

## **Senate Budget Review Committee Summary**

The Senate Budget Review Committee was charged with reviewing three proposals during the calendar year of 2005-2006.

The first proposal was the preliminary review of the School of Nursing Doctoral in Nursing Practice which the committee had several questions pertaining to the proforma attached to this proposal. It was later discovered that this proposal had skipped several procedural steps, the most important being it was never reviewed by the Provost's office. Sheryl L. Klemanski, Assistant Vice President, Academic Affairs discussed this issue with the SBRC subsequently the proposal was forwarded to the Provost for review. After a thorough review and the SBRC concerns were clarified the proposal was passed on to the next level of governance approval. Comments by the SBRC are attached to this report.

The second proposal was the A Doctor of Philosophy in Music Education which already had been submitted through the correct university protocol. There were some assumptions made in the budget which need to be adjusted to reflect assumptions made in the proforma. Another concern was that this program is a collaborative one with the School of Education and Human Services, therefore the proforma cannot double count enrollment and revenue. Again, after a thorough review and the SBRC concerns were clarified the proposal was passed on to the next level of governance approval. Comments by the SBRC are attached to this report.

The last proposal reviewed was a new undergraduate program called Operations Management in the School of Business Administration. There was a reference to a course fee revenue but the university eliminated all mandatory fees to include the course fee effective Winter semester 2006. The proposal did not include the standard recap of revenues and expenses formatted in the agreed upon proforma template. This was later rectified through communications between Sheryl L. Klemanski an Assistant Dean Marcia Lichty, Ph.D. for the School of Business. Lastly, the committee wondered if there is a demand for such a program.

Recommendation by the Senate Budget Review Committee would be to place Sheryl L. Klemanski, Assistant Vice President, Academic Affairs as a standing member of the SBRC.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard J. Rozek, Chair

**SENATE BUDGET REVIEW COMMITTEE  
PRELIMINARY REVIEW OF THE SCHOOL OF NURSING  
DOCTORAL IN NURSING PRACTICE**

1. I've read the proposal and it looks good to me -- the \$3000+ loss in the first year should be made up in subsequent years but, I share your concern about the lack of entry over administration costs. Perhaps, Linda Thompson is going to assume that role in the first year?
2. In any event, given that the program can be started with minimal up-front costs makes the risk of the program small even if there is insufficient demand. In the latter case, it might be explicitly stated that the program appears to be able to be run on just inload and overload teaching by existing faculty (a decision on the 1 additional faculty line eventually needed can be made in a couple of years it seems). Are there faculty willing to do the necessary overload work? The \$11,200 expense in the budget (without a category) in years 3-5 are, I assume, for the 400 hours for a PT independent contractor? Are there no other administrative expenses? Perhaps, the program can be administered fully through the existing graduate nursing masters program administration. The actual expected excess of revenues over costs from the program appear to be sufficient to even possibly pay for the additional library resources that are suggested by the library. If not, the program does appear to be feasible without the additional resources?
3. Where is the imperial data stating that the nursing program can attract those students in the preceding years? Have they performed a market search with justification?
4. There is a strong on-line component with significant part-time faculty usage. There is also a concern about the student/faculty ratio. There is no mention of Graduate Assistants and no money allowed so who will run and support this program? In-load and out-load faculty lines need to be explained in more detail.
5. The library is asking for \$25,000 and the School of Nursing is only allowing \$5,000, Why?
6. There is no prevision for equipment, doesn't the SON need to train the DNP students with equipment? Someone mentioned will there be hand signals for the first year and nothing after the second year.
7. The Tuition Rate Per Credit Hour needs to be redone after Student Congress passed rolling in fees with tuition.
8. No mention of who will run this program or who will coordinate it?

9. DNP mentions a thesis so who will instruct clinical research and who will supervise with no money allotted for this?
10. A question came up pertaining to students. Are 45 students expected to enroll each year? The table predicts twenty-five new students every year but no ratio on how many graduates versus how many coming into the program? Is enrollment incremental? How many are coming from the Master's program because on page 8 it states research credits are 8 for a small project therefore only two years going full-time or three years part-time for a Doctorate in Nursing Practice, just does not seem like enough time for a DNP.
11. Under faculty salary, is this for full-time or part-time and if full-time who will come for only \$35,000 without provision for benefits?

Were students enrolled this Fall, 05 or starting Winter, 06? What is their plan for implementation? There is no provision in the budget for launching the DNP in the fall or winter semester. \$46,000 will be needed to launch this program and budget doesn't have the money. There is some money for web-based or on-line courses but nothing is mentioned in the budget about this incentive money.

## **Budget Review A Doctor of Philosophy in Music Education**

The Senate Budget Review Committee had several questions pertaining to the College of Arts and Sciences, Department of Music, Theatre and Dance Ph.D. in Music Education Budget Proforma.

1. The music doctorate looks like an interesting program, but revenue seems to be coming solely from tuition, therefore what if projections on enrollment are not met?
2. There were many concerns over the graduate assistants:
  - a. Given the shortage of money, it might have a better chance if one or both of the graduate assistantships were eliminated, even if that means only 8-10 students in the program rather than 10-12.
  - b. Concerns were raised over only two graduate assistants taking over many of the responsibilities normally delegated to faculty. What quality control mechanisms will be implemented with no new faculty added to the program. Will this new Ph.D degree be run by graduate students?
  - c. It was suggested that the budget be written in 3 ways: with 0, 1, and 2 assistantships. Then the university can determine whether it has the funds for the assistantships. The savings in part-time teaching salaries with graduate assistant(s) should be incorporated into each budget. Also, only the incremental revenue should be

included (I think that would reflect only 2-6 students, given there are already 6 in the program).

3. This will be the first Ph.D. program at OU that does not need additional Ph.D. faculty. There is no indication who will run the program, no director, no administration, no responsibilities. Is there really no additional cost associated with the music faculty working with the doctoral students? No teaching course load reduction or reduced service? Why isn't there a need for an additional faculty member in a doctoral program even after 10 years of operation. This will send a message that the current faculty are under utilized. What if new faculty position is needed in the future. The proposal should rely on the premise that as the program increases, new faculty will be needed therefore fight for the position later on. No recognition or indication of time involved in mentoring of these students with the current faculty so would be working with Ph.D. candidates.

4. It is also stated that this program will replace the current Educational Leadership which was partly financed by the School of Education with shared resources; therefore new faculty would be needed to replace loss due to switching programs.

5. There are little if any operating expenses operating expenses, no travel for Ph.D. students and nothing for administration. Service and supplies are \$5,000 which is by all standards at this university quite high. Would advertising come from S&S if so the department should state this in the proforma.