

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of March 12, 2013
FACULTY SENATE

<http://www.utoledo.edu/facsenate> Approved @ F.S. meeting on 3-24-2013

Summary of Discussion

Remembrance of Dr. David M. Strothers
Curriculum Committee Report
Next Steps for the Core Curriculum
Implementation of Proposed College of Communication
Continued Consultation on 2013 Reorganization

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 Michael Dowd called the meeting to order, **Lucy Duhon**, Executive Secretary, called the roll.

I. Roll Call: 2012-2013 Senators:

Present: Present: Anderson, Barnes, Brickman, Cochrane, Cooper, Cuckovic, Denyer, Dowd, Duhon, Edinger, Ellis, Gohara, Hamer, Hammersley, Hey, Hill, Hoblet, Humphrys, Jorgensen, Keith, Kennedy, Kranz, Lee, Langan, Lundquist, Molitor, Moynihan, Nigem, Ohlinger, Piazza, Plenefisch, Quinlan, Regimbal, Relue, Rouillard, Sheldon, Springman, Thompson, Thompson-Casado, Teclehaimanot, Templin, Van Hoy, Weck-Schwarz, Wedding, White, Williams, Yonker

Excused absences: Bailey, Cappelletty, Hottell, Moore, Pei-Tsui, Randolph Ellis, Heberle,

Unexcused absences: Crist, Duggan, Franchetti, Giovannucci, Nazzal, Rooney, Tinkel, Willey, Wilson

II. Approval of Minutes: Minutes from January 28th meeting are ready for approval.

I call the meeting to order. Welcome to the twelfth Faculty Senate meeting of academic year 2012-2013. I ask that Secretary Duhon come to the podium to call the roll.

President Dowd: Regarding the approval of the Minutes, please note I incorrectly listed on our agenda the Minutes from the January 15th meeting of Senate for approval today. Instead, the Minutes that were distributed were from the January 28th meeting of Faculty Senate. Do I have a motion to approve those Minutes? Is there a second? Any discussion? All of those in favor say "aye." Any opposed? ***Motion Passed.***

I will begin the Executive Committee report with a couple of announcements. First, Miss Quinetta Hubbard told me that two sets of draft Faculty Senate minutes will be distributed in the next few days for revised comments. When completed, our Minutes will be completely up to date. Speaking for the entire Senate, I want to thank Miss Hubbard for the fine and hard work she routinely performs for the faculty and students of this university. Thank you very much, Quinetta.

For next announcement I will like to recognize Professor Steve Peseckis, Chair of our Curriculum Committee, as he is in attendance today. As this academic year winds-down, we need to make sure our Curriculum Committee has adequate time to review proposals and, then, to present that material to the Faculty Senate for its consideration. To be specific, I have a very strong preference to address all proposed curricular changes by the end of business of the first Faculty Senate meeting in April, which is on April 9th. That is, I have a very strong preference to avoid any such business at the last meeting of the Faculty Senate. I say that because the agenda for the last meeting of Faculty Senate usually quite full, and I do not want to give short shrift to curricular issues. Working backward, this implies that any curricular material departments or colleges want to be approved this semester must be submitted to the senate office no later than Friday, March 29th.

Prof. Peseckis: I actually put down April 1st.

President Dowd: I was going to suggest March 29th.

Prof. Peseckis: Okay, March 29th.

President Dowd: Let's plan for that Friday, the last business day in March, which is March 29th. I encourage each Senator to please take this message back to your colleagues and to the curriculum authorities in your department and college. If they want any curriculum business to be conducted they need to have all such material submitted to Senate by March 29th.

Moving forward, a couple of your Executive Committee members attended the Board of Trustees meeting yesterday. I'd like to point out to Senate a couple of the many issues discussed at that meeting, though I do not plan on discussing them in detail today. This is because I would prefer to have your Executive Committee first have the opportunity to speak about these issues with the provost and the chancellor. One issue discussed at the Board meeting was an informal proposal by Chancellor Gold to create a College of Dentistry. However, it wasn't really a proposal. Chancellor Gold, how would you describe it?

Chancellor Gold: It was just an open discussion with the Board of Trustees about a consideration of process to explore the possibility of the college of dentistry.

President Dowd: Given financial conditions at UT, my first question about that idea is whether you have considered how we going to pay for it?

Chancellor Gold: Of course.

President Dowd: I recognize this was a very soft discussion with the Board. But through cash? Debt? .

Chancellor Gold: The most preliminary discussion.

President Dowd: Another issue discussed at the Board of Trustees meeting focused on our General Education courses. I was particularly troubled by a phrase used by the provost when he described Cameron Cruickshank's proposed work with those courses. The phrase that troubled me was that Cruickshank "is going to re-build UT's general education courses." I spoke with the Provost about this issue earlier today and I hope to continue that discussion with him later. Perhaps the provost would care to provide a brief clarification at this time.

Provost Scarborough: We will talk more about it later. But what I shared with you, what he intends to do is take some existing general education courses and put them back on some new technology particularly a system called, LearnSmart and so to the extent that he is working with faculty to re-build their courses will be the correct way to say that.

President Dowd: President Elect Rouillard, you also attended that Board meeting. Would you like to provide any comments or thoughts on the discussion at the Board meeting?

President Elect Rouillard: I was concerned about this issue of general education being re-designed. The new dean of the Honors College also mentioned something about internships and particularly the Honors College would be interested in working on internships related to entrepreneurship which was a little concerning because that sort of leaves out humanities students and I thought that part of the point of developing all these internships was to help a broader range of students have those opportunities.

President Dowd: I have one last point to make about Dr. Cruickshank. This is the fourth Senate meeting that Dr. Cruickshank agreed to address Faculty Senate and the fourth meeting he was, at the last minute, unable to meet that commitment. To be fair, one time he was “bumped” from the agenda because President Jacobs pleaded that Provost Scarborough instead address Senate. However, for the other three occasions, Dr. Cruickshank first agreed to address Faculty Senate but then backed-out at the last minute. Perhaps Senators will be willing to hope, pray, and do some superstitious dancing that Dr. Cruickshank will again agree to address Faculty Senate and then actually show up at the meeting.

Next, along with our agenda, Miss Hubbard distributed a draft letter to Senators. That draft is an open letter to President Jacobs, Chancellor Gold, and Provost Scarborough addressing some of our concerns about their new teaching workload policy. Although the discussion of that draft letter is a later agenda item, I just want to mention it now because if endorsed by the Senate today, the signatories would be the Executive Committees of both Faculty Senate and Graduate Council.

Your Executive Committee has been quite busy since the previous Faculty Senate meeting, which included participating in many meetings over Spring Break. If Senate permits I will skip the discussion about the various meetings we attended and instead focus on one issue in particular. For this, Senators will recall from discussions at previous Senate meetings that I have been appointed to the committee that is charged with reviewing all university organizational and governance documents to determine if any element of any of those documents are conflict with the Constitution and Bylaws of the University Council. These documents include, of course, the Constitutions of the Faculty Senate, Graduate Council, and every college council. It is important to note that we were also asked to review the document governing Academic Affairs for the Provost and Chancellor. I don't know why, but our scope is so broad that it includes all documents, including those for Student Government.

To be clear, this is a Board of Trustee's mandate. In essence, we have to identify and remove any potential conflicts from all university documents. The Board's mandate includes the requirement that all such documents include a statement known as the “supremacy clause,” which I'll describe shortly. However, following the Board's action, President Jacobs took this opportunity to direct that two clauses, not one, be inserted into each and every organizational and governance document at this university. The second clause is known as the “delegation clause.” I'll get to that clause in minute. First, permit me to circle back to the “supremacy clause.”

Permit me to provide an informal definition of the “supremacy clause” through an example. If there is an element in the Faculty Senate Constitution that is in conflict with the University Council Constitution, then any test of that conflict results in the University Council “winning” that conflict. Because that was an informal definition of the “supremacy clause,” I ask Vice Provost Barrett, Professor of Law, to indicate whether he needs to elaborate on that informal definition.

Prof. Barrett: I think it is close enough.

President Dowd: I have the exact language of the “supremacy clause” here if you want me to read it as it would apply to Faculty Senate.

“Nothing in this Faculty Senate Constitution, Rules, or Appendix shall conflict with the University Council Constitution as approved by the Board of Trustees of the University. In the event of a conflict, the University Council Constitution and Bylaws shall prevail.”

This statement, mandated by the Board of Trustees, is to be included into our governing documents. That was “part 1” of the Board’s resolution. “Part 2” was that if we failed to include that statement in our governing documents by June 30, 2013, the documents would be suspended. In my opinion, this “supremacy clause” is redundant because of the language the Board used to establish the University Council.

In contrast, the “delegation clause” was imposed not by the Board but from President Jacobs only. My interpretation of the “delegation clause” is that President Jacobs views this as an opportunity to have each and every document at this university record his vast power and authority which has been delegated to him by the Board. The “delegation clause” as applied to Faculty Senate would be

“The authority and power of the Faculty Senate to take the actions set forth herein has been delegated and, in the ordinary course of events, will continue to be delegated from the Board of Trustees through the President and Officers of the University to the Faculty Senate.”

Prior to Spring-Break, I had a conversation with one of your Executive Committee Members, Mark Templin. Senator Templin brought up a great point: if President Jacobs put a “delegation clause” in every single organizational and governance document, will there be any sort of “academic decision” left at this university? Alarm bells went off in my head when Mark said this. The implication of President Jacob’s “delegation clause” is that he has eliminated all academic decisions. They are now all administrative decisions. I base that implication on my many years of service as Chair of the University’s Academic Standing Committee, and the many hours I have spent in the university’s Legal Affairs office researching case studies on academic grievances, grade appeals, and academic dishonesty. I have found that if a student takes an academic dispute to court, judges (in general) will not give students “standing” if that academic dispute was adjudicated by a faculty member or group of faculty members. However, judges (in general) will give such “standing” if that academic dispute was adjudicated by a university administrator. Last Thursday I explained this to President Jacobs and first asked him to not believe me on this evaluation. I instead asked him to first consult his own lawyers to determine whether his “delegation clause” created administrative decisions only and, second, whether his lawyers concur with my evaluation of the conditions students will be granted “standing” in court. If correct, President Jacob’s “delegation

clause” may permit students to sue in court instead of following UT’s appeal process because, for example, the student disagreed with the grade received in a particular course. After presenting this and other issues to President Jacobs, he told me he would consult his lawyers and respond to me. Once received, I will report to Senate President Jacobs' response to these issues.

As you can see from our agenda, today we have Dr. Steve Peseckis to presents a Curriculum Committee Report, and Drs. Humphrys & Molitor to discuss UT's Core Curriculum. In attendance today is Debra A. Davis, Dean of the College of Visual And Performing Arts, and the Implementation Team Leader for the proposed College of Communication. She is here to provide Senate with a status report on the implementation of that new college. That will be followed by Provost Scarborough, who will continue his discussion from the previous Senate meetings on the 2013 reorganization.

This concludes my portion of the Executive Committee report. Would any members from the Executive Committee like to add anything at this time? No? Then we will proceed to our agenda items.

Sadly, we must begin another Senate meeting by noting the passing of another colleague, Dr. David M. Stothers. David was a Professor of Anthropology. Here, today, to give a brief Remembrance of Professor Stothers is Dr. Jerry Van Hoy a colleague of his in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology. I invite Dr. Van Hoy to the podium.

Senator Van Hoy: Dr. David Stothers passed away on February 8th this year from complications from a major heart attack.

David M. Stothers earned his MA in Anthropology from the University of Toronto and his PhD in Anthropology from Case Western Reserve University. In 1972 he joined the Department of Sociology and Anthropology as our archeologist and he remained at the University of Toledo his entire career.

During his 41 years at the University of Toledo, David distinguished himself in several ways. He was known as an opinionated and demanding teacher and colleague, but most of all he was known as a dedicated advocate of archeological research, particularly at sites in North Central and Northwest Ohio and in Southeastern Michigan. As one member of the department, Elias Nigem, said, “David is the most committed to his program I have ever known... His life was nothing but archeology.”

When David arrived at UT, archeologists believed that there was little, if any, Native American prehistoric presence in Northwest Ohio. David’s work showed that this belief was wrong. His dedication to his craft led to the authoring and coauthoring of over 60 journal articles and book chapters exploring the prehistory of the Western Basin Tradition and the Sandusky Tradition. As Seamus Metress put it, “he even showed those people up in Michigan that they didn’t know what they were talking about!”

David often included students and members of the Toledo community in his digs. He inspired numerous students to follow in his footsteps and obtain graduate degrees in Anthropology, even though we do not offer an MA in Anthropology here at UT. Whether or not the students became anthropologists, they had valuable experiences that helped define the study of Anthropology at the University.

David also engaged in a large amount of community outreach. He worked with, and gave presentations to, numerous amateur archeological societies. These include the Blanchard River Archeology Club in Findlay, the Sandusky Bay chapter of the Archeological Society of Ohio, the River Raisin chapter of the

Michigan Anthropology Society, the Toledo chapter of the Archeological Institute of America, and the UT Anthropological Society. David has been one of a small number of professionals who work closely with amateur groups to oversee their archeological work and to help preserve archeological sites. In 2012 the Archeological Society of Ohio, the largest archeology group in Ohio with 3000 members, gave David its Lifetime Achievement Award.

David Stothers has been called a curmudgeon but he left behind a positive legacy. And as Barbara Chesney said, "He was our curmudgeon." Thank you.

[Applause]

President Dowd: Thank you, Senator Van Hoy. The next item on our agenda is Professor Peseckis, with a report from the Faculty Senate Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum.

Dr. Peseckis: Yesterday, March 11th you should have gotten a list of courses that are recommended for your approval from the Curriculum Committee. Is there any discussion? All in favor? Any opposed? Any abstentions? **Motion Passed.** *The following courses were approved at the March 12, 2013 Faculty Senate meeting. New Course and Course Modification Proposals Approved by the Faculty Senate on March 12, 2013*

College of Business and Innovation

Course Modifications

ACCT 3110 External Financial Reporting 1 3 CHr

Change credit hours from "3" to "4"

Change prerequisite from "Acct 3100 with a grade of C (2.0) or better" to "1. At least a C (2.0) in both BUAD 2040 and BUAD 2050 and 2. At least an average GPA of 2.75 in BUAD 2040 and BUAD 2050 and 3. At least a higher education GPA of 2.75"

Clarification: Besides the prerequisite change, we want the credits to go from 3 to 4. The prerequisite change is necessary because we are dropping Acct 3100, which was the old prerequisite. The change in credits is necessary because the critical material from Acct 3100 is being added to Acct 3110.

ACCT 3210 Individual Taxation 3 CHr

Change prerequisite from "At least a C in ACCT 3100" to "At least a C (2.0) in ACCT 3110 or may take at the same time as ACCT 3110."

Clarification: It means that ACCT 3110 can be either a pre- or co-requisite of ACCT 3210 and if one got less than a C in ACCT 3110 then one could retake ACCT 3110 and sign up for ACCT 3210 at the same time. There will be some students who will take the two classes together and get credit for Acct 3210 without getting at least a C in Acct 3110, but it is expected that this will be only a small number of students.

ACCT 3310 Accounting Information Systems 3 CHr

Change prerequisite from "At least a C in ACCT 3100" to "At least a C in ACCT 3110."

ACCT 4120 External Financial Reporting 2 3 CHr

Change Alpha code to "ACCT 3120"

ACCT 4130 External Financial Reporting 3 3 CHr

Change prerequisite from "At least a C in ACCT 4120" to "At least a C in ACCT 3120."

ACCT 4310 Internal Reporting 3 CHr

Change Alpha code to "ACCT 3320"

Change prerequisite from "At least a C in ACCT 3100" to "At least a C in ACCT 3110."

ACCT 4410 Government and NFP Accounting 3 CHr

Change prerequisite from "At least a C in ACCT 3110" to "At least a C in both ACCT 3120."

ACCT 4420 Auditing 3 CHr
Change prerequisite from "At least a C in both ACCT 3110 and ACCT 3310" to "At least a C in ACCT 3110 and ACCT 3310."

BAN 3060 Managerial Economics 3 CHr
Change alpha code to "FINA 3080"
Reason: The only change is to the Alpha Designation. This was done to make the students aware that this is a finance elective.

BAN 3070 Business Fluctuations Outlooks 3 CHr
Change alpha code to "FINA 3070"
Reason: The only change is to the Alpha Designation. This was done to make the students aware that this is a finance elective.

BUAD 2060 Data Analysis for Business 3 CHr
Change pre-requisite from "MATH 1260 and 1270 or 1850 or 1920 or 1760" to "MATH 1260 or 1320 or 1340 or 1730 or 1750 or 1850 or 1920."

Reason: The Math department no longer offers the Math 1260/1270 sequence, so a change was required. We also felt we should return to an earlier prerequisite for the course - so as not to set up unnecessary roadblocks for students while still preparing them for the course. Keeping 1260 in there for someone who had the old sequence – keeping some others – to try to cover all options.

EFSB 3590 Entrepreneurship and Small Business Management 3 CHr
Change alpha code to "EFSB 4590"
Reason: Changing course number EFSB 3590 to EFSB 4590 to conform with the course numbering of the entrepreneurship courses in the Management Department.

HURM 3630 Conflict Resolution and Negotiations 3 CHr
Change alpha code to "MGMT 3630"
Reason: Alpha Numeric change to better indicate the course movement into the leadership minor from the Human Resource Management Major.
No change in content

HURM 4710 Training and Evaluation 3 CHr
Change title to "Training and Development"
Reason: Title change better reflects content of the course.

College of Language, Literature, and Social Sciences

New Course

ECON 3270 Natural Resource Economics 3 CHr

Credit Hours: 3

Delivery Mode: Lecture 3 hrs

Offered Fall; Every Year.

Grading System: Normal Grading

Pre-requisites: ECON 1200

Co-requisites: None

Catalog Description: "Economic analysis of natural resource conservation and use, considering the objectives of efficiency and sustainability. Topics include energy, minerals, marine resources, land and agriculture, outdoor recreation, biodiversity and wildlife management."

Course Modifications

ECON 3240 Environmental Economics and Policy 3 Chr

Change title to "Environmental Economics"

Reason: Only changing the name of the course from "Environmental Economics and Policy" to "Environmental Economics". There is a course titled "Environmental Policy" taught by the Political Science department. This course does not explore in detail policies such as the Clean Air Act. This discussion is done in the "Environmental Policy" course.

ECON 3300 Benefit-cost Analysis 3 CHr

Change prerequisite from "ECON 1150 or ECON 1200 or permission of instructor" to "ECON 1150 or ECON 1200 or ECON 3240 or ECON 3270 or permission of the instructor."

Reason: Environmental Science/Studies Majors take (will take) ECON 3240 or ECON 3270 for their one required ECON course. The ECON department, in consultation with the Environmental Science Department, is creating an Environmental Economics

Concentration for the Environmental Studies Majors. Having ECON 3240 and ECON 3270 as prereq. for ECON 3300: Benefit-cost Analysis allows these students to take Benefit-cost Analysis as a follow-up course. The ECON these students covered is more advanced than the original 1000 level prereqs.

ECON 4240 Advanced Environmental Economics 3 CHr

Change course title to "Applied Environmental Economics"

Change prerequisite from "ECON 3200 or permission of instructor" to "ECON 1200 or ECON 3240 or ECON 3270 or permission of the instructor."

Reason: Environmental Science/Studies Majors take (will take) ECON 3240 or ECON 3270 for their one required ECON course. The ECON department, in consultation with the Environmental Science Department, is creating an Environmental Economics Concentration for the Environmental Studies Majors. Having ECON 3240 and ECON 3270 as prereq. for ECON 3300: Benefit-cost Analysis allows these students to take Benefit-cost Analysis as a follow-up course. The ECON these students covered is more advanced than the original 1000 level prereqs.

Adult and Lifelong Learning

Course Modification

COIL 1130 Information Literacy for College Research 2 CHr

Change alpha code to "AL 1130"

Reason for Change: The COIL College has been eliminated.

Honors College

New Course

HON 1000 Honors Orientation 1 CHr

Credit Hours: 1

Delivery Mode: Lecture

Offered Fall; Every Year.

Grading System: Normal Grading

Pre-requisites: None

Co-requisites: None

Catalog Description: "This course will orient students to the resources of the university and to important aspects of college life, including campus resources, academic policies and procedures, degree requirements, and Honors College requirements. In addition, it will strengthen students' academic skills, enhance their career goals, and develop a sense of community with faculty, staff, and peers at UT."

College of Health Sciences

Drafted when JHCOEHSHS

Department of Kinesiology

Course Modification

KINE 1650 Care and Prevention of Injuries 3 CHr

Change from prerequisite: KINE 1110, corequisite: none to

Either prerequisite or corequisite: KINE 110

Reason for Change: A section of KINE 1110 is now offered in Spring semester. These students also take KINE 1650. KINE 1110 is currently listed as a prereq for KINE 1650. KINE 1110 needs to be listed as a either a prerequisite or a corequisite for KINE 1650.

KINE 2590 Microbiology and Infectious Disease 3 CHr

Change prerequisites from "KINE 2560 FOR LEVEL UG WITH MIN. GRADE OF D- OR BIOL 2150 FOR LEVEL UG WITH MIN. GRADE OF D- OR BIOL 2170 FOR LEVEL UG WITH MIN. GRADE OF D- OR EEES 2150 FOR LEVEL UG WITH MIN. GRADE OF D- OR KINE 2510 FOR LEVEL UG WITH MIN. GRADE OF D- OR KINE 2530 FOR LEVEL UG WITH MIN. GRADE OF D-" to "A grade of C or higher in any of the following: KINE 2560, KINE 2510, KINE 2530, BIOL 2150, BIOL 2170, or EEES 2150."

Reason for Change: To improve student success rate in KINE 2590. To reverse the trend of increased fail rate in KINE 2590. To deter students from taking any of the listed pre-requisite courses and KINE 2590 at the same time.

KINE 2610 Evaluation of Lower Extremity Injuries 3 Chr

Change prerequisite from "KINE 1650" to "Acceptance into the Athletic Training Education Program"
Change corequisite to "KINE 2630 Clinical Anatomy for Athletic Training I"

Reason for Change: There has been some confusion on the part of students who took the required classes, but were not accepted into the Athletic Training Education Program as to eligibility for this course. The change limits enrollment to those accepted into the program. In addition, add KINE 2630 Clinical Anatomy for Athletic Training I as a corequisite for KINE 2610. KINE 2610 is already listed as corequisite for KINE 2630. Currently a student can take KINE 2610 without 2630, but not take 2630 without 2610.

KINE 2620 Evaluation of Upper Extremity Injuries 3 Chr

Change corequisite to "KINE 2640 Clinical Anatomy for Athletic Training II"

Reason for Change: Add KINE 2640 Clinical Anatomy for Athletic Training II as a corequisite for KINE 2620. KINE 2620 is already listed as corequisite for KINE 2640. Currently a student can take KINE 2620 without 2640, but not take 2640 without 2620.

KINE 2710 Clinical Skills Development I 2 Chr

Change prerequisite from "KINE 1650" to "Acceptance into the Athletic Training Education Program"

Reason for Change: Eliminate confusion when a student attempts to register for this course after they completed KINE 1650 and were not accepted into the Athletic Training Education Program.

KINE 3610 General Medical Conditions for Athletic Trainers 2 Chr

Change prerequisite from "KINE 2620" to "KINE 3630."

Reason for Change: This course was moved from Fall to Spring, 2nd year in the Athletic Training Education Program. KINE 2620 is Spring semester, 1st year in the Athletic Training Education Program. The appropriate prerequisite is the semester before or KINE 3630.

KINE 3720 Clinical Skill Development IV 2 Chr

Change prerequisite from "KINE 3630, KINE 3610" to "KINE 3630."

Reason for Change: The KINE 3610 course was moved from Fall to Spring, 2nd year in the Athletic Training Education Program. Students take KINE 3610 the same semester as KINE 3720, hence it cannot be a prerequisite.

KINE 4710 Clinical Skill Development V 2 Chr

Change prerequisite from "KINE 3660" to "KINE 3660, KINE 3610."

The KINE 3610 course was moved from Fall to Spring, 2nd year in the Athletic

Reason for Change: The KINE 3610 course was moved from Fall to Spring, 2nd year in the Athletic Training Education Program. Students should have completed KINE 3610 before attempting KINE 4710.

College of Natural Science and Mathematics

New Course

EEES 2720 Coral Reef Ecology 3 Chr

Credit Hours: 3

Delivery Mode: Online

Offered Spring; Every Year.

Grading System: Normal Grading

Pre-requisites: EEES 1150 Introductory Marine Biology or permission of instructor

Co-requisites: None

Catalog Description: "An exploration of the coral reef environment and the dynamics of coral reef ecosystems. Various organisms and their interactions in the web of coral reef life are examined to illustrate the food web and specialized habitats within the reef system. Emphasis on the delicate balance of natural reef processes and impacts of natural and human-imparted stressors on reef health."

MATH 2640 Statistics for Applied Sciences 3 CHr

Credit Hours: 3

Delivery Mode: Lecture (Primary), Computer, Assisted Instruction

Offered Fall, Spring, Summer; Every Year.

Grading System: Normal Grading

Pre-requisites: MATH 1750 or MATH 1830 or MATH 1850 or MATH 1920 or MATH 2450

Co-requisites: None

Catalog Description: "Introduction to descriptive and inferential statistical methods including estimation and hypothesis testing for discrete and continuous models. Modeling relationships between variables, and assessing goodness of fit. Basic concepts in probability. Introduction to design of experiments, clinical trials, surveys and observational studies. Overview of statistical procedures used in biological, clinical and environmental science literature."

Fit: This course has been requested by the Biological and Environmental Science Departments to fulfill their students' requirements for statistical methods. The course will be more focused on methods and their implementation than the current course (MATH 2600) and will employ examples directly related to those departments. The new course will also cover material related to the development of statistical models, which is not covered in MATH 2600. We have indications that some pharmacy students may also be directed to this course. Other departments and programs, such as bioengineering, may consider sending their students to this course.

Similarity: It is a modification of MATH 2600 as described above. MATH 2640 is more focused on methods and modeling. Students in the targeted departments will simply shift their enrollment from MATH 2600 to this course. There will be no net change in use of educational resources or overall student enrollments.

Course Modification

BIOL 2150 Fundamentals of Life Science I: Diversity of Life, Evolution and Adaptation 4 Chr

Change prerequisite from "None" to "H. S. GPA minimum of 2.75 or a ACT R minimum of 20 or ENGL 1110"

Reason: This course is taken primarily by first year science majors; collected data suggests those with H.S. GPAs below 2.75 or ACT R below 20 perform poorly, impacting their GPA, retention and academic success. Imposing prerequisites will better prepare students for success in BIOL 2150.

College of Visual and Performing Arts

Department of Theatre and Film

New Course

FILM 3210 Film Theory 4 CHr

Credit Hours: 4

Delivery Mode: Lecture 4 hrs

Offered Fall; Alternate Years.

Enrollment per section: 35 Per Term: 35

Grading System: Normal Grading

Repeated for credit: No

Pre-requisites: FILM 2340 or Permission of Instructor.

Co-requisites: None

Catalog Description: Course in fundamental concepts in film theory. Examines the history of film theory and its ongoing development in the face of changes in production and consumption practices. Theories covered include classical narrative, psychoanalysis, semiotics, feminism, genre, reception studies, and globalization. This course is Writing Intensive and incorporates frequent writing assignments in ways that help students learn both the subject matter of the course and discipline-specific ways of thinking and writing.

Fit: One of six alternate film studies courses that students are required to pick for eight hours of credit.

Deleted Courses: FILM 2980

FILM 3510 Lighting & Cinematography 3 CHr

Credit Hours: 3

Delivery Mode: Studio 3 hrs

Offered Summer; Alternate Years.

Enrollment per section: 16 Per Term: 16

Grading System: Normal Grading

Repeated for credit: No

Pre-requisites: FILM 2310 and FILM 2320 or Permission of Instructor.

Co-requisites: None

Catalog Description: Advanced production course concentrating on the principles of lighting for video and film. The theory, science and various practices in cinematography are explored through demonstrations, active engagement in studio lighting exercises, and in the creation of film production work outside of class.

Fit: One of six alternate production courses that students are required to pick for twelve hours of credit.

FILM 3520 Audio Production and Postproduction 3 CHr

Credit Hours: 3

Delivery Mode: Studio 3 hrs

Offered Summer; Alternate Years.

Enrollment per section: 16 Per Term: 16

Grading System: Normal Grading

Repeated for credit: No

Pre-requisites: FILM 2310 and FILM 2320 or Permission of Instructor.

Co-requisites: None

Catalog Description: Production and postproduction of audio for film and video. The course focuses on the techniques, concepts and practices for recording, editing and mixing sound for a cohesive video production. Students gain experience in recording, editing and signal processing with a digital audio workstation.

Fit: One of six alternate production courses that students are required to pick for twelve hours of credit.

Deleted Courses: FILM 3360

FILM 3530 Animation and Optical Printing 3 CHr

Credit Hours: 3

Delivery Mode: Studio 3 hrs

Offered Summer; Alternate Years.

Enrollment per section: 16 Per Term: 16

Grading System: Normal Grading

Repeated for credit: No

Pre-requisites: FILM 2310 or Permission of Instructor.

Co-requisites: None

Catalog Description: Advanced production course in the creation of animation and special effects for film and digital work.

Hand-drawn, cut-out, stop-motion, pixilation and various optical effects are explored through in-class exercises and individual productions.

Fit: One of six alternate production courses that students are required to pick for twelve hours of credit.

Deleted Courses: FILM 3360

FILM 3550 Producing and Production Management 3 CHr

Credit Hours: 3

Delivery Mode: Distance Learning (DL) 3 hrs

Offered Fall; Alternate Years.

Enrollment per section: 16 Per Term: 16

Grading System: Normal Grading

Repeated for credit: No

Pre-requisites: None

Co-requisites: None

Catalog Description: Inquiry into the financial, logistical, and organizational aspects of film and video production, focusing on the roles of the line producer, production manager, assistant director and their teams.

Fit: One of six alternate production courses that students are required to pick for twelve hours of credit.

FILM 3560 Digital Post Production 3 CHr

Credit Hours: 3

Delivery Mode: Studio 3 hrs

Offered Spring; Alternate Years.

Enrollment per section: 16 Per Term: 16

Grading System: Normal Grading

Repeated for credit: No

Pre-requisites: FILM 2320

Co-requisites: None

Catalog Description: Advanced course exploring the specific issues involved in digital post-production. Editing techniques, color correction, and various effects are covered through in-class exercises and individual production work.

Fit: One of six alternate production courses that students are required to pick for twelve hours of credit.

Deleted Courses: FILM 3360

FILM 3800 Media for Live Performance 1-3 CHr

Credit Hours: 1-3

Delivery Mode: Lab 3-6 hrs

Offered Fall, Spring; Every Year

Enrollment per section: 16 Per Term: 16

Grading System: Normal Grading

Repeated for credit: Yes, to a maximum of 6 CHr

Pre-requisites: FILM 2310 and FILM 2320

Co-requisites: None

Catalog Description: A laboratory course in production of live media events in which students take on production responsibility for works of media art.

Fit: Elective credit

FILM 3820 Documentary Field Production 4 CHr

Credit Hours: 4

Delivery Mode: Studio 4 hrs

Offered Spring; Every Year

Enrollment per section: 16 Per Term: 16

Grading System: Normal Grading

Repeated for credit: No

Pre-requisites: FILM 2310 and FILM 2320

Co-requisites: None

Catalog Description: Advanced production class focusing on the unique challenges of field production. Various types of documentary work are explored through field assignments relating to social and scientific subjects. This course includes local and regional production work as well as study abroad options.

Fit: One of six alternate production courses that students are required to pick for twelve hours of credit.

Deleted Courses: FILM 3360

FILM 3900 Multimedia Production 3 CHr

Credit Hours: 3

Delivery Mode: Studio 3 hrs

Offered Fall, Spring; Alternate Years

Enrollment per section: 12 Per Term: 12

Grading System: Normal Grading

Repeated for credit: Yes, to a maximum of 6 CHr

Pre-requisites: None

Co-requisites: None

Catalog Description: Students will apply theories of multimedia performance, cinema, new media, and visual arts to the development and exhibition of an original devised multimedia production. The production will test the complex potentialities of multimedia performance as a laboratory for artistic, technological, and cultural experimentation.

Fit: Elective

Deleted Courses: FILM 3360

FILM 4210 Film Censorship 4 CHr

Credit Hours: 4

Delivery Mode: Lecture 4 hrs

Offered Spring; Alternate Years

Enrollment per section: 25 Per Term: 25

Grading System: Normal Grading

Repeated for credit: No

Pre-requisites: FILM 2340

Co-requisites: None

Catalog Description: Advanced cinema studies course focusing on the social, cultural, and political history of film censorship from early cinema through today. Covering early censorship questions, the Production Code Era, the Hollywood Ten, the shift toward the movie ratings system and the MP AA, and present-day concerns about film content.

Fit: Elective

FILM 4220 Media Studies 4 CHr

Credit Hours: 4

Delivery Mode: Lecture 4 hrs

Offered Fall, Alternate Years

Enrollment per section: 25 Per Term: 25

Grading System: Normal Grading

Repeated for credit: Yes, to a maximum of 12 CHr

Pre-requisites: FILM 2340

Co-requisites: None

Catalog Description: Covering issues concerned with film and media history, theory, and criticism and the interrelationship of film to television, radio, print, and/or the Internet. Particular focus of the course can change. Repeatable for credit.

Fit: One of eight film studies which students must select 12 hours for BA degree.

Deleted Courses: FILM 3980

FILM 4230 Filmmakers 4 CHr

Credit Hours: 4

Delivery Mode: Lecture 4 hrs

Offered Fall, Alternate Years

Enrollment per section: 25 Per Term: 25

Grading System: Normal Grading

Repeated for credit: Yes, to a maximum of 12 CHr

Pre-requisites: FILM 2340

Co-requisites: None

Catalog Description: Theoretical and analytical examination of film authorship and its various forms, including directors, producers, and scriptwriters. Consideration is given to the cultural function of the designation of authorship and how this affects reception of films. Particular focus of the course can change. Repeatable for credit.

Fit: One of eight film studies which students must select 12 hours for BA degree.

FILM 4240 Genre Studies 4 CHr

Credit Hours: 4

Delivery Mode: Lecture 4 hrs

Offered Spring, Alternate Years

Enrollment per section: 25 Per Term: 25

Grading System: Normal Grading

Repeated for credit: Yes, to a maximum of 12 CHr

Pre-requisites: FILM 2340

Co-requisites: None

Catalog Description: Critical approaches to serial productions commonly called "genre" films. Consideration of how patterns of recognition form and are sustained in the modes of horror, melodrama, westerns, science fiction, musicals, and others. An emphasis on Hollywood genre production is facilitated by an analysis of cross-cultural influences and divergences. Particular focus of the course can change. Repeatable for credit.

Fit: One of eight film studies which students must select 12 hours for BA degree.

THR 3140 Dramaturgy 3 CHr

Credit Hours: 3

Delivery Mode: Lecture 3 hrs

Offered Spring, Alternate Years

Enrollment per section: 12 Per Term: 12

Grading System: Normal Grading

Repeated for credit: No

Pre-requisites: THR 3110 and THR 3120 or permission of instructor

Co-requisites: None

Catalog Description: The study and applications of Dramaturgy as they pertain to the theatrical production process. Emphasis is placed on pre-production dramaturgy (research gathering and presentation; production concept development); production/rehearsal dramaturgy (pre-audience criticism; concept comments, etc.); and post-production dramaturgy (lobby displays, post-production discussions, etc.).

Fit: One of six theatre studies courses which students must select to satisfy the 9 hour requirement in theatre studies for BA degree.

THR 3420 Stage Management 3 CHr

Credit Hours: 3

Delivery Mode: Lecture 3 hrs; Offered Fall, Alternate Years

Enrollment per section: 12 Per Term: 12

Grading System: Normal Grading

Repeated for credit: No

Pre-requisites: None

Co-requisites: None

Catalog Description: Study and application of professional practices of the Stage Manager as they pertain to the theatrical production. Emphasis is placed on the duties, responsibilities and procedures from pre-production to post-production planning. Fit: One of six theatre studies courses which students must select to satisfy the 9 hour requirement in theatre studies for BA degree.

Deleted Courses: THR4400

THR 3430 Advanced Stagecraft and Technical Production

3 CHr

Credit Hours: 3

Delivery Mode: Studio 3 hrs

Offered Fall, Alternate Years

Enrollment per section: 12 Per Term: 12

Grading System: Normal Grading

Repeated for credit: No

Pre-requisites: THR 1030

Co-requisites: None

Catalog Description: This course is designed to expand upon the foundation of scenic construction techniques formed in basic theatre practices: Stagecraft. Topics include welding/metalworking, advanced woodworking, scenic automation, theatrical rigging, and technical direction/project management/shop management.

Fit: Elective

Deleted Courses: THR4400

THR 3450 Scene Painting 3 CHr

Credit Hours: 3

Delivery Mode: Studio 3 hrs

Offered Fall, Alternate Years

Enrollment per section: 12 Per Term: 12

Grading System: Normal Grading

Repeated for credit: No

Pre-requisites: None

Co-requisites: None

Catalog Description: Students learn the fundamental skills of the scenic artist in large scale painting: preparing and sizing the surfaces, gridding and other layout, and painting techniques and tools used by the scenic artist.

Fit: Elective

Deleted Courses: THR4400

THR 3900 Multimedia Production 3 CHr

Credit Hours: 3

Delivery Mode: Studio 3 hrs

Offered Fall, Spring; Alternate Years

Enrollment per section: 12 Per Term: 12

Grading System: Normal Grading

Repeated for credit: Yes, for a Maximum of 6 CHr

Pre-requisites: None

Co-requisites: None

Catalog Description: Students will apply theories of multimedia performance, cinema, new media, and visual arts to the development and exhibition of an original devised multimedia production. The production will test the complex potentialities of multimedia performance as a laboratory for artistic, technological, and cultural experimentation.

Fit: Elective

I

THR 4150 Theatre Studies 3 CHr

Credit Hours: 3

Delivery Mode: Lecture 3 hrs

Offered Fall, Alternate Years

Enrollment per section: 25 Per Term: 25

Grading System: Normal Grading

Repeated for credit: No

Pre-requisites: THR 3110 and THR 3120 or permission of instructor

Co-requisites: None

Catalog Description: Application of the methods of theatre history, theory, and criticism to the exploration of a specific theatrical theme, style, historical period, or practice.

Fit: One of six theatre studies courses which students must select to satisfy the 9 hour requirement in theatre studies for BA degree.

Deleted Courses: THR4900

THR 4440 Theatre Design 3 CHr

Credit Hours: 3

Delivery Mode: Lecture 3 hrs

Offered Spring, Alternate Years

Enrollment per section: 12 Per Term: 12

Grading System: Normal Grading

Repeated for credit: No

Pre-requisites: None

Co-requisites: None

Catalog Description: Students learn the fundamental skills of the scenic artist in large scale painting: preparing and sizing the surfaces, gridding and other layout, and painting techniques and tools used by the scenic artist.

Fit: Elective

Deleted Courses: THR4400

Dr. Peseckis: I will say one caveat, if there is something that happens to a course that directly affects enrollment for the Fall and for some reason it is not going to make the deadline let us know because there is the ability for Senate to provisionally approve something directly to Senate, only if it affects enrollment.

President Dowd: It will have to come through the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

Dr. Peseckis: Well, it can do that, but there is that provision in there; but I would like for people to get everything through and submitted by March 29th.

President Dowd: Thank you, Professor Peseckis. For the next agenda item we have Senators Humphrys and Molitor to talk about the next steps for the Core Curriculum.

Senator Molitor: We were planning on coming here today and submitting our general education core curriculum proposal for Faculty Senate approval. We have recently learned some information that has caused us to rethink bringing this proposal to the Faculty Senate for approval. The proposal we gave Senate and distributed to advisors and faculty on campus specifies a structure for general education core curriculum that would meet state of Ohio standards. In particular, we proposed having courses approved for what is called the Ohio Transfer Module and particular categories of the Ohio Transfer Module that would be part of our core curriculum. We also distributed a list of courses that were currently part of our Ohio Transfer Module and what we wanted to propose is that this is the list of courses that would be in our new and approved general education core curriculum. Well, what we learned from meetings with Marcia King-Blandford and Peg Traband from the Provost's Office is that that list may not be current; this list of OTM courses is going to be reviewed by the Ohio Board of Regents next year and some courses in that current list will be removed and other courses that are not in the list will have to be added. So, by providing a proposal to you, we would have given you a list of courses that we could not say would be in our general education core by this time next year and will not be valid. So we did not think it was appropriate to bring those courses to you for your approval only to find out later on that those courses are not remaining in our gen ed. core. Before we bring a proposal to Faculty Senate for approval we will try to provide you with what we think is a more definitive list of these courses. We are not going to be 100% certain because we don't know what the Ohio Board of Regents will do.

Here is a summary of this process for your information: there are committees of discipline-appropriate faculty from institutions across the state that review proposals for courses to be included in the university's Ohio Transfer Module. We learned courses are rejected if they are deemed to be not of a general or broad interest. What we didn't know and we were told is that there seems to be a bias towards courses that are in "standard" disciplines. Standard disciplines are subject areas that you will find in almost all universities throughout Ohio such as biology, chemistry, mathematics, economics, history, sociology, music, etc. I am not sure if I can exactly define the term "standard" in this context. I was given a few examples for what determines something as being nonstandard, but I think that is arbitrary for the Ohio Board of Regents to decide. Also what we learned is that courses can be rejected if the information provided in the syllabi is incomplete. For courses to be approved for the Ohio Transfer Module the departments have to provide syllabi for their courses and these syllabi have to contain specific information. It turns out some of the syllabi that we been submitting to the state have not had the information that is required. So, what Senator Humphrys is going to talk about is our process for approval. We want to make sure that when courses are submitted to the Faculty Senate for inclusion in the gen ed. core that we are going to give the state all the information that they are requiring from us. I will now turn it over to Senator Humphrys.

Senator Humphrys: Also in response and it answers the situation that Senator Molitor was just referring to and also we know that we did get some comments last time about turning over to the Provost's Office the responsibility of initially getting a course into the OTM before it would be considered a general education listing at UT. We kind of switched it around and this information that you see up here is a process that we know now that it has to be part of the Ohio Transfer Module in order for it to be gen ed. We will go through this process that was suggested up here so it would start with the core curriculum. We would review the courses that are being applied for to be considered for our general education core and then we will do the approval before it would go on to actually seeing if it can be approved for the Ohio Transfer Module conclusion. We want to make sure that it would be noticed that we do want the core curriculum to continue to be the first step of this process of approval. Also, related to this is the fact that we need as the Core Curriculum to get a really good idea from the state as to what their guidelines are and what the potential for acceptance would be. Obviously, we don't want to be putting forward courses that maybe have no hopes, at least in their particular area of being accepted although we will deal with it as we come to it. The thing that Senator Molitor also referred to is that we now have a copy of a template of the information that the state is looking for when a course applies for inclusion, we just got that last week and that would be very helpful because we did not have any information previously. There was one other issue that we found out in our meeting that Senator Molitor referred to and that is the concept of multi-cultural courses. As you recall, we understood that the state does not have a multi-cultural category; it does not look at multi-cultural as being a potential OTM course. So we were proposing that we would continue to have 6 hrs. as a requirement at UT as an additional requirement to the general ed., so in a lot of senses it was a global requirement. In our discussion with the Provost's Office they indicated that any coursework that we would require would become "general education" and so it would need to be approved by OBOR and so that brings into a lot of additional issues none the least of which would be double dipping because obviously we were proposing that at least one of those multi-cultural requirements could be achieved by double-dipping with a course that wasn't in the OTM. Well, the fact is that is not going to be something that seems like it will be possible. Also the issue would be that if the state seems to be "really interested and focused upon a 120 credit hr. degree program" and if we have a

general education core here that would include multi-cultural courses, a student coming from a community college would not have completed that because that is not part of the typical general education core. So when they would come from whatever community college they would come without having 6 hrs. of multi-cultural courses, and we were told that the state would frown upon us requiring those 6 additional hours because we put the student beyond the 120 hrs. of completion for a Bachelor's Degree. So, I guess with every answer we think we have, it gets to be "20 more questions." Our committee is meeting this week and a lot of these issues will be discussed so we can have some sort of an approach to solving among other things the multi-cultural dilemma as it turns out. We could suggest that programs include multi-cultural courses, but when we make it a requirement we were told that would be an issue with the state. So that was more-or-less the shorter version.

Prof. Edwards: It is my understanding that OBOR does not approve any institution's general education core while it does require approval of transfer module courses.

Senator Humphrys: And that is the type of information that we really as a committee don't feel we have. I know from Education what we seem to be reading as far as written documentation from OBOR isn't necessarily corresponding with the information that we are receiving and we want to be very diligent about not limiting any opportunities that we have here at the university. And so that is why we definitely commit to the fact that we will definitely look into all of these issues because it is too important of a concept for the future for our students for us not to have all of this addressed.

Senator Molitor: Are there any more questions?

Dr. Peseckis: I have a question; you mentioned a 120 credit hrs., but at the moment we are at 124 hrs., have you heard when or how we are going to change from 124 hrs. to 120 hrs.?

Senator Molitor: Senator Piazza, have you heard about when the requirement is going to go from 124 credit hours to 120 credit hours?

Senator Piazza: No, I haven't heard anything additionally to that.

Senator Molitor: I have not as well.

Dr. Peseckis: Is there a mechanism about how to proceed and do we bring that to the Programs Committee or does it come down from administration if there's going to be a change?

President Dowd: It would have to be submitted to the Faculty Senate Committee on Academic Programs.

Dr. Peseckis: Well, it's not only the list of courses, do you think the courses in all the programs are going to change?

President Dowd: The Executive Committee discussed this issue a couple of months ago and we thought it would be beneficial to bring to an Executive Committee meeting members from your committee along with those from the Core Curriculum Committee to try to help the Executive Committee understand how to proceed on this issue.

Senator Jorgensen: Do you know for sure if that is correct if they do not want to exceed 120 credit hrs. because there are programs like Engineering that exceed 120 hrs.? It is my understanding from some time ago that the rest of the state was going semester conversion and they were going to allow degrees at 120 hrs., but it wasn't necessarily that a university couldn't be more than that, it had to be at least 120. They also by the way allow the terms to be shorter by a week, 14 weeks of instruction and 1 week of exams and that is permitted in the state and again it is not required.

Senator Molitor: My understanding is there are exceptions to the 120 hrs, such as programs that have external accreditation. But I am not aware of the other exceptions that would be granted, or if there is some sort of application process that we would follow. I don't know the answer to that.

President Dowd: Given time constraints, this will have to be the last question.

Senator Unknown: Back to the original issue which was the possibility of having general education courses at UT excluded from the OTM because they so far don't meet guidelines. You indicated that you've received guidelines or a template from the state. Now, in the Tag System which is parallel to the Core Curriculum they are defined by discipline-specific topics that must be included in a course, but there's a 70% rule that allows some flexibility. Two questions: One, have you gotten an indication that that is a policy from OBOR? Secondly, have they given you that much detail that we can evaluate here at UT with our syllabi if these courses are going to meet some metric?

Senator Humphrys: I should be clear that the template we received is what they wanted to see on the syllabi to review so it wasn't any sort of criteria of "this is what you need in order to have it meet the guidelines of OTM." It was like, this is what the people who are reviewing the courses want to see on the syllabus so we weren't really given any other direction other than the sort of information they wanted us to have.

Senator Unknown: The point of the question is the decision-making process on their part – if the "rubric" that they are giving us is complete enough that we can make allowances and we can modify courses if necessary.

Senator Molitor: We are going to find that out. We want to make sure by the time we have the processed and approved courses, the issue is not with the state.

Prof. Edwards: These guidelines are all on the OBOR site under the transfer module and you can go there and look them up yourself; they are all clearly laid out.

President Dowd: With that, I have to move Senate's attention to our next agenda item. But before doing that, I want to express my most sincere appreciation for the time, energy, and devotion Senators Humphrys and Molitor have dedicated to this issue for our students.

[Applause]

President Dowd: Now, let's move on to our next speaker. I am quite pleased to welcome Dean Deborah Davis to Senate, as I believe this is the first time Dean Davis will be addressing Faculty Senate. As I mentioned earlier, Dean Davis is also the Implementation Team Leader for the proposed College of

Communication. She has agreed to provide Senate with a status report on the implementation of that new college. I invite Dean Davis to the podium.

Dean Davis: Thank you President Dowd. I am here to answer your questions and give you an update on where we are with the implementation of the new college that focuses on communication. I will go through a very short process and describe it to you: I put out a call to faculty and asked them to give me a brief bio and also their interpretation of communication in the 21st century. After I received those I put them together and created a committee across a variety of different people and different concerns to be able to have this discussion. So we had Paul Fritz from Faculty Senate who is also the Chair of Communication, Kristen Keith who is a rep. for Faculty Senate, Jacqueline Layng who is a full professor in Communication, David Strukel who is a Communications lecturer, John Eidemiller who is in Communication and Television Media Producer/Director, Tammy Kinsey who is a professor in Film and Video, Holly Hey who is an associate professor in Film and Video, Ed Lingan who is an assistant professor in Theatre, Larry Burns because of his connection with the communication field and as an administrator, and then myself. We met for a series of weeks and we started by reviewing a number of things. We reviewed what's going out and in the field, so we spent a lot of time doing that. I had a series of other institutions that I wanted everybody to look at and it was a wide variety: Champlain College, Ball State, BGSU, University of Texas, Austin, Ohio University, and Northwestern University just to name a few. Each of those programs were different – Champlain College is smaller and has a very technical orientation, however recently they decided that because of the technical orientation they are missing some of the gen ed. kind of features, so they are bringing more of the gen ed. back into their program because people who are hiring their students were saying they are very technically savvy but they are not solving the problems they want them to solve, so that was a key point. They also have an inverted kind of an approach; lots of places such as the Ohio University have their students spend a lot of time in theory and content classes and then gave them the equipment. The College of Champlain flipped that and gave them their hands-on machinery and production equipment so they can actually be participating while simultaneously going in to the content courses and those sorts of things. We looked at all those things and everybody went and looked at them individually and brought back points that we wanted to discuss and we had lots of different discussions over what we felt was good or bad or what would work for us because we are balancing what we have going on here and so we spent a lot of time doing that. After we did that I asked Larry to do an overview from his perspective and from the perspective of the people he knows in the field, such as what was out there, what they were looking for, what was going on in the field. We had Professor Layng talk about what they were doing in Communication in the production side and then Paul added his side to it, which was the historical and the contextual content side of it, for a lack of a better word. Then, Ed Lingan presented, why would you want Theatre to be a part of this? Which was really an interesting discussion and actually we were very surprised at learning how to perform in front of an audience, such as the way you stand and the way you act are all a part of how we present ourselves and the crossover between theatrical performance and presentation performances, so that was really beneficial as well. Then we talked a little bit about the other sides of the art side of this, which were things that would feed into that such as the theatre and films areas as well as areas in new media and also in visual arts that would also work in there, as well as audio recording. So, after we had those discussions we finally had to get down to the “nitty-gritty” of logistically deciding—what are we going to do with this? It was proposed that the college be Option 1. A freestanding College of Communication and so I gave them several options to think about. The College of Communication has 13 faculty members and that includes

lecturers. Option 2. The College of LLSS with Communication in LLSS with programs shared with Arts and Business. Option 3. The idea of combining Communication with the College of Visual and Performing Arts. We also discussed each option and the hardest one to run would be a college with 13 people. If you have DPC and a CPC and you can't overlap members, and some of those 13 people are lecturers, it will be almost impossible to staff. Faculty will be in meeting constantly. It is just a very hard thing to do, so we didn't believe that was an option. Since the idea is to focus on communication and what is happening in the world today, the crossover that is happening between the visual and performing arts and communications is something that we are living with in the world today, social media and web design, all those sorts of things impact one another. We discussed that and came up with a solution and presented a proposal to Provost Scarborough the Friday before Spring-Break for The College of Integrated Communication and the Arts and that is where we are right now. We wrote a mission statement and a vision statement. I sent out an email today to the faculty constituents and I will be meeting with them next week to have a broader discussion about it.

President Dowd: Are there any questions for Dean Davis from either Senators or non-Senators?

Dean Davis: Senators Keith, Hey, Lingan -- and I don't see Dr. Fritz -- can also put their "two cents" in.

Senator Hagan: So if you were a standalone communication college with 13 where would you be with your new proposed integrated version? How many people would be in your college now?

Dean Davis: So there are 13 in Communication and 47 in the Visual and Performing Arts so it becomes 60.

Past President Anderson: What happens to the present Department of Communication?

Dean Davis: It comes into the new college.

Past President Anderson: The whole?

Dean Davis: The whole thing. There's sort of a production side and there's the side that is organization/interpersonally oriented and everyone comes together with curriculum being developed to share throughout the other areas that I talked about, and also with the College of Business.

Senator Jorgensen: What was the origin for moving in a particular direction of a college of communication in a broader sense? I mean I read Provost Scarborough's long document and I guess it wasn't crystal clear to me what the origin was for moving in a direction of a college of communication.

Dean Davis: That is something you would have to ask the Provost.

Provost Scarborough: One of the groups made a suggestion that the colleges of communications are at any university growing large numbers of majors.² There is an enrollment growth potential in that field that is changing pretty dramatically. There were some questions as to whether or not our program was one such. We had positioned them to participate in that enrollment growth and growing numbers of careers. A suggestion was made that the professional today has to have an integrated skill set to be relevant. There

are many people that came through the communication program with either journalism or something and having to adapt their career to learning the other pieces because only those who are really thriving and succeeding in this career had this integrated background. A suggestion was made to look at pulling this department out and setting it on its own and letting it pursue this direction. Having come from two universities, having graduated from one and just recently come from another that had a standalone college of communication, the idea seem to have merit. It found its way into the plan believing that it has enrollment growth potential and a more relevant set of educational opportunities that might prepare students for a growing number of career opportunities. I also learned during the process that Dean Davis and Dean Barlowe had already been talking about some joint degree programs and so Dean Barlowe had a particular interest. This was also already on their radar and so when I asked Dean Davis to lead an implementation team to do the additional level of due diligence to decide whether or not this is a good idea she agreed. When I met with the committee to hear their recommendations and when the recommendation seemed to be unanimous and Dean Davis, correct me if I am wrong, but everyone in the room seemed to be pointing in the direction of a college of “integrated communication and the arts” and when I canvassed everyone in the room seemed to have a level of excitement about the idea. I don’t want to speak for everyone, but there were many members in the room that were part of the process. I went to the president and said look, we may be headed in a slightly different direction but it still features and allows communication to think more broadly about what the curriculum needs to be and the kind of students that we can attract for a lot of pragmatic as well as educational purposes they are suggesting this approach and he seemed to be supportive and I was supportive. The idea would be to allow this idea to continue to percolate for a little while and if there was still a level of enthusiasm around it in April when it is time to take such an idea to the Academic and Student Affairs Committee and the Board; we would look to do that. So that is a little bit of the historical context. Again, it is less powerful when you hear it from me than when you hear from people that were in the room and part of the process.

Senator Hottell: I have two questions. One has to do with the stakeholders you said you interviewed and the other has to do with requirements. The stakeholders--there was a discrepancy recently. For example, some of the courses that were proposed by the Department of Communication. There was some discrepancy about whether or not the courses proposed had actually been approved by the department and so that makes me wonder about this issue. Did you interview all the people, all the faculty members in the Communication Department?

Dean Davis: I personally met with the communication faculty. I was aware that there were some courses that were in process and I since learned that there were some issues with some of the courses and some issues with some of the syllabi, and so right now, we are going to hold on those curricular issues.

Senator Hottell: No, because they are two different issues. I am on the Senate Curriculum Committee also and I know what the issues with the courses were. As you know I have some expertise with some of the areas, so I can ascertain that quality is not the issue. The issue is whether or not the department faculty had voted on that as we usually do, does that make sense to you?

Dean Davis: Not with me as the implementation team, that would have been with Dean Barlowe.

Senator Hottell: My point is, since the Communication faculty members were apparently not consulted concerning the classes I want to be sure that you have consulted with all of them regarding this huge change?

President Dowd: Please pardon me for interrupting this discussion, but it is for a point of clarification. The dispute over those courses has since been resolved. At a department meeting, the courses were discussed and then approved by the faculty members in the Department of Communication. If I understand correctly, the dispute arose because one faculty member was not present at that department meeting and was unaware that the courses were approved by his colleagues. When that faculty member was informed that the courses were approved, that faculty member withdrew his concerns, thus resolving the dispute.

Senator Hottell: Thank you. I am sorry. I did not mean to take the question elsewhere by obfuscating it with that, but my one point remains: have you consulted with the Communication faculty and do they think this is a good idea?

Dean Davis: Can I answer that a little bit more?

Senator Hottell: Sure.

Dean Davis: We are scheduling a meeting next week to meet all constituents, for a discussion with everybody to make sure, as we did when we became the College of Visual and Performing Arts. We held a vote on that, which was anonymous and we will go through that same process.

Senator Hottell: Thank you. My next question is about requirements. You probably know what I am going to ask you about. The college that you are presently dean of significantly reduced the foreign language requirement.

Dean Davis: Only one degree.

Senator Hottell: Which is the major degree that you give.

Dean Davis: Not with the larger number of students, which are actually enrolled. They are actually enrolled in the BA degree and that still has a language requirement.

Senator Hottell: It has a language requirement, but 6 hrs. of language and 6 hrs. of culture, not the original required proficiency of intermediate level.

Dean Davis: That is correct.

Senator Hottell: If you become this college that you are talking about, do you assume that the same requirements will be brought over from Visual and Performing Arts or will you have to go through curricular review to decide what the requirements will be?

Dean Davis: The discussion that we have had, Dr. Fritz said that he thinks language is very important and that would be up to the group of people in the Phase II part of the Implementation; it is their job to look at curriculum to make those decisions by recommendation, and then faculty will have to vote.

Senator Hottell: I would like to go on record by saying today that maybe you feel that some of the video and plastic artists don't necessarily need language proficiency through intermediate level....

Dean Davis: It is not my decision; it is the decision of the faculty.

Senator Hottell: I wish I was speaking French because I would have said the plural when I said “you.” I meant your college. The point is you (plural) would be doing a great disservice to journalists of all kinds if they cannot, for example, be relatively fluent in Spanish. You will be cutting them off from jobs all over the country.

Dean Davis: I appreciate that, and we will certainly discuss that; we have not gotten into discussions at that level.

Senator Hottell: Thank you.

Dean Davis: It was brought up and it is important.

Senator Barnes: I wanted to second the comment about the foreign language requirements and also in terms of the presentation that we saw previously about the multi-cultural requirements. I think we are really doing our students a disservice if we are reducing the requirement for foreign language and multi-cultural courses, so any message that you could put out to say, “Please consider what the students need” would be excellent. I mean, it’s been one of my deepest regrets that I was not required to learn a foreign language as an undergraduate student and I bet there are a lot of other folks who feel the same way that I do. It’s hard to express what it would have meant to me professionally to have that, especially now as the world gets smaller. I just want to say please keep that in mind when you are making curricular decisions, not just you, but all of us, that those things are really important to our students’ futures.

Past President Anderson: Were there any concerns raised for the Visual and Performing Arts side? I think it was the Fine Arts and the Performing Arts that are not there particularly for a communication career but they are there to learn how to... one way or another.

Dean Davis: There was discussion and we talked about the word “intergrated” for quite a while. They didn’t like the word integrated in front of communication. But, for us, (Implementation Team) I think integrated is important because it means integrating the arts as well as, communications being integrated into itself also. The arts part of it we debated for a very long time. We went through any number of different combinations with communications and fine arts. There are schools out there that have a wide variety of these combinations. We put a whole series of those up and then really literally worked our way through the process. We had chosen “The College of Integrated Communication and Art.” When we made the presentation to the provost, the provost came back and asked “are you considering the Arts enough, when you don’t use the word “The” in front of Art and so we added the word, “*the* Arts,” so it was distinguished from the communication part but the word integrated was still there.

Provost Scarborough: You also might want to mention in the conversation about a school.

Dean Davis: Yes. We are also considering a new structure, when we get into the logistical part of it. The idea is that we will actually have a school of Performing Arts that would link music and theatre into a performing arts school so they will not be removed from that distinctive quality. Provost Scarborough had met individually with the arts students, because they had a performance the night of his forum. He came over and that was the arts students’ forum. Are there any more questions?

President Dowd: Thank you for coming. I am sorry about that guys but I do have to continue with the agenda. Now, I would like to invite Provost Scarborough.

Provost Scarborough: I think it is great that it worked out the way that it did because the way I hoped it worked with further due diligence and some ideas from the plan it's in fact working out that way and now at least we have one example of that. President Dowd asked a legitimate question earlier today, why did we start with number 1 in the Strategic Plan when most of the interest and concerns lie in number 10 in the plan? I said, "Okay, I started with number 1 because it was number 1" If it works better to start with number 10 we can start with number 10 and work in the other direction. As you can see the plan as I communicated before is a living document. In the current version of the plan you see that it has been changed to recollect the current recommendation of the implementation team that Dean Davis led. You see now even though I need to correct it because the word "integrated" is an important part of what they're recommending so we will make that change, so we won't make that mistake again.

President Dowd: If I may interrupt, just to clarify one issue.

Provost Scarborough: Yes.

President Dowd: Just to have some ground rules, I will have to close this discussion in probably twenty-five minutes or so.

Provost Scarborough: Yes, I understand. As I suggested earlier, the implementation team came back with a proposal that we will let percolate for a while and we will let the implementation team check back with the department to cover all the bases to make sure that people are comfortable. It is not that everyone might be comfortable, but at least all opinions are heard and if we still think as a campus that it makes sense then we will take this to the Academic and Student Affairs Committee in April and on to the Board in May so we can begin to build a budget around this for implementation on July 1st. Similarly, in Strategy 10 in the plan there is the suggestion for taking the current college of Education and Health Science and Human Service and breaking that into three different colleges, so in some ways undoing what was done a few years back when Education was combined with HS Squared and so there is an implementation team that is headed by Penny Poplin Gosetti that has been meeting similar to Dean Davis's group and is working with a proposal to reestablish the Judith Herb College of Education. We visited with the donor to make sure she is comfortable with the kind of reversal of the plans. Her response to me was kind of similar to the response that I had when I heard that we were merging the college, it didn't make a whole lot of sense when we proposed it so I feel comfortable un-proposing it. We felt like, for a lot of reasons, not the least of which some of our competitors were using the merger against us in the recruiting of students and that the cultures despite efforts by the dean and others were never a marriage of cultures that we thought would be the right thing to do. There is a separate implementation team and I have not met with them yet, but I suspect that I will be doing that shortly. I haven't heard anything that suggests that they are not going to recommend letting me move forward with reestablishing the College of Education. Similarly, the Health Sciences piece liked the idea of being a part of the Health Science Campus organization so they have supported the idea of becoming a college of the Health Sciences and establishing a reporting relationship within this [HSC] campus. That leaves them Criminal Justice and Human Services that began to be led under the leadership of Dean Gutteridge who gathered a group similar to what Dean Davis did; they have been meeting and they came back and suggested that this college be called The College of Human Service Professions. For a lot of reasons they did not want the

phrase “criminal justice” even though it is still used in some universities. They thought it would be better given the collection of departments and programs that necessarily weren’t part of Education and weren’t part of the Health Sciences and for the traditional sense they liked the idea of offering this particular banner. I have not yet met with that group either and I don’t have anything to suggest that they will recommend a different path. I would say the one thing I have heard that is a little bit awkward for a lack of a better term, is the idea that the doctoral program in higher education will be a part of this college, The College of Human Service Professions rather than the College of Education. I am not sure that I am able today to explain exactly why it fits better in this one particular college rather than the College of Education, but interestingly I haven’t heard anyone really argue against it either. So, evidently, everyone knows something that I don’t about this particular program and why it fits better.

President Dowd: May I ask for a clarification? Are you referring to the Ph.D. degree or another degree program?

Provost Scarborough: It will be essentially the higher education program.

President Dowd: Will both colleges retain the ability to offer both degrees?

Group of Senators: No.

Prof. Edwards: The whole program is moving over.

President Dowd: Is Higher Education the only program from that college that is offering the Ph.D.?

Prof. Edwards: No, also Counselor Education and School Psychology which is a licensure program also are in the College of Human Services. I don’t know why they are there either because it never made any sense to any of us in the College of Education.

Provost Scarborough: Well, that is good, that is the first thing <laughter>. Perhaps I can pause at that moment. It’s been suggested to me that this is where the most immediate questions and much of the interest lies in terms of ongoing dialogue with the Faculty Senate and I will be happy to do that and what questions I can’t answer today I will be happy to report back. Are there any questions or any thoughts about the college piece?

Senator Jorgensen: What President Dowd was asking I thought was a good question, the College of Education has other PhD programs that are staying in the college, is that correct?

Group of Senators: I would hope so.

President Dowd: Provost Scarborough, you mentioned the degree but would the degree reside into both colleges?

Provost Scarborough: Right. Particularly, I was mentioning the Higher Education Doctoral Program, but I presume the same question could be phrased by perhaps the Counselor of Education.

Senator Piazza: Not really.

Provost Scarborough: Okay.

Senator Piazza: Counselor Education is not Education. In the same sense that medical education and nursing education are not education. Counselors work in medical and other settings not just schools.

Provost Scarborough: Right. Can you help answer the other question about Higher Education perhaps?

Senator Piazza: I can't speak for their motives as well as they can, but they are there by request. It is where they want to be; they were not recruited. As far as I know they were not rejected by Education either.

Provost Scarborough: It doesn't seem to be very inimical it just seems to be a strange outcome to me and to at least one other person.

Senator Piazza: To answer the other question too about the degrees, they are a self-contained program. They offer a Masters' and a Doctoral degree; it is not that their degree is depending on some other program that would be in a different college or something like that.

Provost Scarborough: Right.

Senator Molitor: I have a question about these institutional investments and the different interdisciplinary schools. How were those decisions made? One of the reasons that I bring this up is although I certainly don't disagree with your notion about the cultures within the College of Education, Health Science and Human Service there was a School of Interprofessional Teaming formed by that merger that actually worked very well and continues to work very well. I was wondering why they were not included in this list of interdisciplinary schools?

Provost Scarborough: Right. Okay, let me jump to the interdisciplinary schools. But before I do that, is there any kind of burning opportunities for feedback on college structures, otherwise I will talk about the interdisciplinary schools?

President Dowd: I will ask the troubled question: how much is this going to cost? I want to place that question within two specific contexts. First, in the past this administration has launched into reorganizations and at those times never considered the budgetary impact of such reorganizations. Second, beside explicit monetary costs, have you considered the opportunity costs from this reorganization? That is, departments and colleges are told UT does not have sufficient funds to hire Part-time Instructors, Visiting Professors, or Lecturers, which all generate positive profits. It appears the administration is choosing to forgo its core instructional mission in order to finance this reorganization. Given your background, I trust you have considered the issues of monetary and opportunity costs.

Provost Scarborough: I've looked at this and I really believe the budgetary impact is minimal and let me explain why. Obviously, simply taking the Department of Communication and combining it with the College of Visual and Performing Arts and that is fairly self-explanatory, we are not picking-up additional incremental cost except perhaps re-printing some additional letterheads, but I would propose using the old ones before re-printing new ones up- but in that case, I would say the cost is almost even.

President Dowd: I agree, for that particular case.

Provost Scarborough: In the case of Criminal Justice and Human Services, essentially we are taking an experienced dean that's already under contract (I hesitate to get into too much detail) for a period of time

because we do have people under employment contracts and we are asking an experienced dean that learned to lead that area as far as his on-going production/duties.

President Dowd: Are you talking about Tom Gutteridge, Senior Vice Provost & Dean of Academic Administration?

Provost Scarborough: Yes. So here is a cost that we will occur regardless whether we create a college or not; an experienced dean, one that has been successful and the opportunity for creating a college that has the potential to grow. One of the questions that I am always asking them is, where is the enrollment growth? Because a lot of what grows, the reposition of some of these colleges is to allow them to flourish under their own separate identities to pursue programs that would match careers that are out in the market. For me, this is a low cost and even can be considered a trial period to say with an experienced dean, can these programs grow and thrive, at least for the period of time that we are under contract with Dean Gutteridge anyway? At that period of time then we can ourselves and look at it and say, “okay, was this a good idea to begin with?” If not, nothing is permanent and we just might consider doing something different at that period of time. But there is at least enough momentum and enthusiasm around it with both Dean Gutteridge and the people working in the group that I think it makes sense to allow it.

President Dowd: I presume you are referring to Senior Vice Provost Gutteridge and Vice Provost Poplin Gosetti. Their budget lines would be moved from the Provost’s Office to the new colleges, for example, the College of Education.

Provost Scarborough: Right.

President Dowd: Ok, I get that part of the monetary costs. However, reassigning two Vice Provosts to dean positions is only a small portion of total costs of reorganization. The other part we should talk about when creating these two new colleges is the creation of at least two associate dean positions, two budget director positions, two receptionist positions, an entire staff for two student services offices, and the staff for two college computing offices. Am I forgetting any other positions?

Group of Senators: Secretaries.

President Dowd: Secretaries, of course. Your calculations would need to include the costs for the new secretaries for the new Associate Dean positions and the two new Executive Secretary for the two new College Deans. And we cannot forget the costs of renovating the physical space to create two new dean’s offices. When President Jacobs broke up Arts and Sciences a couple years ago it was estimated that even though the Administration got off cheap by forcing the three new colleges to share student services, it still cost the university not less than \$550,000 in hard dollars. Again, we are creating three new colleges from a single college. We may be saving funds on dean’s salary because two individuals are moving from the Provost Office to college offices, but we are going to be spending significant hard dollars on the creation of these three new colleges. I would like to know if you had “priced out: that information and what explicit costs you have built into the budget to reflect all of these other monetary costs.

Provost Scarborough: Well, I would say that all the things that you put on the table will be discussed with this group. I wouldn’t say that all of those that you laid out as possible additional expenses are automatic, some of those may depend on the growth of the program, but the goal is to keep the cost as thin as possible still allowing programs that have potential to grow. But we will look at it. It also means

that some of the cost perhaps is already embedded in the larger college that simply might be able to be transferred or broken apart and so we will look at that. I will be happy to report back in the end what additional cost we are creating or didn't create; but at least that's some of the big components that you can identify. What I am really doing I think is taking some folks that have skill sets and putting them in an area where the whole university can benefit. Dean Gutteridge is best at being a dean. So again, as long as that is a cost that we are going to bear he can help grow that college and its program during a time at the university when it shifts from being an administrative cost to part of a revenue enhancement potential and that is a good tradeoff in my mind, but it can't be overshadowed potentially by the other problem. It also can solve some other problems in the Provost's Office and it makes the Provost's Office function a little bit better and so there's some win-wins that will occur with some of these moves.

Senator White: Now both of you have implied and maybe you have actually stated that Vice Provost Poplin Gosetti and Dean Gutteridge will not be replaced in the Provost's Office?

Provost Scarborough: The idea is for Vice Provost Poplin Gosetti and Dean Gutteridge to continue to function and remain as dean for a period of time to see whether or not the idea was good to begin with. But to replace both of them with one person - that is a big job.

Senator Jorgensen: Perhaps I missed it, what departments are in the Health Sciences now?

Provost Scarborough: Senator Piazza, can you help me with that?

Senator Piazza: Rehabilitative Sciences, Health and Rec Professions, and Radiology.

Provost Scarborough: The interdisciplinary school conversation has kind of a rich history, am I right? I came in kind of in the middle of that conversation and you may know the history as well as I do, but at some point the university got very excited about the concept of interdisciplinary schools. There were actually proposals for I think the number is twenty-two of these interdisciplinary schools. Even when I was working on this campus there was an interesting conversation that you can hear in terms of do these things really do what they intend to do, which is to create more interdisciplinary relationships among faculty and I heard both sides of that argument; to some extent I had a little bit of a disposition based on being a small part of a conversation. So, when I took this role, again there were people on both sides of this conversation and what I essentially tried to do is find a middle ground to focus the institutional investment in areas where I think we have great promise and a reason for making institutional investments. It is not intended by only naming these four it is not meant to say that we are not wanting to encourage some of the interdisciplinary conversations that have been sparked by this larger conversation, but it is trying to recognize the reality that our pool for institutional investment is limited and the set of criteria that really emerged to identify these had to do with where's their federal funding, where's the institution showing historical or institutional promise in terms of research development, where's their related enrollment growth, where is the intersection of issues that are uniquely applicable to Northwest Ohio? And it was that set of criteria that kind of ultimately led to this selection of four programs - two on this campus and two on the other campus. So that is a quick answer to the question and I would be happy to kind of follow-up either privately or when I am next here.

Senator Techlehamonoit: The College of Graduate Studies Dean awards graduate degrees. The question is since the College of Graduate Studies implements the policies/procedures as well as most of the responsibilities, what is the role of the Associate Deans in the other academic colleges?

Provost Scarborough: What is interesting, you are the first person to ask me that question; it was a question that I had when I first came to Toledo five years ago because the two institutions that we previously had did not have a College of Graduate Studies. But, however, it is also interesting to note that my mother-in-law is a former associate dean in the college of graduate studies and she and I have had this conversation many times, in terms of why do some universities have them and others don't. Is a unique value given the level of investments? Does it still make sense, of course in your opinion it didn't and in President Dowd's opinion it has been a very positive development at the university as it continues to be, but it is not a very "bad" question.

Senator Techlehamonoit: The main thing that I am asking is sometimes there is a...the graduate school mixes with the colleges and the colleges with the graduate schools, so I want a big...for the students to understand when they have questions who do they ask. If you ask the Graduate School then it becomes...

Provost Scarborough: Your goal is my goal and we will continue to work with that. Thank you.

President Dowd: Thank you, Provost Scarborough, for addressing the questions Senators have on these reorganization issues. The next item on our agenda is a brief update from President-Elect Rouillard on the surveys of administrative performances.

President Elect Rouillard: Very brief about the administrative surveys, the distribution list has been established there are just a few issues on the I.T. side and I think that we will have to postpone to the beginning of next week for the survey. I have been assured that it is anonymous. I have been assured that you will be able to access the survey instruments from computers off campus. Watch for a message from the Faculty Senate Office next week announcing the opening of the surveys.

Unknown Speaker: You said before that for administrators who have more than one "hat" we will be able to evaluate both the dean and the chancellor?

President Elect Rouillard: We decided that I.T. was to do one evaluation as chancellor. So that gives as many people as possible access to the survey. There is nothing that will prevent you however in the written comment section of the survey from commenting on that person in both functions or separate out the performance within those two different functions.

Unknown Speaker: Will there be any instructions to that effect?

President Elect Rouillard: That is a good point, I can ask for that to be done. The concern was that people wouldn't take the time to do two different surveys for the same person.

Unknown Speaker: It is one of the problems of having one administrator serve two roles because for those just in the College of Medicine when we appeal to our dean we appeal to our chancellor.

President Elect Rouillard: That is a good point and I will certainly ask that there will be specific instructions in that survey to make comments on both sides.

President Dowd: The last item for today's meeting is an open discussion on current events. I hope Senators examined the open letter that was distributed with the agenda for today's meeting. The Graduate Council Chair, Senator Nick Piazza, provided the first draft of that letter, which was subsequently revised by incorporating comments from members of your Executive Committee. I brought this letter to Senate to determine if Senate was willing to endorse that letter. There are two reasons I am reluctant to putting the text of that letter on the screen for editing. First, I prefer to avoid editing its contents from the floor and, second, as a joint letter from both Faculty Senate and Graduate Council, any proposed change to its language that we may suggest would have to be initially approved by both the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the Graduate Council Executive Committee and, then, by a vote of the Graduate Council.

Senator Thompson-Casado: President Dowd, can I say that it was sent out at 12:15 p.m. today and some of us were not able to get on the computer before we got in here and in this room I can't pull it up, so I have not seen it.

President Dowd: That is a fair criticism. I am responsible for the "short notice" given to Senators regarding the distribution of that letter. Other members of the Executive Committee were not responsible for that, and neither was Miss Quinetta Hubbard – who distributed that letter to Senators as soon as I sent the final version to her. Given revisions were being made to that document almost to the point the letter was distributed, I faced the choice of distributing the letter to Senators with "short notice" and discussing the letter at today's meeting, or delaying the distribution of the letter and discussing it at the next Senate meeting in two weeks. I made the decision to distribute the letter today to prompt a discussion of its contents as soon as possible.

Senator Thompson-Casado: So if it is not up on the screen I have absolutely no idea what you are talking about.

President Dowd: That too is a fair criticism. I apologize for the inconvenience, Senator Thompson-Casado. Can another Senator lend her a hard copy of the letter? Thank you.

Senator White: I do not want to edit from the floor, but it is something that we talked about that you should consider adding – the bottom of page 3 where it refers to an exponential threat and referring to the minimal class sizes and I just want to add the fact that I've been expressing for a while now that this really threatens the future of the university. By requiring minimum class sizes we are stating there are certain smallish programs that we are no longer interested in offering because they don't have enough enrollment to justify something. I am not saying that we should keep every single program on the books, but what I am saying is that programs that graduate five students a year, plus or minus, offer a great deal to the university and one of the main things that they can offer for undergraduate major classes with the possibility of undergraduate research and graduate programs is they offer attraction to new faculty. I can identify up close a number of programs if they were eliminated which will occur over the next few years will lead to a much less attractive place to the kinds of young faculty I am positive we want to attract and this is with respect to workloads.

President Dowd: I agree too.

Senator Jorgensen: I like the fact that there are a number of solutions listed at the end that it is just not a criticism/critique of the present plan and it is clearly worth talking about, a solution, so it comes and presents a picture of wanting to work together to find a solution to these problems.

President Dowd: I ask for a sense of the Senate. Do you endorse you Faculty Senate Executive Committee signing that open letter?

Group of Senators: Yes.

President Dowd: Thank you. I want to thank Graduate Council Chair, Nick Piazza, for taking the lead on writing the first draft of that letter and to Executive Committee members of both the Faculty Senate and Graduate Council who participated in the composition of that letter.

That is all I have for the agenda items for today's meeting. Are there any questions from Senators or non-Senators?

Senator Regimbal: I think I was not listening very well because our old college of Education and HSHS received the ballot to vote for Senate, so what are we supposed to do because we no longer exist in that configuration?

President Dowd: At a previous Senate meeting, the Chair of the Senate Committee on Elections, Professor Michael Caruso, reported that it was impossible at this time to reapportion Senate seats based on current discussions of the 2013 reorganization. This is because we simply do not know at this time what the actual reorganization will be. The Board may get recommendations about college reorganizations in April, but they cannot be official changes until the full Board meets in May. Yet Faculty Senate must conduct elections in April. Unfortunately, this means that Faculty Senate must conduct its elections based on the status quo. That is, we cannot conduct elections based on the reorganization we might expect to occur. Instead, we have to conduct elections based on the existing college structure.

Senator Regimbal: Okay.

President Dowd: I know that is not a good answer, but that is the only answer I can give.

Senator Regimbal: I guess I would like to say is to have these things come up at the very end of the school year makes it really difficult. So we are supposed to go into next year with workload agreements that may or may not have anything to do with our college, that is a crazy way to run an organization and that is just my opinion. We don't know what's going to happen and we are supposed to be making all these new decisions and the same thing happened the last time we were all put together, it came at the very end and all these big decisions were supposed to be made and faculty are not on the payroll and yet worked all through the summer as I remember. The College of Education people I know have worked very hard to make the new college work and now we are being told it is not working. Well, maybe you don't really know what it is going to be and you said in a meeting that in a couple of years we may decide to change it again. It is not like we are operating a "speed boat," we are operating a pretty large ship and it is pretty hard to just change the direction overnight.

President Dowd: I agree with you.

Senator Regimbal: I am frustrated.

President Dowd: I am too. My main concern is over the impact this will have on our students. When President Jacobs divided the College of Arts & Sciences into three colleges, no consideration was given to the impact on students, including the impact on college advising and student services. Sadly, I see that repeating today.

Senator Molitor: I was just going to support what Senator Regimbal has just said. The last time we made this reorganization decision it was “hurry up, let’s do this because we need to do this” and guess what? A few years later we are now reversing some of what we did. This does have a cost; it does have an impact on our ability to advise students, to provide a quality education and to provide a healthy environment for our colleagues. I don’t think that is being considered.

Past President Anderson: Meanwhile, there are certainly other administrative related things such as core curriculum and the latest is that faculty can no longer submit print jobs directly. So, we can’t print our exams that are coming up and now we have to wait for a week until things settle down and we don’t know when they are going to settle down.

Senator Jorgensen: Just to “pile” on perhaps. The idea of the schools which I follow kind of closely because I am associated with one of them. Provost Scarborough, what you are describing I remember as 19. I remember the meeting too, it was the president that came to us and said how about these 19 wonderful schools and some of them sounded like a good idea. Now how do we go from 19 which some people invested some serious time and effort in and we are now looking at three or four of them. This is a frustrating thing because people are investing an awful a lot of energy into this whether it be summer or professional. The other thing is to get this going and it seems that we are at the end of the month we have to move along.

President Dowd: Are there any other items from the floor? Are there any announcements, recognitions, or anything else to be brought before Senate? No? May I have a motion to adjourn? Meeting adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:
Lucy Duhon

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard
Faculty Senate Office Administrative Secretary.

Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

