

**THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO**  
**Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of February 13, 2018**  
**FACULTY SENATE**

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

Approved @ FS on 2/27/2018

---

---

**Summary of Discussion**

Dr. Mary Powers, UT Athletics Representative to the MAC: Athletics Academic Update

Dr. Connie Schall, Interim Associate Vice President of Research and Sponsored Programs:  
Research Update

Dr. Kristen, Past President of UT Faculty Senate: Tuition Guarantee

---

---

**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 Thompson:** President Thompson called the meeting to order; Executive Secretary, Fred Williams called the roll.

***I. Roll Call: 2017-2018 Senators:***

**Present:** Atwood, Barnes, Bouillon, Brakel, Bruce, Chattopadhyay, Compora, Dinnebeil, Duggan, Edgington, Emonds, Ferris, Frank, Gilchrist, Giovannucci, Gray, Gruden, Hall, Hammersley, Hefzy, Humphrys, Keith, Kippenhan, Kistner, Kovach, Krantz, Lecka-Czernik, Lee, Lundquist, Maloney, Menezes, Modyanov, Monsos, Nigem, Oberlander, Ohlinger, Ortiz, Randolph, Relue, Said, Schneider, Sheldon, Steven, A. Thompson, Van Hoy, Weck-Schwarz, Weldy, White, Williams, Wittmer, Woolford, Xie

**Excused absences:** Ariss, Bonnell, Haughton, Jaume, McLoughlin, Niamat, A. Thompson,

**Unexcused absences:** Bjorkman, Hottell, Hoy, Leady, Rouillard, Schlageter, Schroder, G. Thompson, Willey

***II. Approval of Minutes:*** Minutes from the Faculty Senate meeting held on January 30, 2018 are ready for approval.

**President Thompson:** You should've received the Minutes from January 30, 2018. Do I have a motion to approve? Is there any discussion? All those in favor of approval of the Minutes, please say "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? ***Motion Passed.***

**Executive Committee Report:** Welcome to the 11<sup>th</sup> meeting of the academic year! Since our last meeting, Faculty Senate, in collaboration with the Division of Student Affairs, hosted a crisis training workshop. This was a huge success and we were able to train over 100 faculty and graduate teaching assistants. Thanks to all of you who attended this event. We have even had additional requests for departments to be trained and to perhaps link this training to new faculty orientation. We will be hosting a second workshop

date this Thursday February 15<sup>th</sup> in Collier 1200 on the Health Science Campus. Please encourage your colleagues to attend.

Related to the issue of assisting students in crisis, as many of you know, the issue of sexual misconduct is in the news and is part of a national dialogue on college campuses. The safety of our faculty, staff and students is a priority here at UT. While we are one of the safest campuses in the State of Ohio, it is important to be reminded that the majority of us are considered to be a mandatory reporter for any act of sexual misconduct. We must also work together to create a campus culture of zero tolerance for such acts. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee appreciates the continued focus on addressing this issue through the email reminder issued by President Gaber last week. Collectively, let's all continue to work together to make safety a priority on our campus and a culture where everyone feels welcome.

As you know, we have had an outstanding year for Rocket Athletics. We have winning student athletes both on the field and in the classroom. At today's Faculty Senate Meeting, we will receive an update from Dr. Mary Powers, the UT Athletics Representative to the MAC. We look forward to hearing about the accomplishments of our student athletes. Go Rockets!!

Recently, there was a call for proposals for the development of Centers of Excellence at UT. These are areas that have strong potential for future research and collaboration. This initiative is linked to the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs Strategic Plan as well as the overall University of Toledo's Strategic Plan to increase scholarship and enhance our national reputation. There was also a call for applications for a new class for the Scholars Institute Program. Dr. Connie Schall, Interm Associate Vice President of Research and Sponsored Programs, will be here today to update the Faculty Senate on some new research targeted initiatives.

Improving access to a college education and making it affordable is a major challenge for many universities. The University of Toledo has made this a priority through its new Tuition Guarantee Program that was recently approved by the UT Board of Trustees. Dr. Kristen Keith, Past President of the faculty Senate has been a leading force in helping to develop this program. She will be providing a short presentation about this new program and the impact it will have on our students. The Faculty Senate is certainly proud of her leadership on this important cost saving measure.

**Provost Hsu:** Thank you, President Thompson. There are several items that I would like to give you an update on. One is Winter Intersession. We have collected information and data on the courses and Dr. Connie Shriner's office is evaluating the information. I am hoping that perhaps by the next meeting or the following meeting at the latest, that we will be able to bring some data to this group and have you help us evaluate this year's pilot and make recommendations as we move forward. Also, President Thompson asked me to give you an update on some of the searches that are underway on our campus, specifically in the Division of Academic Affairs. We have a search for a Dean of Business that is currently underway. The search committee met in December and they sent out the advertisement for the recruitment. At this time, we're waiting for the applicants to be submitted. We are working with a search consultant on this process, and they are also reaching out to potential candidates. The other search that is underway in Academic Affairs is the associate vice provost for student success. I believe that several of you serve on the search committee for this position. It is my understanding that the search committee is now reviewing candidates' applications. My hope is that the position may be filled by the end of this semester so that there is some time for a transition with Dr. Steve LeBlanc who is currently in that position.

There are several additional items that I would like to report on. I am now the newest user of Faculty 180. In fact, we are in the process of reviewing dossiers for tenure and/or promotion. We have an academic personnel calendar and over the course of several weeks, the dossiers are in the Provost's Office for review. I am reviewing these dossiers every day. I must say that I am extremely impressed by the productivity, scholarship, teaching achievement and service of our faculty. I also must say that I really like the electronic format that Faculty 180 provides. I want to encourage you – and I hope you will encourage your colleagues - to look into using Faculty 180. Starting next year, not only are we going to use Faculty 180 for promotion and tenure dossiers, but we are also going to do all the pre-tenure reviews through Faculty 180. So all of our faculty who are considering promotion or promotion and tenure need to make sure that you begin entering your materials in Faculty 180, because if you do it gradually, you won't have to rush later. I don't know if there are any first-year faculty here, but they are very fortunate because they will be able to do their first-year annual review using Faculty 180, and then the second year and third year and so forth, and so by the time they finish their fifth year, their dossier is already done. In any event, I like the electronic format, but I would be interested in knowing what your experiences are. From a reviewer's point of view, I am impressed with the system.

Another item that I want to bring to your attention is the University's "15 to Graduate" initiative. I don't know how many of you are familiar with this initiative. The "15 to Graduate" campaign is basically promoting the goal of students' graduating in four years by taking 15 credits per semester in 120-credit hour academic programs. We started this campaign last year and next week I will be meeting with all the advisers and student success coaches to get their suggestions on how we might best reach out to students to encourage them to take at least 15 credit hours each semester so that they are able to graduate in four years. When we implemented a similar program at my previous institution, talking to my faculty, their first response was that "our students can't handle 15 credit hours; they can't even handle 12 credit hours, so they'll just fail if you ask them to do 15 credit hours." Well, there are national studies that show the opposite. The studies actually show that even the less-prepared students or students at high-risk based on their family's economic background (for example Pell-eligible students), even these students who register for 15 credit hours per semester, show improvement. It actually improves their GPA. It is the opposite of what we often think— for example, that if you have fewer courses, you get to study more and will get better grades. There is a study done by the Educational Advisory Board (EAB) based on examining data from 1.2 million incoming full-time students representing 137 colleges and universities that looked at students' socio-economic background, high school GPA and other factors. What they found was that the students who took 15 credit hours per semester actually did better in terms of GPA and retention outcomes than their peers who took fewer credits. We are already seeing some positive results of the "15 to Graduate" campaign here at UT. We did some data analysis and if our projections are correct, we're actually going to see higher graduation rates starting with the students that enrolled six years ago. This six-year graduation rate is going to go up over the next four or five years and if we continue on this track of getting students to register for more courses, there is reason to believe that we will improve. So we need your help with promoting this initiative. You and your faculty colleagues are in close touch with your students. They probably trust you more than they trust their parents, right? If their parents say you should take 15 credit hours, they probably would say "no," but if you tell them that they should, then they will probably do that, right? So I would encourage you to talk with your students and have them register for 15 credit hours each semester.

The final item that I would like to report on is a new initiative called “Breakfast with Senior Leaders.” Since Dr. Gaber arrived here at UT, and since I arrived here, both of us have been committed to promoting shared governance. We try to find all the opportunities we can to interact with faculty and get their input into our decision-making. Dr. Gaber started a program called “Breakfast with the President” and some of you may have attended one of those sessions. Many very helpful suggestions have surfaced through those breakfast meetings. So because of the success of those meetings, we now are starting a second program called “Breakfast with Senior Leaders.” I will be hosting two of these breakfasts this semester. In order to have meaningful discussion, we are going to have to restrict the number of people in the room so that we can have a meaningful conversation. I would encourage you -and through you, your faculty colleagues - to participate. I am pleased to report that the faculty response to the invitational email for the “Breakfast with Senior Leaders” was very positive. The two sessions are now full, but we will continue to hold more of these sessions so that more faculty have the opportunity to participate.

Thank you, this completes my report.

**President Thompson:** Thank you. Are there any questions for Provost Hsu?

**Senator Kippenhan:** Thank you for sharing the information about the study of “15 to Graduation.” Could you give us a link or post a copy of that somewhere so we can read it? Is it publically available?

**Provost Hsu:** I happen to have it in my file. That study was done by EAB. If you go to or Google EAB “15 to Finish” and/or: <https://www.eab.com/blogs/student-success-insights/2017/08/15-to-finish>

**President Thompson:** Thank you, Provost Hsu. So next on our agenda is Core Curriculum with Senator Monsos. While Senator Monsos is coming forward, we have valentine cookies because you are our valentine, right?

**Senator Monsos:** As many of you know, we have introduced this semester a co-requisite possibility for students taking Comp I. The way the English department has set this up is the course with the co-requisite has its own number, English 1010. You already approved this course, but now you are approving it to be in the core to count as Comp I. It has the same learning outcomes as 1110. The only difference is there’s an additional hour for students to work more intensively with their writing with the instructor. Senator Edgington is here, so if you have any questions about this, he can answer. Are there any questions? Hearing none. All those in favor of English 1010 counting for Comp I, please signify by saying “aye.” Any opposed? Any abstentions? *Motion Passed.* [[View Approved Proposal](#)]

**President Thompson:** Next on the agenda is Dr. Larissa Barclay with the Academic Programs Committee report.

**Dr. Barclay:** Thank you, President Thompson. Good afternoon. The Academic Programs Committee received a number of proposals. In the essence of time, I have them grouped by college

[[View spreadsheet](#)].

The majority of the program modification proposals are the result of the Ohio State Law requiring a reduction of credit hours to 120. The colleges that fall under that category would be the College of Business, College of Pharmacy, and University College. What you see before you is a spreadsheet that

basically lists all of the specific information in regard to the program modification proposals. I am just going to click through so you can view the volumes of information that our committee has processed. I am not going to go into detail in regard to the College of Business, College of Pharmacy as well as the University College program modification changes. Just in general, there has been a request to reduce to 120 credit hours. I am going to scroll back up to the top of the spreadsheet. For the College of Arts and Letters, we received a proposal modification to change to the department of Communications. The Department of Communications now has two majors and wanted to better clarify the two majors with updating the communication studies, major name, and minimum required class credit. COMM 4910 has now been updated to a three credit course and has been made into a capstone course for all communications study majors. These are the proposed changes for this program; the name of this major needs to be updated from Communications to Communications Study. The required class credit is being increased from 19 to 21. Elective class credit is being reduced from 20 to 15, which also corrects a prior math error. The course modification for the credit change for 4910 was also submitted. The overall major remains a minimum of 36 to a maximum of 50 credit hours. I'm going to skip to the next page because the next college you'll see is all of the Business College proposals with the reduction of credit hours to 120. On page three where I am now, you'll see one exception from the College of Business. The proposal is to "please note that we are making a small change in the IS minor. The minor may be taken by anyone doing BBA program. Due to the limitations of the current curriculum tracking system, it is listed under "BBA undecided." It may be taken by other college majors if they meet the prerequisites." "Also note that a total of four courses equivalent to 12 credits is needed. One of the "optional" courses in the required set may be taken as an elective. However, the same course cannot be used in the required set as well as the elective set." The rationale: "It is designed to make it easier for business students to test out of the IS minor, by taking advanced excel based course, INFS 3250 and then decide whether he or she wants just a minor in IS or a major in IS. The current program requires either minors to take a programming course INFS 3150 to have a minor in IS. Hence, the modification removes an impediment to obtaining IS minor for business students." For the College of Communications and the Arts: This was a department modification. The Foreign Language elective requirement is eliminated. "In their stead, students have three options, conditional upon approval by their department adviser. Student may (1) opt to fulfill their originally required foreign language and multicultural class requirement as set down in Attachment "A" or (2) opt to fulfill this requirement by substituting university multicultural and diversity courses listed in the University of Toledo Catalog, which is available on the website listed here [https://www.utoledo.edu/catalog/pdf/University\\_Core\\_2009\\_2010.pdf](https://www.utoledo.edu/catalog/pdf/University_Core_2009_2010.pdf), or (3) take appropriate upper level electives as approved by their advisor. There is no change in total hours needed for graduation." "Please note that the current course requirement (page 1) and proposed changes (page 2) are in the same attached document. The rationale: "Currently, students having to take foreign language courses do not appear to be achieving fluency in that language and have expressed concerns about the efficiency of the requirement. The faculty agrees our students would benefit by undertaking courses more appropriate for their career paths. This change offers flexibility to students and advisors as well as to help customize career and education paths in such a way as maximally benefit students with disparate career and education plans."

**Lecka-Czernik:** May I ask a question about that?

**Dr. Barclay:** Yes.

**Lecka-Czernik:** I don't think this came to council; I have not seen that at counsel at all.

**Unknown Speaker:** It was the old COCA College.

**Senator Monsos:** It's been sitting in the curriculum tracking system since last spring.

**Senator Lundquist:** So it did or did not go through the college council?

**Senator Monsos:** It went through COCA's College Council and passed.

**Unknown Speaker:** That's how old it is.

**Senator Lundquist:** Well, COCA no longer exists, so there are different requirements.

**Senator Monsos:** The foreign language requirements did not change for the majors that were in the former colleges.

**Senator Lecka-Czernik:** This would be a change now. It was approved by a council that doesn't exist anymore, so wouldn't we have to approve it in our council first?

**Senator Monsos:** I have no idea.

**Senator Lecka-Czernik:** Before we move on, can we find that out?

**Senator Kistner:** At least this part of it has to be tabled.

**Senator Lecka-Czernik:** Right.

**Senator Lundquist:** Part of it has to be tabled because we can't be approving today something that was approved in a college that doesn't exist anymore. I think it needs to go back to the college of which department that it now exists.

**Unknown Speaker:** I agree.

**Dr. Barclay:** I will take that recommendation back to our committee, and we will *Table* the program modification for the College of Communication and the Arts. We will go on further. Next is the College of Engineering submitted five proposal modifications to change. The primary rationale for their changing is not a modification of their curriculum, but to enhance their transfer degree requirement. Basically in summary of these programs is they are looking to increase or improve student outcomes in taking math courses which apparently in the Engineering program there is a lot of rigorous math that is required. Just briefly for these programs, I am just going to highlight the changes here for the recommendation. "The addition of Math 1330 is to ensure students accepted into this program can meet the rigorous mathematical course content that is required for the degree. This is for the degree for BS in Construction and Engineering Technology. For the BS in Computer Science and Engineering Technology, the rationale is: "The increase in higher education GPA standard is to I know good. This will ensure they are remaining in good academic standing upon transfer into the program. Many students see their GPA decline when transferring into Engineering programs, and students entering the program with a 2.0 GPA can quickly end up on academic probation." So the rationale of adding Math 2450 is to ensure students accepted into the program can meet the rigorous mathematical course content." The next Engineering program is the BS Electrical Engineering Technology. The recommendation is to add Math 2450 to ensure students accepted

into the program can meet rigorous mathematical course content. The next Engineering program is a BS in Electrical Engineering Technology. For the BS in Mechanical Engineering and Technology, the proposal is to add Math 1330—a portion of this is cutoff at the bottom here. But the same rationale is to increase students accepted into the program, so they can meet the rigorous mathematical course content.

**Senator Kippenhan:** I have a question on that one as well as the two preceding it. Is it just because the row height is so small that those sentences have been cutoff?

**Dr. Barclay:** Yes. It is basically duplication of the previous row. In modifying the excel spreadsheet to put it into a pdf. format, formatting was skewed and it could not be adjusted. However, this was sent out to the faculty senators and it is available in an excel spreadsheet if you want to review it.

**Senator Kippenhan:** It is cutoff there as well.

**Dr. Barclay:** Oh, is it?

**Senator Kippenhan:** Unless that was a pdf. that was sent out, but that is what I am looking at.

**Dr. Barclay:** It can be resent in the excel spreadsheet format.

**Senator Kippenhan:** Thank you.

**Dr. Barclay:** For the “undecided baccalaureate in Engineering Technology, the statement is from the college. “We are not modifying curricular requirements for the program. We are proposing to change the transfer student admissions standards for the program. The current transfer student admission standard is a 2.0 GPA for all college level coursework (higher education GPA). The proposed transfer student admission standard is a 2.25 GPA for all college level coursework (higher education GPA), and a “C” or better in Math 1330 Trigonometry, or a “C” or better in Math 1340 College Algebra and Trigonometry.” The next program modification proposals are from the College of Pharmacy and those have already been previously discussed as one of the colleges submitting a request for reduction in credit hours to 120. For the College of Arts, Sciences and Mathematics, the program is BS in Geology. The recommendations are for EEES 4640 Applied Geology (3hrs.) to be removed from the B.S. degree and replaced by EEES 4650 Field Studies (3 hrs.). EEES 4480 GIS (1hr.) be added as part of group “A” course electives for B.S. degree and as an alternative to EEES 2510. The rationale: Techniques and experiences students were exposed to in EEES 4240 Applied Geology are also part of the normal curriculum geology field courses offered as Special Topics courses EEES 4980/6980. Moving these special topics field courses to formal course levels EEES 4650 made the Applied Geology course (EEES 4240) an unnecessary duplication. This then is a simple replacement of Applied Geology (EES 4240) with Geology Field Studies (EEES 4650) for the B.S. degree program. The creation of the new course, EEES 4480 GIS (fall) offers another viable skill option for the geology major and can be selected as part of the group “A”, or be an alternative for EEES 2510 which is only offered in the spring.

**Senator Monsos:** Going back to the program that had the admission requirement change. How does that change line-up as opposed to transfer students matriculating into that major, and hence, requirement? Does that make it the same or does it make it different?

**Dr. Barclay:** Based on our review, it looked to be the same.

**Senator Randolph:** Dr. Barclay, I can speak to that. The admission standards for direct from high school students for that program will be somewhat on the same level. This is a transfer admission standard that is intending to bring students in who are well-prepared to continue to be successful.

**Senator Monsos:** So you are asking transfer students to meet a higher standard than direct from high school?

**Senator Randolph:** No, these standards are similar.

**Dr. Barclay:** Okay. For the University College, this proposal was also submitted for alignment with the Ohio State law of 120 credit hours for graduation requirements. Are there any questions? So I move that we accept the proposal modification with the exception of the BA in Communications as discussed. The BA in Communications will be sent back to Council, and the [other] programs be accepted as submitted.

**Senator Monsos:** There are two program modifications for the BA Communications, and I just want to clarify that we are only *Tabling* the foreign language component and not the one that is a name change/credit hour change.

**Dr. Barclay:** That is correct, which is the BA in Communications.

**President Thompson:** There is a *motion* on the floor.

**Senator Williams:** Since it is coming from a committee, we don't need a *second*.

**Dr. Barclay:** All in favor of approving the program proposals with one exception please say "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? ***Motion Passed.***

**President Thompson:** Thank you. Next, we have our athletic update with Dr. Mary Powers.

**Group of Senators:** Go Rockets!

**Dr. Mary Powers, UT Athletics Representative to the MAC:** Thank you, President Thompson. Thank you for having me today. This picture was taken last Tuesday night at the men's basketball game. How many of you were there [show of hands].

[PowerPoint on Faculty Senate Website]

Over 70%, actually 71% of our student athletes in the fall had a 3.0 GPA or higher and they were recognized by President Gaber at last Tuesday's game. This is a picture that was taken last Tuesday. These student athletes were recognized as Rocket Scholars. The last time I gave a report at Faculty Senate was a little less than a year ago, it was later in February last year. It's been a real good year for our Rockets. I want to take a few minutes just to talk about the accomplishments of our student athletes. They've really done well this year. Academically, UT was recognized last spring at the Mid-American Conference Banquet with the Institutional Achievement Award, which meant our student athletes had the highest overall GPA out of all the schools in the Mid-American Conference. That wasn't the only award. They were also recognized with the Men's Faculty Athletic Representatives Award, which meant that our men's teams' overall GPA was the highest in the Mid-American Conference. This was very good for our school. It was very good recognition of our school, our faculty, and how well we work together here at

UT. After a few years when we didn't have any conference championships, we had three teams capture Mid-American Conference championships starting with our Women's Basketball team last spring winning the Mid-American Conference championship, our Women's Soccer this fall, and our Football team this fall. So all-in-all, a lot of good recognition has come to the University of Toledo associated with our student athletes. In the conference and nationally, it's just really been fantastic. This fall our student athletes GPA was the highest in [our] school's history—it was a 3.29 overall GPA which was better than the last record we set, which was last spring at 3.27. We are on an upward trajectory, and we are hoping for better to come. This was the sixth consecutive semester in which our student athletes had better than a GPA of 3.2 and the eighteenth straight semester of at least a 3.1 GPA. This fall semester we had 20 of our student athletes graduate with their degrees; individually, 38 of our student athletes had a perfect 4.0 GPA. Nearly 35%, 130 out of 374 of our student athletes were on the dean's list which meant they had a 3.5 GPA or higher. As I mentioned earlier, 71%, 268 out of 374 student athletes had a 3.0 GPA or better last fall. This slide just gives you the overall team by team GPA from fall semester. Our Men's Basketball and our Football are really right at the 3.0 GPA mark and it's been consistent the last few years. As you can see, some of our teams do extraordinarily well as a team in the classroom. The Faculty Athletic Representatives from all the schools in the conference looked at the student athletes at the end of the fall semester. For the teams that competed in the fall, we looked at their grades and we looked at their academic accomplishments. For each of the team sports that participated in the fall, we selected the distinguish scholar athletes. I'm going to go through the distinguish scholar athletes that were selected from the University of Toledo: First is our Women's Soccer team and this is the team that had the most. Six of our student athletes made distinguished scholar athlete in the Mid-American Conference. You can see their majors are varied. Some of our students have been three-time honorees, for example Isa Echeverri. Isa Echeverri was at the Summer Olympics a few years ago; she competed for the Columbia National Team in the Olympics. She is outstanding in many ways. Our Football team had four. Our Women's Cross Country team had three. Our Volleyball team had two. As I mentioned before, in addition to success in the classroom, we had success in competition with three conference championships starting with Women's basketball, women's soccer, and football this fall. This last slide I want to show you has pictures that were taken at the Mid-American Conference banquet last spring. This is Brad Spellman from the football team who accepted our Men's Faculty Representative Academic Award, and Sarah St. Fort who accepted the Institutional Achievement Award along with President Gaber, Michael O'Brien, and Kelly Andrews who were [also] at the banquet to receive the award last spring. Just to close out, as a reminder, Thursdays are days to wear your blue and gold, and show your Rocket pride. I want to remind you to please do that. Thank you for giving us a chance to share some of the good news. Go Rockets!

**President Thompson:** It is always so nice for you to join us. It is always great to have a past Faculty Senate president here. Thank you for being here. Great things are happening. Next is on to research with Dr. Connie Schall. She is going to give us an update about some exciting things coming out of the Office of Sponsored Research and Sponsored Programs.

**Dr. Connie Schall, Interim Associate Vice President of Research and Sponsored Programs:** I'm going to have my colleague here, Jack Schultz also contribute here. We just wanted to let everybody know about the things that we have coming up and what we've done over the past year too. Coming up in May, and this stems from an effort last year is we provided internal reviews. Well, I shouldn't say "we've provided," the faculty at UT provided internal reviews for applicants for the NSF CAREER award. I really can't say enough good things about the faculty that has served as reviewers. They've been

absolutely fantastic. I think it's been a real positive experience for both the reviewers and the applicants. So what we did last year is we provided three internal reviews. So we had three faculty reviewers review each NSF career work about two weeks prior to the due date, and we had some lessons learned from the previous year. There were a couple of good things that really kind of came out of that. I am going to skip to the "good" part about this. Basically, I've been through a couple benefits that we saw for the internal review. One is that our PI's really had a nice constructive review prior to submission. I think the end result was a more solid proposal for the CAREER and then potentially for proposals after that CAREER award proposal. The other big benefit is that we had faculty reviewers that really hadn't met each other. We had faculty reviewers that were from different colleges and different departments, and I think it was really a great opportunity for faculty from all over campus to connect up. We have one grant writer in the Research Office, and so that is limited assets for all of our faculty here. Eva English helped each one of our NSF CAREER applicants. We are going to kind of head back to what our potential schedule is this year. So part of the lessons learned was, number one, did we really have enough time for people to really kind of take the reviewers' comments and do a re-write where needed. The consensus was "no, not quite enough time." So we've come up with a tentative schedule for this next round of the NSF CAREER award applicant's and said this was all untenured professors. We would like to run a workshop. We do have some volunteers. We have some former program managers here at UT who has volunteered to help us out on a workshop, and we're going to run that in May. It is going to be opened to everyone, not just the applicants. We're going to have to have a draft proposal in hand well before the due date of the proposal, so essentially any faculty who want to participate in the program, they will have to have that proposal draft one month ahead of the due date. Just a caveat, I think last year we did about three weeks ahead and so we're going to push that back one week. We had most of our applicants actually survive the draft and come up with a pretty good draft on that first go-around. The reason for that is if there are extensive changes, it does give the applicant enough time to re-work those changes. We need to give our reviewers at least a week to go over the proposals. We really try to limit two proposals for each faculty volunteer. We had some faculty that were reviewing three proposals, and so it is a pretty tough schedule for our faculty reviewers. But like I said, the reason I would like to alert everybody early is that we will be looking for volunteers again this spring. Are there any questions on that? Are there any questions on what's coming up on the NSF?

**President Thompson:** Could you clarify to the group how they could access Eva? Can they just ask her to help with their proposal? How does that work?

**Dr. Schall:** We have one grant writer for 800 faculty. People can get in touch with Eva English directly. She is going to have to really set her priorities, so she may or may not be available to help every single faculty that request her help. One of the things that we will like to prioritize is basically untenured faculty. We have to make a choice between which faculty in our system who would be un-tenured faculty. The other priority would be major projects limited submission.

**President Thompson:** What kinds of things can they expect her to help them with?

**Dr. Schall:** The narrative.

**President Thompson:** Anything in the narrative like the budget stuff?

**Dr. Schall:** No. And again, that's because we have one grant writer. She really tries to help people out with, for example the "boiler plate" like the CVs. I know there is a whole myriad of paperwork that goes into a grant proposal and into a project narrative, but when she helps you, she is really focused on the project narrative because that is going to win the proposal.

**President Thompson:** Along those lines just for the group, if you have newer faculty that are interested in how to find a particular grant, who would they contact in terms of if they wanted to find out if their using Spin or the foundation?

**Dr. Schall:** That would be Rick Francis.

**President Thompson:** Thank you.

**Dr. Jack Schultz:** May I offer comment?

**Dr. Schall:** Yes, always.

**Dr. Schultz:** First-of-all, Eva is really good at this and when she helps you, it really matters, but we need "six" of "her." So the members of this body would really help the university's research efforts if they lobbied for hiring grant writers in the various colleges. Three deans are currently discussing making such hires and so get out there and help them because we really need that.

**Dr. Schall:** Absolutely.

**Senator Duggan:** The other way around doing home interviews with the various departments over on the Health Science Campus, and this is one of the [faculty development] huge areas on the Health Science Campus that the 400 faculty here are very interested in, grant writing assistants. Would the faculty here be able to utilize grant writing assistance? I'm meaning the faculty here on the Health Science Campus.

**Dr. Schall:** Absolutely. In fact, I think the last go-round on the NSF review, I know there was at least one or two faculty from the Health Science Campus who was in that pool. We just ran another internal review, and we tried to do the same thing for the R-15's, but again, the College of Medicine is not eligible for the R-15's and the NIH reviews. We had faculty from [I think] Pharmacy as opposed to NSM on that last round; I think it was primarily Pharmacy opposed to NSM.

**Senator Duggan:** I did that R-15 review and Eva English was extremely useful. There is a huge interest in getting grant writing assistance.

**Dr. Schall:** Right. I am going to "second" with what Dr. Schultz said. The Research Office has been trying to work with the colleges in hiring more grant writers. I would love to see that because at this point Eva is very good, and she could be a huge assistance to grant writers in the other colleges.

**Senator Giovannucci:** I think one of the issues that Senator Duggan is bringing up is on the Medical Campus; we don't have undergraduate students, so we are not really eligible or competitive for CAREER awards and NSF awards.

**Dr. Schall:** No, you are eligible for the CAREER awards.

**Senator Giovannucci:** We are eligible, but we are not going to be competitive because we don't have undergraduates.

**Dr. Schall:** Oh, because of the undergraduate educational component of it?

**Senator Giovannucci:** Right. So if there is to be an expansion of grant writing assistance, I would advocate that some of those be more towards NIH type of funding.

**Dr. Schall:** In fact, I was asking a question about how we can expand this more widely as opposed to just simply keeping the NSF career or the R-15. We have some ideas and we would like to kind of explore that to figure out how we can be an...to help expand those. But it all really boils down to having willing faculty and internal reviewers who have the time. So just to give you an example, I had 25 and I figured, let me go back and see how many faculty actually volunteered. Not that we picked on all of you because we logistically really had to line people up based on our tentative list of people who were requesting internal reviews. I think we had 25 faculty who volunteered to either review when we needed them or volunteered for a future day. I just can't say enough good things about faculty and faculty volunteers down who have done internal reviews. I think it's really good experience.

**Senator Relue:** If you have a stable of faculty who volunteered and if someone is working on a proposal and would like it to be reviewed internally, can they contact you well in advance of the due date to get an internal review on that?

**Dr. Schall:** We'd like to see if we can formalize that. We are going to have to figure out how to logistically handle that. I mean, that is really where we would like to go. I do think it is a very positive thing and I think Senator Duggan can say the same thing.

**Senator Relue:** That would be the goal to aim for. We talked about this in the department.

**Dr. Schall:** Right, and I'd rather do that sooner than later because we know there's a need for this. I think you participated in the last round with the R-15's, and a lot of interaction and the feedback the reviewers gave to faculty were very positive.

**Colleen Quinlan (College of Nursing):** I just want to ask for clarification. Did I hear you say there weren't any undergraduate students on the Health Science Campus?

**Senator Giovannucci:** No.

**Senator Lundquist:** I just would like to let people know since we were talking about her, Eva English earned a Master's Degree from the English Department.

**Dr. Schall:** I'm going to turn it over to Jack Schultz.

**Dr. Jack Schultz:** My name is Jack Schultz. I think maybe I should spend a minute introducing myself because most of you don't know me. I'm relatively new here. I've been on campus since September. I was brought to the university. Well, I will have to admit, I am a trailing spouse. I am trailing after my wife who has trailed over the last 30 years. It's fair because she is the Dean of the Honors College, Heidi Appel. Anyway, the reason why I was brought on board was to help make the strategic plan come true in terms of research. By which I mean that I've been placed in a position called Director of Research

Development. As a research development officer, we even had a national organization called a National Organization of Research Development Officers. There is a list of responsibilities for that kind of position, and they include among other things, getting people together to form research teams, doing anything necessary to help investigators find and apply for grants—it's all about getting grants mostly, and it also includes professional development. That can include lots of different things. I've had lots of experience training faculty and graduate students in grantsmanship and communication, and so I will be doing some of that here. The one thing we're bringing to your attention at this meeting is we're going to repeat the Scholars Institute Program, which Amy did a magnificent job with last year over a period of about six months. We are going to try something a little different; we are going to try to squeeze it down to an intense boot camp over the spring break week. So it will occupy a half day at least each of the days over spring break week. There are about 20 or so people registered for this, half are from the Medical Campus. We will be doing most of the things that Amy covered, and the things you'd expect. Grantmanship training has its mechanical parts, how to structure a budget and so forth. What I'm going to try to do is really emphasize strategy because we see lots of grant proposals that are technically okay, the elements of the science are mostly there, but they are not structured in a way to sell. Scientists don't like the concept of selling—two letters that resides in the “I don't touch that” part of the vocabulary for scientists is “PR.” But in the current political climate and frankly since forever, winning a grant is a sales job. So we'll be spending significant time helping people figure out what is a sellable idea in the first place, what is a good creative idea, and how to pitch it in a way that wins that grant. So you can see the topics here, they are pretty standard, although we're emphasizing strategy in this. We are going to end the week with panel like reviews of two page mini proposals prepared based on the advice that we've been working on during the previous part of the week, so the trainees have the opportunity to actually participate in the review process to see what that is like, and subject themselves to the criticism of their colleagues, which is something we all have to get over. We think it is going to be fun. We will have the panel directors present their feelings about their reviews before the whole crowd. We don't have any prizes there, but that will be part of the process. The crew helping out with this is probably recognizable to most of you, except for me. The three on the bottom are particularly important because those are former program officials at NIH, and their insight will be very valuable as it was when Amy did it. The members of the Office of Research will be prominent here too because another thing that happens almost daily in the Office of Research is proposals that come in don't meet the minimum requirements or are put together the way that we need them put together to submit. So, we are going to be getting a lot of help from the folks that know how to find those funding sources and write the proposals in the correct way. The reason I'm doing this is because for the last decade my job has been interdisciplinary research at the institute of the University of Missouri where we had 30 investigators from 12 departments and six colleges. My job was the matchmaker and then marriage counselor for the interdisciplinary research programs. It turned out to be very successful. We earned annual research expenditures between \$15 and \$20 million a year with 30 investigators. I really believe in doing things that way, and I am here to try to get the same kind of result. Are there any questions? Thank you.

**Senator Ortiz:** Will you be sending out an email across the university?

**Dr. Shultz:** About?

**Senator Ortiz:** About what you're advertising in regard to the workshop.

**Dr. Shultz:** We've advertised this workshop. I am going to be honest with you. The more, the merrier. If you find somebody that wants to do this and doesn't know about it, I would like to know so I can figure out why they don't know about it, first of all, and second of all, we can get them in.

**Senator Ortiz:** Thank you.

**President Thompson:** That is great. These are exciting initiatives. I am glad to see the second edition of this program. Of course, we are on the upswing of our number of grants awards. Things are happening in your office, so thank you and we're very lucky to have both of you.

Next on our agenda is Senator Keith. You missed the wonderful Executive Report that told all your hard work and success on the tuition guarantee program. Certainly, we are very grateful for your leadership on this. So, can you give us a little bit of an update on what this is going to mean for us?

**Senator Keith:** I apologize to the other presenters; I didn't get here early enough to share the pointer.

[\[View PowerPoint\]](#)

I am going to talk about the Toledo Guarantee Plan which is an undergraduate tuition program. First of all, I want to remind you that University of Toledo has been very sensitive to the price of higher education. We charge one of the lowest rates among the Ohio public universities around. We are actually number five in terms of our tuition and general fee if you look at undergraduates. The lowest are Wright State, Youngstown, Central State and Shawnee. If you look at the discount rate, we are the highest. We froze tuition and the general fee seven times out of the last 11 years; two times we did it voluntarily and the other five times it was imposed by the State. In the fall of 2018, we are going to fix the price of tuition and general fees from other miscellaneous fees like room and board for four years for new bachelor degree seeking students. So the definition is usually something like this: "a tuition guarantee program allows all of our students to pay a tuition rate for a set period of time." If it is cohort based," which ours is, because it is required by the State then these programs require participation for students in the cohort. So the benefits offer certainty regarding the price of a bachelor's degree, but not the entire price because there are a few things that we have exempted, which I will get into in a few minutes. There is price transparency now for four years for students and their parents. It does encourage students' success because there is an incentive here to take 15 hours a semester to get 30 for the year to take advantage of our pricing plateau which is from 12 to 18 hours. There is an incentive here to retain, to persist, and to complete. What it does also is if they do graduate in four years, it increases the time that they can actually spend in the job market with their brand new degree earning the higher pay that accrues to someone with a bachelor's degree. What is its background? In 2013, the General Assembly authorized tuition guarantee programs for two and four-year public universities in Ohio. There's actually revised code, 3345.48 which regulates the four-year public schools. Participating schools are required to adopt rules, and the rules have to include the fact that it is a cohort-based program. Eligibility requirements are basically saying a new student is eligible. The length of the guarantee is because it has to be a four-year period for students who are seeking a bachelor's degree. The students' rights and privileges under the program are—we have to articulate what those rights are in our plan, and we have to help them in numerous places because students have to know what these are, and then what are the consequences to the university for students[who are] not completing in the specified time. There are a couple places where we have to give a mandatory exception to; we can either extend their guarantee period, or we can allow them to take the courses they

weren't able to take free of charge. The first school that adopted the guarantee was Ohio University, which is called The Ohio Guarantee and that was adopted in fiscal year 2016. It was followed by Miami University and followed by Ohio State. As of January 30, 2018, you saw University of Toledo, Wright State, Cleveland State, Shawnee State and Youngtown State which got approval from the Ohio State Department of Education to implement a tuition guarantee in the fall. Bowling Green has a program that was submitted, and it is under review right now. There were articles in various papers in December that said Akron and Kent State are also planning on having a guarantee program in the fall, but they haven't submitted anything to the Ohio Department of Education yet that has been posted for review. If you look at that, that is 11 of the 14 schools that we consider to be the four-year universities. Central State is not submitting one as I understand, nor the University of Cincinnati. The third school is NeoMed, which does not have any undergraduates. So how the plan evolved? In July 2017, a taskforce was formed and charged with developing recommendations for a tuition guarantee program. Matt Schroeder was asked to chair it; Bill Ayres represented the Provost Office; Bryan Dadey represented Finance and Administration; I was on it because I have been doing research on tuition guarantee programs for Larry Kelley who is the Executive VP in Finance and Administration; Linda Rouillard was appointed to represent Faculty Senate; Stephanie Sanders was for enrollment; and then Sammy Spann for student affairs. Based on members' input, a plan was developed and sent out to get feedback from the Registrar, Financial Aid and legal counsel primarily to find out [if] what we were recommending could actually be implemented and finding the difficulties for actually having different group of students be charged different rates because that is ultimately what's going to happen. So based on their feedback we made some changes to the plan. It was then approved by the president, submitted to the Department of Higher Education for preapproval. They recommend highly that we get pre approval before we take it to our Board. We went through several rounds with them because it took a month and a half to basically get pre approval. Then we submitted it to the Board and got the Board's approval on December 18, 2017. We received the Ohio Department of Education's approval on January 30, 2018. Then the implementation taskforce was formed to work on it so it could be implemented and be ready to go in fall 2018. The implementation taskforce is really looking at behind the scenes configurations. There is a configuration team that is looking at registration and billing. There is an enrollment, recruitment, and financial aid packaging team; a student life team—even though it is not in the code, we were required to include room and board; another group is looking at messaging, advertising, and marketing and the website. Then, another group is looking at training, particularly for advisors and success coaches. What is our plan? Here is our plan: It's a four-year guarantee. Participation is going to be required for all new bachelor degree seeking students enrolled at UT for the first time in fall 2018 or later. This includes all first year students, nontraditional students, transfer students and readmitted students. Readmitted students are students who had been at the University of Toledo, but had been out long enough that they actually have to be readmitted to their program(s). So readmitted students are, those that if they enroll at UT as a degree seeking student on or after fall 2018. Again, that doesn't make sense for the first cohort, but it will make sense for future cohorts. You'll be placed in a cohort if you are registered for classes for the first time as of the 15<sup>th</sup> day of the fall or spring semester. So that is important for student accounts and the registrar to figure out who is actually in the cohort. If you came and you registered, and then you dropped out before the 15<sup>th</sup> day, you are no longer a student at UT, and so you should not be in the cohort. We were actually required by ODHE to say something about admitting them into the cohort as of the 15<sup>th</sup> day of the semester. Are there any questions?

**Senator Lecka-Czernik:** I have a question. Are new incoming students automatically part of this plan?

**Senator Keith:** Yes; if they are degree seeking. So it doesn't include non-degree seeking students and it wouldn't include college credit plus students.

**Senator Lecka-Czernik:** I understand. Thank you.

**Senator Keith:** So these are the students that aren't required to be: The continuing students. Again, these students will go away if we continue to have a tuition guarantee program because we will have a new cohort every year. So eventually, we will no longer have continuing students, we will just have students in different cohorts—non-degree seeking students and readmitted students who first enrolled at UT prior to fall 2018. Again, we are treating them more like continuing students. There will be enough to a one-year automatic extension built into the plan so that students don't actually have to request an extension if they are in programs that require more than 126 hours because of accreditation or licensing or programs that are designated to take longer than four years because they are required co-ops or internships. There will be a list of these programs housed in the Provost Office.

**Senator Relue:** I have a question about the “not required for” in terms of, what does that mean? Does that mean the University of Toledo is not required to provide them a tuition guarantee or they're not required to be part of a cohort?

**Senator Keith:** They are not required to be part of the cohort. In fact, these students will not be in a cohort.

**Senator Relue:** So they can't be in a cohort and they don't have a tuition guarantee, is that right?

**Senator Keith:** Right. I don't think initially they would want to be in a cohort because we're going to raise tuition on the first cohort because we are allowed to do that; and so the continuing students will actually pay a lower tuition rate than students that are in a cohort. Now, once you become a degree seeking student, you will enter a cohort.

**Senator Hammersley:** So this is very dependent on somebody not going through...that you get appropriate students in and that we're not losing them as we go along. What is with this plan that it assures that we're not taking students that are inadequately prepared to get a bachelor's degree?

**Senator Keith:** I think we are just taking the students that we ordinary take and we are giving them a guarantee of four years that their tuition, general fees, other fees, and our room and board will not change. They will have a guaranteed rate. The things the provost talked about that we are currently doing to improve retention and persistence, we will continue to do, and other than that, I don't really have an answer for your question. I think we are just going to continue to do what we do—recruit the same students that we recruit and work hard to make sure that we retain them. All that the guarantee is doing is just basically saying, you are not going to see a price increase in these certain areas for four years and so you have an incentive now to finish in four years and if you try to take longer than that, you might see your tuition go up.

**Senator Hammersley:** So what is the stick from the Ohio Department of Education if you lose people out of the cohort or [if] they're taking longer than five years to get their degree?

**Senator Keith:** There is not an automatic stick. What the legislature would like is for college to be more affordable. So, this is a way to make college more affordable or at least make it look like it is more affordable because you are giving students and their families this guarantee. I think the stick part is that our state support, our SSI really is now a function of completion in terms of course completion and degree completion, and so that is where we lose money if our students aren't completing courses or if they aren't finishing and earning degrees then we are not going to get as much state support.

**Dr. Shultz:** Has this been audited to see what the impact is going to be on the financial stability of the institution? Can we afford to do this?

**Senator Keith:** Well, we can afford to do this because we haven't been allowed to have a tuition increase in nearly four years. So this will allow us to actually raise tuition on the first cohort to make up for the fact that we cannot raise tuition up for a four year period on those students.

**Dr. Schultz:** Other universities with frozen tuitions are now considering all kinds of alternatives.

**Senator Keith:** Right. You saw the list of Ohio schools that are all adopting the tuition guarantee. Part of the reason for doing that is because it is a way to get a tuition increase. So yes, there's been lots of analysis of the financial impact it would have on the University.

**Senator Kippenhan:** Just a clarification. Does "housed in the Provost Office" mean on the website? When students come to my office it makes it a lot easier for me to see the current list of programs.

**Senator Keith:** This is part of the charge of the training group, which is to come up with frequently asked questions to provide that information to advisors or success coaches whether they be academic advisors or faculty advisors. We really need to communicate exactly what this is all about in order for it to be successful.

**Senator Hall:** I have a question about how this applies to Pharmacy students because in our program they enter as freshmen and after two years they declare to a bachelor's degree or the Pharm D where they sort of matriculate afterwards. So for students that declare as a Pharm D, do they get this guarantee the whole time or for four years?

**Senator Keith:** Well, this is probably something we need to have a little bit more conversation about. But the four year guarantee is guaranteed for undergraduate and graduate work done by students who are in pipeline programs. So they got the four years for at least a couple years of the Pharm D program. The implementation team probably does need to bring someone from Pharmacy in to actually understand exactly how---

**Senator Hall:** I was actually wondering have you done that already.

**Senator Keith:** I think we have, but it was a while ago, and we forgot how important that group was. We remembered Engineering, but forgot a little bit about Pharmacy.

**Senator Williams:** We are always forgotten.

**Senator Keith:** I am so sorry; it won't happen again.

**Senator Ohlinger:** To add on to Senator Hall's comments. The Pharm D is the entry level degree, and I think there are other programs such as occupational therapy. The entry level degree as a graduate level degree whether it's masters or a doctoral level. We will also have a small contingent of students that will come in with undergraduate degrees entering our professional division as undergraduates because they will be taking 3000 and 4000 level courses. There will always be exceptions, but I think we need to figure those things out.

**Senator Keith:** And with the transfer students, there was a big debate about if somebody transfers in as a junior, how many years are you going to give them? They only have financial aid that for so many credit hours, so if you give them four years, you are giving them the wrong incentive here because they are going to think they have four years to graduate. But in the end, we decided that transfer students will have four years as well simply because otherwise it is too hard to implement. It is too hard to tell just because someone has 60 credit hours exactly how long it is going to take them to complete. So anybody who comes in, a cohort will have a four year guarantee regardless of if they have credit hours or not in terms of the transfer students.

**Senator Lecka-Czernik:** What is the percentage increase of tuition?

**Senator Keith:** We're going to increase tuition 6%.

**Senator Maloney:** I am just wondering if you thought about this for graduate students or professional students?

**Senator Keith:** It hasn't been encouraged by the state. It is the undergraduate tuition programs that have been encouraged. But I know that the College of Law right now is looking at the idea of having a tuition guarantee program starting next fall for law students. We had some conversations in the division of Finance and Administration but the College of Law dean about how that would look and it is the same basic idea that you would guaranteed a tuition waiver, but since the state seems to be more concerned about freezing the tuition of undergraduates, there is more flexibility in what you can do with a tuition guarantee program for graduate students.

**Senator Maloney:** I have one more question. If somebody has an out of state tuition student, will that out-of-state tuition be frozen for those four years too?

**Senator Keith:** So out of state students pay the in-state instructional fee, we think of it as "tuition," as well as the out of state surcharge. We didn't include the out of state surcharge as a guarantee, but some schools have done that but we chose not to. I think in the end we just decided that we were focused more on the in-state part of the tuition in-state students actually pay.

**Senator Hammersley:** The students that are in "Ohio State" and they transfer to us, is it our tuition guarantee going forward, not whatever "Ohio State" had?

**Senator Keith:** Can I just say I hope that never happens. My fear is that since the ODHE forced all of the schools to really standardize the rules in their tuition guarantee, I'm afraid that's the next thing they'll think about doing is basically allow these to be transferable which would be a "nightmare." But right now when they transfer, they are under our tuition guarantee, not Ohio State. I have some more slides that I think would've answered some of these questions. Would you like to see them?

**Senator Kippenhan:** No, Q & A is more “fun” <laughter>.

**Senator Keith:** I will just put them all up here at once. So again, it is four years and it includes intersessions and the summer. For the four years, if you started in fall, you have through summer of 2022. If you were to start in the spring, you have fall 2022. So, it is a full academic year: fall, spring, summer/fall, spring, summer four times. If you start in the summer a few students who graduate from high school and decided to take a class or two in the summer, they will pay the continuing student rate and then they will join the subsequent cohort. So they take a couple courses in the summer and then start in the fall, that’s when they will join the cohort. We don’t have cohorts for summer starts; they will join the fall or the spring cohort. And again, once you are in the program, there are no restrictions on your enrollment status even though we are going to encourage it to stay here to at least 30 hours a year—you can be full-time students, you can be part-time students, or you can drop out for a while if you need to because you have the four year guarantee. We do care what you do in those four years, but we are not going to penalize you if you are not a full-time student. So there is no limit on the number of undergraduate degrees that you can earn or the number of majors, minors, or certificates. Again, this is where the guaranteed rate will cover graduate coursework and establish pipeline programs until the student’s cohort period expires. We don’t currently have a list of what those programs are, but once we have a list will probably ask the Provost again, to keep it current in his office. So we will talk to Pharmacy and Engineering just to make sure there is nobody that we’re missing in terms of if you have a pipeline program. So if you have a pipeline program we want to know about it because you want your students to be able to do graduate coursework at guaranteed undergraduate rates if they are still within their cohort period. People have said that this is not very much, but it is something. If you finish in four years and you stay at UT and earn a graduate degree then you will get a \$500 voucher for graduate work. We would like to be a lot more, but we are trying this out to see how it works.

**Senator Ferris:** Do readmits stay in their original cohort or enter a new cohort?

**Senator Keith:** I am so glad you asked that. With readmits, they stay in their original cohort if it is not expired. They go into the oldest unexpired cohort if it is expired.

So I said you can qualify for an extension because the state has mandated that they are two mandatory exceptions. One is military service and this requires an automatic exception. We are still working on trying to figure out what that means. We had in the plan “a call to active duty” and we were told that the ORC specifically says “military service” and so that is what we need to put into our plan. So we are not really sure how that is going to work, but however it works, it requires an automatic exception. So students who are doing something with military service and therefore cannot attend UT will get some kind of extension to their cohort period. Another one is, if a student can’t finish because the courses that are required are unavailable then they have to have the opportunity to take those courses without requiring a payment of tuition for those courses. This could be a nightmare. So we have a couple things that we really hope will narrow down the number of students to claim that if they weren’t able to take a required course. They have to demonstrate that the course was required via the degree audit and they had to have met with an advisor prior to the start of the second week of classes to discuss alternatives and determine no solution was available. So before fall we are going to have to come up with forms and we are going to have to come up with a way of documenting whether or not students were unable to take a required course and therefore should be able to take the course free of charge.

**Senator White:** Senator Keith, let me ask you about that. What if the course is offered every other year and the student is fully aware of that from the start—I don't see that exception here—then the student during that second year when the course is not offered says, oops, I get it for free?

**Senator Keith:** We are talking about putting together a policy committee to try to come up with answers of those questions. I don't have an answer right now because we need people on that committee who know what students will say and exactly what the arguments are going to be in terms of why they weren't able to do what they needed.

**Senator Kippenhan:** I was going to say I definitely see that problem with students who either double-major or double-degree because now you're starting to hit prerequisites that are going to restrict when you can take a course that would potentially be in your fourth year and it is not being offered.

**Senator Keith:** The Provost Office, Peg Traband is the contact person, is thinking about this very carefully and putting together for people to try to make sure that we cover as many bases here as we possibly can because it can turn out to be just a nightmare in terms of students applying to these exceptions. Then somebody is going to have to determine whether or not it is legitimate or not.

**Senator Kippenhan:** The other thing on your advisor is that, do the students meet with an academic advisor or a faculty advisor in the department of their major because the second week of classes meeting a faculty advisor in the department of their major may not be that easy and there you got an appeal?

**Senator Keith:** This is why this needs to be communicated, vetted, and get the best advice we possibly can because it wouldn't even occur to me to say what kind of advisor you need to meet with.

**Senator Lecka-Czernik:** How about study abroad? If a student goes for one year to study abroad is that an exception too?

**Senator Keith:** We do put in what the non-mandatory exceptions will be because there should be an appeal committee where students can come and say, I think I should have an extension because of "a, b, and c," so what we put in the plan is it will be determined. We are going to need to put together a group of people that can come up with a list of things we will allow exceptions for that we aren't necessarily required to do so by the state, although they do have to be Board approved. So one of the things that probably should be on here which isn't, but it will be I believe is something like a medical withdrawal. Students who have a medical withdrawal should be granted an automatic extension, but we were told we had to do that by the state. Selecting study abroad is also something that we need to consider. But again, part of the reason we hadn't considered a lot of the things yet is because we thought that maybe this was just something we could do later after it was approved and get together with a bunch of people that could really help us narrow it down on what would be important and what wouldn't be important.

**Senator Lecka-Czernik:** If the students decided study abroad, I would like for that student to be included so it is easy for him/her to do so without having to appeal, or write another letter, or appeal to another board because otherwise, we won't get students in study abroad.

**Senator Keith:** Right.

**Senator Lecka-Czernik:** It has to be easy. I mean, they have a lot of administrative things to do anyway, so I think this has to be easy for them.

**Senator Keith:** Well, I understand. I apologize for not considering that sooner, but I will certainly take it back and tell them how important that is.

**Senator Hefzy:** When does this policy go to the Board?

**Senator Keith:** It's gone; it's already there. Not this, but the Board has approved the Tuition Guarantee program.

**Senator Hefzy:** So the Board has approved it?

**Senator Keith:** Right. It would be in place fall of 2018.

**Senator Relue:** You may have mentioned it and I've missed it, but if I am in a cohort and I don't finish by the end of my cohort time period and I have to go another semester, do I now fall into the tuition for that cohort enrolling in that semester or for the one that is in the cohort after I've enrolled?

**Senator Keith:** The oldest unexpired cohort. So if you started in 2018 and it took you five years, you'll be in the 2019 cohort. So if you started in the fiscal year 2019, which is what we're going in next year, and you needed that fifth year, you will be put in the fiscal year 2020 cohort. So it is the oldest unexpired cohort.

These are students that don't really have a very good reason for not completing. So if they didn't finish during their cohort period and they don't qualify for an extension, they will be placed in the oldest unexpired cohort. But if they stopped out or withdrew, when they return, then they will go back to their original until it expires and then if it is expired then it will be placed in the oldest unexpired cohort for its duration. So it is like lather, rinse, and repeat; if they don't finish then they will keep rolling over into the oldest unexpired cohort.

**Senator Kippenhan:** So you are giving them the cheapest possible tuition rate when they readmit?

**Senator Keith:** Exactly. So I don't know why I put this at the end—maybe I do. The tuitions will be the same as before. It will be the flat rate for 12 and 18 hours and prorated if you are part-time. We have an additional rate if you take more than 18 hours. For the general fee, it is credit hour, and it becomes a flat rate at 12 hours. Miscellaneous fees—we really talked about all of the fees that our students pay, and it turned out that is pretty complicated. If you look at tech fees for example, the highest tech fees rate is like \$17.50 per credit hour, and the lowest is \$4.50 per credit hour. So it was hard to come up with an average tech fee that wouldn't disadvantage some students and advantage others. So we ended up including the library's information fee, the facilities fee, the special services fee which pays for transcripts and graduation which is why your students don't actually have to pay to get their transcript or pay a graduation fee, and then the undergraduate career services fee which is new this year. So those things are included in the guarantee, and the state has decided that they are miscellaneous general fees, so they are subject to the rate increases that are allowed by the tuition guarantee. We are also required to put a room and board, and we did not want to do that, but we were required to do that because Ohio Department of Higher Education wants all public schools to include room and board. It doesn't include all of this other

stuff: the out-of-state surcharge, the technology fee, service charges and fines, workshop, course fees, special purpose fees, and optional fees. Some of the other schools have included the out-of-state surcharge free charge; and they included technology fees; and they included course fees. But we really have a complicated fee structure. Look at all the course fees that we have, and it would be page, after page, after page. We have a really complicated fee structure, and we weren't able to simplify it much. So this is what we can do. I am going to put them all up here because we are running out of time. I hope this makes sense because I was trying to think about how to explain it. So in the first cohort we are allowed to raise the price of items covered by the guarantee up by 6%. It is a 6% average, so we could raise tuition by 10% and other things less than that as long as it averages out to 6%, but we went with 6% for everything. For the second cohort, we are also allowed to raise tuition and the general fee, but we have to do it by the sum of the five-year average rate of inflation on all urban consumers and all items and by any legislative prescribed tuition cap, which fiscal year 2019 is zero. Room and board rates aren't subject to the above cap, and they can be determined by the Board of Trustees. For the third cohort, the rules for price changes are the same as for the second cohort. For the fourth cohort, the rules for the price changes are the same as for the second cohort. So the only time we can only "jack up" tuition and fees to 6% is for the first cohort; after that, unless the state allows us to increase tuition, it will just be by the rates of inflation which last year was 1.3%. Larry had me do this for a different presentation. If you take our tuition and general fee for full-time undergraduates and then add them together to get that third column, this is where we are placed because I am ignoring Shawnee State and Central State. We are third from the bottom and you can see our tuition for the first semester –the general fee is \$4,621, and we do discount, students do get scholarships. If I assumed that all the schools that were currently going to put in a tuition guarantee for fall 2018 by raising their tuition and general fee by 6% and the schools that already have one, Ohio State, Ohio University and Miami, raise them by 1.3%, this is where we would fall in terms of our tuition and fees, general fee, and in terms our Ohio competitors. So we haven't moved one inch. The increase for just tuition and fees per semester is \$270. ODHE will consider changes to the rules established in our tuition guarantee plan as long as the requested changes are consistent with the rules established by the Ohio Revised Code, 3345.48. If it turns out that the things that we put in there are totally unworkable, we can request an amendment to our rules. The president has also said years down the road if we find out that this isn't really working very well for our students then we can always consider dropping it. So we may not have to live with it forever, and we may not have to live with what we currently have forever. There is a process to make changes. Are there any questions?

**Senator Ohlinger:** I think this is a simple one. The second cohort you mentioned on the inflation rate, the sum of that, and the biannual tuition cap posed by the legislature, does that come from the State?

**Senator Keith:** Yes, that does come from the State. For the last three years and for next year it has been and will be zero.

**President Thompson:** Let's give her a hand. Are there any items from the floor before we adjourn today? Is there any good news or announcements? One last thing and I did not say this, the crisis training that we did where it was streamed; we actually have it already archived on the Faculty Senate webpage so you can access it. If there are no other announcements, may I have a motion to adjourn?

**IV.** Meeting adjourned at 5:51 p.m.

V. Respectfully submitted,

Fred Williams  
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard  
Faculty Senate Administrative Secretary