

**THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO**  
**Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of March 11, 2014**  
**FACULTY SENATE**

<http://www.utoledo.edu/facsenate>

Approved @ FS meeting on 4/22/2014

---

**Summary of Senate Business**

Undergraduate Curriculum, Academic Programs, Core Curriculum, and Resolutions

---

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

**President Rouillard:** I call this meeting to order. Welcome to the twelfth Faculty Senate meeting of **Lucy Duhon**, Executive Secretary, called the roll.

**I. Roll Call: 2013-2014 Senators:**

**Present:** Black, Caruso, Chiarelott, Cochrane, Dowd, Denyer, Duhon, Edinger, Elmer, Farrell, Gilbert, Giovannucci, Gunning, Hamer, Hewitt, Hoblet, Humphrys, Keith, Kennedy, Kistner, Kranz, LeBlanc, Lee, Lingan, Molitor, Monsos, Moore, Nigem, Ohlinger, Plenefisch, Porter, Quinlan, Randolph, Regimbal, Relue, Rouillard, Sheldon, Skeel, Springman, Srinivasan, Teclehaimanot, Thompson, Thompson-Casado Van Hoy, Weck-Schwarz, Wedding, White, Williams,

**Excused absences:** Anderson, Bailey, Brickman, Cappelletty, Cooper, Crist, Duggan, Ellis, Gohara, Lundquist, Moynihan, Templin,

**Unexcused absences:** Federman, Frantz, Hasaan-Elnaby, White, Willey

**III. Approval of Minutes:** Minutes are not ready for approval.

Academic Year 2013-2014. I ask that Executive Secretary, Lucy Duhon come to the podium to call the roll.

**President Rouillard:** Welcome back from spring break and to good news on our campus. As I pointed out today in my report to the BOT Academic Affairs committee [appended to the end of these minutes], our students and faculty continue to give us reasons to be proud of our institution. I cite in particular the recognition of our Engineers without Borders chapter for its work in Los Sanchez, Honduras. Our Graduate Student Association is preparing for what promises to be another very successful annual Midwest Research Symposium. The 2014 Shapiro Essay Revision Contest had its largest number of participants: 172 students this year, representing a wide array of majors, shows that good writing is valued on this campus. The 2014 UT Juried Students Exhibition at the Center for the Visual Arts highlights the creativity nurtured at this institution. Our student Drew O'Donnel was recently honored with a Jefferson award for his work with Food for Thought, an organization that provides meals for those in need. Another of our students Yelena Zhernovskiy was also recognized with a Jefferson Award for her outstanding and generous community service. So when I read the troubling reports about UT in the Blade, I counter the negative with the positive outcomes of our faculty, staff and students.

And our administration with its questionable initiatives and investments continues to damage the reputation of The University of Toledo. A Feb. 28 article in The Blade reports again on the questionable outcomes of UTIE and its investments, including investments in Xunlight. The article also raises the question of conflict of interest regarding Mr. McCreary's position at UT as executive director of OWS, his position on the Ohio Third Frontier and his position on the UTIE board of directors.

We have repeatedly invited Mr. Bill McCreary to present to FS on initiatives related to OWS and the simulation center on main campus, but there appear to be regular conflicts to his scheduled presentations.

A March 7 Blade article reports that when contacted by the Lucas County Common Pleas Court regarding Mr. Stansley's employment, UT inaccurately reported that he was never employed here. The Blade also reported that Mr. Bill Fall, former chair of BOT has been chosen to replace Mr. Stansley, another former BOT chair, as UTIE chairman, pending Board approval.

We also now know that there have been 2 special BOT meetings recently: at the first meeting, two members of the Ohio Attorney General's office were present during an executive session. President Jacobs was not present at either meeting.

To return to positive things happening at UT, I also note that at this morning's Academic Affairs Committee meeting, Dr. Doug Leaman, chair of biology, gave a wonderful presentation on active learning in STEMM disciplines. He demonstrated what faculty generally do on a regular basis: constantly assess, modify and improve our course content and methodology.

Indeed, at our last FS meeting, we approved numerous new courses and course modifications and we have more today. We want to make sure that senators know that while these are done through a consent agenda, anyone can request that a course be removed from the consent agenda to be considered separately. Please keep that in mind for the discussions scheduled later in this meeting on undergraduate curriculum and academic programs

That is the Executive Report, unless you have questions or comments you would like to add. Of course, I neglected to address the issue of approval of Minutes, but I believe we are going to be approving two sets of minutes at our next meeting. So, I would like to move now to a series of reports. The first report is from Past-President Dowd, an update on Finance and Strategy meeting.

**Past-President Dowd:** Thank you, President Rouillard. This will be a fairly brief report on what is called "carry forwards" for your department's and college's financial accounts. Although this will be a brief report I believe it contains an important message to take back to department chairs.

To provide some context, I will provide some recent history on this issue. If memory serves, sometime in 2007 or 2008 then Chief Financial Officer Scarborough decided that departments and colleges were no longer permitted to "carry forward" funds to the next fiscal year that were unspent at the end of a fiscal year. At that time CFO Scarborough told department chair and college deans that it was wrong to carry forward such funds. He "justified" his decision in a couple of ways. First, he argued, departments and college just amassing a huge amount of funds without any plans for what they may want to spent those funds on. Yet he certainly did not consult with department chairs as to whether they were saving money for some purchase. Further, CFO Scarborough stated that it was dangerous to the university's financial

stability if, all of the sudden, every department and college decide to spend their own money. Instead, he stated that the central administration would make use of those department and college funds.

The impact was that carry forwards in designated accounts would no longer be permitted. CFO Scarborough claimed that money would be placed in a “Saving Account” and made available to departments and colleges by submitting a “B-A-R” – that is a “Budget Amendment Request.” But, as any department chair will tell you, exceedingly few “B-A-Rs” were ever approved. By all appearances were those department and college funds were lost forever to the central administration.

Besides departments and colleges losing most or all of the funds they have saved over the years, the other damnable effect this policy has had has been to all but eliminate any financial planning by departments and colleges. And, of course, the other result of CFO Scarborough’s policy has been to produce a rush at the end of the fiscal year to spend down your accounts to \$0.00. The choice forced upon chairs and deans was to either “spend it or lose it.”

Today, there is a new financial Sheriff in town. In early Fall 2013, David Morlock was hired as the university’s new Chief Financial Officer. If Senators recall, in either late fall semester, CFO Morlock gave a presentation to Faculty Senate. At that meeting he announced a few proposals that he said he would work on implementing. One proposed flipping the return formula for indirect costs on external grants. Another proposal was to again permit departments and colleges to carry forward unspent monies in designated accounts. So far, CFO Morlock has been good to his word. During the past few Finance and Strategy Committee meetings, we have begun to address this issue in greater and greater detail. Now, all appearances are that we will be able to carry forward unspent funds in designated accounts this year.

With regard to carrying forward unspent funds in designated accounts, I ask each Senator to relay this information back to their program director or department chair. For the first time in many years, they will be provided the opportunity to plan ahead. That is, they may not face the choice of “spend it or lose it.” While there may actually be financial planning this year, there are some issues to note. First, not all accounts will carry forward – but funds in most designated accounts will carry forward. The Finance and Strategy Committee will be meeting to determine which accounts will carry forward.

This issue is complicated – but it is complicated in a good way. This is because CFO Morlock is not just permitting carry forwards for this fiscal year, he is trying to restore to departments and colleges all of the funds that have been swept since CFO Scarborough’s policy was first put into place.

As a department chair, I think there should be much rejoicing over CFO Morlock’s new policy – because the amount of funds being discussed is somewhere around \$20 million. Again, I ask that you take this information back to your department chairs. Are there any questions?

**Senator Anderson:** Okay, how does this impact the latest projections of the \$30 million deficit that was already spent?

**Past-President Dowd:** That is an excellent question, former Senate President Anderson. Your issue was part of the discussion at the Finance and Strategy Committee meeting. If I recall correctly, CFO Morlock

has already covered the deficit. The final word will come from the Office of Finance. At this time I do not have a confirmation on that. But as soon as I do get that confirmation I will report back to Senate.

**Senator Relue:** Has there been any discussion about individual faculty overhead return accounts from research grants?

**Past-President Dowd:** That was also discussed during the committee meeting. At this time it appears that funds in this year's overhead accounts will carry forward and funds from previous years will be restored. However, as I mentioned earlier, this issue needs to be finalized and I believe the Finance and Strategy committee will be acting on this soon. Do you remember any other aspects of this issue, President Rouillard?

**President Rouillard:** No.

**Past-President Dowd:** CFO Morlock appears to want to move quickly on this issue. I apologize for not having all of the details and answers at this time, but I wanted to report to Senate what is currently being discussed. I ask Senators to let me know of the issues relevant to them and I will bring those issues to the Finance and Strategy Committee.

**Senator LeBlanc:** The overhead accounts were the primary carry-forward that was lost.

**Past-President Dowd:** Well, in my opinion, overhead and release-time accounts are among the most important accounts that need to be restored.

**Dr. Peseckis:** Is there any chance that because this is something people wouldn't know what accounts there are? Once you designate an account can money from other accounts be transferred to it by the end of the year?

**Past-President Dowd:** Those are most excellent and most relevant questions. Unfortunately, Dr. Peseckis, I don't have definitive answers at this time. As to which accounts this may impact, it will be designated accounts determined by either the Finance and Strategy Committee or the Office of Finance. The relevant account numbers will be known to department chairs and college budget officers. Is the second issue whether funds can transferred from one account to another in order carry forward such funds? I truly wish that would be permitted, but I doubt it will be. We will see. Are there any other questions? Thank you.

**President Rouillard:** Thank you, Past-President Dowd. I would like to invite Senator Hoblet to give us a brief update of Clinical Affairs, BOT meeting this morning. I don't know if you also have some notes regarding the last All Day Leadership meeting; I don't know if we talked about that the last time.

**Senator Hoblet:** We didn't discuss it.

**President Rouillard:** Okay.

**Senator Hoblet:** Clinical Affairs was held this morning on the Health Science Campus at the Radisson Faculty Club. It was most interesting. First, we had an update by Interim Dean McGinnis on the Family Medicine and Geriatric fellowship -- about them both being in good order and there were no real questions and concerns about that. And then Mr. Morlock gave an update on a new sort of broad view of

The University of Toledo Medical Center. It was very interesting and very different in tone than previous reports given by Dr. Jeffrey Gold. He, Mr. Morlock, used different data and different indicators for comparison for The University of Toledo Medical Center. He used Front-Path which is a collaborative of businesses in this area and they are rating and ranking of The University of Toledo Medical Center in comparison with Toledo Hospital or Pro Medica facilities and St. Vincent Mercy Medical Center. In comparison with those they were not faring well. Basically, he gave this broad brushstroke of UTMC in comparison with Toledo Hospital Pro Medica health system, Mercy St. Vincent Medical Center, and then he looked at all university health centers that collaborative that we're in. And what he wanted to do is look at the programming that we have. We have pockets of excellence at UTMC, but we still have very poor ratings and rankings as far as patient-centered care which was a big concern and a real shock to some of the Board members who had heard previous reports on how well The University of Toledo Medical Center has been faring. In fact, Mary Freeman and Joe Zerbey both said this is such the intensiveness of what we heard in the past, how can you explain this huge gap in perception? Basically, Mr. Morlock said, a lot of the indicators were process indicators that were reported on in the past and we're looking at more outcome data. So those are two very different things, however when you are looking at competition in a market, if you were a business and you look at, do we go with an insurance company or a third-party payer for our healthcare benefits that provide services at Pro Medica Health System, St. Vincent Medical Center, or University of Toledo Medical Center and you look at outcomes as far as safety, mortality, those types of outcomes -- you're going to want to go with the best provider. We didn't rank so well in some of those outcomes. We did okay on mortality; we were ahead of the group. But the University Health Center as far as their quality and accountability performance score-card we need to focus on some of these indicators. Patient-centeredness was 32.8%. The highest performer was 81.3% and the median was 57.8%, so we are talking about 20 percentage points which is significant when you're talking about patient-centeredness. We spent a quite a bit of money on patient-centered initiatives and being patient-focused. Safety was a huge concern to me as a nurse, and that's at 50%. The top performers were only at 75%. As you know, safety in healthcare has been an issue in this country. It was brought to everyone's attention in 1999 when the Institute of Medicine reported "to err is human." Businesses woke up and said, "We're paying all this money for healthcare when we have put employees into these hospitals and over 100,000 patients are dying because of errors per year." So these indicators are of concern. He also looked at our region and smaller regional hospitals who do referrals to The University of Toledo. He looked at Fulton County and Wood County as being too big referrers. And Bellvue is another one. We get at least 300 referrals from Bellvue and Fulton County and they're looking for partners. Henry County is currently looking for partnerships right now. But he said the problem with that is, we have the same problems that they are looking for a partner to share. And that's what he's saying is IT infrastructure is one of those things in healthcare that is so desperately needed and good I.T. systems. All of you doctors, Dr. Elmer -- and some of you career ones as I look around the room -- they know that our documentation systems within the out-patient and in-patient setting has something to be desired. So, I found it so interesting and I think that the Board of Trustees found it very interesting and I think everybody needs to know this. We have a vested interest in these ratings and I think we're going to ask Mr. Morlock to come and present this information to Faculty Senate as well. Thank you.

**President Rouillard:** Thank you, Senator Hoblet. And yes indeed we will ask him to come give that same presentation here; it is very sobering information. Next, I would like to ask Senator Humphrys to

come up and give us a report on the BOT meetings and then an update on curriculum tracking which we weren't able to do at the last meeting.

**Senator Humphrys:** The Board of Trustees meeting summary from February 10<sup>th</sup> that was on a previous agenda as well, but we weren't able to fit it in. It was reported that the animal lab and accrediting body gave UT a positive review. The Board of Trustees members were asked by President Jacobs to think about a main campus smoking ban that will be proposed at a future BOT meeting. The VP of Research, Dr. William Messer, announced a goal to bring UT into the top 150 of the NSF total research expenditures institutions. UT is currently 174 on that list and in Ohio it ranks behind OSU, Dayton, Case Western, and the University of Cincinnati. There were 27 sabbatical applications and 12 were approved. This is a 44% approval rate. During Fall 2013, UT had 12 visits from accrediting bodies—all but one resulted in positive reviews. The PhD program in clinical psychology received a “show cause” letter. The Board of Trustees was told that the administration is addressing the issues with this program. The following searches are underway:

- VP of Institutional Advancement—July starting date
- Dean of the Medical College—July starting date
- Associate VP of Human Resources and Talent Development—late spring/early summer starting date
- Associate VP of Finance—April starting date

The University's budget process will be done by mid-March and ready for BOT approval in June. UTMC will be taking over St. Luke's Family Medicine Residency program with UT systematically absorbing the costs of the program. Update on the Honors Academic Village—plan is for the company American Campus Communities to break ground this spring on the new facility in the location of the former Dowd, Nash, and White halls with the new housing facility to open in August 2015. This facility will feature suit-type rooms. The new facility and the development of Scott and Tucker halls into dorms will result in 492 new on-campus beds. Once Carter is taken off-line, the number of on-campus beds will be approximately the same as it currently is. At this time, there is an 81% occupancy rate in the dorms. Are there any questions on that summary?

**Senator Thompson-Casado:** Senator Humphrys, do you know where the students in the new dorms will be parking?

**Senator Humphrys:** No, I don't.

**Senator Thompson-Casado:** Because as faculty on that side of campus we've lost a whole row of parking spaces to the coaches and it's really difficult if you get here after 8:30 a.m. to find a spot to park, and with those students with the added volume I'm interested to know where they will be parking.

**Senator Humphrys:** That's a good question. I don't believe parking was discussed at all.

**Past-President Dowd:** Senator Humphrys, you spoke about the VP of Talent. Would you clarify what that position is?

**Senator Humphrys:** VP of Human Resources and Talent Development.

**Past-President Dowd:** Thank you. Do you know if that's a new position?

**President Rouillard:** I asked about that and if I recall the answer correctly, that position used to exist when Bill Logie was here and then it wasn't filled. So it's an old position that was empty and is now going to be filled.

**Past-President Dowd:** That is why I asked Senator Humphrys about this position. If I remember correctly, the funding for that position was sacrificed via budget cuts back when VP Logie was here. So it appears the administration is creating a new position. Is that correct?

**President Rouillard:** If one looks at it that way.

**Past-President Dowd:** I choose to view it that way.

**Senator Regimbal:** Was there any mention of the cost to live in these new facilities or these new renovated facilities?

**Senator Humphrys:** There was mention of it, but it was very vague. I think it was pretty uncertain. The only general information we were given was that it would be approximately the same as a little more in the ballpark of the current dorm rooms.

**Provost Scarborough:** A couple of things about the facilities. It's not just suite styles. So it's an aggressive floor-plan. It begins with facilities for freshmen that are more dorm-like and then it progresses, such as the student advances into more suite-like options. It has a variety of floor plans and because there are a variety of floor plans throughout the facility, the price structure also varies according to the different living situations. They've done a market study in terms of what we charge for our housing and what the area charges for some of the more department style housing that would be in that facility. Just to remind everyone, we're essentially leasing the property to an outside developer, who is coming in with their capital, who will operate on the policies that we dictate, but it is an outside entity that will be operating the facility. We are not taxing or will be responsible for the bottom-line; they would be responsible for the bottom-line of the facility. It would be marketed as a university affiliated housing option. It would be incorporated into that renovated McKinnon, Scott, and Tucker and then the replacement for Dowd to constitute the academic honors village. The academic house which is historically housing Honor students will be taken offline and renovated in the Fall. So given that, we are also now looking to create a temporary honors floor in Carter for a year until this new facility will be built. When we opened up the website for fall, all of the units for McKinnon and all the units for Scott and Tucker were reserved within 24 hrs. We had parents calling in tears because they couldn't get "little-Johnny" into one of the two facilities. Hopefully, that gives you kind of an overview of what the vision to that is. We are optimistic, Honors College members should be higher this fall significantly, but really the big gain will be in fall 2015 and you'll see a steady growth of progression. When we open this new facility, our goal is to have McKinnon, Tucker, and the replacement of Dowd filled with honor students in the Fall of 2015.

**Senator Regimbal:** I was told that the price is going to be close to \$1,000 per month which sounds steep for students since they can choose to go to apartment-style living for far less than that.

**Provost Scarborough:** There's a range of prices and I will see if I can get my hands on it and get it over to you.

**Senator Hamer:** If UT's housing was operating at 81% occupancy I'm wondering why we haven't considered turning that 19% over into Honors housing? That's a question that just came up with your answer.

The more important question, I recall when this was proposed last Fall or last Spring, Faculty Senate raised the question, why would we be consulting with an outside provider for this housing because clearly if an outside provider is interested in providing it they are seeing it as a chance to make a profit. It seems like we would want to keep the housing as an in-house operation particularly if we are not being able to rent all of our housing. So, I am not an economics person at all and I can barely keep my check-book balanced, but it seems pretty clear to me that we're sending our money to some private enterprise "God knows where," I haven't heard what state they're in, and we're paying them and we're sending how many thousands or hundreds of dollars per month per student clear out of UT and at the same time we're going to be going with...housing and we're in a financial crisis and particularly/supposedly everything is being done to make us economically viable, I don't get it.

**Provost Scarborough:** Let me answer a couple of those questions. Number one, we're working with an outside provider, but the way the deal is structured is that all the excess net cash flow flows back to the university through our rental agreement. So the outside developer is really simply bringing the marketing expertise and infrastructure expertise. In the end, all of the net income flows back to the institution. Also, in the end of the lease term, the building itself reverts back to the institution so we own the building at the end of the sub. This is more of a financing arrangement so that we don't have to tax the university's limited capital debt capacity to essentially build a new facility. I think in the end what you'll see is we're not sending our money out, but we're utilizing a financing facility and in the end I think it is a really good option. The first question is perhaps the most important question, why would a 81% occupancy be looking to build a new dorm? Well, one thing you have to remember is we tore down Dowd...and the plan is to tear down Carter East and West, but what we're really doing is trading newer, more marketable, more attractive, more appealing housing for old unattractive housing which is putting us at a disadvantage. Especially, after Bowling Green went through their campus housing that they did within the last several years, it put us in an uncompetitive position. So more than anything else we're trading out the old run-down facilities for new, to help us with recruiting. And in the end if you count the number of beds that we're demolishing, you also have to remember that we're taking McKinnon which was double occupancy and we converted it to single occupancy, so that was another way we're backing off our inventory. When we're all done, even though vetted these 492 beds we will have still reduced our capacity in housing, but we will have traded our old for new.

**Senator Hamer:** Can I ask about the net cash flow number?

**Provost Scarborough:** Yes.

**Senator Hamer:** I believe that is after we are paying the developer to provide this housing. So I'm still not clear how it can be financially beneficial to us or to Toledo or the state of Ohio to be paying a developer to do this. And I guess the other question would be, where is this developer located? Where is their home office?

**Provost Scarborough:** Their home office is in Austin, Texas.

**Senator Hamer:** Okay, how did we find them?

**Provost Scarborough:** The foundation went through a search process and selected the firm.

**Senator Hamer:** I would like to request (I think that our leadership will have to make this request or maybe I can) that we have a complete financial disclosure of exactly who's getting paid what for this and exactly how much money is coming back to UT and before we get to that net cash-flow how much money are these people getting. I'd also like to know how is this going to benefit us locally to have somebody out of Austin because I know when I was looking at foundations to fund my research they've got to have their home office here or they weren't interested in me. So I don't understand why we would be building this lovely relationship with someone in Austin?

**Provost Scarborough:** I would suggest to you that you invite Matt Schroder at the foundation who led the search process to give you not only an overview of the search process and everyone who participated and the background of the firm that was selected, but also an overview of the upfront financial relationship and then the ongoing financial relationship. I think when you hear all that you will be very satisfied.

**Senator Hamer:** Thank you.

**President Rouillard:** We can certainly work at setting that up.

**Senator Relue:** I have a two-part question. With the level of occupancy, are there particular dorms that are lower occupancy than others or is that kind of an average across the board? And the second part to that is, are there any facilities on campus other than the Radisson for short-term residency for visiting scholars where people can come in the night before and stay overnight on campus and maybe leave the next day where they may be charged a minimal daily rent without having to go to a hotel, but be on campus and enjoy that campus environment? When I did a sabbatical at NGIT, when I went to look for a place to live I was there about a week before and I stayed on campus in one of the dorms. It was very convenient for what I was doing for the time and I don't know if we have that opportunity here, do we?

**Senator Humphrys:** I'm not aware of that opportunity. I don't know if anybody else is?

**President Rouillard:** No.

**Senator Humphrys:** As far as the dorms, I'm not sure. The only occupancy rate that they gave us at the meeting was the general 81% occupancy rate of the dorms. They didn't break it down to specific rates for each dorm.

**Senator Hoblet:** I know that during the summer that that's available, but I'm not sure if it's available all year round. When I took some summer courses as a cohort in higher education here, many people came from different parts of Michigan to take a week-long course and they were able to stay in some of the dorms for a very minimum flat fee per day or per week. So I know that was available during the summer, but I don't know what the occupancy rate is and if it's available all year, but that would be interesting to find out.

**Senator Gilbert:** I just want to make a request on the campus housing for visiting scholars. We have the capacity in the dorm rooms and having them available for visiting scholars would be very helpful.

**Senator Anderson:** I agree. They are available over the summer, but the question then comes, you say 81% or whatever it is -- is that broken down per semester or is that less the occupancy during the highest enrollment per semester, occupancy versus sub-occupancy?

**Senator Hoblet:** Is there one particular person that oversees that in Education?

**President Rouillard:** We can ask.

**Senator Krantz:** The Fall has the highest.

**Senator Anderson:** Then what about the sororities and fraternities -- are they part of that addition?

**Senator Hoblet:** That's a good question; I'm not sure.

**Senator Lee:** I have a question about approval ratio for sabbaticals. I can't quite recall what it was last year, but is that better?

**Past-President Dowd:** Last year only eight sabbatical were approved. This year only 12 were approved.

**Senator Lee:** Eight out of how many?

**Senator Humphrys:** We just had 12 out of 27 which is 44%.

**Senator Lee:** For those of us who don't know the history at UT, is that acceptable or concerning?

**President Rouillard:** It's concerning and it's much lower than it has been historically.

**Past-President Dowd:** I would like to ask the Provost, what Best Practices were followed in choosing which sabbatical proposals would be recommended to the Board of Trustees for approval?

**Provost Scarborough:** President Rouillard saw the presentation that was given to the Board of Trustees. I don't know if you would like to schedule to get that same presentation. It has historical data going back 15 years or something like that. There has been a noticeable fall-off in sabbaticals if you go back 15 years. I think the average at that time was probably in the 40's; then a low point which was last year I believe it was 8; then it picked back up this year which was 12.

**Past-President Dowd:** That's fine, but you only described data. I am asking about the criteria used for determining whether a proposal was acceptable. Was that criteria based on something? Anything academic?

**Vice Provost Barrett:** Well, I'm probably the best person to talk about it because I make recommendations to the provost and he makes them to the president. Basically, with very limited exceptions, in this case, one, I believe, pretty much every sabbatical request that comes to our office has been approved through every level. We had one this year which was disapproved and that one was essentially automatically rejected. To the degree the university doesn't feel it's in a position to fund all of them, which is the instructions I've been given, I have got to look over them and come up with some recommendations to give to Provost Scarborough. The two-years I've done this, because Tom Gutteridge and I did it last year as well, I do an independent review of each proposal to evaluate the strength of the proposal overall. I was asked by the president to consider, in looking at these applications, at the potential

of sabbatical request for impact on the broader world, whether it's the local community or world as a whole, not just its own intrinsic activity. I interpreted that criteria, based on the examples that were given, to mean that they all don't have to be scientific investigations. It could be a poetry book that would be read by numerous people or things of that sort. So I do my own independent ranking of all the sabbaticals requests. I then contact each dean, and sometimes the deans have already kind of hinted at how strong their recommendations are in their letters- there sometimes is a kind of an intrinsic ranking in the way they word their letters. But I contact each dean and ask them how would you rank within your own department or group, and based on kind of combining those two I form an overall ranking. We don't reserve a sabbatical per college, but it's not likely that we are going to give all of them to one college, so there some sense that they should be spread out. We try to take the top proposals across the university with some spread across disciplines. It was suggested at the last University Council meeting, to pretty overwhelming agreement (I feel that is a fair statement), that one way we could approve the process for next year, since UCS doesn't feel like it really adds much to the process since they kind of recommend everybody and then not all sabbaticals are approved, that UCS could do its own independent ranking, which will give us additional guidance across disciplines from multiple people from multiple fields and it would allow them to weigh-in, which I would certainly like. I feel the weight of this is very heavenly on me and would really like that extra input that could then be weighed and put in the mix. So that's an improvement process we're planning on doing next year.

**Past-President Dowd:** I think that's a good idea. But you're describing the operations of your decisions – not the academic criteria that could have guided your decisions. The reason I asked about Best Practices is, for example, this process would be improved if the criteria for successful sabbaticals are established prior to the start of the Fall semester. Knowing the criteria would help faculty understand the process and would also help faculty make the decision as to whether to submit a sabbatical request. As it is now, faculty are being asked to shoot at a moving target in a dark room.

**Vice Provost Barrett:** I would be delighted to have that conversation with the president or the provost to give guidance to the applicants. If the incoming president, Karen Hoblet, could maybe remind me before the sabbatical information is due, since the summer is long and my memory is getting shorter as I'm getting older and busier, I would happily do that. I would also say another thing we put in this year and I plan to continue is on the form itself we ask people to indicate to the degree to which they applied in past years- how many times have they applied since their last sabbatical and been turned down, because I think that's another factor worth considering. If somebody has had a request denied two or three times, I think that's something we ought to weigh against somebody where this is their first time putting one in. I had several meetings with faculty to discuss their applications. I had a meeting with one faculty member who has been turned down I think five or six times. He came with his chair and the chair actually that morning had a meeting with him going over his proposal and she found it to be weak in certain respects as well. He indicated that he basically turned in the same proposal every year because he was told it was fine and it got to the upper level and then he wasn't approved. We're trying to make it more transparent. I want to give you the maximum amount of feedback possible because I want to make as many of these succeed as possible.

**Senator Hewitt:** On that last point, we discussed this at University Council and someone made a comment that it would be useful if there was feedback to the applicants so if they were not selected or

turned down, there would be some articulation why, or perhaps even informative tools for people writing a proposal for a sabbatical.

**Vice Provost Barrett:** I think that's a good idea as well. I will certainly undertake to pass along any additional criteria; it's just a matter of writing that up if there are any. I hope the UCS through its ranking process can give that kind of guidance and feedback. By adding them into the ranking mix I think that's a good role for them to play because their rankings will be (hopefully) weighed very heavily as we develop this process going forward.

**Senator Anderson:** I do think a sabbatical request needs to have value, but financially it's nothing to the university because the department chair has to sign off and say that this person's position will be covered from within the department. So the university really isn't losing anything by sending somebody off to some place. They are gaining something by that person's information that they gather from wherever they are.

**Vice Provost Barrett:** I'm going to pushback on that. Every department chair does sign that statement because it's required in a clause in the collective bargaining agreement so it is signed in a matter of course. But I can tell you as somebody that looks at workload and requests for adjuncts, some departments do absorb that internally and people take on extra loads to cover it, but in some instances we do actually have to find extra people to cover things, so that's not a universal practice. It's kind of a lie that it is frequently signed off on, quite frankly. I've suggested that we no longer have people sign that language for that very reason. I think there is sometimes a cost and it is part of the process or it could be.

**Senator Hewitt:** I assume you are not calling me a liar; I take that very seriously when I sign that.

**Vice Provost Barrett:** And I assume in your department you find a way to absorb it.

**Senator Hewitt:** We do and yet we have.

**Vice Provost Barrett:** My point is that the department should be clear on exactly how the course demands affected by the sabbatical will be met.

**Senator Hewitt:** We had six sabbaticals turned down in the last two years including those that were ranked at the top in our college. We've had people who never had a sabbatical be turned down twice with very strong proposals and they're willing to talk to you about the workload absorbs. But it's quite clear that we would not make any requests with those that were granted. Again, I echo what Senator Anderson said, it doesn't really cost the university; it cost departments in terms of recruiting in the future.

**Past-President Dowd:** My department is a relatively small compared to Mathematics. I mention this because there is a true disparity across departments with regards to covering any such costs involving sabbatical leaves. Compared to smaller departments, larger departments may be more capable of smoothing the loss of one faculty member on sabbatical leave across the department's entire instructional activities. Perhaps a more reasonable approach would be to allow the smoothing to take place at the college level and not at the individual department level.

**Senator Regimbal:** This may be a rhetorical question. It seems that there was a facility planning committee on our campus. So this question is related to the building of residents' halls, was there any discussion about what happens to the space that will be open when you take down Carter East and West?

**Provost Scarborough:** Yes, there is a plan to revisit the campus master plan, but the early discussions are of the idea of moving the competitive baseball field and competitive soccer field off of the Scott Park Campus and back on the Main Campus when Carter East and West is torn down.

**Senator Regimbal:** I would say instead if you're going to move baseball then you should also move softball.

**Provost Scarborough:** Well, baseball/softball all of the competitive soccer fields off of Scott Park into a large enough passive land that could accommodate that when they take Carter East and West down; that's been some of the early, early conversations.

**Senator Humphrys:** Thank you. I'm going to give a brief overview of the curriculum tracking meeting that was held on February 28<sup>th</sup>. It was put together by Marcia King-Blandford and President Rouillard, Dr. Peseckis and I was there.

Basically, changes have been made to the online form that allow for more lines of type being visible upon printing the document. In the past, the biggest hurdle to this online process was that emails weren't sent to the correct people for review. This was due to the curriculum authority list being out-of-date. The Provost's office is in the process of updating the list of people who have curriculum authority at the department and college levels. This will assure that emails for approval will be delivered to the correct individuals and that the form successfully flows through the process. The Provost's office has also developed a schedule to continuously update the curriculum authority list. **Here's how the process will work:**

1. Go to [curriculumtracking.utoledo.edu](http://curriculumtracking.utoledo.edu)
2. Sign in using your MyUT username and password
3. Select the action you want to take (e.g. New Course Proposal, Program Modification)
4. Fill-in the required information and print the form for future reference
5. Submit the form electronically
6. This starts the automated email system that systematically notifies the next approving authority to review and accept the curriculum request
7. Send a copy of the printed form to the Faculty Senate office to alert the Senate that this curriculum issue is coming through
8. Once it reaches the Faculty Senate level for approval, it will be brought before the Senate by the appropriate committee
9. It then reaches the Provost's office who submits it to the Registrar

Because changes to the form can be made at any level up to and including the College dean, it is suggested that the originator of the process frequently check the submitted online form for possible revisions. A suggested future change to the process would be to limit modifications to the form to only the originator. It is important that individuals having approval responsibilities within the department and

college are attentive to the automated emails that are sent asking for review—otherwise, the submission will stall at that level. The new form should be uploaded on the system sometime in April. In the meantime, the current form can be accessed using the same process as previously described. It was suggested that Faculty Senate conduct training sessions for the new form first thing in Fall 2014.

**Senator Anderson:** In an all-perfect world, it is approved, it has linear progression.

**Senator Humphrys:** Right.

**Senator Anderson:** But, Faculty Senate comes along and says I want this changed back to “whatever” and that has not been able to be done because once it’s approved by the “college curriculum” the department can no longer make changes and sign off.

**Senator Humphrys:** You are correct; after it leaves the college level there can be no changes put on the form. Now, in a case like that (in an ideal world) it has to go back to the originator and the person who uploaded it in the first place and to say to them, we really would like to change this or that and they would have to go in it.

**Senator Anderson:** And make corrections?

**Senator Humphrys:** They should be able to do that. If not, Dr. Peseckis was mentioning what he does since he got a copy of the actual printed form – he can go in and Marcia said what is uploaded on the system is what’s given to her on a printed copy (at this point). So that is probably your best bet to make the change on the printed copy. There is an issue still and we talk about the fact that I can be the originator and give it to my dean and my dean can change something major on this form, and unless I keep up with it I won’t see that change. So, until we can get to that point where only the originator can make a change it’s going to really be up to us to really track this to make sure that something drastic doesn’t happen that you don’t agree with.

**Senator Molitor:** Someday it is my goal to have a general education curriculum and when we do finally have that we are going to have to have an approval process. One of the suggestions that I’d like to make is on that form when you check “general education,” that the course comes to the Core Curriculum Committee chairs at the same time it goes to Undergraduate Curriculum or to Academic Programs -- whatever is relevant. Instead of having us wait for this entire approval process to be completed before it goes to the Faculty Senate Core Curriculum for approval, it would be nice if we can do it at the same time.

**Senator Humphrys:** You know Senator Molitor I think it does because your name is the curriculum, one of the co-chairs that the emails are going to go to.

**Senator Molitor:** Okay.

**Senator Humphrys:** So you are actually on the system now.

**Senator Molitor:** I know, but the way it works is that it's sequential; it doesn't come to me until Dr. Peseckis actually signs off.

**Senator Humphrys:** Oh, I see.

**Senator Molitor:** Dr. Peseckis can't sign off until Faculty Senate approves it. It would be nice if it came to us at the same time so that at the same time Undergraduate Curriculum was approving course changes or new courses, Core Curriculum could sign off on this as well.

**President Rouillard:** With a caveat that if Faculty Senate then doesn't sign off, then it would be [cut off].

**Senator Molitor:** Certainly.

**Past-President Dowd:** May I provide an historical perspective on this issue? Up until 8 or 9 years ago, it was permitted for a new course proposal to be submitted concurrently to both the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum and to the Senate Committee on Core Curriculum. But problems arose when the Core Curriculum committee recommend approval of a new course for the Core but the Undergraduate Curriculum committee recommend that the actual course not be approved by the full Senate. I suggest that concurrent review of such proposal by both committees is perfectly fine. However, we should be vigilant about maintaining a sequential approval process. Only after the Undergraduate Curriculum committee and the full Senate approves a new course should its inclusion into the Core be considered.

**Senator Molitor:** I would just request notification at that same time. I have no objections to waiting for UG curriculum to approve before I approve.

**President Rouillard:** Dr. Peseckis is next on the agenda, undergraduate curriculum.

Dr. Peseckis: You all should have received these yesterday. Are there any questions?

**President Rouillard:** I have a couple of questions about the new criminal justice courses. Many of them are indicating that they can be repeated for credit with no limit set.

**Dr. Peseckis:** That was not marked on the form and I need to get feedback from them. I'm sure it can't be unlimited, it's just they didn't fill the block in. I think that is a simple thing to clean up. It doesn't mean it can be taken forever. I think part of that when I read the syllabi for these courses that their enrollment would be electives and they offered them up perhaps with other numbers and so they have "Women in Crime," I don't know how different that course can be year-to-year, but that's one thing can be cleaned up.

**President Rouillard:** Okay. I have one other question about the speech-language pathology course. Oh, no, I'm sorry that's a question for Senator Anderson.

**Past-President Dowd:** For this proposal, are we considering approval, pending verification that there is a limit to the number of times a course could be repeated?

**Dr. Peseckis:** Pending verification for that. It can be repeated if they have good explanations as to why it should be repeated and it should be a limit.

**Past-President Dowd:** Good. There must be some sort of limit.

**Dr. Peseckis:** There has to be some limit. It can't be taken forever. They just didn't check the box because they didn't have enough time to do that.

Another question I had was Kinesiology 2540, I want to point this out- they were asking to change the grading system and I emailed Marcia King-Blandford because I don't see this very often and I couldn't actually remember it and she said, "yes, that is actually what she prefers; if people want to change the grading system we do process it through the Senate." Even though it seems like perhaps a trivial change she would like that on record. It seems like that is sort of the prerogative of the instructor how they want to grade, but this is something she would like processed through Senate. Are there any other questions?

**Senator Thompson-Casado:** Dr. Peseckis, I had a question about the COCA program for BA students in Art.

**Dr. Peseckis:** Well, programs are Dr. Anderson's and it is actually the last set of courses. But there is an intro course for COCA that's approved, but there are no COCA courses on this list. Is there anything else?

**Senator Thompson- Casado:** Okay.

**Past-President Dowd:** Dr. Peseckis, for the Minutes, would you mind clarifying the issue we are considering for the Criminal Justice course?

**Dr. Peseckis:** I will not sign off on these until we have a clear answer from them that there is an absolute limit or else they should be repeated. Would your pleasure be that they not be repeated?

**Past-President Dowd:** No. If a college wants their students to be able to repeat a course, then that's fine. But Senate needs to know how many times that college will permit a student to repeat

**Dr. Peseckis:** Once; we will say once.

**Past-President Dowd:** *[statement was garbled on recording]*

**Dr. Peseckis:** Yes, it just goes back. My expectation is...they can only do it once more. I mean, how many variations of a course can one have on a syllabus?

**Past-President Dowd:** *[statement was garbled on recording]*

**Dr. Peseckis:** Overall, the electives make sense for what they are trying to do.

**Past-President Dowd:** Thank you, Dr. Peseckis. I just want the Minutes to reflect what issue Senators are voting for.

**Dr. Peseckis:** So we are voting that that would be clarified as to how many times they can repeat.

**Past-President Dowd:** And the understanding is students will be permitted to register for the same course one additional time.

**Dr. Peseckis:** With the understanding that it is one more time.

**Past-President Dowd:** And if is not?

**Dr. Peseckis:** If it's not I will bring it back.

**Past-President Dowd:** Thank you. Again, we are not trying to pressure this department on what to decide, we just need clarity on what their decision is.

**Dr. Peseckis:** Sounds good to me. All right, all those in favor of approving these courses say "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? ***Motion Passed.*** Thank you very much. *Senate approved the following courses:*

***New Course and Course Modification Proposals Approved by the Faculty Senate on March 11, 2014***

**Course Modification  
Judith Herb College of Education  
New Course**

***SPSY 3100 Psychological Testing and Assessment* 3 Chr**

*Delivery Mode: Lecture*

*Weekly Contact Hours: 3*

*Offered: Fall, Spring, Every Year*

*Prerequisites: PSY 2100 or MATH 2600, or Permission of Instructor (one of three must apply)*

*Catalog Description: "This course provides an overview of the major topics in the field of psychological testing, such as norms, descriptive statistics, reliability, validity, test development, defining and measuring intelligence, educational assessment, personality assessment, and clinical assessment."*

*Fit: Elective course at the undergraduate level. It is expected this course will be taken by undergraduate*

*psychology students, and some students majoring in education. The course would serve as an elective toward degree completion."*

*Similarity: "After communicating with faculty from the psychology department it appears no course exists that is similar to the proposed course."*

**College of Health Sciences**

**New Course**

***CRIM 2050 Applied Criminology* 3 Chr**

*Delivery Mode: Lecture 3h*

*Offered: Fall, Spring, Summer, Every Year*

*Can course be repeated for credit: No*

*Prerequisites: None; Corequisites: None*

*Catalog Description: "This course examines the theoretical causes of crime in relation to the duties and responsibilities of police and corrections personnel, and the development of criminal justice policies."*

*Fit: This course will serve as a lower-division, required course within the criminal justice baccalaureate degree curriculum, replacing CRIM4300 Theories of Criminal Justice course for students entering in the Fall, 2014 and thereafter. It can also serve as a lower-division elective for students in other social sciences. This course will provide career-oriented criminal justice majors with a basic understanding of the theories of crime causation as they apply to the clients they will encounter in the criminal justice system. This course is being added to ease the transfer of credit from community college criminal justice programs in Ohio and Michigan, which offer a similar course at the lower-division level. It is also being added to fulfill the requirements of the Ohio Board of Regents (OBOR) Transfer Agreement Group (TAG) to offer a criminological theories course at the lower division that is transferable to all other universities and community colleges in Ohio.*

*Similarity: The proposed course is similar to the Sociology course SOC 4710 Criminology, but differs in several ways. First, the proposed course takes an applied, vocational approach to the understanding of criminological theories. It discusses the explanations for criminal behavior with an orientation toward helping future law enforcement and corrections personnel understand and treat offenders. The sociology course discusses crime causation from an empirical and theoretical orientation. Second, the proposed course is offered at the lower-division level to match similar courses offered in community college curricula, while the sociology course is offered at the upper-division level for students with a firm foundation in sociological theories, research methods, and statistics. Finally, because the proposed course is being offered at the lower division and through the Criminal Justice Program, it meets fulfills the OBOR TAG requirements for this mandatory TAG course. Being an upper-division course with a theoretical orientation, the sociology course does not fulfill this OBOR TAG requirement.*

***CRIM 3250 Women and Crime* 3 Chr**

*Delivery Mode: Lecture 3h*

*Offered: Fall, Spring, Summer, Every Year*

*Can course be repeated for credit: No*

*Prerequisites: None*

*Corequisites: None*

*Catalog Description: "This course will explore the causes and social consequences of crimes by and against women. It will explore feminist theory and examine the interlocking effects of gender, race and class."*

*Fit: This course will serve as an upper division elective offering within the criminal justice baccalaureate degree curriculum. It can also serve as an upper-division elective for students in other social sciences. This course was recently offered twice as a "special topics" course which produced enrollments of 37 and 43 students, demonstrating student interest in this topic. Finally, this course addresses issues of diversity by exposing students to the experiences of female offenders, victims, and criminal justice system workers.*

*Similarity: "We know of no similar course within the College or University."*

**CRIM 3300Sex Crimes3 Chr**

*Delivery Mode: Lecture 3h*

*Offered: Fall, Spring, Summer, Every Year*

*Can course be repeated for credit: No*

*Prerequisites: None*

*Corequisites: None*

*Catalog Description: "Overview of a variety of sex crimes, characteristics of sexual predators, theories to explain sex crimes, and current legislation and "treatment" efforts utilized today to combat sex crimes."*

*Fit: This course will serve as an upper division elective offering within the criminal justice baccalaureate degree curriculum. It can also serve as an upper-division elective for students in other social sciences. This course was recently offered three times as a "special topics" course which produced enrollments of 28,38 and 46 students, demonstrating student interest in this topic. Finally, this course addresses the important issue of society's handling of sex offenders, an important criminal justice and public policy topic today.*

*Similarity: "We know of no similar course within the College or University."*

**CRIM 4000Narcotics Policy and Enforcement 3 Chr**

*Delivery Mode: Lecture 3h*

*Offered: Fall, Spring, Summer, Every Year*

*Can course be repeated for credit: No*

*Prerequisites: None*

*Corequisites: None*

*Catalog Description: "This course will explore the "War on Drugs" from a historical, pharmacological, economic, political, and practical perspective."*

*Fit: This course will serve as an upper division elective offering within the criminal justice baccalaureate degree curriculum. It can also serve as an upper-division elective for students in other social sciences. This course was recently offered twice as a "special topics" course which produced enrollments of 40 and 58 students, demonstrating student interest in this topic. Finally, this course addresses an important issue central to the operations of the criminal justice system.*

*Similarity: "We know of no similar course within the College or University."*

**CRIM 4010Probation and Parole 3 Chr**

*Delivery Mode: Lecture 3h*

*Offered: Fall, Spring, Summer, Every Year*

*Can course be repeated for credit: No*

*Prerequisites: None*

*Corequisites: None*

*Catalog Description: "An introduction to the history and dynamics of probation and parole, how they interact within the criminal justice system, and the effective treatment of offender clients."*

*Similarity: "We know of no similar course within the College or University."*

**Course Modification**

**CRIM 2150Applied Psychology and Criminology for Criminal Justice Personnel 3 Chr**

*Change alpha numeric to "CRIM 3210"*

*Change course description from "This course will focus on the social and psychological explanations of offenders' behaviors. The needs of victims and behaviors of criminal justice professionals will be addressed" to "This course overviews mental disorders and substance abuse problems common to persons entering the criminal justice system. Related social policies and criminal justice practices are critically examined."*

*Reason for change: The course title and description are being changed to better reflect the actual content of the course as criminological theories are not addressed in this course as it is presently taught. This course level is being raised from a lower division course to an upper division course to assist students with fulfilling their requirements for upper-division credits.*

**CRIM 2230 Constitutional Law 3 Chr**

*Change title to "Criminal Procedure"*

*Change course description from "A comprehensive study and analysis of the Bill of Rights of the U.S. Constitution and its effect on the administration of justice." to "An examination of the Bill of Rights of the U.S. Constitution as it applies to arrest, search, seizure, detention, interviews, and interrogations."*

*Reason for change: The title and content of this course will change slightly to address two concerns. First, the change will facilitate the ease of transferring lower-division credit from community college programs. Such programs in Ohio and Michigan require a criminal procedure course rather than a constitutional law course. Second, in its present form, this course covers topics well beyond the scope of law in the criminal justice*

context, crossing into the pursue of the Legal Specialties and Political Science programs. The revised version of the course will be limited to examining the constitution as it applies to the actions of agents of the criminal justice system.  
Content Change: Whereas the present course covers topics well beyond the scope of law in the criminal justice context (such as the interstate commerce clause, school desegregation, etc.), crossing into the pursue of the Legal Specialties and Political Science programs, the revised version of the course will be limited to examining the constitution as it applies to the actions of agents of the criminal justice system.

**KINE 2540 Human Physiology Lab** 1 Chr  
Proposed Change: Change grading system from "Grade Only" to "Normal Grading".  
Reason for change: Provide the instructor the opportunity to assign "PS/Ne" or "A-F" grades.  
**College of Language, Literature, and Social Sciences**

**Course Modification**  
**ENGL 2960 Organizational Report Writing** 3 Chr  
Change title to "**Professional and Business Writing**"  
Change prerequisites from "ENGL 1100 or ENGL 1110" to "ENGL 1100 or ENGL Core Course."  
Change catalog description from "Instruction and practice in report writing within an organizational context. Emphasis on the analytical report based on research" to "Instruction and practice in multiple forms of professional and business writing within an organizational context . Emphasis on the analytical report based on research."

**College of Natural Science and Mathematics**

**Course Modification**  
**MEDT 4010 Clinical Laboratory Techniques** 2 Chr  
Change alpha numeric to "MEDT 2010"  
Change prerequisite from "Admission to Clinical Internship" to "BIOL 2170, BIOL 2180, and instructor approval"  
Reason for change: This course serves as an introduction to clinical laboratory practice, and should be taken prior to other courses in the MEDT clinical sequence. In addition, we plan to submit this course to match the OHL008 TAG, and it should be offered at the 2000 level.

**President Rouillard:** Thank you, Dr. Peseckis.

**Senator Lee:** Can I just ask a quick question? You might have heard about Dr. Salvador about some RN to BSN courses for approval, what is the last [cut off]

**Dr. Peseckis:** I think the thing that was sent was that she wanted the courses to make it into the system for students to start registering in March if you get them in by February. If nursing has something and you want to immediately get it processed we will get it processed.

**Senator Lee:** And to this body, does that have to be in by April 8<sup>th</sup>?

**Dr. Peseckis:** The meeting factor is when Faculty Senate stops meeting.

**Senator Lee:** Which I think is the 22<sup>nd</sup>, isn't it?

**Dr. Peseckis:** We will try to encourage people to have them in sooner, but obviously if there's something because we try to get things up-to-date before the Summer break.

**Senator Lee:** From the Executive Committee, I just would kind of like to inform her.

**President Rouillard:** I think you might want to count on April 8<sup>th</sup>.

**Senator Lee:** That is what I was suggesting.

**President Rouillard:** That is the last time it can come before this body because the last meeting will go mostly to elections.

**Senator Lee:** Okay; I will tell her that. Thank you.

**Dr. Peseckis:** I know we don't want to bring up curriculum stuff at the last meeting, but it has happened. Actually, if you want to thank the committee very much for processing these over Spring Break. I sent these out asking for responses and everyone helped, so I'm really happy this time.

**President Rouillard:** We are grateful to you. Thank you, Dr. Peseckis.

**Dr. Peseckis:** Thank you.

**President Rouillard:** Next, we invite Dr. Anderson.

**Senator Anderson:** Okay, I apologize for the late notice on these. I don't know if you had a chance to look over this material, so at this point I will certainly ask if there are questions.

**Senator Molitor:** I believe it was the Criminal Justice change; they actually made specific requirements about which general education courses must be taken. If that's the one I'm thinking of, and pardon me if it's the wrong one, one of them actually said for the humanities or social sciences we will require two of four specific courses. This is fine, except our general education requirements may be changing and those courses may no longer be part of the general education. I just wanted to make them aware that they may be changing their program requirements again.

**Senator Anderson:** I think that is true; also, LLSS requirements have a series of courses changing for the humanities.

**Senator Molitor:** Okay, those were minors, but this is a program.

**Senator Hewitt:** Why didn't they just require the courses and just allow them to double-dip as general education?

**Senator Molitor:** Well, they are reducing the number of credit hours, so I assume they are trying to fit everything in, that's what they are trying to do.

**President Rouillard:** Actually, that was my question on one of these programs, the speech-language pathology- moving the four credit hrs. to go from 124 to 120. The description said that it was to comply with the directive from the Provost's Office about reducing the number of credits, but the state hasn't actually mandated that.

**Unknown Speaker:** What college?

**President Rouillard:** Health Sciences.

**Provost Scarborough:** Yes, Health Sciences.

**President Rouillard:** But that is what they are saying in their explanation and so I was a little puzzled. My understanding is some of these initiatives to reduce credit hrs. for graduation are our initiatives and aren't really at the level of a state mandate yet.

**Provost Scarborough:** Yes.

**President Rouillard:** So, is there anybody from that program who might want to talk about that initiative to drop the number of hours for graduation, if that's not in fact directed from your office?

**Unknown Speaker:** Was that directed from your office?

**Provost Scarborough:** No.

**President Rouillard:** Is this something that we want to pull out of the consent agenda?

**Past-President Dowd:** Pardon me, President Rouillard. Proposals for Academic Programs are not presented as a consent agenda.

**President Rouillard:** Okay. I thought it was.

**Past-President Dowd:** Proposed curriculum changes are presented as a consent agenda, but programs are not.

**President Rouillard:** Do we want to pull back then until somebody can talk to us a little bit more about this reduction in credit numbers?

**Senator Anderson:** Okay, we can do that, it's only removal of electives.

**Dr. Peseckis:** There's a lot of talk about that -- that there will be movement from 120 credit hrs., but I don't know if it's mandated yet or what the status of that is.

**President Rouillard:** Senator Monsos, you talked to me a little bit about this sort of social agenda, this Complete College America.

**Senator Monsos:** There is an organization called, College of America - 15 credits, 8 semesters, 120 credit hrs. that's what the state is looking at. I don't know what the Health Science Campus may have been told, but in our meetings we were told that this looks like the direction the state is going and certainly it's a requirement for new programs and we might all like to look at our programs to be prepared in case it turns into a directive. We did in my college toy around with whether to just go ahead and do that and we decided not to at this point, but this program might have made a determination.

**Dr. Peseckis:** The state was saying 124 credit hrs.

**Senator Monsos:** No. UT said 124 credit hrs.

**Dr. Peseckis:** So, if it went to 120 credit hrs. we couldn't graduate students?

**Senator Monsos:** The state will not forbid us to go to 120 credit hrs.

**Provost Scarborough:** Even though we didn't have anything to do with this particular program in the College of Health Sciences there has been an ongoing conversation about following this...that began as a national movement called, Complete College America, then became adopted by the Board of Regents in a taskforce-recommended report called, Complete College Ohio. In the Complete College Ohio taskforce listing of recommendations -- because that's all they are at the moment -- as I understand it is this notion of 120 semester credit hrs. as a degree program unless an accrediting body demands it to go higher. So it

is something that I guess you're hearing that it's a direction that they were heading, but they had not yet arrived. So we have talked about why this national agenda and what's moving it. It's primarily an affordability agenda. It's a college completion agenda trying to make it reasonable so we're not making it harder for people to obtain a college degree, that's essentially the motive.

**Senator Anderson:** But as long as a program wants to change the number of hours and it doesn't go below the minimum of the state requirement.

**President Rouillard:** But if the institution has it set in the core. You see that's part of the problem. Do we need a motion to pull this out?

**Senator Wedding:** There's enrollment statement in keeping with the new state requirements. It's my understanding that that statement is not valid, so why not pull this? If they want to say they are going to reduce it from 124 to 120 credit hrs. "PERIOD," perhaps it will be a different discussion. But right now they say we are keeping the new state requirements and I'm hearing that those do not exist. This is...information and it should not be passed on by the Senate.

**Senator Anderson:** Okay, that's true for both criminal justice and speech pathology and criminal justice is making other changes as well. It can't be approved until the university has made some kind of declaration of a reduction of 124. credit hrs.

**Past-President Dowd:** The minimum number of credit hours is determined by the Faculty Senate.

**Senator Anderson:** Right.

**Past-President Dowd:** The minimum number of credit hours that must be earned to receive any baccalaureate degree from UT is 124 credit hours. My memory of this issue is that the 124 credit hour benchmark was established by Faculty Senate when the pre-merger UT converted from a quarter-system to a semester-system in 1996-1997. This means that no undergraduate degree can be awarded if the number of earned credit hours is below 124.

**Dr. Peseckis:** So we need that clarified and someone needs to make a decision, can programs like this be approved at one point or do we just have to wait?

**Provost Scarborough:** Here is what I was suggesting, the more heads around this the better. But I don't think this will be the first issue we are going to face, this may be the second big issue. The first big issue we are going to face is this OTM issue.

**Provost Scarborough:** [disk change]...That the state has made a decision to say "if your general ed. is 36 hrs. or less your general ed. needs to be in the OTM."

**Vice Provost Barrett:** We have a letter from the state that says that, so I don't think there's a lot of doubt about that.

**President Rouillard:** Can you forward that to us; it would be helpful to see that.

**Provost Scarborough:** Yes. So I think that would be the first issue and if that issue gets played out in a way that causes us to have to then fix a lot of degree programs then I think the 120 hr. thing is maybe a

second issue we may want to consider at that time. It has not yet been communicated to us as a requirement, but only as a task force recommendation, so I don't think it's the big issue right now.

**President Rouillard:** What we see with this question of 120 credit hrs. for graduation is in fact similar to the way the state with a lack of clarity communicated about core curriculum, to say the least. I'm watching the clock because we need to get through this and there are two resolutions that we need to discuss.

**Dr. Peseckis:** I have a quick suggestion. When pulling these, maybe we can go back to these people and suggest for the moment to put them into electives? That should go up to 124 credit hrs. and we can deal with this issue later.

**Senator Anderson:** And this one we can just pull it?

**Dr. Peseckis:** That's what I'm saying.

**Senator Anderson:** What I mean, for the Speech Language Pathology just means not pulling because that's the old gen ed., but for Criminal Justice it would mean adding another elective. So we could keep the Criminal Justice one other than providing that they add another elective.

**President Rouillard:** Yes, add the electives.

**Senator Molitor:** Not directly related to the approval of these, but I would like to make a request of the Provost that you start being proactive to look at the impact of an OTM-only gen ed. on our degree programs. We're going to need to know if this comes through and we have to have an OTM-only gen ed. how this is going to impact our undergraduate degree programs.

**Senator Anderson:** Okay, I pulled those two.

**Senator Thompson-Casado:** Is it time for the COCA question now?

**Senator Anderson:** Yes.

**Senator Thompson-Casado:** Their BA for students in Art and they're changing the requirements for foreign language and I just wanted to make sure that I understood what they were doing with that. What I understood was that they are having the students take 1110 and 1120 and then one of the options was a semester abroad.

**Senator Monsos:** It's exactly the same as Visual and Performing Arts had as a college. Communication would move to that same requirement.

**Senator Thompson-Casado:** But it says here that Communication wasn't moving to that same requirement.

**Senator Monsos:** No. This is what we currently have as our college in used to be called, under A & S "distributive requirements."

**Senator Thompson-Casado:** Right.

**Senator Monsos:** It has nothing to do with gen ed. Except that we specify some of the gen. ed courses. In CVPA we had made a change to the college requirements and at the time COM was in LLSS and they did not make that same change, so they came in and had a different foreign language requirement than the other three departments do.

**Senator Thompson-Casado:** Okay.

**Senator Monsos:** So this change will make COM have the same Foreign Language requirement.

**Senator Thompson-Casado:** As the Arts?

**Senator Monsos:** Yes, as the Arts.

**Senator Thompson-Casado:** And that was a semester abroad and it could be in any country, no?

**Senator Monsos:** No. They have to have at least one year of foreign languages.

**Senator Thompson-Casado:** 2150, so it's still the same then?

**Senator Monsos:** No. One year is still the same, but that second year, they can either do the second-year...

**Senator Thompson-Casado:** Yeah, I understand that. But after 1120 they can easily do the one semester abroad, and it's any language for that one semester abroad, correct? So, it can be Canada?

**Senator Monsos:** Yes,

**Senator Thompson-Casado:** Okay. So they may not take any language courses at all while they're there. I just want to make sure I understand this correctly.

**Senator Monsos:** Yes.

**Senator Thompson-Casado:** And then the other option was the 1080 or the 1090 which are English Language courses out of Foreign Language, correct?

**Senator Monsos:** No, those are foreign language courses.

**Senator Thompson-Casado:** But they are in the English language and Foreign Languages.

**Senator: Monsos:** Yes.

**Senator Thompson-Casado:** Okay. Perfect.

**Senator Monsos:** Because they would not have enough foreign language.

**Senator Thompson-Casado:** Right. I just wanted to make sure that I understood about that semester abroad as well.

**Senator Unknown:** So that's the gen ed. requirement?

**Senator Monsos:** I whip myself for using the word “core.” I apologize. It’s all my fault. It should have said current college requirements. It is not the gen ed. We are not changing the gen. ed.

**Senator Anderson:** Is there anything else for discussion? All right, I will call the question then. Let’s vote on all of the new programs. All in favor of approving these three new programs say “aye.” Any opposed? Any abstentions? ***Motion Passed.***

Okay, all the modifications except for Speech Language Pathology and Criminal Justice. All in favor say “aye.” Any opposed? Any abstentions? ***Motion Passed.*** Thank you very much.

**President Rouillard:** All right. Thank you and thank you to your committee as well, we appreciate it. And that brings us to the resolution that was sent out with the agenda:

**Discussion of Resolution for a Faculty Hiring Plan**  
*Whereas The University of Toledo expects numerous faculty retirements in FY 2015;*  
*Whereas there is currently no explicit hiring plan;*  
*Whereas workloads are currently being developed for next year;*  
*Whereas the retirement of faculty with graduate faculty status will have significant negative consequences for our graduate program;*  
*Whereas Faculty Senate is the Board-recognized body responsible for curricular matters;*  
*Therefore Faculty Senate requests that the Administration present a faculty hiring plan to Faculty Senate before the end of the Spring 2014 Semester.*

**President Rouillard:** As you recall from the meeting where Dr. Jacobs attended Faculty Senate and he answered some questions, there was a question about a faculty hiring plan. And he made mention of the fact that that plan will be taken to University Council with no mention of it coming to Faculty Senate. So the Faculty Senate Executive Committee is bringing forth this resolution asking you if you wish to pass this resolution requesting that Dr. Jacobs bring that faculty hiring plan here before it goes to University Council.

I’m assuming that it’s clear enough to read otherwise we can read it for you if you don’t have a copy. I did find one typo, “consequences for our graduate programs,” with an “s.” Are there any modifications?

**Senator Relue:** Are you also wanting this before or on the April 8<sup>th</sup> meeting as opposed to the 22<sup>nd</sup> because that’s a month before the end of the semester?

**President Rouillard:** That’s true. We can certainly do that; we can specify April 8<sup>th</sup>.

**Vice Provost Barrett:** So three weeks from now?

**President Rouillard:** Yes. Is that what you want? Are there any other changes? Is this something that you would feel comfortable voting on this afternoon, given that there are three weeks?

**Senator Anderson:** Yes.

**President Rouillard:** Or four weeks.

**Speaker Unknown:** That’s not very much time.

**President Rouillard:** At any case, I think the point is that this body needs to be consulted and informed about any faculty hiring plan. Can I ask for a vote? All those in favor of approving this resolution, please

signify by saying “aye.” Any opposed? Any abstentions? Thank you. **Resolution Passed.** *The following resolution was unanimously passed by Senate:*

**Discussion of Resolution for a Faculty Hiring Plan**

**Whereas** The University of Toledo expects numerous faculty retirements in FY 2015;

**Whereas** there is currently no explicit hiring plan;

**Whereas** workloads are currently being developed for next year;

**Whereas** the retirement of faculty with graduate faculty status will have significant negative consequences for our graduate programs;

**Whereas** Faculty Senate is the Board-recognized body responsible for curricular matters;

Therefore Faculty Senate requests that the Administration present a faculty hiring plan to Faculty Senate before the end of the Spring 2014 Semester. \*\* [friendly amendment" - changing "before the end of Spring 2014 Semester" to "by April 8, 2014"?] \*\*

**President Rouillard:** The next resolution relates to core curriculum and we are bringing this to you today for your consideration. It is not necessarily imperative that we approve this today. *The following resolution was NOT passed on March 11, 2014.*

**Whereas** FS passed a competency-based core curriculum on April 26, 2011 before our last HLC visit;

**Whereas** FS approved a new set of core courses on March 27, 2012;

**Whereas** it is the responsibility of the Provost office to code courses;

**Whereas** repeated requests by FS of the Provost office to code said courses have not been fulfilled;

**Whereas** OBOR OTM courses are not mapped to competencies;

**Whereas** OBOR now requires that an institution's core curriculum total 36 hours and be identical with an institution's OTM courses;

Obviously, this has nothing to do with assessment. This doesn't stop assessment, assessment goes forward. But in the interest of advising the students more accurately, this proposes that we officially go back to what apparently is currently being done in advising. Senator Monsos said, "I apologize" for using a term that simply lacks clarity. And this certainly doesn't mean that we can't think about competency in our courses, or in the way we assess them, or in the way we instruct learning outcome, but it will certainly simplify matters for our students. It also will allow the state time to clarify its statements on OTM courses and what would be considered being compliant with OTM. One of the questions that Senator Molitor and Senator Humphrys very clearly identified is if a student doesn't transfer then why does the student need to complete the Ohio Transfer Module. If students need to comply with state mandates that you take "x" number of courses in humanities and "x" number of courses in social sciences, why mandate that those courses have to be in the OTM if that student stays in his/her home institution for four years or six years? The state hasn't made that clear. The state is also not making it clear, if an institution's gen ed. has to all be in the OTM if you have 36 hrs. The other problem with our gen ed. or core curriculum or whatever you want to call it is that ours is basically 30-33 hrs., it's not even the mandated 36 hrs. So, this resolution is simply to provide some clarity for students and advisors that we go back to the courses that are listed in our current catalog in the hopes that clarification at the state level will make these initiatives a little bit easier to define. I'm going to open the floor up for any comments and/or questions.

**Senator Anderson:** Okay, when I undertook the initiative of competency-based core curriculum, I was told by hundreds of people not to get involved because it would not help anything and of course, those people were correct.

**President Rouillard:** Actually, I interrupt you right there. I think that the discussion that we had about competency is still a valuable discussion.

**Senator Anderson:** I agree. I do recommend this resolution as long as that material that was accumulated be somehow archived for use.

**President Rouillard:** That's right. This is a suspension.

**Senator Anderson:** Our problem with the competency-based core that we had in the past was that it didn't follow through. It sort of said "okay, here's the general education part" and that was it.

**President Rouillard:** Well, I think part of the problem of our initiative was that we were attempting to map our core curriculum or gen ed. to core competencies that were not mapped to what the state was doing. I think that was the problem. And I think that people such as yourself were very generous with your time and your efforts in working on this project. This is a good opportunity to recognize what you and many other people did during this whole process. It was a very arduous time-consuming process and we're appreciative of it, but I think that given the lack of clarity at the state level, we're in a position where we can't advise students really.

**Senator Anderson:** I agree.

**Past-President Dowd:** The new core was approved by Senate in Spring 2012. However, throughout the year-long discussion prior to that lead included the constant question of how we would implement the proposed core. Administrators kept insisting on a competency-base core but would never answer the question of implementation. They would not address the question about how advisors could possibly advise students.

**President Rouillard:** That's a very good point. I think the other problem with this initiative was that because the students were not going to be held to these competencies for graduation, we were doing this mostly for assessment in any case and I think that that's the biggest value of that whole exercise. We as instructors can certainly look at these competencies and see how we address them in our courses and we can certainly structure our courses around them. But I think it would be a puzzle to the students if they're not being held to these graduation requirements and then they're being assessed on those.

**Senator Molitor:** Just to follow-up on that point. A number of departments have indicated that they are using these core competencies as the basis of their assessment processes and they should be encouraged to do so.

**President Rouillard:** Absolutely. Are there any other comments?

**Senator Humphrys:** I do have all those materials so I'll double check to make sure they are all in one place, but I can get those to whomever in terms of archiving them. And I think as far as this particular proposal, I think what this does is it embraces the "fantasy" that we are going according to what was passed by Faculty Senate in March of 2012. Nothing was ever changed even though really we did have a process that could've been implemented, but that was dependent upon it being put into Banner which it never was. So, we may as well publicly admit to what the reality is and this is the reality. Nothing is different today than it was in "2010," it's all the same.

**Provost Scarborough:** The only thing that I would offer is just a cautionary. I know Faculty Senate has gone a long way in terms of establishing a very constructive working relationship with the Board of

Trustees. The only reason why I mention that is just to remind you at the end of this process that led to this competency-based curriculum. I think there was a resolution by the Board of Trustees to support this competency-based core. The only reason that I mention that is you might want to consider giving time for this presentation to the Board that will occur in May which Senator Molitor and Senator Humphrys will be a part of. You might want to consider waiting to take action; essentially now would be contrary to an action the Board of Trustees is taking until they understand why you chose to do that, that would be point one. Point two would be simply to maybe ask a question. My understanding in terms of why these courses haven't been coded is because when we tried to get them coded we got push-back from the state that what we were trying to code didn't fit in the Ohio Transfer Module and they wouldn't let us code the courses. So to me this is all tied into that much larger issue in the Ohio Transfer Module. Now, President Rouillard knows because I've been open and honest with her, I'm not a big fan of competency-based education and I have no problem saying that, so I want you to know where I'm coming from. But, I am concerned that maybe right now this action might not be the best time to do this.

**Senator Krantz:** To put a fine point on it, technically, it was the general education component of the core curriculum; the entire core curriculum was not created. Doing away with the competencies right now -- I agree with the provost -- it is going to throw an enormous wrench into the upcoming mid-term review by the Higher Learning Commission, that's not the full-blown site review that would happen in 2022.

**Vice Provost Barrett:** Yes, 2022 would be the full blown HLC visit. I just submitted four proposed dates for our 2015 and 2016 visit and I had to pick two each semester, so it will either be one of the first two-weeks in November or one of the first two-weeks in April.

**Senator Krantz:** My point is, as of right now, the competency base is a framework for allowing assessment of general education and also, to a degree, the programs. And in absence of that we're going to have to come up with an alternative framework very quickly, that's going to be very difficult. My personal recommendation is allow us on the Core Curriculum Committee to have a discussion including ramifications for assessment.

**President Rouillard:** Absolutely, we do not need to vote on this today by any means.

**Senator Molitor:** I would just like to answer both of these. First of all, with respect to the Board of Trustees resolution we're not repealing it and saying "no", we're just saying it's being suspended because practically it's not being enforced. If HLC comes and finds out our students are following a core curriculum that is different from what is on the books and provided in our catalog as an approved core curriculum, I think that's a big problem. I think we need to right away recognize we have to formally accept whatever is the gen ed./core curriculum that is being followed right now so at least we're providing a consistent answer to HLC; I think that's the most important thing. Second of all, with regard to the assessment of the general education, this process is starting and we're going to get a chance to review and to find out what are the outcomes that our general education courses are following, and I'm betting we're going to find out that we can put them into these overarching five core competencies. It may not be those specific sub-competencies of each one, but I think we will be able to satisfy HLC and I would argue that we could just let that process play out and we are going to see what we're going to get. Because in reality there are many constraints on these general education courses that are outside of our core curriculum that have to do with state requirements, that have to do with transfer requirements, that have to do with degree program requirements, and I think we need to let that proceed as it's going to proceed.

**Senator Krantz:** To reinforce Senator Molitor's previous comment, we absolutely must get resolution to gen ed. OTM. We have to get that resolved; nothing else matters in this entire "ball of wax" if we don't get that resolved. And the second point, the HLC is pushing strongly this competency-based method of assessment, so we need to make a rational decision following discussion.

**Senator Molitor:** I would agree with that.

**President Rouillard:** But you can certainly assess, based on competencies, without throwing your entire gen ed. or core curriculum out the window. The two can be married together and I think that what the Core Curriculum Committee has come up with this Spring in terms of an assessment process does that very thing.

**Past-President Dowd:** I agree with what both of you are saying. I also think that the provost is giving good advice regarding this resolution. Rather than voting on it today, we can revise the resolution to avoid displaying disrespect to the Board of Trustees on the issue. However, I would like to bring up one other point. Assessment of courses is important for the provost to show the HLC that it is occurring. And determining the core curriculum is also important for a different reason. But what we cannot forget is that students are being caught in the grinder here. This is a student issue. Currently, advisors don't know how to advise students under the new core – and that is the first issue we have to clarify. What happens with HLC is very important, but in my opinion that is not as important as being able to tell students which courses they need to take.

**Senator Lingan:** I'm just curious as to where this confusion is happening because I advise and I don't have this confusion that's being spoken of here. I advise the way I always have. I was there for that conversation and I don't see that that conversation actually affected the way I advise at all, so I'm a little confused on where the conversation about advisor confusion is happening.

**Past-President Dowd:** So, you are ignoring the new core? Practically speaking, advisors are doing the same thing: they are using the old core.

**Senator Lingan:** But where's the confusion at? That's what I'm saying, as far as I'm concerned, do we need to do this in order to keep doing what we're doing?

**Senator Krantz:** The rule that exists right now is the state distributive requirement, plus two diversity courses from The University of Toledo, that is the rule and I agree with Senator Lingan, it's clear.

**Past-President Dowd:** This resolution is simply saying that because the new core is not operational we are going to suspend it and officially let advisors use the old core. That is all it is saying.

**Senator Molitor:** To respond to Senator Lingan's question. You could not advise students the way you are advising them if you follow the Spring 2011 and Spring 2012 core curriculum that was approved. In fact, in Engineering we couldn't even graduate our students because of all the math classes they take; none of them were on the list that was approved in Spring 2012.

**Senator Lingan:** That, I understand. But, what I'm saying is - regardless of whether this declaration that the competency-based core curriculum is suspended is put through - from what I see we're already acting as though it doesn't exist anyway.

**Past-President Dowd:** But you have a tenured position while other advisors do not. This resolution allows advisors to act in good faith. They can tell the students they are going to use the old core.

**Senator Hoblet:** It says what we're doing. It is not a shell game. It doesn't say we have this competency based curriculum. It says we're using the core as we have.

**Senator Monsos:** But this resolution as stated seems to be placing the blame on the Provost's Office.

**President Rouillard:** No. I think it is also explaining that there's been a huge lack of clarity at the state level.

**Senator Monsos:** I don't see the state being even mentioned.

**President Rouillard:** I believe it was.

**Past-President Dowd:** We can revise it if necessary.

**President Rouillard:** I thought I did, but we can certainly put it in. I think that what happened in the Provost's Office, we had a provost that was not an academic, Bill McMillen and I think perhaps he was not aware of a lot of these issues and things didn't happen. Now, the other problem to this is things didn't happen because they were incredibly confusing at the state level and when those two things meet we're not going to be able to implement anything.

**Senator Anderson:** As I recall when we were setting this up Cincinnati has a competency-based core which matched... I think this is all very much as someone mentioned -- making sure Senate is acting in good faith and it's not a shell game. So I think it is probably a good idea to suspend and really emphasize that word "SUSPEND."

**President Rouillard:** There's no need to vote on this this afternoon. But, this is the beginning of at least considering the question and considering the possibility. The other thing that I'm struck by is I heard a certain amount of clear definition of what the problem was. Senator Krantz, you talked about HLC moving towards competency-based assessment and Senator Hoblet, you just used the term competency-based curriculum; those are two different things and yet we proceeded along this way as if they were one and the same and yet, what we ended up with was two different things and it is not necessarily a bad thing to think about assessment in terms of competency. But given some of the restrictions that we had to work with at the state level, trying to redefine and trying to map our core curriculum to competencies that don't match up to OTM, puts us in a really hard position and it's going to be hard to realize and hard to accomplish that.

**Senator Molitor:** Just a couple of comments. What is it saying about Faculty Senate if we are playing a shell game? We have this curricular authority and we're basically saying go ahead and follow the old curriculum even though we have this curriculum that has been on the books for two years. Again, I think it's important that we be very honest as to what our policies are and what our curriculum is. The other point I would like to make regarding the Provost's Office -- we were blindsided by this. We were approached by advisors midway through Fall 2012 saying "oh, by the way we couldn't enforce any of this because it wasn't showing up on the system." We had rushed through Spring 2011 and then again Spring

2012 to get this all done so that students enrolling Fall 2012 could follow this curriculum and it was not implemented. We were not told by the provost, we had to find out second hand.

**President Rouillard:** And for clarity's sake, this did not occur under Provost Scarborough's watch.

**Provost Scarborough:** We were trying to play catch-up with the processing. The reason we couldn't get it into the system is because we couldn't get it approved by the state before we could implement it.

**Past-President Dowd:** May I make a suggestion? Wait, I'll defer my suggestion as Senator Humphrys had her hand up before me.

**Senator Humphrys:** Something I believe I mentioned at the last meeting and something "we" as senators here spend time talking about these things and on committees and so on. The big issue to this is that on March 27, 2012 Faculty Senate approved a new set of general education courses and they were never uploaded. So the big "fantasy" of this is that, do we really have control over the curriculum? This was far before any questions that we were told by the previous provost and the people who were occupying that office, we were never told that this is going to be an issue and then we were just disregarded. And to me that's a big issue because that's what we're here for and that's one of our major goals and major responsibilities overseeing the curriculum. Right now there's no really concrete indicator that what we say means anything.

**Past-President Dowd:** That is, UT had a provost who simply refused to acknowledge that Faculty Senate made a decision on this issue.

**Senator Humphrys:** That's right.

**Past-President Dowd:** I suggest that the Executive Committee send this draft resolution to Senators and invite comments and revisions. We can bring it back for Senate consideration at a subsequent meeting.

**President Rouillard:** As Senator Molitor said, it will allow us to have a more extensive presentation at an upcoming Board of Trustees meeting and I think perhaps that will help them understand as well.

**Provost Scarborough:** Let me just say, I think that's the thing we can most look forward to because as you just suggested, we just need to get these issues resolved. My hope is that it will all be...educating the Board and bringing all parties to the table and throwing everything on the table as well. There are options, this is what Faculty Senate would like to do and the state of Ohio would like for us to do. My goal is at the end of May we have a clear path that we all can follow, that's my hope.

**President Rouillard:** Is there anything else? I thank you very much for your comments and your thoughtfulness. Is there a motion to adjourn? I apologize; Vice Provost Barrett has a quick announcement.

**Vice Provost Barrett:** Two quick things. As some of you know, we are bringing in Barbara Walvoord, a national expert on assessment, at the very beginning of April. On Tuesday, the 1<sup>st</sup> at 2:30-4:30 p.m., she's doing a workshop on general education assessment. We still have some spots available, so please encourage people who are teaching gen ed courses to sign up for this. You can email Alana Malik, or our GA, Emily Hickey or me, and I'll pass it along if you do that. On the new front, we have constituted our committee heads for the HLC visit in 2015-2016. David Meabon from the College of Education and Akira Takashima from the College of Medicine are going to be our co-Chairs. We have five criteria to

deal with so we have appointed five criterion teams leaders. I'm going to go through them really quickly. The point in bringing this up is that we're in the process of starting to populate our committees, so please pass this along to your faculty to see if anyone is willing or interested in volunteering for one of these committees. We need faculty involvement and we would like it to be broad-base faculty involvement on these committees. If you have any questions you can certainly forward them to me. I'll give you the names quickly for the five criteria and five chairs and you can contact them directly to express interest: Charlene Gilbert will be heading criteria 1., which is the mission of the university, it's program and its overall goals. Criteria 2., which is integrity, ethical, and responsible conduct, is being headed by Terry Romer, the University Registrar. Criteria 3., which is teaching and learning quality and research support, is being headed by Connie Shriner in our Teaching and Learning Center and is also a faculty member. Criteria 4., teaching and learning evaluation and improvement; so assessment type activities, is being headed by Barbara Kopp Miller, the Chair of our University Assessment Committee. Criteria 5., resources and planning and institutional effectiveness, is being headed by David Cutri, the Director of Internal Audit. So, those are our heads and we obviously want faculty on all these committees and faculty from both campuses so please pass that along and get back to us. Thank you.

**President Rouillard:** May I have a motion to adjourn? Meeting adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

**IV.** Meeting adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted by:

Lucy Duhon

Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape Summary: Quinetta Hubbard

Faculty Senate Administrative Secretary

## Faculty Senate Report to BOT Academic Affairs, Tuesday, March 11, 2014

Dr. Linda Rouillard, Faculty Senate President

FS has had a busy schedule this spring. At our last meeting we approved 32 new courses and numerous course modifications in an effort to keep the curriculum up-to-date and innovative. Among the new courses are a sequence of upper level chemistry courses [analytical Chemistry, separation methods, electrochemistry, spectroscopic methods, medicinal chemistry, protein crystallography] and pharmacy courses. Today, we have another 6 new courses and 5 course modifications along with some program modifications.

We continue to take pride in our faculty and student accomplishments.

Our students have shone a positive light on our institution, as demonstrated in the Blade Section "Midwest in the Midwest." Toledo readers will find their student documentaries submitted for Assistant Professor Gaby Semaan's Arabic Culture and Commerce course, and for his Arabic Conversation and Composition class. One video entitled "The Arab Life in America" features interviews with UT students of Arabic heritage. Another film entitled "Medieval masters of Medicine" features interviews with such medieval luminaries as Rhazes, Avicenna, and Albucasis. These videos are available at [mideastmidwest.com](http://mideastmidwest.com) on the Blade website, and I'd like to take a few minutes to show you some excerpts. Such student-faculty collaborations readily available to the Toledo community vividly demonstrate some of the many strengths of our institution in contrast to some of the problematic articles that have been appearing in the Blade of late.

I would also like to cite the recognition of our Engineers without Borders student chapter for its volunteer work in Los Sanchez, Honduras where UT students literally build bridges. Our Graduate Student Association is preparing for what promises to be another very successful annual Midwest Research Symposium on March 29. Last year, there were 200 participants, and 300 in attendance. The 2014 Shapiro Essay Revision Contest had its largest number of participants: 172 students this year, representing a wide array of majors, demonstrating that the process of writing, and the process of fostering *good* writing are valued on this campus. The 2014 UT Juried Students Exhibition at the Center for the Visual Arts highlights the creativity of our students nurtured by our faculty at this institution. Our student Drew O'Donnell was recently honored with a Jefferson award for his work with Food for Thought, an organization that provides meals for those in need. Another of our students Yelena Zhernovskiy was also recognized with a Jefferson Award for her outstanding and generous community service. Our student athletes continue to earn high gpa's. There is much good news on our campus. Such positive news helps to overcome some of the recent troubling reports about UT in the Blade.

Needless to say, we remained concerned about UTIE, its outcomes, investments, and direction, as well as its personnel issues. We have invited Dr. Jacobs to update the FSEC on UTIE.

Faculty Senate continues to work on core curriculum issues that are exacerbated by conflicting and unclear information from OBOR regarding the Ohio Transfer Module. For instance, it is not clear if the state is mandating that our core curriculum must include *only* courses currently approved for the OTM. There are questions about students who remain at the same institution and who do not transfer. Have they satisfied state mandates if they take core courses in the appropriate categories even if those courses are not in the OTM? UT's core consists of 30-33 hours: 9 hours in skills courses and 21-24 in subject areas, including a diversity course which is not mandated by the

state. The state mandates a minimum of 36 hours in gen ed. If we move to be in compliance, what effects will this have on individual UT programs even as we are being pressured to reduce time to graduation?

Such confusion and mixed messages at the state level, along with institutional delays in coding, make recent initiatives difficult to implement. As I reported to you in my Oct. 15 comments, in 2011 FS put aside UT's previous 300+ core courses, and adopted a new set of core competencies. In Spring 2012, FS completely repopulated the core curriculum with approximately 100 courses mapped to the new set of competencies rather than to the OTM. Those 100 courses were never approved by the state for admission into the Ohio Transfer Module, nor were these 100 courses coded in Banner as mapping to the new core competencies. Students, then, continue to be advised and registered into courses according to the old core courses listed in our web catalogue.

FS may consider suspending the competency-based curriculum it passed in spring of 2011 because of the mixed messages the Provost office has received from the state, and because of the institutional delay in coding the courses we approved for the competency-based core in spring 2012. This, however, *does not nor will it* preclude the process of assessment that the FS Core Curriculum committee has undertaken in anticipation of the 2015 HLC visit. I commend the work of that committee under the leadership of Senators Mary Humphrys and Scott Molitor who will report further on this issue at a later BOT meeting. They and their committee have been conscientious and diligent in their work on behalf of our students.