University of New Orleans

UNO Faculty Council Meeting (transcript)

July 18, 2014

This is a slightly-edited, uncorrected transcript of the summer Faculty Council meeting outlining the Faculty Governance Committee's emerging program prioritization initiative. As the quality of the audio and video recordings varies, it should not be considered verbatim. A video recording of the event is available online at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FUsLqXzk8q8&feature=youtu.be

Please note that this document not a substitute for official minutes, which still need to be approved by the Faculty Council at its next meeting.

(Transcription done by Dr. James Mokhiber, Dept. of History)

Connie Phelps, Chair: Greetings, Welcome to the Faculty Council Meeting. It is the first one that has been live-streamed on YouTube. Congratulations for being present, and hello to our virtual audience. […] The first thing I want to do is to thank Dr. Richard Hansen for suggesting that we provide virtual participation here, and then I would like to thank Beth Blankenship and the guys from Instructional Media and Technology in our control booth in the back for setting this up and for suggesting this classroom. I think it is a great thing.

Let's go ahead. I call the meeting to order. For those who may not know me, my name is Connie Phelps, I'm a faculty member in the library and I'm chair of the UNO Faculty Council. This is actually a Faculty Council meeting, even though we are going to be discussing most of all the Faculty Governance Committee's work. But because it is a Faculty Council meeting, and it is the next Faculty Council meeting after the April Faculty Council meeting, we need to approve the minutes of the April 24 meeting, as circulated to everyone in the meeting notices. [*The motion was moved and seconded.*] Any discussion? Hearing no discussion stands approved as circulated.

We'll go ahead and continue on with the agenda. First of all, brief remarks from me. The Faculty Governance Committee came into being following the Faculty Council meeting of February 14, 2014. I'm sure many of you all were there. It was the Faculty Council Meeting where the Academic Freedom, Tenure and Professional Ethics Committee had a resolution that was passed. And Dr. Fos, thank you, basically agreed to stop things that were going on at the time, which was the Faculty Workload Policy, Faculty Evaluation Policy, program reviews…things that were being worked on at the time. He agreed to stop those and seek additional faculty input. That is how the Faculty Governance Committee came into being, to be the vehicle, or a vehicle for this faculty input.

The Committee met for the first time in March, I believe. But we basically started working initially on the Faculty Workload policy, which was approved – a framework for a Faculty Workload Policy – was approved at the Faculty Council meeting on April 24, this spring. Now the departments are free to go ahead and construct their own workload policy based on that framework.

The second thing that we were going to work on was the Faculty Evaluation policy, but Dr. Hansen came to us early this summer, came to the Senate Executive Committee and then to the Faculty Governance Committee and asked us to please ask us to work on the Program Review/Revitalization work. And that's what we have been doing all summer. We've been meeting weekly on Wednesdays in the library, and you all have gotten emails. The first ten minutes of the meeting are set aside for any faculty member – you don't have to be on the committee – any faculty member , to come to those meetings and ask questions, or give input. So this is to be a very open process. You all should feel free to drop by those meetings. And essentially, that's where we are right now. So the Faculty Governance Committee had asked to call a Faculty Council meeting so that we can see where are, and get additional input from faculty. Again, we are trying to be as open as we can be, and give regular updates.

Here with me we have Dr. Pam Jenkins and Dr. Wendy Schluchter, who are the Senate President and Vice-President. It's difficult because you have a Chair of the Faculty Council and a President of the Faculty Senate, so it's a little confusing at times.

The first thing that we are going to hear today are some remarks from Dr. Fos, and they will be followed by some remarks from Dr. Hansen. Dr. Fos?

Dr. Fos, UNO President: Thank you very much. I want to first thank the Faculty Council. As you have been told, Dr. Hansen has asked the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to start looking at some academic revitalization that involves some restructuring. I want to thank the Faculty Governance Committee for their work, they actually do meet every Wednesday. We've actually expanded the group a little bit, which I'm sure other people will tell you more about. I go to the meetings, and I personally think the progress so far has been very significant.   Some great discussion, other people are going to tell you exactly what's been going on. We'll get to that. I wish I could stand here and tell you that we could take all the time we think we need, and be as deliberate as we think we should be doing this revitalization of our academic programs. I wish I could say that, however I can't. Our fiscal stability situation is such that we don't have the luxury of time. And I understand that in a perfect world we would spend a lot more time, but we must conclude this process […] I thank everyone for being involved in this process so far.

Secondly, I think this revitalization process would be necessary whether or not we have fiscal stability problem. It's sort of counter-intuitive. Money is not the driver of this effort. The savings from it will help us, but it's really not the driver of this process. I personally feel any forward-looking institutions should actually periodically stop and evaluate whether their academic programs are actually meeting the needs of their students. And meeting the needs of the communities they serve, both the business community and other communities.   Each and every academic program should be evaluated, to make

the determination whether or not we are still meeting the needs of our constituencies. And as I said others will come behind me and tell you about the process.

Finally, I think this is most important for you to understand. I want to give the Faculty Council, the Faculty Senate, all the faculty and staff at this university a commitment that once our structural deficit is removed – I sent everybody an email last week, a week ago telling you the plan, and we really think that at the end of this academic year our typical deficit that's been as high as $7million, this year we start at $3 million, will be erased -- that any money that is saved as part of a reduction of academic programs, will be reinvested, strategically, into programs that exist. So this is not just a budget-cutting exercise, this is an exercise I hope, and I hope that I'm not naïve, hope that will actually make us a more efficient, more effective university for our students. Thank you very much.

Connie Phelps: Ok, next we have Dr. Hansen, who is Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Dr. Hansen: Great, thank you very much. I think I started on March 10 here, and my first two meetings were with Connie and Elaine and we started talking about the academic programs and what needs to be done and what the history has been around our program review and evaluation. And then I met with the Faculty Senate leadership. We had a great conversation in the library, and we talked about the future of UNO and the future of our academic programs and how central our academic programs are, obviously, and how we have to get through this phase of evaluation and maybe look at our programs to get ourselves in line with a university of 9000 students versus 17,000 students. To a person around that table, and a lot of them are here today, they all said "yes, let's roll up our sleeves and begin looking at this, looking at our academic programs," from both the standpoint of programs we want to support and programs, out of the 84 programs, there might be some that are not going to be [in reach?] And I think they recognized at that point that the choices and issues that they were going to be dealing with, but, to a person, they said yes, let's do it. And then after Elaine cycled off, I started working with Pam and the relationship has been very strong, equally, and we've developed a great working relationship, a collaborative relationship that says let's bring faculty together. I've asked the deans to be at that table, because we cannot make these kinds of decisions and look at this data that we are dealing with, without having the total academic leadership at the table. And we will eventually as some of the process that we will talk about in a few minutes, reach out to more department chairs. We have department chairs in this faculty leadership group that we're working with, but we will eventually, at the appropriate time, reach out to additional department chairs.

So what I think what we have at this point is a working group of about 40 people, which is really the primary academic leadership of the institution, that are looking at these programs both from a standpoint of what programs we want to support, and which programs will not be part of our effort as we move towards, as we move towards the future. So it's very positive from my standpoint, and I haven't met a faculty member yet, I've met quite a few of you individually, that hasn't said to me in many different ways, we need to do this, we need to do it now. And we're willing to be involved in this process. I want to thank the faculty leadership for saying yes to beginning to work on this and we're working through a careful process that I think will have very important results for the future of this university.

Connie Phelps: Thank you Dr. Hansen. Next on the agenda, we have Senate President Pam Jenkins.

Pam Jenkins, Faculty Senate President: We got an email that the sound wasn't coming through the streaming? OK, thanks. Thank you so much for coming out on this rainy day. Our part of it now is to talk about the work that we've done through the summer. I came to the party a little late, the Faculty Governance Council was formed when I came on in June. I have been very impressed with the willingness of people to work on this issue, to come to not just one meeting a week, but because we have subcommittees now they come to two or three meetings a week, plus they write documents and everybody stays at the table. And for me it's really [inaudible] for faculty to do this work. I represent myself as co-facilitator of these meetings along with Matt Tarr, who is the Chair of the Faculty Governance Committee, who is in France. I hope he's watching.

And I want to talk a little bit about this process so you understand it. Every Tuesday Matt and I and Dr. Hansen meet and work on the agenda and the issues and the statement that goes out to you every two weeks. Last week we made the table larger, because we're coming to some really hard parts of this discussion. I want to talk about two things. First of all communication. We have an intentional communication plan with you. What I invite you to do if it is not working, or if you have other ideas, is to let us know. First of all, these meetings are open to faculty and there is a ten-minute beginning of each meeting, where if you have a concern you can speak. You have an email address that you can email Matt and I, and we've answered every email we've gotten. With the permission of the senders of the email, we have either read those emails at the meetings or we've sent them on to Dr. Hansen and Dr. Fos. And we have these bi-weekly updates and this Faculty Council meeting. So our intention is that you know what we are doing. If you have questions and concerns, talk to us about them.

The idea of shared governance [inaudible] was started in March. And I'm impressed by the people at the table. But I want to tell you what we did. We were asked to look at restructuring and revitalization in this larger committee and it's an academic process. So where did we start? We started reading people who have written about this, we started looking at how other universities have done it. We did a literature review. Then we spent a couple of weeks creating criteria, which you will hear about in a minute. These are conceptual and rather abstract criteria. We divided up into subcommittees that are working on data and larger analytical questions. We know it's not just about a data point. And now we are working on weighting the criteria. We met last week on that and next week we'll meet on that. Most people have a little break while we gather the data, both quantitative and qualitative. And then we come back to meet August 20th, and we'll meet weekly again until the end of October. So that's really the process that we're in. We invite you to come, to talk, to send us emails and talk to us about it. So, Wendy's going to take over. Everybody from a subcommittee is going to stand up and tell us what they do, and we do that intentionally because it is collaborative. And so you are going to see all the subcommittee chairs.

Wendy Schluchter, Senate Vice President: I'm Wendy Schluchter, and I can tell you with honesty that I didn't expect to be doing this this summer. None of us did, actually. So I think one of the things that impressed me most is how collaborative the process is, how willing everybody is on this committee to work hard, how serious, how thoughtful people are. None of us is taking our responsibility lightly at all,

and I want to assure faculty of that. We are listening to all input. And so I encourage you to email Pam and Matt. If you have any questions or concerns. They are doing an absolutely fabulous job shepherding this through this committee. Rich Hansen has been incredibly collaborative and very much willing to listen. That is a wonderful, refreshing change. It is. I think the thing that has impressed me most in the last few months that I have been involved in this process is how transparent we are trying to be. I hope that you feel that, because that has really not been the history of UNO since I've been here. So I hope that will continue.

Basically, our work has been centered around trying to figure out what are the important components of the program. And how do we measure that. So we have several sub-committees that we've broken up into based upon some of the criteria that we've come up with. As Pam alluded to, there are several chapters we've read, this is not the first time that somebody's gone through this. So why should we have to reinvent the wheel. What we want to do is tweak it to represent what we would like to measure for our programs at UNO. So that takes some time, what we've done is taken 10 criteria that are generally used by a lot of groups, and sort of collapse them into about seven that we're going to be looking for data to measure each program. And, we've even collapsed those down into working groups that collapse some of those together to talk about how we are going to acquire data, where those data are going to come from. Right now we're working as a subcommittee to try to look at, ok, we've decided what data we might want, how are we going to score that data. When you compare programs. So we're kind of wrestling with those questions right now. But I have confidence that we have a lot of very hard-working people with great ideas, and so I feel pretty good about where we are now. This is hard. We get frustrated, we get very nervous and uncomfortable when we talk about these things, so I hope some of you will come to these meetings and see that. None of us is taking this challenge lightly at all.

So, what I am going to do is introduce some of our subcommittees that are working right now and let them talk a little bit about each of the things they are working on. We have an order in the agenda, and so I'm going to take it out of order a little bit because it might make more sense to do it that way. So I'm going to invite Darrell Kruger who is the Chair of the Guiding Documents Committee so he can talk a little bit about some of the documents we started off with here.

Darrell Kruger, Dean of the College of Education: Good afternoon to all of you, to faculty colleagues who are here as well as to those who are joining us remotely. I was delighted to be invited to serve on the Faculty Governance Committee. I echo what Wendy has said in terms of the process and where we are to date. Wendy said a number of things that I will probably reiterate. One is of course that there's 3,500 institutions of higher education across the US and many of them in the last 10-15 years have been doing exactly what we are going through. There are many that are doing what we are doing today as well. Higher education is nested in technological and economic changes, funding changes as we know, and so as Wendy said we are not alone. And one of the texts we started with Robert Dickeson's *Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services.* Let me emphasize it is programs _and_ services. So we are dealing here with academic programs, but on the non-academic side of the house there is a similar process going on.

Essentially the subcommittee that I chair is looking at both external documents to UNO as well as internal documents. And sharing those with our subcommittee. Our subcommittee meets, most recently we looked at the process of really looking at data. And what types of data we needed to match to criteria and then equally important, the weighting component. Because we have eight something, and we will essentially apply these criteria looking at data and then essentially score programs. And so, as Wendy said and as many members of our subcommittee have said, there's no need for us to reinvent the wheel, this has been done before. What we will do will not copycat another institution, we're looking at the University of Alaska at Anchorage who've had some information about the process. They're a different institution from what we are, so we need to tweak both the language as well as probably the weighting of the criteria.

UNO has not not done this before.   I've only been here…I'm delighted to be here at the start of my second year, but as we looked at some internal documents, Dickeson's work has been referred to as little as two years ago, using some of the criteria. I think I will echo at the outset about the whole tone of shared governance, and the way we are approaching this. I think we are in a good spot. My subcommittee will welcome any input from you in terms of any documents that you know of that can add to our thinking. So thank you.

Pamela Jenkins: Ok, so now I would like to call up Cherie from the External/Internal Demand Subcommittee.

Cherie Trumbach: Richard Speaker is actually the Chair of our committee, but he is out of town right now. Basically the external and internal demand subcommittee was tasked with developing ways to evaluate two criteria. To decide what data would measure a program's demand from students attending UNO. We were also asked how to evaluate the external demand for the programs or similar programs. In other words, the national and state trends that influence demand and take a look at those. The external demand can anticipate future enrollment as well as whether our programs are fulfilling their potential. In order to evaluate internal demand for undergraduate programs, we intend to use the three- to five-year trends in a number of majors, the number of completers, and course enrollments by major. Double majors would be counted in both programs. Analyzing SCHs by major will also be used to understand the demands for courses by non-majors. In addition, Department Chairs will provide a list of courses required for students in different programs. SCHs for general education courses will be included in the analysis of internal demand.

For graduate programs, we'll include three- to five-year trends and the number of enrolled students, the number of applicants and the number of completers as well as a breakdown of students by region. So New Orleans, Louisiana, United States versus international. Although this criteria will be primarily evaluated using three-to five-year trend data, Departments will also be able to provide a short narrative that explains any recent or proposed initiatives that will impact internal demand or factors that these data do not include. To evaluate external demand we hope to be able to obtain national and Louisiana trends in program enrollments. If [new?] programs are developing in a particular discipline, this will also be taken under consideration, if we have the expertise to offer the new area. We will also consider the number of comparable, competing programs in Louisiana and the reputation of UNO's programs.   These

are the primary sources we will use. We will also consider the WISE initiative and other initiatives that demonstrate an immediate workforce need. In some disciplines, there is good information about workforce demand. In those cases, departments can provide BLS or other data that show a specific demand for graduates in an undergraduate major or graduate program. This can include local and regional demand. Because many undergraduates do not take jobs that are directly related to their undergraduate major, without specific information showing workforce demand, the job potential will be assumed to be similar.

Departments will also have the opportunity to briefly explain the factors that impact programs.   Such as limited resources that have impacted their demand, [new] initiatives such as online programs have been implemented, or if there are synergies, external forces or ways that a program can be reconfigured that the data might not show. We've come up with a number of issues that we have to consider. In addition to freshman majors we also need to look at transfer majors and evaluate these items in the context of graduation rates. We are charged with evaluating degree programs and we need to find the right way to balance program demand with non-program demand. Many programs have been hindered by budget cuts and loss of faculty and staff members, so we'll need to find out how to address performance in the context of resources. Also the criteria for graduate programs will likely be different than from undergraduate programs and we need to decide how to treat that. Some proposed responses for these issues that we have reflected upon include: how have resource limitations impacted internal demand, in what specific ways? How can the program be reconfigured to make it stronger and increase demand? What external factors indicate that this program is in greater demand than UNO is currently able to serve? What are the competing programs in the region, in Louisiana, the US? And what are the projected enrollments of other UL and other universities in the region and in Louisiana? We also want to look at what synergies are not adequately reflected by the data? And what external forces on the program are not reflected in the program.

Pam Jenkins: I am the acting chair of the Size, Scope, Productivity and Quality. That's a big thing to measure. So Size, Scope and Productivity is one of the criteria and I'll talk about that one first. My committee, this one is probably an easier one to measure, because there are a lot of institutional research data already gathered on this. So, I feel like this one is fairly straightforward, we're going to be looking at – and the other thing that strikes me is, we've met as a subcommittee and submitted what we think are the potential data, but a lot of things are potentially overlapping. So we're going to have to figure out, we're going to gather these data but maybe we count them in this category versus this category. That still has to be fleshed out. So you are going to hear some repeating things that we're collecting in more than one category. We're still figuring out how that is going to work exactly. We want to get an idea of the size, scope and productivity for each program, and so that would include the size of that program, or the majors, the number of majors, the number of SCHs generated by those majors. We also want to get an idea how much that program might contribute to General Education requirements at UNO. So we are going to look at non-major SCHs for that. Because this should be strategic we wanted some way of linking our particular category to the Strategic Plan, so we came up with trying to measure what the Urban Mission, how it fits in with the Urban Mission, by looking at the incoming freshman, where they are coming from. So that could reflect some of what Cherie said – we're

trying to figure where we're actually going to count that. And then we wanted to get an idea of how productive a program was, in terms of getting students through the pipeline. So we are going to be looking at retention rates, the number of students graduate in that major. We also want to get a really important component, to look at productivity of faculty. We are going to look at research and creative productivity. By looking at just numbers of different types of publications, books, creative works, that faculty perform in that program. We're also going to be looking at the numbers of grants applied for as well as received by faculty. As just a measure of how engaged faculty are in their research. We've discussed some other things recently in a meeting that I haven't presented yet to the larger group so I'm going to hold back on that, but we're looking at, we're cognizant of discipline-specific things that exist and we're trying to be as broad as we can in those categories.

In terms of the other subcategory that we're also charged with looking at, the Quality, this is a very big challenge and we're still trying to wrap our brains around this one. The idea is that you want to measure the quality of the inputs of a program, and that includes students coming into those programs, as well as the faculty teaching those programs. So we're going to try to look at the input quality by looking at the measure of each faculty in that program, how much SCH production they have and the rank of that faculty, so are they tenure-track, are they adjunct, instructor? We feel like that gives you an idea whether all the teaching is being done by adjuncts in that faculty versus full-time faculty, just to get a sense of where the teaching is coming from. We're also going to try to look at students coming into the program, their ACT scores, to get averages for incoming freshmen for various programs. The last thing is looking at facilities that program has to offer. So this is probably going to be in a narrative form, by the Chair, where they can talk about any equipment they have, labs, you know, what's the quality of those types of things that they have to offer students. The last part of Quality is the output section. This is going to look at, for where the data exist – and we realize that not every program have these data or collect them – if they have them, we would like to see, to look at the quality of graduates, which can be measured by national exams like GREs, the MCAT Medical Admissions TEST, any sort of national exam like the ETS field test that you might administer for your IE documents, any of those data that you can provide would be really helpful to look at that. Some departments do exit surveys with their students and so they may have some idea of a satisfaction score or something about that. And then the last thing we're going to look is that some departments also, via follow-up, may have some idea of placement of their graduates. We realize that not everybody is going to have this data but if they have them we feel like they can accurately help us judge or get an idea of the quality. So that is where we ended up.

And so the next subcommittee to come up is the Revenue and Cost Data committee. I'm not sure if it is going to be Peter and Kevin? OK.

Kevin Graves: Neither Peter nor I are the chair of that subcommittee. Jim Logan is not able to be here. Our charge with the Subcommittee of Revenue and Cost is basically to measure the cost-effectiveness of every program. There are immediately some difficulties with regard to the definition of a program and a department in which that program is housed. Because as we look at how the revenue stream is generated, first and foremost, it comes from students so it is revenue data that is broken out by category of funds, which first include state allocation and then self-generated funds for tuition. These

are always going to be initially linked to a course that's housed in a department with a course prefix. However there are multiple programs in some departments so we are going to additionally need to break that out with regard to programs, [that those courses are included]. Because our goal here is to measure the effectiveness of 84 different programs. So we're going to look at, also, all revenue that is generated from student fees, such as non-resident fees, graduate enhancement fees, graduate enhancement fees, lab fees, professional program fees, student technology fees, any fee that can be attached to a particular program, whether it be a professional program fee or whatever it might be. We are also going to ask that we get a clear and concise written explanation about how tuition waivers are accounted for in the UNO system. Are they first [listed?] as a cost and then that being an actual sum of money that is not collected, or then are they first, then, or additionally, listed as a revenue? We need to know that and know exactly how to account for that. Revenue generated by every academic administrative unit drilling down as far into each level as we possibly can. Revenue also associated with the research efforts of a particular academic program. UNO, being a research institution, and that being our mission, the programs that bring in external funds will be accounted for as well. So we're going to be looking at contracts, grants, indirect returns from those external funds and so forth. We're also going to seek a description of any other source of revenue that we have not necessarily identified thus far that can be attached to a particular program. We are cognizant of the fact that, as we move through this process, we're going to discover that there are additional pieces of information that we need that we may not have thought of at the outset, as we begin the process. So we're going to keep that data-gathering mechanism firmly in place throughout. [...] Cost data on all academic programs will include of course faculty salaries, plus the fringe, and we'll break those out separately position by position and then begin to include those, assign them to a program, even if it is a percentage. We all know that a number of faculty across the campus will teach a series of courses that are taught in multiple programs. So we are not going to disavow that whole notion by ignoring it, we'll break out to the degree possible the percentage of effort that a faculty member has within a particular program. We're going to also look at what the current faculty vacancies are in those various programs and, just because a faculty position is not currently filled does not mean that it is not necessary and needs to be included, with regard to the costs [of delivery of that particular program.] Also, looking at Graduate Assistant budget support and any other special costs that might be unique to that particular unit. All the programs across the campus have unique elements associated them by virtue of the discipline. And so we can't just put a carte blanche list out there that's going to apply and be a template that is going to apply to every single program. We're also going to want to know the cost data on all non-academic expenditures, drilling down on unit costs as much as we possibly can. And this will go into and include the research costs and the administrative costs of a department and of a college and so forth. Ultimately the whole point of the Cost/Revenue process is to determine the cost-effectiveness of delivering an academic program. Peter?

Peter Schock: As a transition from one point you just made, I think that everyone realizes that the Cost/Benefit criterion is a potentially volatile one. Faculty don't like being reminded that they are revenue-generators, but to be honest with you, that's what we are. But as a measuring stick that understandably generates apprehension, and I think it probably useful to emphasize at this point that this is one criterion among many yet-to-be weighted criteria. It will be a fraction of the overall rating of

a program and we haven't even determined what [weighting] revenue and costs will receive. This is going to be a complicated undertaking and I think what Kevin has shared with you makes that pretty clear.

Just to double back for a minute on the issue of revenue. Revenue generated by programs, it's really important that we drill down as far as we can. Kevin mentioned the fees. That might seem to many of us that we're getting pretty far [into the weeds] when we're talking about this fee or that fee. But they really do add up. It's not merely course fees, there's this thing called the non-resident fee. There was a time when non-resident tuition amounted to $10 million. Heretofore we never understood whether or not academic programs were credited with that revenue, when in all fairness they probably should. And so it is important the we understand, before we subtract the costs that a program incurs in generating tuition revenue that the non-resident tuition, the non-resident fee is [incorporated.] Similarly, with tuition waivers, we can also mention, we have to determine whether or not a tuition waiver is a genuine actual cost that the department generates or whether or not it is more a matter of accounting. One way of looking at it is to say that a tuition waiver is proceeded by projected tuition that would be generated by an incoming graduate student is then foregone when a student receives a waiver. In which case it is not an actual cost, in true budgetary terms, but a wash, accounting wise. Revenue, projected revenue, cancelled out by cost of waiver. This [again?] is a significant amount in determining what programs are doing for us in terms of revenue generation and what they are costing. There are about 300 graduate assistants on this campus who receive stipends out of the General Fund. I'm not sure exactly how many of them get waivers out of the General Fund if we want to, again, regard this as a cost, but it has impact as fallout on all of the programs at a graduate level. Those are a couple of points that I want to round back on to illustrate that this really is a complex undertaking [inaudible].

Pam Jenkins: The next subcommittee to report out is the Impact, Justification and Essentiality Subcommittee. I think Greg Seab is going to..

Greg Seab: There is a lot of overlap from this category with perhaps other categories but we have perhaps somewhat more of a qualitative emphasis on the data. There is some quantitative data, but there is also qualitative assessment of the impact, justification and essentiality. What we want to look at is primarily the way programs align with the mission and goals of the university. And also how they relate to other programs at the university. As part of our urban mission, we are going to ask for context from the departments in narrative form about the relationship of each program to the city and to the state, ties to local industry and community groups, and to the culture of the area. And how the program meets the needs of both the city and the state of Louisiana and of the Gulf Coast region. More quantitative, we can ask for the percentage of program students and graduates that find jobs in the New Orleans area and the state and we include students in that because we should recognize that many of our students are working in the city or the state, while they come here. And what internship venues programs contribute to UNO's presence in Louisiana. For the research mission, it is mostly quantitative and overlaps thoroughly with some other things. What are grants for research and creative endeavors to be all inclusive, what publications, shows or other professional activities have been produced by a program. In both absolute numbers and per faculty member, so that just the big departments win hands down, you want to look at productivity. For globalization and internationalization, we've looked

at the number of foreign students, the number of joint ventures that a program has with international entities like 3+2 programs and study abroad, and also the number of students involved in campus organizations that have some international or global relations as part of their goal. We want to look at the potential for service learning, we're not yet entirely clear how much of that is going on, regarding service learning as SCHs tied to work in a community, rather than internships that aren't tied to courses. It is also very, very important to look at the relationships between programs. So we want to tlooka t the essentiality of a program, and one way to do that is to consider the number of other programs requiring courses from a given program. In particular, do these programs meet accreditation requirements? In other words, does this program have to have this course, from the original program?   The number of courses required from a given program by each of the other programs, the number of SCHs in courses for majors, core courses, and for service courses, and courses needed to fulfill optional concentrations [for students?] Now that's largely quantitative data, but finally and perhaps most important is a qualitative assessment of impact. What programs are essential to your program? What are the dependencies of programs here? Could the university meet its goal without having this particular program? Will removing the program have a significant impact on the university both budget wise and in other ways, and finally, ultimately the bottom line qualitative assessment for the university to continue to be an urban research university without this program.   We welcome any help.

Wendy Schluchter: The last subcommittee we have actually hasn't met yet, is Budget. That was one of the big concerns early on, that we really have an accurate transparency and confidence in all areas of the budget. That we know where UNO's money is being spent, and where, given that our mission is education and research, that the first thing that should really be on the table in terms of discussion and budget reductions is non-academic sides of things. So right now there is a lot of discussion about getting together a budget committee for the whole campus, and I know that's in the works and so we also formed a Budget Subcommittee within our group, which may or may not be part of that committee, I'm not sure how this is going to work. But I just want to assure people here that everyone on our committee, the overall Faculty Governance Committee, has asked for some confidence of where money is being spent and how it is being spent. So I think that there will be more information on that to come.

So with that I'm going to turn it back over to Connie for questions.

Connie Phelps: Thanks to all the previous speakers, for giving us some idea of what the subcommittees are working on and what the overall larger process is right now. We are going to open it up to questions, and Pam is monitoring the email address for all of you out there remotely. There are also index cards if you want to write down a question.

Audience questions follow.

Rob Stufflebeam, Philosophy: Academic Affairs has been underreporting our majors and completers significantly, so I'm delighted to hear that double majors are going to count. There are two kinds of double majors, there are the double majors who, in our case, list philosophy and something else and there are double majors who list something else and then philosophy. Those are being counted, nor are the post-bac students, and these represent a significant percentage of our majors.   In our case, it's

29.73% of the fall majors, it was 31.71% of the spring majors, and it ended up being 33.3% of completers that were underreported. So I did an analysis of the College of Liberal Arts, we're the most affected, followed by Foreign Languages and History, Political Science…I also did an analysis of the College of Business and there was significant underreporting there. So the data absolutely have to be correct. It hasn't been. So if there is anything I can do to help with that, I've got the analysis for the COLA and the COB, but…there are accurate ways of generating the data, it just hasn't been done. Very frustrating.

[indistinct: Can you give us those?]

Connie Phelps: It is important that we have accurate data, so thank you very much. Questions? Comments? For those of you in Virtual Land I think we are having a thunderstorm here.

Question: I'm new to UNO. How do you define enrollment? Does a double major count as two students, or one student?

Response: I think…maybe Rich should answer this question. I think, but I might be wrong, it counts as one student. Whatever they declare as their primary major, which is exactly what the speaker's point earlier was about. So we're going to have to figure out how we're going to do this. So one way…Chair's are going to be involved in the ranking process for their programs. And there's going to be a narrative involved. There are ways that you can provide data to us, if you feel like the data aren't accurate.

Rob stufflebeam: But if you use the list of enrolled students, which everyone has access too, it's accurate. It lists double majors, regardless of whether they are primary or secondary. The Post-Bacs. Again, I've done that analysis.

Rich Hansen: We'll get the data.

Connie Phelps: Questions?

Question: So you talk about grants and research. What about community work? We have a lot of applied community work.

Greg Seab: We certainly want to consider that and hope to get it as part of the narrative from the Departments, and any numbers that are available. So yes I think that is important.

Connie Phelps: Yes, that goes to the impact of the program. Comments?

Question: What is the timeline to have the report finalized?

Rich Hansen: Our goal is to get the recommendations on any program discontinuance by the end of October. So we're going to be working quickly here. But we have time to do it. End of October is our deadline to get any recommendations to the president.

Connie Phelps: There are interim deadlines and timelines. Sorry, I didn't get a chance to load those into the presentation.

Pam Jenkins: The question I have over here is can the reports by the various speakers be put on line? I think that is very possible. It would be great to have you guys review the data requests. This is a lot of information at one time. It is for us too. The second part of that it's important to meet the needs of the faculty as well as the students. Any other comments about the process?

Steve Striffler: When I hear this it seems like everyone is taking this incredibly seriously, and you've thought about all these things I would have never thought about. It's all very impressive. When I think about this…I always tell students to come talk to me before they start a project paper, and I say to three-quarters of them you can continue down that road, but there's not a chance you are going to finish that this semester. I'd just like to hear from the faculty, based on all this, are the faculty even vaguely confident they can pull this off according to the timeline. I was on this Committee. I'm just curious.

[Crosstalk]

Nancy Easterlin: So one of our recent discussions in the Committee was about the data, and whether we could get all this data in time. Rich assured us that most of this is really available. It's a really tight timeline but we are going to do our best.

Question: You say that most of the data are available, but I want to go to this gentleman's comment, is it accurate?

Wendy Schluchter: Yes, this is a big concern of ours as well. And I think that's why we really want to make sure that Chairs really have the opportunity to look at all the data for their program, feel confident that it's accurate, and they're going to be highly involved in this process as we go through. I think that's the plan. The other thing I want to comment about…Steve made a great comment…all of us are sort of deer in the headlights, but what I think we are trying to do now in subcommittee work is to really focus in on our subcommittees, really focus on the data we've requested, figure out which pieces are the most important, that we have the most confidence in, that are comparing apples to apples across programs. And then trying to figure out how we're going to score that. For each program. It's a challenge.

Pam Jenkins: It's a great comment. We've had this discussion in the subcommittee. We wonder if we are going to head someplace we can't move off of and we asked for everything. And we know inside our subcommittees we are going to take and rank how important these criteria are in each subcommittee and we're going to come back. So, you're right. But we have to go forward.

Question: Are there any resources to have one or two people maybe devote forty hours a week. I think with all these different people devoting five or ten hours a week to this you might have trouble, by October. But if you had someone on-campus or off-campus to do your data analysis. A contractor or whatever, if you had someone that could spend all of their time focused on that, I think it is a very doable thing, you could know that your data is going to be formatted, and you could put your data into some kind of index or metric where you could rate, you could look at the departments in a fair way.

Rich Hansen: So the most direct answer is no, we don't have any resources to do that. So I'm going to be trying to find resources internally to get this done. But I want to come back to the data question.

This whole project hinges on the viability of the data that we are going to be presenting, that we are going to be organizing. For the first group that I was working with, the cost containment committee, I just gave Jim Logan an entire raw database. Here, look at it, chew it up, do whatever you want with it. Test it against anything you're interested in testing it against. So that's what we intend to do with the data as they become available, as these requests are made. I hope to get to a place where I can create an evidence file of some kind with carefully indexed and categorized pieces of data that all of the committees and you all can all go to online. And anything that you've mentioned before, like the majors and double counting, get those to me and we'll make sure we factor those in. I just want to reinforce that the viability of the data is really important.

Vern Baxter: We've been involved in this kind of restructuring analysis for over a year and I'm not really worried about finding all the data. What I'm really concerned about is what we are going to do once we have it. You have all these programs that are going to be ranked one to eighty-four. Does that mean that the eighty-fourth is going to be gone? What are the criteria by which we are going to make decisions, based on the data? I think the transparency here, the data collection, perfectly coherent, but I don't see much progress figuring out on how you're going to act on it. The other piece is where does the UL system fit into this? Is there an agenda that will somehow be in place at the system level and take these data and evaluate what we think should happen. I guess my big question is how are we going to figure out what to do with the data, in terms of enhancing and getting rid of programs, and what is the strategy for dealing with the system who has to approve all this.

Pam Jenkins: I'll answer the first question. Somebody over there can answer the second. This is all method, Vern. We're just at the place where method, where we know what kind of data we're hoping to get. We're working in subcommittees to rank the data inside of the larger criteria and we have a plan, once we have that, to come together to do this ranking. Come and see what happens. We're not there yet. It is going to be a struggle around what's available, it's going to be a struggle…as you heard, some criteria show up in each subcommittee. Where is that criteria going to count? It's this analytical process that we're going to do in the fall. I'll let Rich answer the system question.

Rich Hansen: The system's involved… once the recommendation on program discontinuance goes to the president, leaves our campus and goes to the board of supervisors, and then the board of supervisors has to approve that. Beyond that, they're not going to be involved with the president's decisions. The only way they are involved is on approving any program discontinuance because there are system policies around teaching out programs. You have to make sure that every single student that's in a program that's discontinued is treated fairly and equitably. There are very distinct policies around how faculty at different ranks are treated and afforded…as we go through, if you are involved in a program that's discontinued…that's where the system's involved at this point. They're not going to be involved in anything further than that once the president makes the decision on discontinuance.

Nancy Easterlin: We're not going to be ranking 1-84. If you look at the guiding documents of other schools that have done this, they have a sort of numerical scoring process for each one of those criteria and you add those up and you come to a number for each program, but it's not a matter of ranking those top to bottom. It's not the same at all.

Darrell Krueger: I'd like to add one more thing. Places that have done this tend to put programs in categories and you are going to have numeric breaks, but obviously those aren't hard breaks, just like you look at decide on student grades at the end of the semester, you have someone who has a 78, you are using some other judgment criteria going into it. What we don't get from what's done before is sort of how this piece is done that Vern asks about. Next Friday I'm going to chat with the provost of one of the institutions that went through this because there are elements that we can't get from reading a document.   So your question is a great one but not necessarily one that we have an answer to at this point.

Robert Dupont: Part of the charge of this committee is revitalization. I'm a little concerned that Chairs, the way you describe our jobs, in the fall will be spending most of their time, to use the shorthand, playing defense. Putting together narratives, data. But the whole outlook will be please don't do something to me. If revitalization is a key part of this, perhaps it will extend beyond your deadline, but it seems to me, that you need a similar process for generating new ideas, new programs, growth opportunities. And if you somehow, well I'll use the word, burden the chairs with putting this all together in a short amount of time, I don't know how many chairs are going to have time to think of new things. So maybe as a follow-on, a parallel, maybe some kind of internal think tank where people know something about the labor market…but I hope that growth part, that revitalization part, is at least as important as what we can save.

Pam Jenkins: Absolutely. And if you heard our committee we always say revitalization and restructuring. It's very clear to us that it is both.

Question: This is the psychotherapist in me talking right now. This is a really complex issue, I've been here a couple of decades now. UNO has always lived that old song, if you can't be with the one you love, love the one you're with. It's time to be with the one you love, even if the one you love is complex and complicated and might give you a hard time. It's time. Should have done this fifteen years ago.

Pam Jenkins: You know, that's what we all say to each other in these meetings. It is time to do this, and we're willing to put the work in. I just want to say this: the data list looks so long because we know that some programs can't be measured in ways that you can capture with a particular data point. We know…I'm a qualitative researcher…we know there are other things that make a program. So we have everything in there. And it will sort itself out. We hope.

Question: I recommend that we do find resources to have someone do the data analysis. There must be at least money to buy one person out of a course a course buyout, to do data analysis. Before we restructure our university based on data we haven't fully looked at.

Pam Jenkins: Great point.

Question: [indistinct] In the last five years Louisiana lost about [?] in higher education funding. Why don't we do this at the state level? With four million people, maybe we have too many state institutions.

[crosstalk]

Question: A couple of comments. First of all, about the data. The data is not going to sort itself out. It's going to be upon the committee to sort it out. I think there are a number of anxieties and I think I think there are two things are being mixed together. First of all there si going to be the cost cutting part. Which means the 84 programs are not going to survive. There is a target of $1million…[crosstalk. No target!]

Peter Fos: The email I sent out the other day has nothing to do with this process. The $1million has nothing to do with this process. The savings from this process won't happen for at least 12 months after January, so understand that. Anything that we do now with revitalization and restructuring that causes a program to be discontinued, the money savings will happen in January 2016. So no. The $1million in my email has absolutely nothing to with this. It is another challenge that the interim Vice President has taken on to find $1million in Academic Affairs for this year. For this year's budget that started July 1.

Question: What is the [target] How much?

President Fos: Beg your pardon? In the revitalization? Whatever the process comes out and tells us. Because whatever we save will be the revitalization fund. No, there's no target. I told you in my remarks, money is not driving this effort.

Steve Striffler: Still not divorced from it though…

President Fos: No, the expectation is that there will be some savings, because I need to indeed invest in some programs. But I don't have any extra money laying around that I can say Let's give this money to engineering or whatever. That money doesn't exist. It's not going to exist. Income now is the income we got, unless we get students to be increased. That's really a tough thing to do. We haven't had much success. If you go back and look at the data, we've been doing this since 2008, and we haven't quite figured out how to stop it. Working hard at it. The only monies that I can give to any program…how many programs need money on this campus? 84, right Vern? I don't have any money. But if we do have some savings from this revitalization effort it will be invested back in the programs.

Question: So there is a task at hand to classify some programs as non-viable, however that's defined. I think that's causing some anxiety and this is sort of a separate issue from the longer term revitalization, however that's defined. And so there seems to be, I don't see any mention of a process of how this is going to happen, on an annual basis, or a permanent basis. There seems to be no sort of structure set up. I take it this is going to be a temporary committee, so there's going to be a report and then what. If there's money to be invested, how is that to be invested? I think part of the anxiety is…the inclusion, for example…personally, I'm a little uneasy having others looking at our numbers not having any context. One last point: I don't see anything that asks the Department to actually present a vision for themselves, all I heard is a short write up. Which is different. What the department can do is inherently tied to funding. What the department can do with six faculty, ten or fifteen faculty. To me, that is actually a very important part, we write grant proposals and all that, so it seems a little odd that departments are only allowed to do a short write up. The other thing that I would suggests is that there

should people from all the departments early on. We can't put everything on the Chairs. There's not much time.

Pam Jenkins: Those are good comments. I particularly liked the one about long-term planning. Rich do you want to address that?

Rich Hansen: In the best of all worlds, and I think in the last year we asked all departments to write statements concerning the long-range plan 2020. On the other hand, we also have to put some effort into the annual program review so that it's not just a gathering of some quantitative data. So there's got to be some effort put into that also. Because if we do the annual program basis in a real basis it will, you know, impact this. So once we make these decisions we'll continue to improve.

Pam Jenkins: Connie, do you want to talk about the membership of the Faculty Governance Committee.

Connie Phelps: Of course the membership of the original Faculty Governance Committee was put together with representation by the Senate Executive Committee – Elaine is sitting back there so if my brain has a gap – we thought we were looking initially at the workload and evaluation policy, so we knew we needed people from department chairs in areas where they teach a lot of freshman classes, so we had Peter and Tumulesh on there. And we got a dean, we had Elaine from IDS, we had a couple representatives who happened to be also on the Senate Executive Comitteee but who are representing the Faculty Council, I'm one of those. When we sat down we looked at it we had what we thought was fair representation from all the colleges and the library. And we tried very hard, for example to be sure that, for example, from Liberal Arts – how could one person from Liberal Arts represent the diverse people from Liberal Arts? We made sure that we got Cheryl from Fine Arts, we needed someone from a different aspect of this, so we tried insofar as possible without putting everyone on campus on the committee to ensure that there was fair and adequate representation from all the Colleges and all the aspects of the departments in the university. Now of course, even in the library, if you put me on a committee, you put Marie on a committee, we have different expertise,she is going to know things I don't know…but that is what consultation is all about.   Initially, when we put this committee together and it was kind of a patchwork kind of thing trying to ensure adequate representation. Since then, in June we put together a more formal charge for the committee and we have a list of members and it includes the Senate Executive Committee and an elected representative from the colleges, IDS representative, Deans, department chairs if they're not already on there…insofar as possible we've tried to be as fair as possible because it is not just this process that we're dealing with, it is the other things that we are dealing with, the workload, the evaluation…so we're trying insofar as possible to be sure that there is appropriate representation. I hope it's fair, I think it's fair. Without putting someone from each department, the whole campus on the committee, I don't know how we're going to get everyone represented. But I hear your concern. We've tried. And the meetings are open. So if you have concerns. You are welcome to attend the meetings, the first ten minutes there is open speaking. Some came in past the 10 minutes and they were asked if they had concerns to express. We are trying to be as open as possible, as inclusive as possible. There is going to be a lot of burden that is going to fall on the department chairs. We hear your concern. Come to the meetings.

Pam Jenkins: I've one question from the email, a question which I don't think we can answer but I want address it: "Preliminary data that I've recently seen gives SCH-related credit to the department/program that teaches the course but not to the department/program that owns the student. Is this final?"

Pam Jenkins: No. We are struggling with this issue and the ways that we can look at it. We know it is a critical issue. These are the kind of intricate, complex issues that we have to answer all the time.

Pam Jenkins: We probably need to end this at this time. Come to the meetings, we welcome you. It's not a perfect process, but it is the process we probably needed to do 20 years ago.

Peter Schock: To borrow Jack Nicholson's great line, what if this is as good as it gets? Because this is as good as it's going to be. And it is going to be better than what we undertook before Hurricane Katrina, washed it away, which is a one at a time, which is a one at a time, one by one academic review process. That really wouldn't have worked, because it would have looked at programs discretely. We have an opportunity to look at the programs together as they contribute to the university's mission. Which is what this is about.

Connie Phelps: Thank you everybody. This is a Faculty Council Meeting, so do we have any new business. Any old business? Do I hear a motion to adjourn? Thank you!

[Meeting adjourns]