

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of September 27th
FACULTY SENATE
<http://www.utoledo.edu/facsenate> Approved @ FS on Oct 25, 2011

HIGHLIGHTS

Barbara Floyd, Jeffrey Gold, William McMillen, Penny Poplin Gosetti, Heather Huntley

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

President Lawrence Anderson called the meeting to order, **Lucy Duhon**, Executive Secretary, called the roll.

I. Roll Call: 2011-2012 Senators:

Present: Anderson, Batten, Cappelletty, Cooper, Cuckovic, Dismukes, Dowd, Duhon, Ellis, Franchetti, Giovannucci, Hamer, Heberle, Hewitt, Hey, Hill, Humphrys, Kistner, Kranz, LeBlanc, Lingan, Lipman, Lundquist, Mason, Molitor, Moore, Nandkeolyar, Ohlinger, Peseckis, Plenefisch, Powers, Regimbal, Rouillard, Sheldon, Slutsky, Solocha, Teclehaimanot, Templin, Thompson, Thompson-Casado, Weck-Schwarz, Wedding, White, Yonker

Excused absences: Brickman, Duggan, Hoblet, Hornbeck, Hottell, Lee, Malhotra, Moynihan, Nazzal Piazza, Randolph, Shriner, Skeel, Tinkel,

Unexcused absences: Chesney, Crist, Hammersley, Willey, Wilson

II. Approval of Minutes: Minutes from the September 13th meeting are ready for approval.

III. Executive Committee Report:

President Anderson: I am calling the meeting to order. Welcome all to the third Faculty Senate meeting of academic year 2011-2012.

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

Executive Secretary Duhon: I just want to mention a couple of housekeeping items. There is a note on the agenda that says if you are late to please check in with the secretary. It will be very helpful if you can check in with Quinetta or me, so we can get your name when you arrive. The other thing is, if you would please announce your name before speaking that would be helpful also, she does a great job, but sometimes there are gaps.

President Anderson: Minutes from the September 13th meeting were sent yesterday for your review. May I have a motion for approval of the minutes? Second? All in favor? Any opposed? Please let the record show the Minutes from September 13th meeting have been approved.

Since our last Senate meeting, the Executive Committee has attended the September Board of Trustees meeting on Monday of last week, had lunch with the President that Wednesday, and had an Executive Committee meeting Wednesday afternoon. At the Board Meeting, four resolutions were passed that have some bearing on our lives. They are:

Resolution 11-08-16: “Administrative Officials as the Appointing Authority”. There are a lot of “whereases” that concern the Ohio Revised Code. Then it resolves that “the Board of Trustees of The University of Toledo hereby makes the following designations:

Section 1: The person holding the position of President is designated as the “appointing authority” for purposes set forth in Chapter 124 of the Ohio Revised Code.

Section 2: The persons holding the positions of Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, Chancellor and Executive Vice President for Biosciences and Health Affairs, Vice President for Administration, and Senior Human Resources Officers are delegated the authority by the President to act in his capacity as “appointing authority.”

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED,

that the Board of Trustees hereby rescinds all previous resolutions and pertinent policy provisions relating to the appointing authority for The University of Toledo and former Medical University of Ohio Boards of Trustees.”

Resolution 11-08-17 concerns the “Westside Rail Corridor Land Conveyance.” The resolution states that the University of Toledo Board of Trustees authorizes the president to conduct diligence to negotiate and make and enter into all agreements necessary for incidental acquisition of this real property from the Wood County authority, with the intention of purchasing the empty rail-line that goes essentially to the campuses among other places, using it for certain purposes as we see fit.

Resolution 11-08-18 is “Action by Written Consent of the Sole Member of Science Technology and Innovation Enterprises (DBA: The University of Toledo Innovation Enterprises).”

It establishes the list of Directors and their terms.

Resolution 11-08-19 is “Approval of New Board of Trustees Bylaw 3364-01-11 and Rescission of Administrative Rules and Regulations.” This is mostly concerns the Health Science Campus. After a few “whereas’s” it says “therefore now be it resolved that the administrative rules and regulations of the Medical College of Ohio amended and approved on July 27, 1999 are hereby rescinded in their entirety; and... that Board Bylaw 3364-01-11 is hereby approved and adopted by the University; and ... that any remaining necessary portions of the Administrative Rules and Regulations of the Medical College of Ohio will be set forth in University policy and established by the President or his designee within his existing authority.”

Those resolutions were passed.

Senator Thomason- Casado: I’m sorry I don’t understand, could you tell us what is the impact of the first resolution?

President Anderson: Are you referring to the appointing authority?

Senator Thomason- Casado: Correct.

President Anderson: Well, maybe it will be best if Provost McMillen addresses your question when he comes up to talk later. But it does say, “...using the general authority to appoint officer commission board of body and have the power to appoint or removal from positions of any office, commission, or institution.” I expect that it has to do with the ability of our senior administrators to terminate the contract of a chair for example without necessarily getting the Dean’s approval. I think that is probably how it would affect us. Are there any other questions? Let’s continue with the Executive Committee report then.

Much of the Board meeting was given over to Dr. Poplin Gosetti and the self-study report for the HLC. Two items in her report raised eyebrows: a statement that all administrators have appropriate backgrounds

and degrees for their positions, and the conflict between budget statements that we are meeting our mission and at the same time likely to experience further cuts. At the lunch with the President, we mostly discussed possibilities for making student's experiences here at UT more favorable, both financially and academically.

At our Executive committee meeting, Dr. Barbara Floyd, Professor of Library Administration, past President of the Senate, and Chair of the Senate Ad-hoc Committee on Program Review, outlined the report she will be giving you today. We also spent some time with EC members Karen Hoblet and Susan Batten discussing concerns about how the Senate is addressing (or not addressing) issues of concern to the Health Science Campus. We proposed modifications to the agenda and other possible changes. We will continue this discussion at the executive level next week. We also discussed issues concerning IRB certification, and will follow up by inviting appropriate personnel to make a presentation. We discussed an invitation to the Senate to fill seven slots on the Academic Honors Committee. Senator Dowd will include something about that in his upcoming report. One other situation was brought to our attention: there has been a significant increase in the number of cases of STDs appearing at the health center. In addition, the patients (students) appear less concerned than they should be about the long-term consequences. This issue is something that we may want to address with our students in an appropriate way. We may also want to have a formal report to the Senate by the Medical Center about this issue.

I have a question to ask you since we are speaking of medical issues; is anyone is interested in flu shots? Would you like to get one right here at a Senate meeting?

Senator Dowd: Flu shots? This is a full-service Senate.

President Anderson: Yes, this is a full service Senate. Would you show by raising your hands if you would like to receive a flu shot at a Senate meeting? Okay, many of you would.

This concludes the Executive Committee report. Are there any questions? Next on the agenda Senator Dowd will give an update on committees.

Senator Dowd: The Committees on Committees will meet this Friday, September 30th and will seat members of all Senate committees. I hope that Quinetta and I can get the notifications out to the Senators and non-Senators shortly after that. As President Anderson mentioned, the Senate has been approached to appoint eight members to the Academic Honors Committee. Faculty Senate has appointed individuals to that committee for a number of years. This year the Executive Committee has extended an invitation to the Graduate Council Executive Committee to make three of the appointments, so we are "sharing the love" in essence. We hope to come up with a short list this week and make the appointments next week. At that time we'll notify the Provost Office of those appointments. Please feel free to nominate someone for this committee and note that self-nominations are welcome too. But if you would, please be quick to act. If interested, send an e-mail note to Quinetta listing your nominations. Often faculty confuses this committee with the Honors College. Note that the Academic Honors Committee is not affiliated with the Honors College; among other duties, this committee selects distinguished University professors, commencement speakers, and honorary grievance recipients etc. Are there any faculty members in attendance who have served on the committee in the past? Perhaps they can stand and briefly describe some of the committee's duties?

Unknown Speaker: One of the duties that we've done in the past is review dossiers from some of the distinguished professors. We also reviewed dossiers from individuals that wanted to be a guest speaker for graduation ceremonies. It's actually a fun process and it is not very time consuming, at all. I served on it for three years along with Sara Lundquist. It is actually a really fun committee to be on; well to me it

was fun. It is a lot of reviewing and you get masses of data to look through, but it is kind of fun seeing what others are doing in their colleges. If you are interested, I recommend that you join that committee.

Senator Dowd: Thank you. Senator Lundquist, would you like to add anything?

Senator Lundquist: I guess the most time consuming part of it is to select distinguished university professors. I think it is a great committee to work on.

Senator Dowd: Again, this committee's work is very important. If you want to nominate someone or if you want to nominate yourself please contact Quinetta, but you have to do it soon. Are there any questions? Thank you.

Senator Cooper: I have one comment that I want to make which is about flu shots. I would hope if we are going to offer flu shots to the members of the Faculty Senate that there is also a mechanism to offer to other groups of faculty on the Main Campus.

Senator Batten: Dr. Cooper, my name is Susan Batten and I am from the College of Nursing, and we have just finished mapping out a point of service for both campuses with probably over thirty-five intervention points for students, faculty, and staff. We are going to go where people are rather than having people come to central service. More is coming out probably toward the end of the week and much to facilitate this, plus it will be free.

Senator Cooper: Thank you.

President Anderson: Next, Barbara Floyd will give an update on program review as chair of a Senate ad hoc committee. This committee was established last year with the intention of finding equitable measures of program viability and possible reduction of redundancy by merging and creating cooperative links between existing programs.

Professor Floyd: Actually just to clarify, we are not the Faculty Senate ad hoc Program Review Committee; we are Faculty Senate ad hoc Committee on Academic Programs. As you may remember for those of you that were on the Senate last year, this is a committee that was charged jointly by the President and the President of the Faculty Senate in January of last year. This committee came out of the reorganization of the colleges that had just been completed. The charge, as the President conveyed it to us, was as follows: "The fifth and final step of this reorganization plan will be to sort through the more than 100 departments, seeking synergies, possible redundancies, and alignment with the colleges in which they exist. This critical stage is still under development, but obviously will constitute a large project as it unfolds." So, that was our initial charge as the committee. We spent some time considering how we would attempt such a study, which seemed quite daunting because we were looking at every single department to try to determine these aspects. In February we met with consultant Barry Cohen and with his encouragement we began to revise our study. The reason that we did this is because we figured out merging academic departments might have some purposes, but, if your purpose was to save "money," this is really not a very sufficient way to go about doing that. It is likely not to result in a lot of savings.. Instead, Barry recommended that the committee move in a new direction which was focused on developing a formula that would allow for evaluation of program-level viability and sustainability.

So, we moved from looking for redundancies and synergies in academic departments to looking at program viability and sustainability. The goal was to identify timely, relevant, accurate, and interpretable data regarding programs and their performance outcomes. So that was, at that time, the goal of the committee. Unfortunately, when we began to look for formulas and models that would guide us, we realized that there were none that we could find that would allow for such an analysis using only

quantitative data. What became obvious is that we wanted to look at programs not for just quantitative analysis and financial viability and sustainability, but also look at qualitative data. From looking at quantitative and qualitative data we thought that we might begin to identify data and concrete information that can inform decisions about academic programs.

So, in order to look at qualitative issues, we began to work with Penny Poplin Gosetti in her efforts to embark on benchmarking program review. As many of you know, and those of you who were perhaps department chairs and were involved in this process will know, last spring every undergraduate academic program had to prepare a benchmarking self-study report. This effort was already underway when our processes were melded together. We decided on a multi-pronged approach for our committee. First, we would review the more than one hundred benchmarking program review reports, a daunting task I can tell you. Working with Barry Cohen, we would develop a data set for models of financial viability and sustainability to see if such models can be developed, particularly if Institutional Research could segregate program-level data that would allow us to begin to address the issues of program viability and sustainability. Based upon the benchmarking report evaluations, we would recommend programs that would participate in full program review that would begin this fall, 2011. I am sure that you heard from Penny, there is currently an ad hoc committee that is looking at developing a process for full-blown program review that will begin this fall. Based on our analysis of benchmarking reports we also made some recommendations on how full program review might work as we move forward.

The committee proceeded to review all of the bench-marking reports. We had two-person teams that evaluated fifteen or twenty of these reports according to a rubric that we developed. This was a grueling process that took place over the summer and it occupied a lot of time. I want to publically thank all of them. I also have to say that some of these evaluations are ongoing because some of the reports came in very late; some were not submitted until August. So we are still struggling to try to finish the program review evaluations.

So, based upon our committee findings, the following is what we thought is important for program review and for assessing viability and sustainability. First, program review, and financial viability and sustainability analysis, cannot produce meaningful results without assessing graduate programs in tandem with their undergraduate components. Undergraduate and graduate programs are often linked by faculty and curricula. Evaluations of quality and any recommendations concerning one will surely impact the other. I am pleased to say, based upon discussions that the program review ad hoc committee has had, that it looks like program review will involve individual program reviews at the graduate and undergraduate level, but will bring those reviews together to present a unified report about the entire academic program at both undergraduate and graduate level. Second, while our committee was still conducting its research, we were stunned to learn that decisions to eliminate some programs were already made without the kind of relevant, accurate, and interpretable data that was supposed to guide these decisions. We believe, and our report states: Program elimination should only occur after both qualitative and quantitative analysis that shows significant weaknesses that cannot be remedied. As part of that effort, however, we also believe that it is important for faculty to have input into such decisions. In order to have input into those decisions faculty need to be effective participants in decision making, which means we have to be willing to critique and comment on the programs of our peers. Otherwise, decisions on program elimination may be carried out without faculty peer input, and an important component of shared governance will be lost. So when it is time for you to volunteer or you are asked, for example, to serve on one of these academic program review committees in the fall, I hope you will take it seriously and recognize that without this kind of service on these committees and without your eagerness to review the programs of your colleagues, we are not going to have a say in what the outcomes of those reviews might be. Our analysis of benchmarking reports shows some interesting things and these are the following:

1. The data that is collected and used by academic departments in preparing their program review reports varied widely in quality and consistency.

2. Program review reports varied widely in quality and content, making comparisons between the reports very difficult.
3. The rubric used to evaluate program review reports was prepared long after the reports themselves were prepared, which meant that what was being evaluated did not always match what was asked of the departments. So, that was a problem that is being amended as we moved forward in program review by developing a template and the rubric in tandem.
4. Many reports lacked trend data which would allow for analysis over time.
5. Because reports varied widely in content and quality, evaluators were left to evaluate quality of reports rather than quality of programs.
6. No program review for over ten years has resulted in some departments lacking the ability to succinctly articulate program strengths and weaknesses. This is something that I think is very important as we move into program review. One of the things that I found is that there needs to be some effort and way to indicate to departments how to write self-study reports and how to write them more effectively.
7. Academic programs have poorly worded or outdated mission statements, and these usually are not aligned with the university mission statement
8. .

Those were some of the process issues that we discovered. However, there are other things that I think that came out of our review of these reports which are perhaps more important, such as the following:

1. Many programs noted it is impossible to improve faculty diversity, which, of course, is one of the goals of this institution, because of the lack of new hires in recent years. As people have retired, without the opportunity for national searches and an effort to diversify faculty within a program it is not going to happen. That ought to be a concern of the institution.
2. Many programs expressed concerns about continued viability and sustainability due to lack of faculty hires. Many, many programs seem to be operating at the tipping point, and quality has been impacted by lack of faculty. Sustainability and viability of all programs are in question without hires. Faculty often struggle because there is so few faculty available to support their program. That was seen time and time again.
3. We also realized in our analysis that the elimination of degree programs will not likely result in significant cost savings, at least not immediately, because most programs are staffed by faculty with tenure. Of course I suppose you could eliminate tenured faculty, but that would be a difficult process. So, if you are going to eliminate a degree program you will not see the immediate cost savings that the institution might think is possible.
4. Eliminating degree programs but continuing to offer courses in those subjects (which I think is a possibility) will lead to a different kind of faculty member attracted to those programs. Let's say that you eliminate a degree program in English, for example, but if you did that you will still have to offer English courses. But, the kind of faculty who would be attracted to teaching in a program like that will be very different from a program where you are offering an undergraduate degree and master's degree. You may have faculty who do not have Ph.D's. You may have faculty that don't have a research focus or are research-active. Those are things that will impact quality, and that needs to be kept in mind if those kinds of decisions are made sometime in the future.

Full program review will begin in October. As you know, there will likely be between fifteen and twenty programs that will go through this first round of program review. Program review has not been in place at UT since 1997, at least on the Main Campus. Our recommendations for that process are these:

1. Since program review has not been in place for so long, data that would allow for wise allocation of resources has not been available. As a result, personnel resource allocations

have been made without data on program needs or quality. Faculty hiring plans must take into account program review outcomes.

2. Because of the length of time since the last program review, we recommend that all program reviews should include narratives from outside evaluators. Again, this seems to be something that we are moving towards. This is something that the Program Review ad hoc Committee is in agreement with.
3. Departments that will undergo program review should be educated as to how to prepare effective program review reports, including how to gather and display data, support qualitative statements with quantitative data, and gather and display trend data. For a lot of programs that have accreditation requirements, this is no problem because they generate this kind of stuff all the time; but the programs that are non-accredited have very little data on hand or at least have not made an effort to collect it generally. Nor do they know how to best display it and to make their case. We are suggesting that as we go forward a tutorial on how to prepare an effective self study will be integral to program review.
2. We still have some work to do such as: Development of a model for assessing program viability and sustainability. Institutional Research is working on this model that will allow for identification of program-specific data that does not penalize departments based upon program requirements. Feedback to programs based upon the evaluation of benchmarking program review reports is still being compiled. We hope to provide feedback to each program on its program review reports to provide constructive comments on how to improve their program review reports in the future.
3. Some program review evaluations are still being completed due to lateness of submission of these reports.
4. An ad hoc committee chaired by Penny Poplin Gosetti is currently working on developing a process for full program review; I believe that it will be worked out in October.

I just want to publically thank all of the committee members who worked very, very hard over the summer reading all of these reports and trying to analyze them and trying to provide feedback to the authors that will be helpful to them as we go forward. It really was an extraordinary amount of work and I know that people really don't want to do this kind of work over the summer. I just want to thank them all for all of their efforts. I also want to thank Penny Poplin Gosetti and Heather Huntley for their efforts to help the committee complete its work. I will be happy to answer any questions.

PowerPoint slide:

Final Report:

Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Programs

Original Committee Charge

Committee was jointly charged by the President and the President of the Faculty Senate. The statement from the president at time indicated the following:

“The fifth and final step in this reorganization plan will be to sort through the more than 100 departments, seeking synergies, possible redundancies, and alignment with the colleges in which they exist. This critical stage is still under development, but obviously will constitute a large project as it unfolds.”--President Jacobs, January, 2011

Evolution of Committee Charge

In February, Barry Cohen of Kaludis Consulting was assigned to help our committee carry out its charge. Cohen suggested that merging departments was unlikely to result in significant cost savings. He instead recommended a new direction for the committee.

- Develop a formula that would allow for the evaluation of program viability and sustainability.
- The goal of the study would be to identify timely, relevant, accurate, and interpretable data regarding programs and their performance outcomes.

Evolution of Committee Charge

It soon became clear that no such formulas existed in higher education that would allow for such analysis. The committee recognized that quantitative data would need to be assessed along with qualitative data. At this point, the committee merged its work with work being done by the provost's office to conduct a benchmarking program review process

In March, the committee decided on a multi-pronged approach

1. Review more than 100 benchmarking program review reports
2. Working with Cohen, develop a beta test of models for financial viability and sustainability
3. Based upon benchmarking reports, recommend which programs should begin full program review this fall
4. Based upon our analysis of the benchmarking reports, make recommendations on how full program review should proceed.

Committee Findings

1. Program review, and financial viability and sustainability analysis, cannot produce meaningful results without assessing graduate programs in tandem with their undergraduate components. Undergraduate and graduate programs are linked by faculty and curricula. Evaluations of quality and any recommendations concerning one will impact the other.

Committee Findings

2. While committee was still conducting its research, decisions to eliminate some programs were made without the relevant, accurate, and interpretable data that was supposed to guide these decisions. Program elimination should only occur after both qualitative and quantitative analysis show significant weaknesses that cannot be remedied.
3. If faculty want input into such decisions and be effective participants in decision making, they must be willing to provide critique and commentary on the programs of their peers. Otherwise, decisions on program elimination may be carried out without faculty peer input, and an important component of shared governance is lost.
i.e., when program review committees are established this fall, it is hoped faculty will be willing to serve.

Analysis of Benchmarking Program Review Reports

1. The data collected and used by academic departments in preparing their program review reports varied widely in quality and consistency;
2. Program review reports varied widely in quality and content, making comparisons between the reports difficult;
3. The rubric used to evaluate program review reports was prepared long after the reports themselves were prepared, which meant that what was being evaluated did not always match what was asked of the departments;
4. Many reports lacked trend data which would allow for analysis over time;
5. Because reports varied widely in content and quality, evaluators were left to evaluate quality of reports rather than quality of programs;
6. No program review for over ten years has resulted in some departments lacking the ability to succinctly articulate program strengths and weaknesses;
7. Academic programs have poorly worded or outdated mission statements, and these usually are not aligned with university mission statements.

Analysis of Benchmarking Program Review Reports

Common themes revealed in analysis of program review reports included:

1. Many programs noted it is impossible to improve faculty diversity because of a lack of new hires in recent years;
2. Many programs expressed concerns about continued viability and sustainability due to few new faculty hires. Many programs are operating at the tipping point, and quality has been impacted by lack of faculty. Sustainability and viability of all programs are in question without hires.
3. Elimination of degree programs will not likely result in significant cost savings, at least not immediately;
4. Eliminating degree programs but continuing to offer courses in those subjects will lead to a different type of faculty and a likely decline in quality. Replacing research-focused Ph.D. faculty with part-time, lecturer or visiting faculty will impact quality of instruction.

Recommendations on Full Program Review Process

Full program review will begin in October. Program review has not been in place at UT since 1997. Our recommendations on full program review include:

1. Since program review has not been in place for so long, data that would allow for wise allocation of resources has not been available. As a result, personnel resource allocations have been made without data on program needs or quality. Faculty hiring plans must take into account program review outcomes.
2. Because of length of time since last program review, all program reviews should include narratives from outside evaluators.
3. Departments that will undergo program review should be educated as to how to prepare effective program reviews, including how to gather and display data, support qualitative statements with quantitative data, and gather and display trend data.

Committee Work Still Outstanding

1. Development of a model for assessing program viability and sustainability is still under development. Institutional Research is working on a model that will allow for identification of program-specific data that does not penalize departments based upon program requirements.
2. Feedback to programs based upon the evaluation of benchmarking program review reports is still being compiled. We hope to provide feedback to each program on its program review reports to provide constructive comments on how to improve their program review reports in the future.
3. Some program review evaluations are still being completed due to late submission.
4. An ad hoc committee chaired by Penny Poplin Gosetti is currently working on developing the process for full program review

Thanks to Committee Members

Susan Batten, College of Nursing
David Cutri, Internal Auditing
David Dabney, Finance
Mike Dowd, College of Language, Literature and Social Sciences
Larry Fink, College of Business and Innovation
Mary Humphrys, College of Business and Innovation
Andy Jorgensen, College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics
Sara Lundquist, College of Languages, Literature, and Social Sciences
Holly Monsos, College of Visual and Performing Arts
Walt Olson, College of Engineering
Steve Peseckis, College of Pharmacy
Celia Regimbal, JHCEHSHS
Glenn Sheldon, Honors College

Senator Dowd: I would like to comment on Barbara Floyd's leadership for that committee. We got the work done because Professor Floyd made us do it. I mean that in a good way. She provided excellent leadership and she really kept the group together through the changes to the committee charge and when faced with very difficult work. Although different committee members worked on different areas, Professor Floyd is primarily responsible for coordinating all of the work that was completed. Thank you, Professor Floyd. [applause]

Senator Lipman: I would like the Minutes to indicate that we commend Barbara Floyd for her fluent intention to support detail and her illusive clarity of the pros and for the direction of her report as a model for other reports that Senate receives. I would like to ask President Anderson if there's a way to make that claim in the Minutes. Thank you.

President Anderson: It has been recorded and is officially in the Minutes.

Professor Floyd: I am thankful and I appreciate it.

President Anderson: I will ask for a motion to support Senator Lipman's sentiments.

Senator Lipman: I so move.

Senator Dowd: Second.

President Anderson: Any discussion? All in favor? Any opposed? The motion passed unanimously.
Motion Passed.

Senator Hamer: I have a question. There was a point and a few concerns that the committee had which did not show up in the recommendations. It seems like it was a very big concern which is about programs being cut before the evaluations are done. I am aware of one program for example that was formed over the summer that will be cut. It has been said that there is no discussion to be had. It's one of thirty-six or so programs nationally. It is nationally recognized. It produces professionals that are locally, in Ohio, nationally, and internationally. It seems like the Senate needs to take a very strong stand on those sorts of things since so many of you spent a lot of time over the summer making very, very important decisions. I don't see that stamp coming from our discussions will really push it through.

Senator Dowd: I would like to point out that the issue that you raised were provided in the Faculty Senate report to the Board of Trustees in June. Regarding the cancellation and elimination of programs, your Executive Committee expressed to the Board of Trustees that we do not understand is why faculty

on the *ad hoc* committee chaired by Professor Floyd were asked to perform their analysis if their difficult work would not be used to inform recent decisions by the administration. As Professor Floyd noted, the administration made the decision to eliminate programs without data or analysis. Again, that point was explicitly made in the Faculty Senate report to the Board of Trustees.

Senator Hamer: I think that is very important. But I don't think that we should just sit here though and accept that that happened because decisions will all be revisited and it makes...of all the work. It destroys programs and about two decades of history. It really does not motivate me (I don't know about others) to volunteer for any program review work. That is not the big point. The big point is that it wastes everyone's time when administration asks people to do work, but clearly are not paying any attention to them.

Professor Floyd: I would agree completely and that is why it is a dual edge sword. If you have an agreement that this is what we are going to do then the administration needs to let us do it. And we need to follow it through and produce a product that says "here's everything," that is the struggle.

Senator Hamer: I agree. I would like to move that we request that the Board of Trustees put on hold any decisions regarding program review that have been made before this committee's finding(s) have been reviewed. I think it needs to be a motion and we need to carry it through. I don't want to be a troublemaker, but it is ridiculous not to.

Professor Floyd: Well, I think that this committee is probably not at that level. The benchmarking reports were very brief reports. They don't provide in-depth information about all of the data that really ought to go into the kind of analysis that one will do if they decide to eliminate a program. I think a better approach would be to ask for the programs that have been suspended that a full program review occur for those programs, including financial viability and sustainability to see exactly what the issues are and if they can be remedied in some way. I'm not sure if this report addresses that.

Senator Nandkeolyar: I have a question about the slide before this which talks about viability, there's no objective with financial in front of it. However, in other places I saw financial, so which is it?

Professor Floyd: What we are suggesting is that in addition to qualitative analysis that happens in programs review that IR develops a formula that will allow for financial viability and sustainability to be analyzed. That is still a work in progress. As I stated before, they are trying to segregate program level data to run it through a formula that does began to address exactly these issues of sustainability and viability. I'm not sure how long that will take. They do have one model that they think might work, but then the College of Business, for example, pointed out the issue of dual majors and minors does not enter into that equation. Therefore, it may not work and we need to think of another model. I don't know how long that is going to take, but it seems to me that you just can't do one without the other; both quantitative and qualitative data needs to be part of an analysis if programs are in danger of being eliminated.

Senator Nandkeolyar: Most PhD programs are not financially viable so are we going to become an undergrad institution?

Professor Floyd: Well, I don't think that that is the intent. I think that the intent is to try to see what programs may be in trouble. Plus, is it possible to get additional resources to those programs? But I don't intend to speak for administration. I think that it is all a part of a package these days. We have limited resources, we want to focus on quality programs, and it needs to be a way to access what those are.

Senator Cuckovic: It seems to be that new faculty hiring is an issue, have you planned for the future how you are going to address it (the positions), the advantages?

Professor Floyd: I don't know, but what we are saying is that any faculty hiring plan needs to take into account these assessments of program quality. Please keep in mind we have not done this in ten years. Personnel have been allocated without this kind of understanding what programs are out there with real needs. We don't seem to have that kind of data. So, our point is if you are going to have a faculty hiring plan then you need to have this kind of analysis so that you know where to allocate resources because there are so few.

Senator Heberle: The recent call for suggestions for faculty hiring focuses on strategic plan and study for excellence have allocated resources for that purpose. But that is not about program review across the University (which is the things that I'm hearing) and what Mike suggests is the tension between the two in terms of trying to take strategic plan seriously and do something with it in terms of allocation of resources and program review process that is somehow prompting us to do all of this work and show how our programs are contributing etc. to the University whether or not it is about more local and particular concerns. Is strategic plan studying for excellence, or is it a University wide thing that allows these accredited programs to exist because we are an accredited University?

Professor Floyd: Our committee is not allocating resources.

Senator Heberle: I was not recommending that.

Professor Floyd: Faculty hiring plans should look, we believe, to program review to help identify programs that with additional resources could improve quality or continue excellence.

Senator Heberle: My final point was perhaps if we do something more. I came here in 1997 and I have never been part of the program review. If we do something more in terms of historical memories of the institution about what purpose program review that have served in the past and what that would do now, maybe that will help.

Professor Floyd: I think if you read the committee's report there is a section that discusses what the intentions of the program review that existed in 1997 were. I think that those things are all still valid.

President Anderson: Before we go any further I do want to go back to Senator Hamer's comment and I am going to take her motion as not necessarily a motion for the Senate today, but a motion for the Executive Committee to come back next time with a motion to be voted on that would present Senate's view on the matter that then could be sent directly to administration and on up to the Board. Is that sufficient?

Senator Hamer: Yes.

Senator Wedding: When President Jacobs first announced this he said one hundred departments, and of course there are not one hundred departments on this campus. Are we now interpreting that as programs opposed to departments? Where are we going with this? Are the words "program and department interchangeable?" My second question is did this work also look at the Medical College or was in solely for the Main campus?

Professor Floyd: I will address the issue. Are programs departments? No. Departments have multiple programs, so programs are different from departments. We only looked at undergraduate programs because the Graduate Council has purview over graduate programs and they were conducting their own review of Ph.D. programs over the summer. So, the programs that we addressed on the HSC were nursing and pharmacy. So, yes, if they were undergraduate program then we did review them.

Senator Wedding: What about the president who called for elimination of departments? Is that still in play or has that gone away?

Professor Floyd: I think that you have to ask the president about that. That is not what our committee looked at.

Senator Dowd: May I comment on this issue? Earlier in the discussions it was evident that there was nothing to gain from eliminating departments. In fact, both President Jacobs and the consultant Barry Cohen remarked that by doing so they would just alienate faculty and students with minimum cost savings. Both President Jacobs and Barry Cohen stated that they had no interest in eliminating departments. In fact, the president said to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee that the only way that he would consider merging departments is if the faculty in those departments wanted to merge.

President Anderson: That is correct. Alright, at this time I would like to invite Provost McMillen up to the podium. We have not had anyone from administration to address Faculty Senate this year. Unfortunately, Chancellor Gold is not able to attend this meeting or he may come later. Provost McMillen is going to make a few comments and then it will be open for questions and answers, some of your concerns and questions can be directed at Provost McMillen.

Provost McMillen: Thank you, President Anderson. I do have an obligation at 5:30 p.m. I am having my first Student Advisory Committee meeting for the Provost Office, featuring pizza, so unfortunately I will have to leave early. I would like to talk about five or six items and maybe say a couple of words about program review. I also want to extend my appreciations to Barbara Floyd. I know that everyone has worked hard on that committee over the summer. I was reading Inside Higher Education this morning where I saw a reference to the University of Texas system where legislatively they have mandated any program that doesn't graduate twenty-five students in a year will be cut. There's a debate right now going on in Texas about it. I worry about things like that. There's an article in the Chronicle that features cutting Physics programs, but interestingly enough without taking into consideration that physics is often a feeder major to other professions. It is just a "nutty" idea coming out of Texas right now. I always worry about that kind of legislation because legislatures read about what each other are doing. There is a national legislative conference as you may know that meets and exchange those types of ideas. I think two things about program review; it is difficult coming from an external point. It is like the Regents have done and many of you might remember what happened years ago with history degrees around the state. So, there are legislative and Regents' initiatives that are going to affect program review, and those we have to fight as a unit and as a system with our sister schools. The other issue (and this was an issue in the last budget and it has to be more carefully done) and that is the panicking over cutting programs to try to save money in the current budget. I think that was unfortunate last year how that affected all of the deans because they were under enormous pressure. I hope that we can avoid that this year. I've been in discussion meetings weekly with David Dabney, and we are hoping to come up with a better system than we have. We would have to start earlier with the budget. It will have to be a more reasonable approach. I also suggested to him since the state has a two-year budget then why can't we have a two year budget. I think a two year budget makes a lot more sense. We already know what the next two-year state appropriations are. There may be variations because of a budget amendment or a capital bill coming out of the state. But there's no reason why we couldn't have a two year budget because the issue that plagued us this year was not knowing what the state and the governor were going to do. We can do a budget right now and maybe we should. It will take a little longer and we can be a little bit more reasonable about it. It is just something that we can think about as we go along. I would also like to cover a couple of other points. The Ohio Revised Code is a separate section for every university. When the two institutions were merged five years ago, MUO and UT were eliminated in the old Code and the new law was passed. In passing the new law it came out pretty much like all the rest, I mean you can look up universities like Bowling Green and Kent

State and you will find the same thing. The state creates an institution and creates a name and then creates a board of trustees. Now, when we were created it was a very elaborate concerning the Board because we were worried how the two Boards would merge, which we really didn't have to worry about. If I remember correctly, basically the law establishes two different things. First, is the membership of the Board which is the number of Board members. Secondly is the duty which is essentially the appointment of the president and managing finances. That's about all it says and there's not much else. So anyway, I will look that up and report back for specific questions. Quickly moving on so there's time for answers and questions, neither Chancellor Gold nor I know exactly what the appointment authority means. Hopefully, we will find what we hope it means, but we don't think it really make much difference to the Provost's or Chancellor's offices. Chuck Lenard and his staff are really working with us, hoping to streamline the paper work in this institution. I think that all of you are needlessly overwhelmed with paperwork. Hopefully, this authority will eliminate some of that will allow us to make some hires very quickly throughout the institution. We will staff and also streamline payments. I know people have waited too long for some reinforcements. I know that there's been some talk about payments this year and hopefully we can just do a better job of that. If that's what appointing authority means then I guess that is a good thing. I would like to mention something that I experienced this afternoon. I went to the Engineering accreditation visit and there were sixteen engineers from around the country who were in town for the past three days at the College of Engineering. That was a very interesting meeting. Nobody was allowed to say anything while they talked for an hour and an half. I want to record that even though I never experienced that before I thought Engineering came off very well. It was a good accreditation visit, I believe; I think Senator LeBlanc is nodding his head in the back in agreement. What was very interesting about it was a precursor for the Higher Learning Commission. The Higher Learning Commission is going to have about the same number of people and it is going to be three days in February as oppose to days in September. But a lot of it was amazing. For example, how many of the same phrases came up, continuous improvement, assessment, and core curriculum came up. I don't want to be naive about it. I think those are issues that can come up in any college. The language was so similar to what we have been reading in the HLC criteria, various criterions that we are writing about. The accreditation grouping people have all gotten together or else or reacting to Washington. It was very interesting and I think that I can say that it is not premature to say that the college did very well. Finally, I would like to mention one other thing that we are going to do in the Provost Office, but for those of you that are from the Health Science Campus you would have to talk to Chancellor Gold. I am going to take about \$25,000, and more if needed and establish a travel fund. I have gotten a couple of request and I also remember during my interim role last year getting a couple as well. We are going to setup a travel fund for faculty who need a little extra money to travel. I know people need money to travel to conferences because they are expensive. It's important to promote the University of Toledo name among your various disciplines. I already had one person who is in this room inquire about travel, so she's in line ahead of everyone else. If it is small amounts like seven hundred dollars or one thousand dollars it will be okay. I really believe that University of Toledo should have travel and it should supported by the Provost Office.

Senator Rouillard: Thank you for that very generous offer for the travel budget. If I could, I would like to put a bid in for the College of LLSS in line after the person that you have already spoken to; because our college as a whole has been informed that we have absolutely no faculty development funds. So, it's not a question of coming up short but rather it is a question that we do not have any money.

Provost McMillen: I know some of the colleges are more flushed and some have only a little or no money, so I will address that issue and I'll talk with Alice as well.

Senator Rouillard: Thank you.

Provost McMillen: It is very important money.

Senator Dowd: I want to raise an issue. At the last Finance Committee meeting of the Board of Trustees it was recorded that the university has tens and millions of dollars in surplus from the previous fiscal year. Do you know offhand what portion of those funds are onetime monies verses monies generated from budgeted lines?

Provost McMillen: I think that it is about ten million; I believe that was the final figure.

Senator Dowd: It wasn't \$11.5 million?

Provost McMillen: That came from a lot of different sources. One of those sources was the final payment, the one that were worried about which we were anticipating in coming in at \$7.9 million, but because it was the end of the year it came in about.

Senator Dowd: If I remember correctly, \$9.2 million was from state share of instruction.

Provost McMillen: I was going to say ten million. I actually never knew this, but the subsidy payments are not simply divided up by taking a final number and dividing it up by four quarterly payments. In fact, it has actually fluctuated as various subsidy recordings are made etc., so that was a part of it. The hospital came in with a profit of approximately \$3 million.

Senator Dowd: I ask this because of the previous budget cuts to Academic Affairs. If any of the surplus monies came from budgeted lines in academic affairs could that money be returned to academic affairs? Also, for one-time monies, whether it is \$9.2 million or \$10 million in state share instruction, is Finance planning to carry-over those funds to the next fiscal year? Because that money could be used to shore up accounts that money could be applied to faculty.

Provost McMillen: You may know more about this than I do because you go to the Finance and Strategy meetings. It is still being debated. The thing that you are listening to is the president's Town Hall meeting and furloughs came up. I think I can say that we are probably not going to have furloughs. But the President is the final arbitrary of that.

President Anderson: It appears that furloughs are very unlikely.

Provost McMillen: I think that there's some talk about helping some of the groups of people that haven't has raises and of course the biggest one is the PSA, but they are not unionized. They have not had a raise in a long time.

Senator Dowd: Earlier you suggested that we need to start planning a two-year budget based on the state's two-year budget; I think that it is a terrific idea. That could translate into deans and chairs getting information about the budget earlier. That would really help our planning. In particular, it would help the Graduate College plan better in terms of allocating assistantships. In turn, colleges and departments could make their offers to potential graduate students sooner. That would remove a little uncertainty from our students' lives. Again, I think that this is a terrific idea.

Provost McMillen: We have this enrollment admission summit. There were a lot of good ideas about admission and enrollment, but one of the real key ideas was financing teaching and graduates assistants earlier. Because not only does it help with department plan and not only does it gets "better" T.A.S to commit to us. We have a list of proposed faculty hires that basically came from the deans. I can speak for myself; I have authorized three or four of the deans. I believe money disciplines your meetings in the fall when hiring take. So, we are spending that money right now and we will have a broader plan. I appreciate your goal to excellence that was made earlier. We have to hire more broadly though, but not just

replacements for retirements and people leaving the institution but for important programs. We are putting that together and authorizing. I know that President Jacobs has made it very clear in the past that minority hiring is very important.

President Anderson: Alright, that is the end of the discussion. Is there any other new business from the floor?

Senator Lipman: I have one question and maybe I should of thought about this when Barb was at the podium. I was under the understanding that the ad hoc committee is for program review. Might it not be advisable to have a standing committee?

President Anderson: Well, we do have the academic programs committee. The academic programs committee passes modifications for whatever programs that are coming along. I think that what Professor Floyd is doing is very different and it might make a lot of sense to have a standing committee on program assessment. So, as we are revising our constitution the Minutes will take note-of that. Is there anything else from the floor? Then I will have you take a quick break and get some refreshments and prepare ourselves for Dr. Penny Poplin Gosetti and Heather Huntley.

[Break]

Higher Learning Commission presentation
(Minutes will be forthcoming.)

IV. Meeting adjourned at 6:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:

Lucy Duhon
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard

Faculty Senate Office Administrative Secretary.