

Natural Sciences and Mathematics Council

Meeting Minutes for January 22, 2013

Wolfe Hall 1240 3:30 – 5:00 PM

Call to Order

Roll Call – Secretary Jon Bossenbroek

Present: James Anderson, Bruce Bamber, John Bellizzi, Jon Bossenbroek, Mike Cushing, Fan Dong, Hans Gottgens, Xiche Hu, Edith Kippenhan, David Krantz, Nick Podraza, Tony Quinn, Joe Schmidt, Friedhelm Schwarz, JD Smith, Gerard Thompson, Sibylle Weck-Schwarz, Don White

Update on Faculty Workload Policy

Summary of Workload Issues – Krantz

From the perspective of the UT Administration:

Strategic planning process, meetings with various groups since November

(1) Defined the financial problem; (2) discussed problems; (3) proposed solutions

Actions proposed by the Administration:

Restructuring admin positions and Colleges

Re-focus on undergrad teaching mission

Portals to serve specific student demographics

Evaluation of the financial problem

Projected \$36 M deficit for FY14 “Not a sustainable economic model”

Causes:

End of Federal stimulus funds

Reduced enrollment

Continued reduction in State subsidy

Used capital funds to support general operational budget

Health-care costs

Administration states that :

Deficit NOT related to SIM Center – BOT vote, separate source of money

Deficit NOT a single fiscal year problem

Deferred capital spending – new science building on hold

Athletic program taken off the table

Provost has addressed many groups – Faculty Senate, Grad Council, University Council, College Councils

Consistent message; has answered questions directly and calmly

Economic model presented by the Provost:

Cost accounting by academic unit and academic activity

Annual deficits under this accounting: NSM \$6M, Engineering similar, Law \$1.5 M, VPA similar

By activity:

Teaching – only net positive cash flow

Research – funded research breaks even; unfunded negative; specific definition of “funded”

Administration – negative

Service – predominantly negative; positive examples OSU hospital [??] – an odd definition of service]

These economic forces do not apply only to UT; statewide and nationwide

Moody's : previously only elite and low-cost would do well; revised to ALL universities now under threat

Recent action by BGSU 11% reduction in faculty

From Administration perspective, the only activity that can generate additional revenue quickly is Teaching

Need to increase “teaching productivity”

Key Question:

Is this a one-year correction, or a longer-term structural problem?

Univ. Council – Administration proposed review in 3-5 years; UC advised review in 1 year

All this led to the Workload Memo from the Provost

Provost states that the letter “codifies what is in the CBA”

Key points: (some of these are interpretations)

Likely that each faculty member will teach 1 to 1.5 more courses per academic year

Dept. Chairs will teach

Lecturers retained

Part-time instructors and VAPs likely to go

Status of TAs not clear at this time

Contentious issues:

Value of research and research-active faculty

30 students per undergraduate class

Impact on quality of courses and value of degrees granted

Time frame:

Courses for Fall 2013 by January 30 (?)

Workload by Feb 6

AAUP statement not to sign workload agreements

This was modified in the following memo

Current Status of Workload Issues – Dean Bjorkman

Workload document – presented to Deans in early December

Many discussions, a few changes, but very close to what was presented

The Provost seems to be walking back the document slightly

Two big concerns

Faculty that are very research active, which is very critical to both graduate and undergraduate programs.

Course limits – are there courses that should have exemptions.

Some science classes should be small for safety reasons and because of room size
Graduate level instruction and upper level courses are a major concern

Will need to make the argument for the classes.

Dean's opinion – still a process in flux.

There is apprehension about bringing in new grad students.

VAPs probably gone.

Administration is trying to move toward similar formats between Workload and ARPA... maybe even electronic.

Things going on in the world outside of Toledo ...

Suggests reading discussion written by Mitch Daniels (previous Republican Governor of Indiana, current President of Purdue University)

Seems like a better model for discussion – more balanced approach, concerns of faculty.

Current conversation is very strict... and feels handed down.

Our college being singled out as a major money loser.

Research potential fell off last year (partly because of end of Federal Stimulus funds)

Change in State model – SSI State Share of Instruction

Moving to course completion and degree completion

Need to pay attention to help students

Unfortunate sense of unease of whether higher education is producing and effective

We need to be careful to show the value

We need to document and brag about successful students

Pressing issue

Work through workload issue first

If the Administration makes all faculty teach 12/12 – how much savings?

Maybe \$6 million benefits across the University

Krantz – State now has new rules for receivership.

If ratio of revenue to debt drops below a certain level, State can take over the University.

Dean Bjorkman – How do we count graduate credits?

Try to maximize productivity

We are going to have to look at programs and degrees [within College and across the University]

Need to think carefully and strategically. What do we need to be, and justify why those activities are core and essential.

Provost, very focused on undergrads, doesn't seem to understand graduate productivity.

Don White – thanks for not resigning

Most pertinent question – at Grad Council

Decide which programs are we going to cut?

How does cutting a program impact students, faculty, etc.?

What are we telling incoming faculty?

Should we explore connecting with BG?

Dean Bjorkman – Would you rather be involved in making the decisions or being told what the decisions are?

White – How much discussion has there been about top heavy admin?

Dean Bjorkman - Lots of new mandates, which have resulted in administrative offices.

For example – ADA regulations; some real legal issues that have to be met

Hans Gottgens – Educating scientists is expensive

Equally bewildered...

We weren't invited to be involved in the discussions.

Dean Bjorkman – we need to invite ourselves

We need to come up with a set of recommendations, then invite ourselves.

Edith Kippenhan – Lecturer contracts at 12/12, so how to teach 30?

Dean Bjorkman – what about course coordinators?

James Anderson – What is meant by the cap on classroom size?

Dean Bjorkman – At this point, this is a vague issue

David Krantz – the full implications of that policy have not been thought through

Gerard Thompson – What should we do about admitting new grad students [for the fall semester]?

Dean Bjorkman – Dean Komuniecki is hoping to have an answer this week.

Best recommendation: be practical and tread cautiously.

Xiche Hu – Comment – The time to build things is slow.

Dean Bjorkman – Yes, while it is easy to destroy; terrified that faculty will leave.

Dean Bjorkman – We need to think about how do we get students here?

Need recruitment.

BK – need students to tell Provost about why they are here.

Tony Quinn – I've lost confidence in people with business models.

The high wage jobs are in sci/tech, and those must have degree, wouldn't you structure your program around those degrees.

Do they have business acumen?

Dean Bjorkman – Dean Gutteridge of the College of Business is involved

David Krantz – the cost accounting method does not capture the value of many academic activities

May not know the true value of an academic unit or activity except in its absence

How to sustain college of medicine, without foundation?

David Dabney appears to be the one that moved University to this cost-accounting model

Gerard Thompson – It seems the workload memo did not have anything to do with all the discussions that Provost Scarborough had with the various groups.

David Krantz – majority of the responses from the faculty did not make it into the Strategic Plan.

One of the key problems facing the University is a lack of clear communication between board-admin-faculty, and a lack of trust between admin-faculty

David Krantz – In support of Dean Bjorkman

We need to make the argument to give more control to College level.

And that going forward we need to be proactive.

Motion to Approve Minutes from December 11, 2012 Meeting

Motion by Kippenhan, Second - Bossenbroek, Vote – unanimous.

There is a need for an Interim spring-semester replacement to Faculty Senate for Paul Hewitt (Dept. of Mathematics & Statistics)

Any nominations to replace? None now

David Krantz – Can we do this by email?

General agreement that it can be done.

Update on Curriculum Committee business – Tony Quinn

Course in Big Ideas in Science - progress has been slow.

Notion of recruiting 2 or 3 volunteers to lead that effort.

Several issues about implementation that need to be dealt with.

General Sciences Degree

Maybe the wrong approach.

Perhaps a couple of individuals draft the program.

Send an email to CC and Executive Cmt – looking to an individual to produce that program.

Modifications to BA in Biology – Tabled for now.

Existing (previous) degree is still in effect

Will just keep that program for now, possibly reconsider changes in the fall

Math has submitted new courses and changes

Gerard Thompson – all dealing with statistics

Students were supposed to have a course in Real Analysis

Most PhD programs don't require Real Analysis... Other topics are more appropriate at this time.

Also had to make other changes to the Statistics program.

Summary of discussion by NSM Council Executive Committee – David Krantz

New Business from the floor

Saturday Science starts Saturday

Announcements

None

Move to adjourn - Mike Cushing, Second – Joe Schmidt, Vote – Unanimous.

Adjournment at 5:00 PM