the outcome for a decision.

Senator Barden: Chair Jorgensen has a good point about coming back to Grad Council and Senate. Speaking as a Senator and Chair of Graduate Council, even if the substance of what we passed hasn't changed, if the chronology changes, I think it would be very good for the new chronology or a bit of the sense of what the new time frame is going to be to come back to both bodies.

UPC Co-Chair Dowd: We are following the timeline developed last year, however not by exact dates, but by the process. We are getting information and developing form to this process. As issues and recommendations develop we of course will report these to Senate and Graduate Council.

Senator Lipscomb: The Research Office is currently prioritizing the research area. How does that fit in with your mission or your charge? They have asked to focus on research areas of excellence and on the basis of that prioritized.

UPC Co-Chair Dowd: They are not prioritizing. The UPC will be doing that. They may be conducting an internal investigation, but it is not prioritization. The process Dr. Calzonetti is setting up is different from prioritization. One of his current activities is identifying the research centers and institutes on campus. Another deals with identifying the areas of research excellence. Those are separate processes.

Provost Goodridge: The inventories of centers have nothing to do with prioritization process. What Dr. Calzonetti has requested is a review of the existing programs, which could be a departmental graduate program or a small group within the department of gifted research. A review of the six that identified for investment in the faculty hiring program to see if we want to add additional programs to that six. Identify those for selective investment. It is a separate process.

UPC Co-Chair Barlowe: A number of units, both academic and non-academic consistently conduct internal review processes and evaluations that in some ways are akin to a prioritization process, but that is not the same thing we are doing here.

V. Calendar Questions: Log Item 0506-01

Chair Jorgensen: As you know, the Faculty Senate is in control of the academic mission of the institution. We determine the academic regulations, program degree requirements, the core curriculum - everything related to the academics. In addition we pass on students who have earned their degrees consistent with these regulations and requirements. We, of course, delegate the details to various people in the university. So in accordance with our policies, I read the following Log Item motion for you to vote on.

Motion: The Faculty Senate, acting for the University faculty, hereby recommends to the President and Board of Trustees the awarding of degrees to all candidates who have fulfilled all the requirements of their respective degrees, as listed in the academic regulations of the University and of the colleges in which they are enrolled, at Commencement exercises on the following dates:

December 17, 2005 UT Law and Fall Commencement

May 06, 2006 UT Law and Spring Commencement

This is a motion from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, no second is needed. Comments? We are voting on the awarding of these degrees consistent with the policies and curriculum we passed. All in favor please say aye. Opposed like sign.

Motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

VI. Other Business: Faculty Senate Elections

Chair Jorgensen: As you may know, our esteemed Executive Secretary has been appointed Interim Associate Dean in the College of Arts and Sciences and therefore feels the need to resign from her position as Executive Secretary. I would like to remind you that in addition to being Executive Secretary, the person in this position also represents all of you on the FS Executive Committee in the dozens of meetings we attend. We will now elect her replacement.

Senator Stoudt, Chair FS Election Committee: I would first like to mention very briefly what the Executive Secretary does. There are three duties:

1. Call the roll for all Faculty Senate meetings.
2. Proof the minutes that the Faculty Senate Office Secretary prepares.
3. Enforce the Faculty Senate Constitution attendance policy

Nominations are now open.

Senator Lipman: I nominate Senator Kathleen Thompson-Casado.

Senator Thompson-Casado: Between A&S Council, Faculty Senate, and Union Benefits committees, Joel, I appreciate the nomination but respectfully decline.

Senator Skeens: I nominate Senator Steve Martin

Senator Martin: I accept

Senator Stoudt: Hearing no other nominations, nominations are now closed. All in favor of electing Steve Martin to the position of Faculty Senate Executive Secretary please say aye. Those opposed like sign.

Steve Martin elected to the position of FS Executive Secretary by unanimous voice vote.

VII. Adjournment: Meeting adjourned by Chair Jorgensen at 5:00 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Debra Stoudt
Executive Secretary

Tape summary:
Betsy Welsh