

Faculty Senate Curricular Review Committee Report

April 22, 2010

William Follette, Chair (Psychology); Stacy Burton (English); Stephen Jenkins (Biology);
Ronald Phaneuf (Physics); Howard Rosenberg (Art); David Ryfe (Journalism);
Madeleine Sigman-Grant (Cooperative Extension)

Background:

In response to a budget reduction resulting from the actions of the special session of the Nevada State Legislature in February, the Board of Regents of the Nevada System of Higher Education reduced the operating budget of system institutions. The budget reduction for the University of Nevada, Reno was approximately \$11 million. This amount was in addition to approximately \$33 million already absorbed by UNR in prior rounds of budget reductions. The economic impact on UNR is more severe than for most national public institutions in part because of the state of Nevada's historically lean investment in higher education. Up until these most recent reductions, the significant majority of cutbacks occurred while having relatively small impact on the academic programs and mission of the university.

In June 2008 the faculty Senate recognized that at some point budgetary decisions could, in fact, significantly affect the academic and research missions of the University. On June 5, 2008 UNR faculty Senate passed a statement of principles that would guide such cuts should they become necessary. One element of those principles was to endorse the use of strategic cuts in order to preserve the teaching and research missions of the university. Those principles were subsequently endorsed by the president at several town hall meetings and by the Board of Regents as recently as April 16, 2010. In the spring of 2010 the executive board of the Senate reiterated their support for those principles and that support was again reported to the full Senate in the chair's report.

This level of budget reduction can only be accomplished in one of two ways according to the NSHE code. The first method requires a declaration of financial exigency, a method not adopted by the Board of Regents. The other method provided in code invokes the curricular review process. . It is important to note that under curricular review individual members of the faculty may not be targeted for termination. Rather, only whole curricular units may be discontinued or reorganized (see code reference below). The Provost and the chair of the faculty Senate negotiated the structure of the curricular review committee that was outlined in broad strokes in the UNR bylaws. The procedure was presented to the Senate in March at which time the Senate approved the charges for the Faculty Senate Curricular Review Committee (hereafter referred to as FSCRC). The Senate then elected three members to the committee from the Senate, and the executive board appointed three additional members. The committee was chaired by the immediate past president of the faculty Senate who was empowered to vote in the case of ties on committee recommendations.

The committee met with the Provost on multiple occasions. Initial meetings were to understand the elements that went into the identification of programs to be targeted. We met on other occasions to understand how some data were interpreted. The committee met with one or more representatives from each program that had been identified in the Provost's plans. Where possible the initial meeting also included the dean of the impacted unit and one or more senators from the college. The purpose of that meeting was to ensure that all present understood the process and agreed that the processes

specified by the unit had been followed. In addition, anyone present was invited to speak. The committee also gave individuals the opportunity to contact the committee and schedule a private meeting. Several such meetings occurred. Because of the constrained timeframe, the committee was as flexible as possible in meeting with various interested parties. The committee then reviewed each proposal in its most current form and presents its recommendation to the full senate herein.

Assumptions:

The FSCRC operated under the charges of the senate. Primary was that faculty governance requires that we participate in this process. In spite of the accusation that to participate is to be complicit, we believe that to abdicate this responsibility is to forego the most fundamental aspect of faculty governance – control of the curriculum. That said, the academic planning process defined in NSHE code section 5.4.6 [2-9-10 (2)] bears little resemblance to what most would understand as curricular review. Examples of more familiar curricular review found on the web described evolutionary processes to review goals and redirect resources that occur on periodic cycles ranging from 5 to 30 years. However, recent economic conditions have produced dramatic curricular changes at universities across the country that are similar to those UNR is experiencing. Approaches to meeting financial challenges range from furloughs to abrupt large-scale program, department and college closures with various levels of faculty involvement. When program closures have been implemented in these latter cases, where criteria are available they are not dissimilar to those used by UNR. It is clear that the primary goal of this instance of curricular review is predicated on economic circumstances and the need to achieve a targeted savings goal.

At the outset we assume there is no single correct solution to this problem. Given the short timeframe, it is not possible to evaluate all combinations of program reductions that might yield the cost savings necessary and yet achieve the unequivocal best curricular outcome. Our perspective on the task necessarily has been to assess whether process has been plausibly followed and whether the initial plans and counterproposals are reasonable rather than beyond criticism.

Given the evolution of the University over the last quarter century and given that budget reductions have already had an impact, we assume that programs affected by these plans will impact people who are fine scholars and teachers and dedicated to the University. We do not anticipate that there will be any easy choices to be made, and certainly that has not been the case.

Context:

The FSCRC studied the plans and responses with an understanding that there are financial goals to be achieved in a timeframe poorly suited to the task. This timeframe resulted from the timing and specific actions of the legislature, the Board of Regents, and the upcoming end of the fiscal year. This timeline precludes multiple iterations of plans and alternatives. In spite of the incredibly compressed time to respond, the FSCRC has been impressed by the variability in creativity and responsiveness of the programs involved. Even assuming that additional time might have placed more ideas on the table, some counterproposals have been creative and entail sacrifices and trade-offs, while others have been less so. Some of this variability has been the result of some entities having more options from which to draw, but some counterproposals or lack of counterproposal reflect other factors.

Neither the committee nor the provost can evaluate all possible routes to achieve the fiscal goal. The plans and counterproposals have been evaluated in good faith recognizing that most programs had different interpretations and weighting of the data used to evaluate the plans. The committee recommends rejecting some plans put forth by the provost. Where that has occurred, it is in the absence of knowing the alternatives. It is possible that plans that we do not accept would be accepted if compared to an even more aversive alternative. It should be clear that if the FSCRC recommendations are accepted by the senate and president, additional review will take place that must identify reductions equal to the difference between our recommendations and the budget goal targeted by the provost and mandated by the action of the legislature. Should the senate reject additional proposals and the president agrees, the additional review process would identify more cuts. However, as the remaining budget goal to be reached is changed, it is possible that strategies to attain those goals might lead to very different proposals.

It is difficult to know how to interpret the votes from the various colleges and planning committees. Response rates (voter turnout, if you will) varied from small to large. Some colleges approved plans and others rejected them. The committee heard some comments that faculty thought the plans were “done deals,” which perhaps explains the low response rates or lack of counterproposals from some units. That view was a mistake as several counterproposals were accepted and some original plans were rejected. The FSCRC did not see any of the programs affected to be without import to university mission. We understand fully how difficult it is for faculty to vote for the termination of programs and colleagues. This in no way diminishes the importance of “no” votes, but only recognizes the difficulty of the task and the faculty predisposition to value one’s colleagues’ contribution to the intellectual milieu and our disposition to not temper our appreciation by assigning monetary worth to particular aspects of the academic enterprise.

There are several inevitable malign consequences of this process in addition to the unintended deleterious consequences yet to be identified. One consequence is that faculty members who have devoted significant portions of their career to UNR will feel diminished, unappreciated and alienated. Absent the larger, tragic financial constraints within which the university must operate, the justification for program elimination or reorganization will not make sense nor should one expect that it would. Programs that can reasonably claim to have national or international prominence may have achieved their stature through identifying more with a national or international group of scholars than with a local constituency. Some programs with exceptionally talented faculty have been identified because they have distributed their efforts under a set of assumptions that changed almost without notice. That said, there are other instances where programs have had clearer signals that practices should change but have not.

An additional negative consequence of cutting programs is that people will assume that they have been targeted in some more personal way. The committee heard comments of this nature and found them disturbing. There is nothing this report can say that will disabuse people of that belief nor is that our role. What we can say is that we discussed this issue with the Provost, who gave understandable justifications for the plans that were generally consistent with the guidelines described in the planning document. This concern will play out as it will. What the committee can say is that the spectrum of our colleagues affected spans the more outspoken and insular to the most gentle and collaborative. If we peruse those not affected directly in this round of curricular review, we will still find that spectrum fully represented.

This process has the effect of making higher education more homogeneous. If we continue down this road, UNR will lose its uniqueness. In the provost’s criteria uniqueness and separability were sometimes conflated. Some programs that are unique, and therefore valuable to the UNR community, are also separable, and therefore subject to closure. In fact, as the process has unfolded, it has been difficult to distinguish between that which is extraordinary and that which is singular. As secondary education faces the specter of meeting gratuitous accountability standards, it is worrisome that consumers will opt for the familiar rather than the diverse. It is the diversity of ideas, techniques, subject matter, persons and personalities that make American universities the gold standard for developing creative thinkers and innovators in the arts and sciences. To apply an imperfect metaphor, we believe that over-pruning of our academic programs will inevitably kill the tree.

Finally, there is an unintended yet acknowledged unfairness in this process. Curricular review is taking on an entirely new function if for no other reason than the rapidity with which changes are being mandated. While the FSCRC can see virtue in a more central and assertive role for curricular review as a means of allocating resources, this level of cutting in this timeframe will not produce a better university. The outcome may be a leaner and meaner university; however “leaner” means something more akin to starving, and “meaner” entails mistrust.

Budget:

The overall budget target of over \$11M was mandated by the action of the Nevada legislature. The provost has cut over \$3M from administration, athletics, etc. The curricular review proposal deals with the over \$8M that will be cut from academic programs. While the overall target cannot change, the budget figures used various sections of the initial proposal have in some cases evolved through negotiations and discussions. The FSCRC’s report presents the budget implications of our recommendations to the Senate as clearly as possible. However, given the fact that some aspects of implementation remain to be worked out, particularly regarding Proposal 3, the budget figures in this report involve some approximation.

Comparative Summary of Projected Budget Savings

Program	Provost’s Proposal	FSCRC Recommendation
Closing two departments & reorganizing the remainder of CABNR	\$4,558,000	\$4,558,000
Reorganizing the College of Education and closing some programs	\$1,558,000	\$1,558,000
Closing some foreign language majors	\$ 878,000	~\$325,000
Closing Interior Design	\$ 190,000	\$190,000
Putting some humanities/social science graduate programs on hiatus	\$ 177,000	\$115,000
Closing Supply Chain Management	\$ 487,000	\$487,000
Closing the Statistics concentration	\$ 327,000	0
Closing the UNSOM Department of Nutrition	\$ 248,000	\$248,000
Total savings from curricular review proposals	\$8,423,000	\$ ~7,481,000

Charges for Faculty Senate Curricular Review Committee
Approved by the Faculty Senate on March 25, 2010
University of Nevada, Reno

Because of the recent financial crisis facing the state and the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE), the University has undertaken the curricular review process to identify programs that may be reduced or eliminated. In the opinion of system counsel, financial considerations are a legitimate component of such analysis, as budgetary constraints force a choice between which programs provide the most value. The NSHE Code allows the University to define these procedures, though the ultimate decision resides with the President and the NSHE Board of Regents. The curricular review process was negotiated between the Senate Chair and the Provost, but the specific proposals were not.

The responsibility of this Faculty Senate Curricular Review Committee (FSCRC) is to advise the Senate as it makes its recommendations to the President. This responsibility derives from Section 3.5.4.b(iv) of the UNR Bylaws, which is itself authorized by sections 5.4.5 to 5.4.7 of the Code.

The charges for this committee are:

1. Review the Provost's proposals for program reduction, reorganization, or elimination, along with each of the responses and the reports of the colleges, the Institutional Strategic Plan, the June 2008 Faculty Senate Principles for Dealing with Budget Reductions, and other relevant materials.
2. Assess whether the Faculty Senate's principles were followed and verify that process described in section 3.5.4.b of the UNR Bylaws, and detailed in the Provost's Academic Planning Process, was followed.
3. Did the affected programs and/or the college faculty support or object to the curricular review proposals, and were substantive changes or alternatives proposed?
4. Did the department's response and/or the college's report contain substantial and credible new information that affects the merits of the curricular review proposal?
5. If substantive changes or alternatives were suggested, report on whether those recommendations were or should be considered by the Provost and the President.
6. With respect to each proposal and every suggested alternative, provide a recommendation and your rationale to the Faculty Senate.
7. Report the results of the above assessment to the Faculty Senate, along with any other suggestions it might consider as it makes its recommendations to the President.

Placement of certain graduate degrees on hiatus for five years, including the PhD degrees in Anthropology, History and Political Science and the Master's degrees in Philosophy and Speech and Communications

(Proposal #7)

Provost's Proposal and Rationale:

The College of Liberal Arts has three doctoral programs that currently graduate less than one student per year and two master's programs that currently graduate fewer than five per year. The Provost's proposal would put these degree programs on hiatus in order to reassign faculty teaching responsibilities congruent with Board of Regents' faculty workload policies and reduce contingent instructional funding by a total of \$177,000 per year.

Program Responses:

Each program developed a strategic response to the Provost's proposal, in consultation with the CLA dean. The responses articulated the histories and curricular strengths of these programs, explained the reasons for their current numbers of students, and responded to the Provost's fiscal goals. Speech Communication accepted the proposal for hiatus as being in the best interest of a department in transition. The other four departments prepared counter-proposals, with the following terms:

Anthropology

- Institute differential teaching load among faculty to provide necessary instruction
- Reduce contingent instructional funding by the proposed amount of \$31,344
- Retain doctoral program

History

- Demonstrated that faculty teaching load already meets Board of Regents' expectations
- Retain option to request contingent instructional funding in the current amount of \$6,000 to provide courses not otherwise offered
- Retain doctoral program

Political Science

- Demonstrated that faculty teaching load already meets Board of Regents' expectations
- Reduce contingent instructional funding by the proposed amount of \$7,335
- Retain doctoral program

Philosophy

- Institute an increased teaching load of one course per year per faculty member
- Reduce contingent instructional funding by the proposed amount of \$63,696
- Retain MA program

The Provost accepted each of these counter-proposals and signed Memoranda of Agreement with the department chairs and dean.

College Response:

The College of Liberal Arts Planning Committee accepted the Provost’s proposal to place the master’s program in Speech Communication on hiatus for five years. Since MOAs had been signed regarding the proposals affecting Anthropology, History, Political Science, and Philosophy, it did not act on those proposals. The CLA faculty voted 80-10 (with 183 faculty eligible to vote) to accept the Provost’s proposal.

Faculty Senate Curricular Review Committee Analysis and Recommendation:

Charges 1 & 2. The committee reviewed all documents, responses, and reports in relation to this proposal in the context of the Curricular Review process specified in the UNR bylaws, section 3.5.4.b; the Provost’s Academic Planning Process; the Institutional Strategic Plan; and the Faculty Senate principles set in June 2008. It met in person with the chairs of the affected departments, the chair of the CLA Planning Committee, and the CLA dean. The specified processes and principles were followed.

Charges 3 & 4. Four departments presented counter-proposals, which the Provost accepted in signed Memoranda of Agreement. The fifth department accepted the Provost’s proposal. The CLA Planning Committee and CLA faculty accepted the Provost’s proposal.

Charges 5 & 6. Proposal 7 included putting five CLA graduate degree programs on hiatus for five years. Four affected departments signed MOAs that allowed the programs to remain active, in most cases by making sacrifices in order to reach the Provost’s budget target. The FSCRC concurs with the fifth affected department, the CLA Planning Committee, and the CLA faculty in accepting the Provost’s proposal to put the master’s program in Speech Communication on hiatus for five years.

IMPACT of Provost’s MOAs and FSCRC’s Recommendation

Department/Program	Faculty	Staff	Budget Savings
Four MOAs + one graduate degree program placed on hiatus	0	0	\$115,000

Reorganization of the College of Education

(Proposal #4)

Provost's Proposal:

Using available data, the Provost originally proposed to reshape the College of Education to focus its mission primarily on training teachers for direct placement in K-12 school systems. To that end, his original proposal would have done the following:

- Close all Master's Degree Programs in the College & make corresponding changes in workload
- Close programs in School Psychology, TESOL, Counseling, Marriage & Family Therapy, & Higher Education Leadership
- Consolidate College into 1 unit with no more than 40 tenure-track faculty positions without departmental boundaries.
- Close MA, ME, and MS degrees in all counseling fields, TESOL, and all Education Specialist, Ed.D, and Ph.D. programs in the College of Education

Summary:

The Provost's target reduction in this proposal is \$1.558 million. This proposal would eliminate 6 tenured faculty, 4 tenure-track faculty, and 3 classified positions.

College Response:

Upon receiving notice that it had been placed under curricular review, the College of Education set about developing an alternative proposal. The Provost met several times with leaders in the College as they developed this alternative.

The College's alternative proposal does the following:

- Creates a single doctoral degree that includes a core of key research and foundational courses, with areas of emphasis in areas of high-need and faculty strength. Examples could include literacy, STEM education, special education, and leadership.
- Retains the M.A. programs in school counseling and ESL of a more limited scope, puts the MA-TESOL program on a 5-year hiatus, and closes marriage and family therapy and school psychology programs.
- Reorganizes the college with no departments, a minimum of administrative support (1 Dean, 2 Associate Deans) and more active faculty involvement in all aspects of college governance. This structure results in a faculty of 40.
- This proposal amounts to a cut of 7 instructional faculty positions, bringing the total number of faculty positions down from 47 to 40. Four of these positions will be saved through retirements.

Summary:

The College's proposal has the effect of immediately cutting \$1.3 million from its budget. Its target reduction will remain \$1.558 million. The difference will be made up over time through separations and retirements. The Provost has agreed to extend an incentivized separation/retirement opportunity to College faculty to facilitate this process. Moving forward, the College's total number of faculty lines will remain at forty. As individuals retire and assistant professors are hired to replace them, the difference in salary will be kept by Central Administration until the target reduction is met. This alternative proposal recommended by the College of Education and accepted by the Provost will eliminate 3 tenure-track and 3 classified positions.

Faculty Senate Curricular Review Committee Analysis and Recommendation:

As to this committee's charges, we find the following:

Charge 2: The Provost's recommendation abides by Faculty Senate principles and the process described in section 3.5.4b of the UNR bylaws.

Charge 3: The College of Education made a substantive alternative proposal. The College Review Committee accepted this proposal on a vote of 15-1 (with one abstention). Faculty in the College of Education also voted on this proposal. Out of 73 eligible faculty members, 43 voted to approve the proposal, 7 voted against the proposal, and one abstained. Many concerns were raised during discussion of this proposal. The most salient of these concerns have been written down as a series of suggestions for improving the proposal. The faculty agreed to forward this list of suggestions to the Chair of the Faculty Senate and the Provost.

It is worth noting, however, that faculty members in COE raised several concerns. One concern has to do with the impact of these faculty reductions on faculty diversity. Three of the six individuals to be terminated represent one or more under-represented groups. The Provost has provided this committee with data indicating that UNR is meeting its diversity targets in most areas except in the category of tenure-track faculty. We believe this issue should remain in the forefront of the College's concerns as it replaces retired/separated faculty with assistant professors. The second concern has to do with a matter of process within COE. The Academic Planning Process states that the dean of an affected unit must organize a curricular review committee to respond to the Provost's recommendations. It does not mandate how this college-level committee ought to be formed. Concern has been expressed that COE ought to have relied on the college's standing curricular review committee to review the Provost's proposal rather than create a new committee of departmental chairs. Process issues like these have been raised by a variety of units. We believe they are properly discussed in a separate memorandum on process questions that this committee will submit to the Faculty Senate at a later date.

Charge 4: See the response to Charge 5 below.

Charge 5: The Provost signed a Memorandum of Agreement accepting the College's alternative proposal as a replacement for his own. In that Agreement, the Provost commended the College for placing value on retaining positions for tenured faculty, and for its creative response to this budget crisis.

Charge 6: Though no unit wishes to see its number of programs and faculty lines cut, the faculty in the College of Education are to be commended for squarely facing the situation before them and devising an innovative solution. We recommend acceptance of their proposal.

IMPACT of FSCRC's Recommendation

Department/Program	Faculty	Staff	Budget Savings
COE	3 Tenure track	3	1.3M

College of Agriculture, Biotechnology and Natural Resources (CABNR) closure and reorganization of remaining units

(Proposal # 3)

Provost's Rationale:

Using available data, the Provost proposes to close CABNR and two units (Proposals #1 and #2) while reorganizing the remaining units in order to build larger departments to achieve critical mass, unify range science and two interdisciplinary graduate degrees into one unit, improve compliance for use of animals in research, and create synergies for basic and applied biological and biochemical sciences. The proposal closes CABNR while retaining the Center of Economic Development in some other unit (e.g. Extension of Business Services); moves one position to fill a vacancy in the Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Sciences (NRES); converts one-half-time position into a whole position in Sociology to sustain the Applied Statistics Program; moves the Departments of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, Nutrition, NRES, and the program in pre-veterinary medicine into the College of Science (COS) where they are closely aligned; closes the meat plant and the Main Station Farm; and relocates the Nevada Agricultural Experiment Station (NAES) to the Vice President for Research. The total savings amounted to \$4.558 million. In addition to rationale provided in Proposals #1 and #2, this recommendation will result in large savings from administrative costs from operating the meat plant and farm and from the large administration currently operating CABNR. The number of faculty and staff impacted are: 14 tenured faculty positions, 2 tenure-track faculty positions, and 12 classified positions in addition to 7 persons from the administrative unit.

Department and College Responses:

Both official and unofficial comments from individual faculty members, departments, the Dean, and external stakeholders were made to the Provost, to this committee, and to members of the Board of Regents. This input reveals the enormous attention this proposal has generated. Rather than providing specific details of all these responses, the committee will summarize the activities:

- On March 1, the Provost announced his recommendation.
- The CABNR College committee consisting of Department chairs and one individual faculty member from each department meet to discuss the Provost's recommendation. They worked on a document which the CABNR Dean did not allow to go forward to the Provost.
- March 25, the NRES Department submitted a response to the CABNR Dean and the Provost. If the department was to be moved to the College of Science.
- On April 8, the Acting Dean of CABNR submitted an alternative proposal to the Provost, which included a statement from the Departments of Nutrition and the NRES response. This proposal was presented to the CABNR faculty at this time. Of the 70 of 87 eligible faculty who voted, the Provost's original proposal was rejected (78% opposed, 14% in favor and 7% abstaining). The faculty also voted to accept the 4/8/10 CABNR alternative by a vote of 53% in favor, 44% opposed and 2% abstaining.

- When presented with the CABNR alternative, the Provost rejected it citing the following reasons:
 - The cuts outlined were horizontal in nature and did not focus on programmatic issues.
 - They shifted the budget burden to others (e.g. reassigning faculty to UNSOM).
 - The budget cuts fell almost \$2M short of the target.
- Meanwhile, external stakeholders provided many cogent comments to the Provost via email, letter and in a face-to-face meeting.
- The Provost and CABNR Dean met to discuss retaining a much scaled-down College of Agriculture.
- The Dean and CABNR College committee met again. The Dean presented the Provost's rejection of the CABNR's alternative and the requests of the external stakeholders to maintain an agriculture presence at UNR. After discussion, on 4/13/10 they developed a second alternative. Initially, the College Committee did not wish this alternative to go out for a faculty vote. They were encouraged to reconsider this decision by the FSCRC and the document went out for faculty vote. This alternative suggested streamlining administrative costs, reducing operating costs (in IT, NAES remote locations), making the Main Street Farm and the Meat Plant self-supporting, eliminating vacant positions, reducing NAES funding, reorganizing Student Center functions, reducing salary expenses at the Valley Road Field Laboratory, reallocation of 20% FTE for 2 faculty and reorganization of the departments with loss of faculty and staff. These proposed changes amount to \$3,986,755 in savings, which falls short of the \$4.458 M needed. The difference would be made up by returning future salary savings.
- On 4/15, the results of the faculty vote (70 out of 87 voted) were tabulated: 31% in favor, 55% opposed and 15% abstaining. Therefore this second alternative was not sent forward to the Provost to determine whether he would accept it as a substitute for his original proposal.
- The FSCRC has considered the original Provost proposal and the alternatives presented by CABNR.

Faculty Senate Curricular Review Committee Analysis and Recommendation:

Charge 1: The proposal, responses and information provided in numerous face-to-face meetings of the committee with the Provost, the CABNR dean, CABNR's faculty senators, and affected faculty were extensively reviewed.

Charge 2: The Provost's original recommendation abides by Faculty Senate principles and the process described in section 3.5.4b of the UNR bylaws. It should be noted that our review took into account the existence (in many of CABNR's programs) of valuable 'islands of excellence' conducted by exceptional and internationally known faculty.

Charge 3: As explained above, the faculty voted several times on the alternatives presented by its planning committee and Acting Dean. It should be noted that the short turn-around time for voting on either of the alternative suggestions resulted in written complaints by faculty. Given the enormity of the potential impacts and perceived lack of clarity, the time allotted between receipt of alternative proposals and submission of votes was insufficient. In addition, not all faculty members were engaged in

the conversations. Most discussions involved departmental administrators and one representative from each department. Given the large size of the faculty, this representation may not have been sufficient for input.

Charge 4: As the process evolved, substantial and credible new information was provided by the faculty and external advisors. This new information prompted the Provost to reconsider the initial recommendation and to work with the Dean and advisors on a new proposal that would create a scaled down College of Agriculture. Some of the information presented in defense of the Provost's criteria for vertical cuts was aggregate college data rather than data for the specific programs and units being considered for reorganization and closure, e.g. costs per student FTE.

Charge 5: The two alternative proposals presented by CABNR were carefully considered by this committee. While the first proposal (4/8/10) was approved by the CABNR faculty, it was rejected by the Provost. The committee received the 4/13 proposal and the CABNR faculty vote which rejected it. The FSCRC believes that, with more detail and time, the 4/13 proposal warrants revision and reconsideration by the CABNR faculty, Dean and the University Provost.

Charge 6: With respect to each proposal and every suggested alternative, our recommendations and rationale are as follows.

Provost's original proposal: This committee recommends rejection of this proposal as there is a substantial need to retain an agriculture presence at UNR.

Alternative Proposal 4/8/10: This committee agrees that this alternative does not meet the goals of the University and rejects this proposal.

Alternative Proposal 4/13/10: This committee has some reservations about the lack of specificity contained within this proposal. While it retains a College of Agriculture, there appears to be insufficient direction as to programmatic (e.g. vertical) cuts. Therefore, this committee rejects this proposal as it is currently written.

Recommendation from FSCRC: This committee recommends that the alternative proposal 4/13/10 be the foundation for further consideration. There is a substantial need to retain a College of Agriculture at UNR, with a much smaller administration and a tighter focus. This has appeal to constituents, retains critically needed research and education components (especially in rangeland expertise), and maintains Biochemistry, Nutrition and NRES, the pre-vet program and the Center for Economic Development while reducing administrative costs. This would also preserve the Nevada Agricultural Experiment Station. In addition, there exists a strategic opportunity with the potential expansion of the USDA Agricultural Research Service in rangeland activities. We recognize that this plan retains the provost's intent to save \$4.55M through the reorganization and downsizing of CABNR and further recognize that this may mean the closure of Animal Biotechnology and Resource Economics.

Because the Provost's CABNR proposal represents a large portion of the total budget reduction, an extension should be granted to allow for further negotiations based on the 4/13/10 alternative proposal. We recognize that this will result in a shortened timeframe for notification of those tenured faculty members who may be terminated. The FSCRC considers the risk of not allowing further dialogue to outweigh the benefit of the full year notification process.

IMPACT of FSCRC's Recommendation

Department/Program	Faculty	Staff	Budget Savings
CABR	?	?	\$4.5M

Closure of the Department of Animal Biotechnology

(Proposal #1)

Overview:

The Provost's initial proposal was to close the Department of Animal Biotechnology (AB) including its B.S. programs in Animal Science and Animal Biotechnology and its M.S. program in Animal Science. The initial counter-proposal from the College of Agriculture, Biotechnology, and Natural Resources (CABNR) would preserve the Animal Biotechnology Department and faculty lines while ostensibly saving money by eliminating two vacant positions, reassigning two faculty engaged in stem cell research to the School of Medicine, and reallocating 20% of the salaries of two faculty members to endowment funding. However, this counter-proposal from CABNR would likely have saved UNR about a third of the amount suggested in the counter-proposal and substantially less than the amount saved by the Provost's original plan.

An alternative plan for reorganization of CABNR and NAES (Nevada Agricultural Experiment Station) was presented on 13 April 2010. This plan would retain four faculty positions from AB but close the department and shift these faculty to another department, presumably NRES.

Provost's Rationale:

The Provost's rationale for closing the AB Department was based on relatively low enrollments and numbers of majors, on the possibility of preserving the pre-veterinary program by transferring it to another department, and on the relatively isolated nature of a major research effort in the Department. The Provost also made use of an external program review conducted in Fall 2009 to justify his decision.

Departmental Response:

The FSCRC has considered the original Provost's proposal and the alternatives presented by CABNR. We have also met with interested AB faculty and carefully considered the department's responses to the Provost's proposal. The AB Department provided a comprehensive and thoughtful response to the Provost's proposal. They reported that the annual number of graduates with B.S. degrees has increased from fewer than 15 in the late 1990s to about 20 in the past 6 years, while the annual number of M.S. graduates has remained between 0 and 6 since 1995. There are approximately 200 majors, with half of these in the pre-veterinary medicine program. They showed that their number of majors per RI-FTE (full-time equivalent faculty lines devoted to resident instruction) was greater than values for CABNR as a whole and 6 other colleges. This is a misleading comparison, however, because faculty in other colleges have explicit role statements specifying percentages of time allocated to teaching, research, and service. Therefore, although contracts of these faculty may show 100% resident instruction, it is not reasonable to simply count up the number of faculty in a Department in the College of Science, for example, and use this as the divisor in calculating number of majors per RI-FTE for that Department, unless the same divisor is used for the Animal Biotechnology calculation.

The AB Department has an internationally known research program in stem cell biology using sheep as a model system to study hemophilia. The medical and basic science importance of this research is unquestioned. However, the external review team noted that "as biomedical researchers in CABNR, they appear to work largely in isolation from other researchers at UNR." Further, "Although the

historical reason for emergence of this group within AB are understandable, these reasons alone do not justify this structure moving forward.” In addition, this research program depends on intensive use of costly University facilities.”

Faculty Senate Curricular Review Committee Analysis and Recommendation:

Our analysis of this proposal is contained within our analysis of proposal #3 for reorganization of CABNR. Please refer to that analysis.

Closure of the Resource Economics Department (Proposal #2)

Provost's Proposal:

The Provost's original proposal proposes to eliminate the Department of Resource Economics in CABNR. His proposal moves a member of the faculty who currently teaches APS270 to the Sociology Department. This faculty member already has a 0.5 appointment in the Sociology Department. In this way, the Provost believes that a savings of over 50% of departmental SFTE can be made.

In addition, the Provost's proposal moves the University Center for Economic Development (UCED) to Cooperative Extension or the College of Business. The Provost believes this will save 30% of the Department's grant awards.

Given these savings, and the fact that few faculty teach outside the major, and so make this unit easily "separable," its closure will have minimal impact on the rest of the university.

The Provost realizes that, in closing the unit, he is sacrificing the strong research record of the faculty.

Department Response:

In its response to the Provost's original proposal, the Department argues that the Provost has miscalculated its average SFTE. It argues that only 2.3 faculty positions are devoted to teaching, and that if this number is used the department's average SFTE is much closer to the university norm. Also, the Department notes that most of its faculty have a 25% teaching load and are contractually bound to teach less than faculty in other departments.

The Department also argues it is only happenstance that one member of the faculty taught 58% of the SFTE [in Applied Statistics] during the period under review. Many other members of the faculty have taught this class in the past.

The Department also argues that, for many criteria used by the Provost, resource economics is at "national norms" for similar departments at other universities.

Finally, the Department argues that UCED cannot do its job without the support and expertise represented by other members of the faculty.

Faculty Senate Curricular Review Committee Analysis and Recommendation:

Our analysis of proposal #1 is contained within our analysis of proposal #3. Please refer to that analysis.

Closure of the degree program in Interior Design

(Proposal #6)

Provost's Proposal and Rationale:

Interior Design is a degree program now in the College of Liberal Arts that has been at the university for 37 years. In 2008-2009 it had 15 graduates and 89 majors. The program has one tenured faculty member; most courses in the major are taught by individuals working on letter of appointment. Interior Design courses are not required for any other degree programs at the university, and the program does not contribute to the university's research mission. Closing this program and its one faculty position would result in budget savings of \$190,000 per year.

Program Response:

The Interior Design Program objected to the Provost's curricular review proposal. In its response, the program reported that its own records indicate "over 100 declared majors active in the last two years," a count that the program argues reflects the fact that its students may take a semester off or enroll at TMCC for a semester (four courses required for the major are not offered at UNR). Of the 2002-2009 graduates who have responded to alumni surveys, 85% are employed in positions closely related to their degree and 89% in Washoe County. The Nevada State Board of Architecture, Interior Design & Residential Design requires individuals wishing to register as interior designers to have a bachelor's degree in the field; all states that regulate interior design require national certification through the National Council for Interior Design Qualification, which requires a mix of education and experience. The program's response included detailed information on the importance of the program in the region. The program proposed that a viable alternative to closure might be to relocate the program to Extended Studies.

College Response:

The College of Liberal Arts Planning Committee reviewed the program response thoroughly. It voted in support of two recommendations: 1) that the Interior Design program explore the option of moving to Extended Studies, including the option of continuing to award bachelor's degrees, and 2) that whether or not a move to Extended Studies proves feasible, all state funding and CLA resources be removed from the Interior Design program no later than June 30, 2011. The second of these recommendations was thus "to accept the Provost's implicit proposal to remove state funding." The Provost's proposal, the Interior Design response, and the CLA Planning Committee's response were made available to the college faculty (183 eligible to vote). CLA faculty voted on the Provost's proposal, which they supported 44-41, and on the CLA Planning Committee's recommendations, which they supported 67-24.

Faculty Senate Curricular Review Committee Analysis and Recommendation:

Charges 1 & 2: The FSCRC reviewed all documents, responses, and reports in relation to this proposal in the context of the Curricular Review process specified in the UNR bylaws, section 3.5.4.b; the Provost's Academic Planning Process; the Institutional Strategic Plan; and the Faculty Senate principles set in June 2008. It met in person with the director of the Interior Design Program, the chair of the CLA Planning Committee, and the CLA dean. The specified processes and principles were followed. Faculty affected

by every proposal, including this one, expressed concern about the speed of the curricular review process.

Charges 3 & 4: The Interior Design program objected to the Provost’s proposal, but while its response demonstrated the value of the current program it did not contain substantial new information that affected the merits of the curricular review proposal. Both the Provost’s proposal and the CLA Planning committee’s recommendations, which included the fiscal substance of the Provost’s proposal, were supported by the vote of CLA faculty.

Charges 5 & 6: The Interior Design program suggested a possible alternative institutional placement in Extended Studies, the CLA Planning Committee recommended that the program actively investigate this possibility, and the CLA faculty voted in support of this recommendation. In the FSCRC’s analysis, the alternative of moving the Interior Design program to Extended Studies merits thorough consideration. Such consideration would necessarily include whether the program could be fully self-supporting under a financial model feasible under Extended Studies’ practices and whether a NSHE degree program can be located in Extended Studies. The program director reports that a similar institutional arrangement has worked successfully at other research universities. There could be advantages to this placement, since Extended Studies has experience with other programs oriented toward professionals in the region. It would be premature to recommend that the Interior Design program be moved to Extended Studies before the thorough consideration described above. However, the FSCRC does recommend that the program and the Provost explore this possible alternative to program closure. The FSCRC concurs with the Provost, the CLA Planning Committee, and the CLA faculty in recommending the full removal of state funding for the Interior Design program by June 30, 2011.

IMPACT of FSCRC’s Recommendation

Department/Program	Faculty	Staff	Budget Savings
Interior Design Program	1 tenured	0	\$190,000*

*includes operating and contingent instruction

Closure of the degree programs in Supply Chain Management

(Proposal # 8)

Provost's Rationale:

Supply Chain Management (SCM) is a major within the Managerial Sciences Department of the College of Business offering a specialty B.S. degree. Five tenured and tenure-track faculty are associated with this program, which had the fewest majors (38) and B.S. graduates (12 of 228) in the College in 2008-9 and limited external grant funding. SCM courses are not required by other majors. The proposal is to close the B.S. in SCM and retain 2 of these 5 faculty members in the Managerial Sciences Department to teach operations research courses that would become requirements for a degree in Managerial Sciences. Elimination of the SCM program and three tenured faculty positions would result in budget savings of \$486,974 per year.

Department Response:

The response to the proposal was well organized and factual. Among SCM programs, the UNR program is well regarded externally, being ranked 12th overall in the U.S. and 10th in the world for research productivity. The program serves the land-grant mission by connecting effectively and partnering with key logistics industries in the region and state that account for more than one in five jobs in Nevada. Logistics play a key role in economic development in Northern Nevada and SCM graduates are in high demand. The SCM major is considered difficult by students but has been successful in placing 100% of its graduates in the workplace, both in Nevada (> 50%) and nationally. Nearly 1/3 of the students enrolled in SCM classes are from other majors. SCM classes have enrollments comparable to those in other majors in the College. The SCM faculty has a significant service teaching role in the College. Student numbers in the SCM major began a slow decline from 70 to 30 after "Logistics" was dropped from the title in partial response to a common course numbering mandate in 2002, but has recovered to 40. SCM faculty members are active in research, their publications are frequently cited and they are engaged in other professional activities and services. One senior SCM faculty member has offered to retire. A report indicated that of 83 faculty members eligible to vote in the College of Business, 37 voted in favor of the Provost's proposal and were 16 opposed.

Faculty Senate Curricular Review Committee Analysis and Recommendation:

Charge 1: The proposal, responses and information provided in face-to-face meetings of the committee with the Provost, deans and affected faculty were reviewed within the context of Faculty Senate principles for dealing with budget reductions.

Charge 2: The evidence presented and made available to the committee concerning the process indicates that relevant Faculty Senate principles and UNR Bylaws governing curricular review were followed. The level of transparency in the review process by all participants was considered adequate. An issue of concern to faculty and the committee was the limited time period that was available to complete the curricular review process, which was considered detrimental to its overall effectiveness as an implementation of strategic planning.

Charge 3: Faculty representatives of the SCM program offered objections to the proposal on several bases. SCM is more strongly connected to the Nevada business community, consistent with the land-grant mission, than to other College and University programs, although SCM faculty members do have

service teaching responsibilities in the College. Although the number of majors is relatively low, enrollments in SCM courses are competitive within the College. SCM is a “niche” program that is more highly regarded nationally and internationally than any other program in the College of Business and attracts a relatively smaller number of excellent students that are in high demand upon graduation and find well-paid jobs in Nevada and elsewhere. The research productivity and reputation of the faculty in the field are high.

Charge 4: While the SCM program did not dispute the enrollment and graduation data upon which the proposal was largely based, an argument was presented that other significant factors such as the program’s national and international reputation, research productivity, connectedness to the business community and service teaching role merited comparable consideration. A convincing case was made based on the data presented that enrollments in SCM classes and particularly upper-division classes are competitive with other programs in the College of Business.

Charge 5: No alternative proposal was offered by the Department or College, although the committee was told in a face-to-face meeting with SCM faculty and the College dean that one SCM faculty member has offered to retire.

Charge 6: While the program and its faculty have many significant accomplishments and strengths, it is the committee’s judgment based on information received that the proposal to eliminate the B.S. degree and program in SCM does adhere to the academic planning criteria and standards set forth by the Provost for the curricular review process. The connectedness of the SCM program to the College and University is relatively low, as are enrollments in the major. The progress of students in other majors would not be adversely affected by elimination of this program. The SCM program is unique in the state and one of a small number in the western region. The support of this proposal by 70% of the voting faculty in the College was a significant factor in the committee’s assessment. With great reluctance, the committee supports the proposal of the Provost. There is no question that the College of Business and the University would be weakened by the loss of such a flagship program and accomplished faculty, and the economic development of northern Nevada would be negatively impacted as well. The prestige of the College of Business would suffer locally, nationally and internationally as a result.

IMPACT of FSCRC’s Recommendation

Department/Program	Faculty	Staff	Budget Savings
SCM	3 tenured	3	\$487,000

Closure of degree programs in German Studies, French and Italian [Studies] in the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures

(Proposal #5)

Provost's Proposal and Rationale:

The Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures (hereafter FLL) in the College of Liberal Arts offers undergraduate majors in French, German Studies, and Spanish; minors in French, German Studies, Italian Studies, Japanese Studies, and Spanish; and lower-division courses in Chinese. It also has a master's degree program in FLL with specialization in French or Spanish.¹ The department's baseline state budget includes 17 tenured and tenure-track faculty and 3 lecturers. Many lower-division sections are taught by contingent lecturers and LOA instructors. FLL as a whole contributes to the university's research mission, though individual faculty research productivity varies widely.

The Provost's proposal to reorganize the department would retain lower-division courses in each language presently taught but close all degree programs except the BA major and minor in Spanish, the MA FLL specialization in Spanish, and the undergraduate minor in Japanese Studies. It would close the BA major and minor in French (in 2008-2009: 8 graduates, 64 majors [including double- and triple-majors], n/a minors), the BA major and minor in German Studies (in 2008-2009: 1 graduate, 16 majors², and 14 minors), the minor in Italian Studies (in 2008-2009: 27 minors), and the MA specialization in French (no data provided in initial proposal or FLL response). Closing the degree programs would include cutting the positions of 8 tenured faculty: 4 in French, 3 in German, and 1 in Italian. Lower-division courses in those languages would be taught by contingent lecturers and LOAs. The proposal would also cut a .53 classified position in the department.

The proposal notes that the lower-division foreign language courses complement other degree programs (e.g. international business) and prepare students for study abroad. However, it seriously underestimates the centrality of instruction in foreign languages and literatures at a research university. All B.A. degrees require at least four semesters of college-level coursework in a language other than English. Five colleges at UNR offer B.A. degrees: the College of Business Administration, the Reynolds School of Journalism, the College of Science, and the College of Liberal Arts. The study of literature in its original languages is central to the liberal arts mission of the university, and graduate programs in liberal arts disciplines across the country customarily require at least four college semesters of language and literature coursework, often more.

Closing French entirely would result in budget savings of \$470,000 per year; closing German Studies entirely, \$282,000 per year; and closing Italian Studies entirely, \$116,000 per year. These figures would be offset by the contingent instructional funding required to retain lower-division language courses (a point discussed more fully at the end of this report).

¹ The proposal includes closing the MA in FLL with a German specialization, but the responses imply that this has already occurred.

² Includes both German and German Studies majors; the former was discontinued and the latter created in 2009.

Program Response:

FLL objected to the Provost's curricular review proposal. FLL did not respond departmentally but rather submitted four separate responses regarding a proposed cut in classified staff and the proposed closure of degree programs in French, German Studies, and Italian Studies. The response to the proposed cut in classified staff emphasized the size of the department's instructional staff, which includes numerous contingent instructors (currently 7 lecturers and 20 LOAs). The response to the proposed closure of Italian Studies emphasized the considerable hard work of the single tenured faculty member in the program and the undeniable cultural significance of Italian literature and language.

The response to the proposed closure of German Studies emphasized the high research productivity of two of three tenured faculty members, their contributions to other instructional programs at the university, and their understanding of their legal rights. The response to the proposed closure of French demonstrated that the Provost's initial data regarding the number of French majors and minors was inaccurate and argued that French has been producing an increasing number of majors and minors (and growing more rapidly than Spanish, which the proposal cited as the only FLL degree program producing a significant number of graduates).

While the various responses offered some options for limited short-term savings, the department did not present a strategic response that made serious, long-term concessions toward reaching the Provost's sizeable budget target.

College Response:

The College of Liberal Arts Planning Committee reviewed the department's responses thoroughly. Because the 0.53 classified position was not explicitly defined as support for French, German Studies, and Italian Studies, the committee concluded that closing it was not strictly a matter for curricular review and did not vote on that portion of the Provost's proposal. With regret, it voted to accept the Provost's proposals to close the minor in Italian Studies and the major and minor in German Studies. Each of these votes was qualified by the understanding that—as stated in the Provost's proposal—lower-division language courses, taught by contingent lecturers and LOAs, would continue to be offered in response to student demand. With regard to German Studies, the CLA Planning Committee specifically stated that its acceptance rested on the stipulation that “two contingent lectureships be created to cover the courses in lower-division German language and Core Humanities lost by the closure of the major and of the positions associated with it.”

The CLA Planning Committee voted against the Provost's proposal to close the major, minor, and graduate specialization in French. In so doing, it cited data in the French response showing that the initial proposal rested on incomplete data regarding majors, minors, and graduates. Moreover, it disagreed fundamentally with two premises of the Provost's proposal: 1) that an FLL department that offered BA and MA degrees only in Spanish would be of advantage to Nevada's growing Latino and Hispanic populations and 2) that a research university with a liberal-arts mission could legitimately offer undergraduate degree programs in only one foreign literature. In voting against the Provost's proposal, the committee stipulated that “tenure-track faculty in French should assume teaching responsibilities commensurate with Board of Regents workload guidelines.” Specifically, the committee recommended a move to a 3-3 load given the very small number of MA students specializing in French.

The Provost’s proposal, the FLL responses, and the CLA Planning Committee’s responses were made available to the college faculty (183 eligible to vote). CLA faculty voted on the Provost’s proposals and on the Planning Committee’s recommendations, with the following results:

	Accept	Reject
German Studies—Provost’s proposal	23	63
German Studies—Planning Committee proposal	38	52
French—Provost’s proposal	16	70
French—Planning Committee proposal	69	20
Italian Studies—Provost’s proposal (accepted by Planning Committee)	45	44

Faculty Senate Curricular Review Committee Analysis and Recommendation:

Charges 1 & 2: The FSCRC reviewed all documents, responses, and reports in relation to this proposal in the context of the Curricular Review process specified in the UNR bylaws, section 3.5.4.b; the Provost’s Academic Planning Process; the Institutional Strategic Plan; and the Faculty Senate principles set in June 2008. It met in person with the FLL chair, the chair of the CLA Planning Committee, and the CLA dean. The specified processes and principles were followed. Faculty affected by every proposal, including this one, expressed concern about the speed of the curricular review process.

Charges 3 & 4: FLL objected to the Provost’s proposal. The department’s responses reiterated the value of the current programs and demonstrated that initial data on French majors and minors was erroneous. They did not otherwise contain substantial new information that affected the merits of the curricular review proposal. Regarding Italian Studies, both the Provost’s proposal and the CLA Planning Committee’s recommendations were supported by the vote of CLA faculty. Regarding German Studies, the CLA Planning Committee accepted the Provost’s proposal, with stipulations, and the CLA faculty voted against it. Regarding French, the Provost’s proposal was rejected by both the CLA Planning Committee and the vote of CLA faculty.

Charges 5 & 6: In its various proposals FLL suggested modest alternatives that fell far short of the Provost’s budgetary targets. The CLA faculty vote came closer to those targets, and the CLA Planning Committee’s recommendations closer still. A sizeable gap remains, however, as is not surprising given that this set of proposals would reduce the number of tenured faculty in FLL by 47%.

In its review of the Provost’s proposal and FLL’s responses, the CLA Planning Committee emphasizes that contingent instructional funding for lower-division language courses in French, German, and Italian should whenever possible include both lecturers and LOA instructors. With particular reference to German, it argues that “meeting these ongoing needs requires full-time lecturers who might have an ongoing stake in the programs, not LOAs.” The FSCRC shares the committee’s concerns regarding quality and continuity of lower-division instruction. It also recognizes that as a practical matter it may be impossible to find qualified individuals willing to teach on LOA for enough sections to meet student demand for these courses. However, determining the best form of contingent instruction for a given program is not part of the curricular review process. Such decisions should be made by deans and chairs at the college and department levels. In the current budget situation they necessarily will be constrained by fiscal realities.

In the strongest terms, the FSCRC reiterates the view expressed by the CLA Planning Committee: a research university must offer degree programs in literatures—not only lower-division courses in languages—in more than Spanish and English. In this context, and given the significant enrollment numbers in the French major/minor, it cannot recommend removal of state funding for the French program. Regrettably, given present fiscal realities, small student enrollment in German Studies, and the need to prioritize degree programs over minors, it is impossible to make a similar statement regarding German Studies or Italian Studies.

After long consideration, the FSCRS concurs with the Provost, the CLA Planning Committee, and the CLA faculty in recommending the closure of Italian Studies by June 30, 2011. Regarding German Studies, it concurs with the Provost and the CLA Planning Committee in recommending program closure by June 30, 2011. Regarding French, it concurs with the CLA Planning Committee and faculty in recommending against program closure.

The FSCRC understands that one necessary consequence of the recommendation to preserve the French program would be programmatic cuts elsewhere at the university through the next round of curricular review. It is not our province, but rather the Provost's, to propose where those cuts would be made. However, absent a strategic response from the department to this end, we note that instructional economies within FLL could be a first step toward bridging the gap between the initial budget savings sought and the actual savings to occur if the French degree programs and tenured faculty are retained.

IMPACT of FSCRC's Recommendation

Department/Program	Faculty	Staff	Budget Savings (includes operating and contingent instruction)
German Studies	3 tenured	0	\$282,000
Italian Studies	1 tenured	0	\$116,000
<i>Less contingent instructional funding to continue lower-division courses</i>			<i>n/a; at current enrollments an absolute minimum (all LOAs) would be \$50,000; half lecturers, half LOAs would be about \$100,000</i>

Closure of the degree program in Statistics

(Proposal #9)

Provost's Rationale:

The Provost acknowledged the importance of statistics for education in all of the natural and social sciences at UNR. He pointed out that introductory statistics is taught in several departments on campus, including Mathematics and Statistics, and suggested that there may be some redundancy in teaching introductory statistics that will be addressed in a follow-up review aimed at providing introductory statistics more effectively and efficiently. The Provost further suggested that enrollments in upper division and graduate classes in statistics are low and that number of graduates with degrees in mathematics with a statistics option is also low. This proposal would save approximately \$229,000 and result in the loss of three tenured faculty members in the Department of Mathematics and Statistics.

Departmental Response:

The Department of Mathematics and Statistics made several cogent arguments in their written response to the proposal to close the program in statistics, with loss of three tenured faculty members.

First, they questioned a basic premise of the Provost's analysis that Statistics is a separate identifiable program within the Department, which is one of the criteria for program closure based on curricular review. Although statisticians teach other mathematics courses and there is substantial overlap in the requirements of the four basic options for B.S. or B.A. degrees offered by the Department, the fact that the Department recently renamed itself from Mathematics to Mathematics and Statistics is consistent with the Provost's recognition of Statistics as a separable unit subject to curricular review.

Second, the Department disputed the claim that upper division and graduate enrollments and numbers of majors with emphasis in statistics are low. They stated that the Department "generates more SFTE than any other unit at UNR", that it has the second highest number of majors in COS, and that statistics is the second most popular option among majors of the four basic ones available. Based on data they presented, average enrollments in 600, and 700-level probability and statistics classes are higher than those in 5 physical science programs in COS, while enrollments in 400-level classes are second only to those in Chemistry. They didn't compare these enrollments to enrollments in upper-division or graduate classes in Biology or Geography, however.

Third, the Department agreed that a review of introductory offerings in statistics is warranted, but suggests that statisticians in the Mathematics and Statistics Department should be leaders of this review because of their expertise in statistics.

Fourth, the Department documented the scholarly productivity of the three faculty members proposed for termination. These individuals have impressive publication records (one received the Mousel-Feltner Award for Excellence in Research or Creative Activity of the Colleges of Liberal Arts and Science in 2007). The statisticians in the Department have also been successful in securing extramural funding to support their research. Finally, they work on many cooperative research projects with faculty in Geography, Hydrology, and other departments at UNR.

The FSCRC met with the Interim Chair of the Department, who effectively summarized the Department's objections to the Provost's proposal. Unfortunately, neither the Dean, Associate Dean, nor other representative of the COS Dean's office was available to meet with the FSCRC.

Faculty Senate Curricular Review Committee Analysis and Recommendation:

Charge 2: The Provost's review process followed the Faculty Senate principles and section 3.5.4b of the UNR Bylaws.

Charge 3: The Department objected to the Provost's proposal but suggested no alternative. We received the results of voting on the Provost's proposal by the College of Science on Thursday, 15 April, 6 days after the deadline. Forty-six percent of eligible faculty in COS voted; with 63 votes in opposition to the proposal and 17 in favor. On 15 April, Dean Jeff Thompson proposed an alternative that would ostensibly save 85% of the money estimated to be saved by the Provost's proposal. This plan involved closing the undergraduate and graduate degree options in statistics but retaining one of the three tenured faculty members in statistics to teach two upper-division classes required for several majors at UNR. This alternative was rejected by the College Curricular Review Committee by a vote of 7 to 1 and by a vote of the College faculty (40 opposed, 20 in favor, 35% of eligible faculty voting).

Charge 4: The Department did not successfully rebut the premise that Statistics is a separable unit within Mathematics and Statistics, subject to potential termination through curricular review. The Department did make a convincing case that the Provost's analysis of enrollments and graduates in the statistics option were incorrectly interpreted. The Department made a valid point that statisticians in their Department should be involved in reviewing and streamlining introductory offerings in statistics, although it's arguable whether they should lead this effort. Certainly faculty in other departments whose students need statistics should play an important role in this process as well.

Charge 5: No substantive changes or alternatives were suggested.

Charge 6: The Provost's analysis focused primarily on undergraduate instruction, in particular in beginning statistics. We believe that this analysis gives insufficient attention to the fundamental contribution made by mathematical statisticians to the research enterprise at UNR. The research focus of this group of three faculty members in Mathematics and Statistics is of great importance to research in geology, hydrology, and especially global climate change. While more diversity of interests and expertise might be desirable, we can't gainsay the contributions that these researchers make to a variety of research projects in the physical sciences.

Although there is apparently no viable alternative proposal from COS at this time, we recommend rejection of the Provost's proposal to close the statistics program in the Department of Mathematics and Statistics. The Department teaches an enormous number of students, statistics is one of the most sought-after options among majors, and the three statisticians have high levels of scholarly productivity and external funding in support of their research. UNR has had a fragmented approach to teaching statistics for decades; if this is to change, as it should, statisticians in the Department of Mathematics and Statistics should be central to the effort to rationalize the teaching of statistics. If anything, when economic conditions improve, the statistics program should be targeted for growth and diversification.

It is difficult to make this recommendation without knowing what alternative options are available if the Provost's initial proposal is not implemented. Once these options are known, the FSCRC might wish to reconsider this proposal.

IMPACT of FSCRC's Recommendation

Department/Program	Faculty	Staff	Budget Savings
Mathematics and Statistics	0	0	0

Closure of the Division of Nutrition in the School of Medicine

(Proposal # 10)

Provost's Rationale:

The Division of Nutrition, also referred to as the Center for Nutrition and Metabolism, is a small and somewhat isolated unit within the School of Medicine that is claimed to duplicate offerings of the Department of Nutrition in the College of Agriculture, Biotechnology and National Resources. Cost effectiveness is cited as a factor because of the required infrastructure. Closure of the program would eliminate one tenured faculty position and save \$248,214 per year in state funds.

Division Response:

The Division counters that it has an applied medical/clinical focus that is distinct from that of the CABNR Department of Nutrition, and that its nutrition program is interdisciplinary. The Division plays a central role in the education of undergraduate and graduate medical students, preparing them for the required nutrition portion of national examinations on which UNSOM students score above the national average. The Division team is inter-disciplinary, has promoted self-learning and developed self-directed Web-based modules for the required first-year graduate class. Despite its small size, the Division has a national reputation and is recognized by professional peers for leadership and innovation in the field. Its research/clinical focus on obesity and diabetes is nationally recognized and the two efforts are synergistic. The record of scholarly output has been consistently solid. The state funding received is highly leveraged in that the Division has on average attracted several times that amount in external grant support during the past five years. The clinic was self-supporting during three of the last four years but is currently operating at a loss. External research support has declined recently, although proposals are currently under review.

College Response:

The response of the Division of Nutrition was presented to the UNSOM Budget Committee, which served as its Curricular Review Committee. A proposal was presented by a senior faculty member of the Division of Nutrition to reduce state salary support from 1.0 to 0.8 FTE. The UNSOM committee did not consider this to be a sufficiently substantive reduction in expenditures. The Division's research contribution and current grant funding (\$412,000) were considered to be relatively low by UNSOM standards, as was the educational impact of program closure. The UNSOM committee agreed unanimously with the proposal for closure and a subsequent vote of the UNSOM faculty resulted in 63 in favor and 54 opposed.

Faculty Senate Curricular Review Committee Analysis and Recommendation:

Charge 1: The proposal, responses and information provided in face-to-face meetings of the committee with the Provost, department chair, UNSOM senators and a senior faculty member were reviewed within the context of Faculty Senate principles for dealing with budget reductions.

Charge 2: The evidence presented and made available to the committee concerning the process indicates that relevant Faculty Senate principles and UNR Bylaws were followed. The summary of the process and proceedings provided by UNSOM was particularly informative and helpful. Concern was

expressed about the extremely short time period that was allotted to the curricular review process and the negative impact on its quality and effectiveness.

Charge 3: Based on its medical and clinical focus, the Division of Nutrition contested the assertion that it duplicates the offerings of the Department of Nutrition in CABNR. It asserted that state funding has been leveraged significantly by grants received during the last five years and that its strong national reputation is especially noteworthy, given its small size.

Charge 4: The information and documentation presented in the response of the Division of Nutrition highlighted instructional, clinical and scholarly accomplishments. Innovation in web-based and self-guided instruction was also noted. Numerous strong external letters of support provided evidence for the high regard in which the Division is held by professional peers at major institutions.

Charge 5: A senior faculty member offered to take a salary reduction from 1.0 FTE to 0.8 FTE, which was not considered to be sufficiently substantive by the UNSOM Budget Committee.

Charge 6: The Division of Nutrition provides instruction and research opportunities to UNSOM, and well as patient care in its clinical practice. It is a high-quality program that has achieved national recognition in research on diabetes and obesity. Its clinical practice is well regarded and subscribed, although is not currently self supporting. The Division has attracted substantial research funding in the past, but that level has fallen recently. It has evolved as a distinct and largely separate unit with UNSOM with a substantial infrastructure that is not considered to be sufficiently cost effective to be sustainable in the current budget scenario. A curricular revision is already under way in UNSOM and a claim was made that the impact of closure of the Division on required nutrition courses would be manageable. While patient services could likely be maintained within UNSOM, the loss of clinicians might be an unintended negative consequence. Closure of the Division of Nutrition would result in a significant loss to the University of prestige, research capability, instruction and clinical practice. The timing may be optimal to explore opportunities for synergy and to encourage collaboration among nutritionists in UNSOM and the CABNR Department of Nutrition. A more cost-efficient organizational structure may be possible that could add breadth, strength and sustainability to the University’s capabilities related to nutrition. The judgment of this committee is that the stated principles and criteria for curricular review were followed and substantiated, and the process observed the appropriate provisions of the NSHE Code and UNR Bylaws. The committee most reluctantly endorses the proposal of the Provost.

IMPACT of FSCRC’s Recommendation

Department/Program	Faculty	Staff	Budget Savings
Division of Nutrition	1 Tenured		\$248,214