

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of November 22, 2016
FACULTY SENATE

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

Approved @FS on 1/17/2017

Summary of Senate Business

College of Graduate Studies Update- Dean Amanda Bryant – Friedrich
15-week Semester Discussion

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 Humphrys: I call this meeting to order. Welcome to the seventh Faculty Senate meeting of AY 2015-2016. I ask that Executive Secretary, Lucy Duhon come to the podium to call the roll.

I. Roll Call: 2016-2017 Senators:

Present: Ariss, Atwood, Barnes, Bjorkman, Bouillon, Burnett, Cappelletty, Compura, Crist, Devabhaktuni, Duhon, Edwards, Emonds, Giovannucci, Gray, Gruden, Hall, Harmych, Hoy, Humphrys, Keith, Kennedy (substitute for G. Gilchrist), Kippenhan, Kovach, Kilmer (substitute for B. Patrick), Krantz, Lanham, Lundquist, McLoughlin, Modyanov, Mohamed, Monsos, Nathan, Nigem, Oberlander, Prior, Randolph, Relue, Rouillard, Said, Sheldon, A. Thompson, Tian, Van Hoy, Weck-Schwarz, White, Williams

Excused absences: Brickman, Dowd, Duggan, Haughton, Jorgensen, Lecka-Czernik, Wittmer

Unexcused absences: Jaume, Malhotra, Martin (substitute for G. Thompson), Niamat, Schaefer, Srinivasan, Thompson-Casado, Willey

II. Approval of Minutes: Minutes of September 27, 2016, meeting of the UT Faculty Senate and Minutes of October 11, 2016, meeting of the UT Faculty.

President Humphrys: Welcome to the seventh Faculty Senate meeting of the academic year. We have two sets of Minutes to approve. The draft Minutes of September 27th were distributed for review. Is there any discussion? Hearing none. May I have a motion to approve the Minutes of September 27, 2016? Any opposed? Any abstentions? **Motion Passed.** The draft Minutes of October 11, 2016 were distributed for review. Is there any discussion? May I have a motion to approve the Minutes of October 11, 2016? Any opposed? Any abstentions? **Motion Passed.**

Executive Committee Report: Since our last meeting, your Executive Committee members have met with President Gaber and Provost Hsu and have discussed issues affecting the University community. Included in these topics is switching to a 15-week semester (discussion will begin at today's meeting), the campus master plan, online tenure and promotion materials submission, dean and department chair evaluations, and the possible addition of a shortened "intersession" semester to the academic schedule.

Regarding the possibility of making tenure and promotion materials available for online review, President-elect Amy Thompson and I have met with representatives from the Provost office to discuss the

logistics of achieving this option. We will be coming forward at a future Senate meeting to present what this process might look like—its benefits and challenges and the best practices of other universities who have already instituted this option.

I am serving on the search committee for the Vice President of Advancement. Last week the committee interviewed candidates off-campus and extended an invitation to a group of candidates to come to campus. Those individuals will probably be at UT during the first full week in December. Open forums to meet the candidates for the Vice President of Advancement will be held, and Quinetta will send out that schedule once it is put together.

Last week, at the invitation of President Amal Mohamed, I spoke at the Student Government meeting. I was impressed by the enthusiasm and support for the University by that group of students. On behalf of the Senate, I expressed our interest in having a meaningful relationship with the Student Government and to continue to consult with them on issues of interest to both bodies. I also had the opportunity to receive student feedback on the possibility of going to a 15-week semester, which I will share with you when we talk about that subject in today's meeting.

The Strategic Planning process continues on track to present a report to the University community by the end of this academic year. The process has extended beyond the Strategic Planning Committee to include invited faculty, students, staff and administrators to serve on sub-groups providing input on a variety of areas important to the University. We will keep you posted on the progress of this process.

Vice President of Diversity and Inclusion Willie McKether has put together a new group called The University Council on Diversity and Inclusion. This group meets monthly and its primary role is to assist with both implementing UT's Strategic Diversity Plan and addressing matters related to diversity and inclusion at UT. The group includes representatives from all University constituencies, as well as members of the community. Senator Sharon Barnes and I serve on this committee. That concludes today's Executive Committee Report.

Next, I would like to welcome our first guest, Dean Amanda Bryant-Friedrich

[Applause]

Dean Amanda Bryant-Friedrich: It still sounds strange for someone to refer to me as the “D” word; I request respectfully that no one call me that<laughter>. It is really a pleasure to be able to come and speak [to you] today at Faculty Senate. I want to share my vision with you and then go over some of the things that we have been actually working on and then hopefully get some of your input.

This is my vision that I decided very early on when I was actually interviewing for the position. I put it into this graphic and it served me well to this point and so I want to share it with you today. Each piece means something, at the very bottom of it is the foundation of The University of Toledo – the College of Graduate Studies is as strong as its foundation, and that is why those two are actually the same size. We work very closely with the university's administration because we are kind of like a little university within a university. As I talk about some of the things, some of the tribulations and some of the joys that

we have, you will see where it all comes in. At the very top is the roof, which is our graduate professional program and how we support those programs. It became very clear to me when I started in January of this year, working on strategic enrollment planning, that I had no idea that I was going to end up on the other end of the spectrum. People were telling me what I needed to do and so I feel very in tuned with how our community sees graduate education and a lot of the things you want to see. I have heard a lot of opinions, not only for strategic enrollment planning but as well as...planning. I've been in a lot of conversations to hear the voices of our faculty, staff and our students and the things that people want to do. One of the big things that I always hear is about marketing- people say to me that there is absolutely no marketing of our graduate program. Well, what I found out is that the graduate school is doing a lot of marketing and you guys in your colleges do a lot of marketing also. So one of the things that I started to look at there is how we can support the efforts that are already ongoing and try to get to a point where we are representing the same message. There is a message of quality, there is a message of reputation and there is a message of visibility that needs to be overarching in all of our communication to the outside world of the university and so that is part of what I wanted to look at and we've already started. The associate deans that are responsible for the graduate programs in our colleges looked at how to find a way to get that marketing into a place where it is not as painful.

I believe it was last week or the week before last, I did the Coffee with COGS on both campuses- on the Main Campus in U-Hall and on the Health Science Campus in Mulford Library- that was really a wonderful experience for me to see the program directors come in and talk with potential graduate students as well as our current graduate students. So we had very informal conversations and talked about what worked for them and what did not work for them over a cup of coffee. A lot of things that they talked about that we are all concerned about is their quality of life here on campus and how it is supported. Tell me, what is that linked to? Money. The quality of life is linked to money. All of our graduate students struggle to pay tuition and we have graduate students that get stipends and things like that, so we listened to the ways that they found to support their own lifestyle, which was very eye-opening for me and it's also an area of importance to all of us. Now, that also goes with recruitment and so we started recruiting students and we recognized through those conversations that you have to take the financial aspect of graduate studies into consideration. There are some students out there – and some of you know – who will not even entertain a university if they're not getting full tuition and a stipend and there are other programs where students pay full tuition and so recruiting to those different markets is very different. We are trying to get a feel and understanding of what the market is looking for and what it actually wants etc. One of my objectives is diversity. I've been at The University of Toledo since 2007 and finding represented minority students in a lot of our programs is very difficult and so I want to make sure that we are paying some attention to that. In the next year I plan to reorganize my office a bit so we will have someone in the office that will actually focus upon diversity and diversity in all of our programs. We actually put in some efforts in STEM disciplines, they tend to be the ones that... are underrepresented with minority students, so we put in some efforts there. We sent representatives from colleges to Detroit and we also sent representatives down to the Annual Biomedical Research Conference for Minority Students which is the conference that entertains the largest number of minority bio-medical students for recruitment.

Policy and procedures: a lot of people and especially our students become extremely frustrated with the entire process to...enrolling in and progressing through and graduating from our graduate and professional programs. Now, I think that is unacceptable, to be honest; it is hard enough to get a graduate

degree so our students shouldn't be suffering in the process. We are actually trying to do a little bit to try to understand what our policies are and I know you guys are doing a lot of policy thinking as well. We don't want to be police officers but we have to make sure that things are in place so people can progress in a way that they should, and we are also looking at ways to automate a lot of our procedures so that there's not so much paper-carrying and people "telling" me to take a piece of paper over to the graduate school, that's antiquated, and so we are working on trying to find a way to improve that. So policy and procedures are one of the first things that I started looking at when I entered into the office in July. I am really interested in hearing your input because faculty members are typically involved in that process; usually, your students come in and they want to know "what am I supposed to do "with this piece of paper?" so I need to know from you where you see the barriers and things like that, especially in recruiting.

Funding – we need money. One of the things that I think is that the traditional model for graduate education is pretty much out of the window of looking at the way things used to be. So I am really hoping as the College of Graduate Studies we can start to try to bring in funding through grant mechanisms as well as from private sources. The other one is professional and personal development, our grad students are very savvy individuals and professional students are even at a different level when it comes to trying to engage their future profession. So we are trying to make sure that our graduate students are getting the best development that they need, including the soft skills that they need to be successful in a workplace and that is the main focus in what I want you to engage in. We are trying right now to develop programs and one of the key pieces to that is alumni. I believe that alumni have gone through and are in the workforce and they know what works. So bringing them back to campus to help us with that professional development program is a key area that I look forward to building next year.

Support Services: I don't know if you all think about it, but as a graduate student, a professional student, remember that important version of your life where you really were and if you were like me, I said I wanted to go to another country to get my degree- a lot of people that we have here come from other countries to get their degree. What do they need when they land here? What do our domestic students need? We need to put a lot more thought into that. We were having the conversations today for strategic planning and I said that we often talk about student affairs here at The University of Toledo, but it is almost unsaid that that's undergraduate student affairs. We need to think about graduate student affairs and that's a different need because students are older, they have other things that are important to them. So actually understanding how to develop and sustain their finances, that is huge to them and they are in a different place. We are trying to provide housing for people who are single and married. Childcare is a major issue and so that is also a focus that I really want to tackle- that is the hardest one and I am not going to stand here and try to say that's easy, because trying to get the funding, the resources and support is not easy. So one of the things that I want to do is partner with our community. A lot of our students that come from abroad have local members of their community here and that can help us a lot for making those students feel more at home. We have resources here on campus to help students learn how to manage their finances and things like that. Those will continue and those are important areas.

Here are two last things that I want to talk to you about: First, I've decided that I'm going to actually present in January a call for proposals. So I want to ask for innovative, interdisciplinary graduate programs. I sit on the Chancellor's Council for Graduate Schools for the state of Ohio and I get to see a lot of proposals coming in from our sister institutions from the state of Ohio. We are really

underrepresented in that pool and I have faith that our institution has some ideas to put forward programs that are stellar and will be really attractive to our students... So in January you will see an RFP come out, looking for new, innovative programs and I want to encourage programs that currently have issues with enrollment and trying to reinvent themselves, because I believe that is one of our strategies for moving forward. I hope everyone will get excited about that and you will see that in January. We also have a fun fact, The University of Toledo has four professional science master's degrees, we have the largest number in the state of Ohio and that is something that is very unique to us, and for that reason we will actually sponsor a conference on the topic in 2017. The last thing I would like to ask you to do is ask your students to register for classes. Graduate students have a tendency to put off registering for classes forever and I have these "people" who are always asking me about enrollment numbers.

President Humphrys: Are there any questions? Okay. Thank you so much, Amanda.

Now, we will move on with the agenda. Our next guest is Provost Andrew Hsu; he's here to give us an update on things that are happening at UT.

Provost Hsu: Good afternoon everyone. Over the past few meetings I've been mostly reporting to you on what's happening at the campus level and in the Provost's office, but today I would like to bring you some information from Columbus. Many of you probably know that every month there is an IUC president meeting and IUC provost meeting. IUC is the abbreviation for Inter University Council, which consists of the 14 public universities in the state. The IUC works closely with the Ohio Department of Higher Education and there are often initiatives and directives that come from the Chancellor's office, and sometimes that is in response to the state legislature. At the last IUC meeting there was a discussion about the budget for higher education and the next budget cycle. We know what IUC and the Chancellor's office are going to request, I think the request is going to be for a 4.5% increase in SSI and 0 increase in student tuition. The Chair of IUC, Bruce Johnson, believes there is no political will to actually "give" us that increase, because the governor more or less has said that there won't be a tuition increase. The new Senate and House are pretty much partnering and they are going to support this proposal. So the bottom line is that the people in Columbus are not extremely optimistic about the future budget situation. There was also a discussion that the Ohio Department of Higher Education has guaranteed transfer pathways and one of the initiatives under that is there is a state-wide faculty committee led by the associate provost of Ohio State, Randy Smith. He led the taskforce and discussed a proposal to develop 2+2 programs by region. The idea is that the four-year institutions would partner with 2-year institutions so pathways are developed for 2+2 degree programs. Students will be able to complete two years at a community college and then be able to transfer into a four-year college and take [another] two years at a junior and senior level, so there is no more need for remedial courses. This is slightly different from the matriculation model that we currently have, which is basically at the course level. We have a matriculation agreement with two-year colleges on what courses can be transferred, but now the new requirement is what two-year degrees will transfer here and we'll transfer students into their junior and senior level courses of programs. They've identified some "better" majors for these types of activities and then they're going to have sub-committees for them. The suggestion is that we send our associate deans for academic programs in these mega majors to the state to discuss what a partnership would look like. I don't think they're going to regulate at a state level what it is going to look like, but they're going to develop guidelines and timetables and so forth, so we can come back and work with our partners to develop these programs. At some point we're going to be asked for input and suggestions are going to be given to us too.

The IUC also discussed the fact that our governor has proposed to fund Western Governors University as a state institution using state dollars. Many of you probably know that Western Governors University does something called competency-based education. What we discussed is that the 14 Ohio [public] four-year institutions can provide the same program and it'll probably be better service because of our partnerships with local communities and industries. We are putting together a proposal to the state that all 14 institutions can develop a plan to develop competency-based programs to offer to all citizens because the state should be giving their dollars to us rather than to bring Western Governors University here and share our dollars. So we put together an ad hoc committee, and at this point there are five provosts, I, myself, being one. We are serving on this ad hoc committee to develop a proposal for the entire IUC Provosts to then present to the IUC Presidents and if the presidents agree with it, then it will be presented to the governor. So, that is something that we will be discussing also with the faculty and the department chairs and program directors to identify programs that would be suitable.

The last topic we discussed was reporting duplicate programs to ODHE/ the governor's task force. There is legislation, an Ohio Revised Code section 3345.35, that requires all state institutions to evaluate all courses and programs based on enrollment and student performance, and in addition to that, to evaluate benefits of regional partnerships in teaching these low-enrollment programs. The Chancellor's office, who is probably taking directive from the governor, is requiring all the state institutions to report on low-enrollment programs, and a timeline has been developed. They have given each region a long list of programs by university with the number of degrees awarded and so forth. Our task is that we need to first look at that list and by March come up with the list of programs that we say we're not going to review; we tell them these are the programs that are good to have, even though they are argumentative, we are going to keep them and we're not ready to review them for potential elaboration and elimination. Then by September we need to tell them the rest of the list, and there might be a few that we'll consider. The things that we'll have to consider, based on that directive, are the programs that make sense for a regional partnership and what are the programs that make sense to be eliminated. By September we are asked to report our progress back – of what have we been talking about for these lists, and hopefully it's a short list. By the end of December, we are asked to provide a final plan, the closing stage that tells us that these are the programs that we are going to collaborate with our regional partners [on] and what programs have to be eliminated. So I guess my goal is that we won't have programs that we will eliminate. We already have been discussing with Bowling Green on programs that we could partner [on] and in fact, some of the programs are in the College of Arts and Letters and one in Science and Education that we're going to talk about. One of our plans is to have some of these low-enrolled courses taught/alternate between campuses, simply through a sharing process where no money changes hands. I will be happy to answer any questions.

President Humphrys: Are there any questions?

Senator Kippenhan: Thank you for the update from Columbus, it was very interesting. Regarding the partnership between BG and UT to share courses, will Bowling Green students be able to [then] telecommute into a live lecture at UT and we could return the favor for their courses, and thereby increase our enrollment numbers in otherwise low enrollment courses?

Provost Hsu: That is the plan. The plan is not to have our students register for their classes and their students register for our classes. So it's simply, for example, we will teach an Arabic class here and they

might teach an Italian class on their campus and students on our campus who wish to take an Italian class – which we don't have any faculty teaching here – could sign up for an Italian course that has our course number and pay our tuition, so in a way we're getting "free" service for an Italian class and receiving our revenue from that, but then again, they will get the free service from our Arabic class. The hope is that at some point we will review this and make sure that it is balancing the number of courses that we offer and they offer.

Senator Kippenhan: But will our students have to go to BG to take that course?

Provost Hsu: No. I was told that BG is a physical campus and so are we, and so we have the same facilities- so it would be easy for us to give a lecture here with the physical facility and be restreamed to another campus. I don't know what the level is that we have right now, but ideally the lecturer will be able to see the students on the screen from the other campus as well.

Senator Rouillard: Thank you to the Provosts at the IUC who are resisting Western Governors. Western Governors is a problematic model. One of the reasons why it is problematic is that the people who benefit the most are the publishing companies. McGraw-Hill and Pearson, for instance, offer sale platforms and materials for those self-paced programs. Even as our state is professing to want to drop the cost of textbook expenses for our students, they appear to be willing to hand over "wads" of cash to publishing companies, so thank you for your resistance in that effort. I would also be very leery of competency-based education in general, as it is modeled after Western Governors, which has a notoriously low graduation rate and so those things need to be kept in mind when developing any kind of a model along those lines.

Provost Hsu: Right. Certainly, we are not suggesting [for any] funding for Western Governors. Our faculty need to develop our own programs and feel comfortable with the quality of the program.

Senator Rouillard: Right. Finally, the other thing I would ask the provost to ask Bruce Johnson is why as a registered lobbyist he is such a defeatist. He is making some pretty good money to argue on our behalf in Columbus and he doesn't seem to be able to deliver. So somebody has to ask him, as a lobbyist, why can't he help us more?

Provost Hsu: Well, I guess I can certainly ask that question at the IUC provost meeting, but in a different way.

Senator Rouillard: Thank you.

Provost Hsu: But my understanding is because after this election, both the Senate and the House will become more one-sided with one party dominating the other party. So there's no opposition, so IUC is basically forced to work with the majority party and work within that framework, and that is like working within a "box," not outside the box.

Senator Rouillard: Thank you.

Senator Krantz: To build on Senator Rouillard's point, former Provost McMillen advised us as he was leaving for retirement to become actively engaged in politics within the state and rather than to rely on a single lobbyist, there are 14 four-year universities in the state of Ohio, and each should have a

representative who is capable of lobbying independently rather than just a single person. Is there a mechanism for doing that, and is there some thought on the IUC committee engaging that approach?

Provost Hsu: I think it is at the state level- I am not aware of that. I know at the federal level, each campus is represented by a lobbyist in D.C.

Senator Krantz: I think the underlying point of Provost McMillen was that he had been very effective with talking one-on-one with legislators, so he was able to override party affiliation and talk reason.

Provost Hsu: Certainly, I think our government relations group is doing this.

President Humphrys: Are there any more questions? Thank you, Provost Hsu. Now, we are moving on to our Undergraduate Curriculum report from the Chair, Senator Diane Cappelletty.

Senator Cappelletty: So the committee was active in these last couple of weeks. We had one new course proposal and ten new course modifications. We are asking for more information on the new course proposal and five of the ten course modifications, so we have five course modifications that we are recommending to Senate for approval:

EECS4980 is a special topics course. The information that we had needed from them was, in essence, how someone might be graded or evaluated. This is a Special Topics course that they are going to run at an undergraduate level that matches at a graduate level, potentially trying out new courses and then gaining a new course into the system after they've trialed it. They provided us with that information and we were good with that course then.

EET4250 was a course that, through the years, different instructors had different emphasis on what it was that they were teaching, so they looked through a syllabus and now it's going to require a fairly standard presentation of content and once we got that information back we were good with that course.

The next two, *EBUS3180* and *4040*, courses were just title course description changes and there were no problems with them.

The last course, *PSC454590*, we just did the approval on that. I signed off on that. I want to let everybody know that it needed to be signed off by the Undergraduate Curriculum and Core Curriculum- it was simply a core curriculum issue that we had voted on at the last meeting. So we are really looking to get an approval for [all] four of those courses and again, I am asking that we consider them all together. Does anyone object to that? All right, are there any questions before we vote? Hearing none. All in favor say, "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? ***Motion Passed.*** Thank you.

We have one amnesty document, so what I want to tell you just very briefly, how we plan on moving forward to get all the amnesty documents that are still pending cleaned up, hopefully by January. So some courses within the amnesty document have already been handled within the curriculum tracking system, and other courses in that document are still pending approval through the amnesty process. So moving forward to try to make this happen a little bit more quickly and efficiently- what we've agreed upon to do, and I've talked about this with Marcia King-Blandford and Mary Humphrys, is I'm going to organize the material and the committee is going to review all of the material. If we have no questions whatsoever on the courses that we would recommend, or changes that have been put forward, we will recommend Senate

approval. If there is anything that we question or don't think should happen, or it violates the amnesty process that is in place, we will separate them out for saying that we recommend that they not be approved. We will notify the individual colleges and instructors and if they want to proceed with those changes, then they will have to create a course modification for them in the curricular tracking system. So that should allow us to really get through all the amnesty documents that are still out there, fairly efficiently over the next couple of months to have it set in January, which is my hope with all of that.

The first one that we were easily able to get through, because it was relatively short, was for CALL. The courses that are in the highlighted orange up top, those are the courses that are inactive in the system, so we didn't have to review them. The courses that are in red are courses that we had an issue with for one reason or another. For both of these, they were experience-based courses that they wanted to move from IS to lecture and that made absolutely no sense to any of us to have an experiential course listed as a lecture. So we said that we were going to recommend approval for those two, and I think further down there's one or two more at the bottom. So the bottom one is a 4000-level course that has the same course description as the 2000-level course and we didn't know how that was going to differ, providing that same information. The one above that has some typos in it and some other areas that needed corrected and those are the ones that we will look at, and it'll stop us from moving the documents forward, and if they want those changes made, then it would go through the curriculum tracking system. So are there any questions on this? I will ask that we support the recommendations of the committee to not approve the four courses that are marked in red, and to approve the courses that are not highlighted and forward them to the amnesty process. Are there any questions? Hearing none. All in favor say "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? **Motion Passed.** Again, I truly thank you.

President Humphrys: Thank you very much, Senator Cappelletty. It was a big project and I appreciate that you have straightened all this out. Thank you. Now, we are going to move on to the Core Curriculum Committee report and the Chair is Senator Holly Monsos.

Senator Monsos: My committee is working on a proposal that we started talking about with Faculty Senate last Spring. Those of you who were on Faculty Senate last year will recognize the first few slides of the PowerPoint. This is what the current academic guidelines and procedures for academic programs and review document says: "*the general education requirement is no fewer than 36 semester hours for bachelor degrees.*" Then we jump to the Ohio Transfer Module and this is what the Ohio Transfer Module says about what courses need to be in the Ohio Transfer Module, and it specifies those as 36-40 hrs., it says, *they have to be from five categories and 24 of those 36 hrs. are specified as to what category they have to come from and the other 12 are not.* It also specifies that they need to be at the 1000- and 2000-level. So this lays out what the state of Ohio says and what we currently have, which is not 36 hrs.

Problem: In addition to our gen ed., we have a two multi-cultural course requirement, U.S. diversity and a second category that have changed its name a couple of times, it has been non-Western and it has been non-U.S. Currently, we allow one double-dip of those multicultural courses which come from, particularly, 1000- and 2000-level courses that have been identified as being in Humanities or Social Sciences; therefore, students are allowed to double-dip one, and that is why the difference of either 30 or 33 hrs. – whether they double-dip one course or not. There's an additional specification having to do with the Ohio Transfer module that we must treat native and non-native/transfer students exactly the same; we can't ask transfer students to do different things than we ask the native population and vice versa.

So, what we see is three options, but I think there are probably some other options that people might be able to come up with, but these seem to be the most logical to us in order to get into compliance with the state. But on the other hand, we could not get into compliance with the state which is where we are now. We can leave it and let it stay at 30-33 hrs., leaving our current multicultural courses as they are, operating at all four levels. But, this is not what the committee recommends, although it would mean that students could complete their gen ed. in 30 hrs.– it would leave us out of compliance with the state, as we are reading those documents now. We see it as a problem and it also prevents incoming students from being able to transfer all 36 hrs., so they have excess credits that our native students were not asked to take. Now, they could count somewhere as an elective or in some other category, but they are expected to do more hours of gen ed. work and bring that in through the transfer module than we require.

So the second option, in order to try to keep the credits as low as possible, we can go to 36 hrs. and change our current requirement where you can double-dip one multicultural course to one or two multicultural courses. But given that, courses that count for the gen ed. must be at 1000- or 2000-level, that means any of our 3000- and 4000-level multicultural courses will not be double-dip courses and it may dis-incentivize students from taking the 3000- and 4000-level courses because if you can get away with 36 hrs. instead of 39 hrs., then a lot of students are going to want to do that. We currently have somewhere around 45 (forty-five) 3000- and 4000-level multicultural courses, but I think this will have a pretty negative impact on enrollment for those courses. We also have very few courses currently in the U.S. diversity category that are double-dip courses, so we want to look at the other ones in the 2000-level courses in that category and try to get as many of those acceptable in one of the five categories as we move those into a double-dip mode. The advantage of this is, with planning, students could get a gen ed. with 36 hrs. However this is where we need your guidance- the multicultural component as I understand it was originally set up so students could get it at the introductory level, but also so that they would engage with the content at a higher level, and that is why we allow 3000- and 4000-level courses. If that's important to us, then this is probably not the right option because there are not going to be students that are going to seek out those 3000- or 4000-level courses when they could double-dip two of them at a 1000- or 2000-level.

Therefore, our committee is leaning toward the third option, which is to leave the one double-dip as it is and the second one can be anything. Now, certainly there will be students who don't take their second one at a 3000- or 4000-level, either because they are attracted to a particular course, or because it didn't occur to them, or for whatever reason they may or may not take it. But with one double-dip we would have a greater percentage of students who would engage with multicultural material at a higher level. It does mean that the core requirements would be 39-42 hrs., depending on whether students took that one double-dip or not. I am not asking for a vote, but I'm asking for a direction. Is the committee going in the right direction? Philosophically, does Faculty Senate feel that it is important that we keep these 3000- and 4000-level multicultural courses in the core? I welcome some feedback.

President Humphrys: Is there any feedback for Senator Monsos and her committee?

Senator White: My brain is “bogged down,” so I am sorry.

Senator Monsos: I'm sorry.

Senator White: Where are the students able to “dip” because I’m confused about where we’re double-dipping?

Senator Monsos: For example, History of Jazz which is a multicultural U.S. diversity course is also a gen ed. humanities course, so students, by taking that course, fill two categories- they fill the humanities requirement and the multicultural requirement, the U.S. Diversity one. Currently, that would mean that they would have to take their non-U.S. Diversity, whichever name we’re going by now, and even if it was a double-dip course, it would not count because we only allow one.

Senator White: So we are talking dipping only within the gen ed. requirements?

Senator Monsos: Only the multicultural courses within the gen ed.

Senator White: Right. So you are filling two gen ed. category requirements; we are not talking about major requirements and the college requirement etc., right?

Senator Monsos: No, it would fill the gen ed. and the multicultural. The multicultural is not in the gen ed., except for the courses that double-dip.

President Humphrys: But no major...

Senator Monsos: That would be up to a department or a program to decide and specify what multicultural course people in the program would take.

Senator Lundquist: So if someone took a 3000- and/or 4000-level English course and that course is a multicultural and also an elective in their major, would that be double-dip or not?

Senator Monsos: It would not be a double-dip because a 3000- and 4000-level course cannot count in the gen ed.

Senator Lundquist: [*Indecipherable*]

Senator Monsos: But that would be up to the program.

Senator Rouillard: Doesn’t option 3., “*increasing the gen ed. up to 42 hrs.*,” is this going to make it harder for students to double-major or major in a couple of minors?

Senator Monsos: Dr. Molitor has done some initial work as we reported last Spring. We looked at the programs and asked, are they already doing this and are they meeting this requirement?

Dr. Scott Molitor: We found that in looking at students and their courses for completing their course degree program requirements, almost every, if not all degree programs have specific requirements that also satisfy the gen ed. course categories. So what we found is that almost every program on campus, if you look over a five-year period, would meet this 39-42 credit hr. requirement. The only exception was a couple of programs in the Health Sciences and the reason for that is that those programs actually had science courses that were very specific to their programs. So like respiratory therapy, the students do not take a regular biology course, they actually take a special science course from the Health Sciences and those courses were not in gen ed., and those were the only programs that we identified as not meeting the requirements. I think there was one other program from the College of Business that if you looked at the

five-year average, it was not meeting the requirements, but that did not seem to be built into the degree program, it was just improvising students on what courses they have to take.

Senator Monsos: It may be that we we're looking at too small of a sample.

Senator Rouillard: But with that being said, there are some students in some programs that would be harmed by that, so are we going to carve out an exception for that?

Senator Monsos: We need to draft a proposal [we have one right now] and insert the language that those programs that have accrediting bodies that require a higher level of course that falls within one of the five categories – those programs can apply to the Core Curriculum Committee for an exception.

Past-President Keith: Can I suggest a fourth option?

Senator Monsos: Sure.

Past-President Keith: So if you go back to your original slide where you showed non-compliance – the 30-33 – could we just insert a sentence that says “six additional gen ed. hours to be determined by the program” and would that get us to where we want it to be?

Senator Monsos: No, because we allow 3000- and 4000-level multicultural.

Past-President Keith: But the six hours would give you the first double-dip, so if you add everything up, what do we have? So it will be 27 and one multicultural will give you 30, and then if we said “six additional gen ed. hours to be determined by the program,” wouldn't that give us 36 hours, which is really what you want to get to, right?

Senator Monsos: But we will still have another three credits of multicultural so it is still 39.

Past-President Keith: Well, just add that sentence.

Senator Monsos: Well, that is what 39 hrs. does.

Past-President Keith: Right, but if we just simply say, “6-9 gen ed. hours to be determined.” Well, we will have to phrase it a little differently to allow for multicultural at the 3000- and 4000-level---

Senator Monsos: Which would be 39 hours.

Past-President Keith: All right, so say, “six hours of gen ed., plus the program can choose the multicultural.” We will have to phrase it differently, but---

Senator Monsos: Well, programs can choose it now.

Past-President Keith: But the problem is that you want to get us to 36 hours of gen ed., right?

Senator Monsos: Yes.

Past-President Keith: And programs can say, “we will give them one hour for math” etc. Is the science labs part of the gen ed.?

Senator Monsos: They are.

Past-President Keith: So move some hours there. Dr. Molitor was just basically saying programs can just easily--- People who have better language skills than I have – is there a way to just phrase this where we can just basically leave it up to the program to determine how we’re going to get the 6-9 additional hours?

Senator Monsos: I don’t see how that is any different than how it is now.

Past-President Keith: Well, it’s probably isn’t.

Senator Krantz: Past-President Keith, functionally that is optional...what you just proposed. And just for clarity for everyone’s advantage, please recognize The University of Toledo’s core curriculum as two components – they are independent – which is the general education curriculum and then our requirement for the multicultural, two courses in multicultural. So if you’re looking at state requirements, then you are really looking at the gen ed. and how it is equivalent to the Ohio Transfer Module, and that is different from The University of Toledo core.

Senator Monsos: Which is the gen ed., plus the two multicultural.

Senator Krantz: Correct.

Senator Monsos: Which is the terminology that I propose we use going forward so we stop talking about those two different things.

President Humphrys: As Senator Monsos mentioned, we’re not going to ask for a vote today, so we’ll send this out [to you] so you can be thinking about it and talking with your colleagues. Senator Monsos will come back in December or maybe next semester and we’ll actually take a vote.

Senator Kippenhan: When you send that information out, can you please send the webpage URL address so we can see which courses are listed as gen ed. courses?

President Humphrys: Sure.

Senator Monsos: It is in the catalog.

President Humphrys: Okay.

Senator White: And relative to the way my brain works or doesn’t - math was used as an example, but it really wasn’t an “example,” so I would ask Dr. Molitor, as it is relative to Engineering, to show us an example of that and how the upper division of multicultural courses and lower division of multicultural works, that would help.

Senator Monsos: Dr. Molitor, can you do it?

Dr. Molitor: What’s that?

Senator Monsos: Take a program in Engineering and---

Dr. Molitor: Yes, this works well with all programs.

Senator White: So this is an example of how this works in particular, the upper and lower level of multicultural?

Dr. Molitor: Would you like for me to come up and do it now?

Senator Monsos: No, I think we have a 15-week conversion that Senate needs to discuss at this time.

President Humphrys: Right.

Dr. Molitor: Senator White, I would be happy to meet with you separately and show you.

Senator White: Thank you, Dr. Molitor.

President Humphrys: Great! Thank you, Senator Monsos and the members of your committee because it is an ongoing thing that we may get to a conclusion soon. I would like to get to our 15-week semester discussion by 5:30 p.m. So I would like to ask the Academic Regulations Committee Chair, Dr. Celia Regimbal, to come up and talk about a policy that they're proposing.

Dr. Celia Regimbal: Good afternoon everyone. I am bringing forward to you an academic credit hour definition, policy proposal. We do not have a definition of what a credit hour is equal to and it's important that we have that, particularly in light of the conversation about the number of weeks in a semester. It is also important that we have that definition for federal aid, and consequently this would be a new policy. It reads, "*a semester credit hour is awarded for a minimum of 750 minutes of formalize instruction that requires a minimal of 1500 minutes of out of class assignments offered during instructional weeks of the academic term and may include the final exam week of the term. The university recognizes that formal instruction may be offered in a variety of modes. The University awards credit based on a semester calendar. Instruction that does not follow the standards of a semester calendar will need this criterion. Faculty Senate is the body responsible for establishing semester-hour guidelines for the modes of instruction.*" I know that there was a conversation about the Board policy and I believe you looked back to that policy from the Board and have asked ---

Unknown Speaker: I haven't heard anything, but I have asked.

Dr. Celia Regimbal: We've asked General Counsel. So what this does is expand the definition of a credit hour, which is different from what the Board policy had. The Board policy is about the same as it-reads, "*a credit hour may be awarded to students when they exist reasonable scientific evidence ascertain by state of the art assessment methods that a quantitative knowledge have been mastered equal to and historically and traditionally required to 750 minutes of formalize instruction that typically require students to work on out-of-class assignments, the average of two hours for every hour of formalize instruction.*" If accepted the suggested definition becomes the recorded policy.

Senator Monsos: This speaks to lecture courses that the 750 minutes is contact and the 1500 is out-of-class; however, it does not speak to studio and lab. I would like some language that says that there is a different way of calculating for those types of courses.

Dr. Regimbal: When we looked up what other institutions had stated and what is being presented is in keeping with our peer institutions.

Senator Monsos: It is not in keeping with the state.

Senator Regimbal: It is “in keeping” with the state policy.

Senator Monsos: The state goes on to say that *in case of*.

Senator Regimbal: Well, it doesn’t say how many minutes those things equate to.

Senator Monsos: It says 2250

Senator Regimbal: Wait. So, consequently, what we said was that the Faculty Senate would be responsible for those modes of instruction and I have seen documents where the modes of instruction were very carefully detailed –to the point that even some of the lecture classes were determined by “A” and “B’s,” because if you have a lecture of 300 students and then you have recitation sessions, is that the same as someone doing a lecture for 30 students? What we [the committee] talked about is that the Faculty Senate would reflect on those modes of instruction. Rather than putting the time in the policy, is that what you’re hoping it would be?

Senator Monsos: Is that is what it is meant by “*Faculty Senate is the body responsible for establishing guidelines for rules and instruction?*”

Senator Regimbal: It is, and that would be in the Procedure part. What we’ve been asked to do as we go forward is to try to have [our] policy very simple and have a procedure outside of the policy so that it is easier to change the procedure when needed. Would that be correct for the people that were in that conversation?

President Humphrys: Yes, trying to separate procedure from policy?

Past-President Keith: Didn’t we think the definition of formal instruction actually did cover a variety of modes? We actually looked at the link that you had at the bottom. The definition of formalized instruction that the chancellors directed us to actually did talk about the different modes of instruction, so we thought the term *formal instruction* actually would cover all the different ways that we teach.

President Humphrys: Now, do we need to hear from the university legal people before we vote on this?

Senator Dowd: Yes.

Senator Cappelletty: I thought it was for here, but I just sent a document that was actually titled more for associate degrees from the state that defined a lecturer, a lab, independent study, and field study. It had different minutes associated with it based on the category, but I don’t remember who shared that with us last year, but we’ve been operating off of that and internally looking at that. I think I know what Senator Monsos is talking about because our experiential sort of falls the same way because it was “goofy” and the state under field study, beyond just saying this number of minutes per credit hour of contact time also put a statement in there that it was paid and so the students had a paying component. We have stuff that we categorized as field study that if we stick with that type of classification we would have to change

because our students are not allowed to pre-pay. They had some very interesting things beyond just the minutes associated with it, but the minutes are not consistent with the 750 for every road of instruction that is out there.

President Humphrys: Maybe what we can do is have the people who have comments or concerns about this to forward those to me or Dr. Regimbal so she can then take those comments and concerns back to her committee. While we are waiting on the information from the legal counsel here at the University about the Board, their policy on what constitutes a credit hour, that we will put it all together and have Dr. Regimbal come back for a vote.

Senator White: Can we also get a simple statement or whatever an appropriate statement would be on how this is an elaboration on things that the state requires or what's already in place at UT?

Dr. Regimbal: We do not have a policy?

Senator White: So UT does not have a policy?

Dr. Regimbal: We have a Board resolution that addresses credit hour, but there is no policy that defines a credit hour. For HLC reviews I believe we need to have a definition of a credit hour, such as, "how many minutes do you spend for a credit hour?"

Senator White: So if I search for some of those numbers, will I find what I am looking for?

Dr. Regimbal: The Ohio Board of Regents says that the definition of a semester hour is *one semester credit hour will be awarded for a minimum of 750 minutes of formalized instruction that typically requires students to work out of class on assignments that averages twice the amount of time as the amount of formalized instruction or 1500 minutes*. It is acknowledged that formalized instruction *may take place in a variety of modes*. The state has a definition of a credit hour, but we don't have anything in our documents that says, as I understand, what do we see as a definition of a credit hour, so we need to have that as we put in reports at the state and federal level.

Senator White: So it sounds like the gist of this is, what is typical is minimum, right?

Dr. Regimbal: Well, I don't think that we're working on replacing any kinds of words; it's just to say that it will read 750. It seems that no matter where you look, a credit hour is defined as 750 minutes. You can just say 750 minutes, but some of the people are going to have problems with a credit hour being worth more and having more time. If you have a lab, you are going to spend more than 750 minutes for a credit hour in a lab. If you have an independent study, how much time are you going to have to spend in an independent study or dissertation hours? I mean, we can get into the weeds of that regarding how much time you spend in different places, but 750 minutes seems to be nationally the standard that's accepted, at least from our peer institutions.

President Humphrys: Okay. If you do have questions or comments, make sure that you get those to Dr. Regimbal. It is really important that we do get a policy that defines what we consider to be a credit hour. Thank you so much, Dr. Regimbal, and thank you for your committee.

Well, now to the university catalog. Let me just go through this real quick. Again, this is our initial discussion. The plan is for us to talk about this more in-depth or continue the conversation at our

December meeting. If we feel comfortable with voting on it then, it will be able to go to the Board of Trustees at their December meeting, which will allow it to be implemented in the Fall of 2017. I've taken many of these slides from information at a presentation that came from the Provost's Office. We have used 750 minutes as our traditional definition for what constitutes a credit hour. You have to have 30 weeks of instructional time for an academic year. So it is based on a period that you have the first day of classes of an academic year to the last day. The reason that this seems to have significance is some institutions, I know this is true of Ohio State, do not start on a Monday. If you start on a "Wednesday" then you don't get credit for the Monday and Tuesday of that week. Here are the institutions that are currently 15 weeks in the state of Ohio. Now, of course, our semesters currently have 17 calendar weeks and that's because with both semesters we had an equal number of days that we are off, based on either Fall Break, Spring Break or holidays.

The following are reasons the Provost's Office has given for why we should alter our calendar to align with the majority of other four-year institutions in the state of Ohio: 1) To improve time to a degree- you might ask what does that have to do with it? Primarily, it's because it will allow ultimately, again these are two different subjects and we are not looking at any intersessions at this time, via a shortened semester that could occur between the end of Fall and the beginning of Spring- students would have an additional semester during which to take courses. Also, a student who takes Comp I in the Fall and doesn't pass, but is scheduled to take Comp II in the Spring, if there was an intersession it would allow them that to take Comp I again before Spring semester. Senator Lundquist's heart is beating quickly as I say this, but you get the gist<laughter>. 2) Experiential learning opportunities- Fall semester will start a week later, so it would allow students more time for study abroad and it would afford the opportunity to have a longer break between the two semesters. Currently, our semester spans 17 weeks and in the Fall we have Labor Day, two days of Fall Break, and we have three days of Thanksgiving, so that's six days. Then in the Spring we have the Martin Luther King, Jr. Day, so that's one day and then five days of Spring break.

Unknown Speaker: We also have Veterans' Day too.

President Humphrys: That is right. When I was having a conversation with Peg Traband from the Provost's Office she mentioned that Veterans Day can fall on the weekend—so it doesn't always impact the schedule.

So, what would a 15-week semester look like? The actual time would be 16 calendar weeks as opposed to 17 weeks. Exam week would count towards the minutes and actually that apparently has been possible, but we never looked at it that way; we always looked at exam week as being over and above what the requirements are to satisfy what the state requires to constitute a semester. Then in the Fall semester, we would continue to have the current days off that we do. Fall semester would begin a week later and it would end at the same time, but there would be four weeks between Fall and Spring semester and Spring would end at the same time. The proposal for these bullet points above are dependent on the fact that the three-day-a-week courses would have to be 55 minutes long and not 50 as they currently are, and that the two-day-a-week courses would be 80 minutes long instead of 75 minutes. We will have to do that in order to allow for exam week to remain at 120 minutes. If you keep it at 50 minutes three times a week and 75 two times a week, you will end up having to have more than two hours during exam week, so it would kind of throw off what we traditionally do for exam week. Now, here is what it would look like,

compared to what we currently do. So you see that we start on August 21st and with a 15-week schedule we would start later.

Senator Cappelletty: Why delay starting in the Fall as opposed to ending earlier to allow potentially longer intersession time if that is part of the plan?

President Humphrys: I think that is a question we would definitely have to ask. I don't know, but it seems to be a Nursing College issue.

Now, you can see if we stay at 50 minutes, then our exam week will have to account for 30 more minutes, and it kind of throws things off a bit. So here's what the Spring semester would look like: and again, the one to the very left is where we currently are, and the one in the middle is 15 weeks with the current 50-minute courses and the one on the right would be with 55 minutes.

Senator Relue: Why Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday when the Fall term begins on Mondays?

President Humphrys: That is a good question, and again, this was provided for me--

Senator Krantz: Part of it is because the departmental meeting is on Monday - it takes the middle option.

Senator Kippenhan: Then we will have different start dates depending on what day Veterans' Day is on and that wasn't accounted for.

President Humphrys: Well, I don't think so, because all of these are based on having the same amount of days off. Do you see what I mean? Any of these columns considers all those things.

Senator Rouillard: Do we know how Pell Grants would work if a student has to pay to take a course with the intention to catch up? Do we know what the consequences would be for residence halls and keeping the residence halls open for students? Another issue and question that I wonder about is, all right, you've got four weeks between the end of Fall and the beginning of Spring semester and you have two major holidays in there that would end up costing probably at least four days of instruction.

President Humphrys: We have to remember that this 15-week semester is being proposed with or without the intersession.

Senator Rouillard: Okay.

President Humphrys: So this particular 15 weeks we may not have an intersession. It is my understanding about the intersession that it won't start till after January 1st, if we do it, so it is only two weeks. But again, at this point we are only looking at, do we want to go to 15 weeks..

Senator Rouillard: Thank you.

Senator Hall: In the 55-minute plan, does that involve adjusting all the classes' start time so they have more time to get [to and from] between classes?

President Humphrys: Yes. Currently, they have 10 minutes between. So a course that starts at 9 o'clock would be over at 9:55 a.m. and then they would get 10 minutes, so the next course will start at 10:05 a.m.

I did look at some of the other institutions that have 15-week semesters and they do have that kind of interesting schedule where things don't start on the hour or half-hour.

Senator Kippenhan: Just out of curiosity, did anybody bring up the fact that you will have to cut content to accommodate for labs?

President Humphrys: Well, yes, actually I did receive some concerns from Senator Jorgensen who is out of town right now. He had concerns about the cutting of the amount of time that would be devoted to that and I have his comments and I did let him know that he can share those since we are not going to be voting until the next Faculty Senate meeting.

Senator Kippenhan: Yes, while adding five minutes per class period works for lectures you can't put a second experiment in the same lab period and you can't start and finish an experiment somewhere in the middle, so we're going to effectively lose content in our labs.

Senator Devabhaktuni: Yes, but I think most of the major schools in the state are able to do it, so obviously, I think there's a way to do it. It might be necessary to readjust the way we deliver the content.

President Humphrys: Good point.

Senator Kilmer: Will we still have formal instruction during exam week?

President Humphrys: Yes, if we go to 55 minutes, the exam week will remain two hours. So it would be just the way that it is right now. If we don't vote on the 55 minutes, then it will stay at 50 minutes, but go to 15 weeks then that is when exam week will be trickier because it would require 150 minutes.

Senator Devabhaktuni: President Humphrys, what is the plan on year of implementation?

President Humphrys: I'm sorry?

Senator Devabhaktuni: When will this be implemented?

President Humphrys: Well, if it gets approved by Faculty Senate, then it would go the Board of Trustees for their December meeting and the plan would be for it to go into effect Fall of 2017.

Senator Wedding (substitute for S. Ariss): Are we going to vote on this today?

President Humphrys: No.

Past-President Keith: What will we be voting on? Will we be voting on just moving to a 15-week semester whether or not we're talking about 55-minute classes or 50-minute classes?

President Humphrys: I think that is probably a good point. I will be open to listen to peoples' inputs, but it would seem like we probably should make all of the decisions.

Senator Devabhaktuni: Is it possible, just to get a feel of Senate, to do a hand vote here today to show if we're in favor of 15-week or keep things as is?

Senator Thompson: Can I say something before we do that?

President Humphrys: Sure.

Senator Thompson: I just want to clarify something.

President Humphrys: Sure.

Senator Thompson: Wasn't the whole impetus of this that really in our contract we weren't getting paid for that extra week? Isn't our contract based on a 15-week semester, am I wrong about that?

President Humphrys: I don't know. I defer to people who know the contract.

Senator Thompson: I think part of the discussion was, if I remember, that we were actually going longer than we needed to, in terms of minutes, and that was part of our discussion. I could be wrong, but did our contract even go for that extra amount of time?

President Humphrys: That is a good question. I should mention very quickly that one of the reasons that time-wise it becomes rather important is because it would be much harder to just roll over a schedule from Banner as opposed to talking to the people that oversee Banner, so it would be easier for them to make the changes before it gets rolled over.

Senator Lundquist: With these longer class periods, and keeping 10 minutes between classes, will we will be able to maintain the same number of class-time slots, or will there be fewer?

President Humphrys: That is a good question, especially on Tuesday and Thursday. I know Peg Traband in the Provost's Office has been working on the scheduling part of things, so I will ask her.

Senator Cappelletty: The colleges that are already operating on their own, will they still be exempt from this process?

President Humphrys: That is my understanding.

Senator Kippenhan: So from the bullet points we are in favor of this change. But if we're going to offer an intersession period then I think we need to be looking at part of the proposal ahead of the vote. If we are not going to gain significant funds from it and a significant amount of students are not going to gain from the change then why are we changing it in the first place? I don't think it should be two separate conversations, we need more data upfront.

President Humphrys: Well, one thing I want to say is, I did look at the current universities that have 15-week semesters and some had intersessions and some did not. Also, I did talk with the Student Government about this. It had been suggested that students might have concerns related to paying the same for room and board even though the semester will be shorter, but they didn't see that as an issue at all. I don't recall any of the Student Government representatives seeing this as an issue.

Senator Oberlander: So to clear up one of the statements - the exemptions for certain programs, specifically from the College of Nursing, is we'll run the two 17-weeks and then we'll have a 13-week Summer session in order to get in and 14-weeks with the exams, so we will be exempt, is that what I heard it was?

President Humphrys: That is my understanding.

Senator Oberlander: The way that this is suggested, we will run three 15-week semesters back-to-back-to-back and the only grade that faculty will have will be the four weeks between the Fall and Spring and actually going back-to-back from Spring to Summer and from Summer to Fall as Nursing faculty. But if the exemption will allow us to start the nursing semester one week early, one week off the campus schedule then that might...that initiative.

Provost Hsu: I know that the Law School and Medical School will be on their own calendar. I am not sure if Nursing wants to be on this calendar or on their own calendar because we haven't discussed that. Certainly, three 15-week sessions is one option if the faculty prefers it, but I would imagine that Nursing will...

Senator Oberlander: I don't think the issue is 15 weeks; we like the idea of having the semesters look the same other than the Summer... [*Indecipherable*].

Provost Hsu: Certainly, that is something that the College of Nursing will decide.

Senator Krantz: To intentionally throw a wrench in the timeline of this- if we as the Senate are voting on this, for this to be perfectly democratic, we senators should be getting input from the colleges and departments that are represented. We have in the Science Council discussed this, but it was just informational and the same thing in the department and there's been no determination of the faculty...

President Humphrys: I agree with that. I will send this information to you right away. We want to make sure that you get a feel from the people who you are representing, and that is why it might not be in our best interest right now to take a straw vote, unless you would like to; maybe for the purposes of that, because at this time we will basically be representing ourselves as opposed to our colleges. So, what we will do is I will take back these questions specifically to Peg Traband about some of the issues that were brought up, and get her input on what the facts are. Then we will come back and talk about it and have it be a main topic of discussion at the December meeting. Is there anything else?

Senator Wedding (substitute for S. Ariss): Faculty salaries will not be impacted by this under the contract. Under the contract you have a starting date and ending date for the academic year and so your salary will not be decreased as a result of this. Secondly, I would think that we need to do something to try to increase enrollment on this campus. I've heard that a lot of our students work and giving them an extra week in the Fall and Spring will give them two weeks of work, and I think it would be a plus to them. I think students will like this. Also, this idea of intersession that we're not talking about, if we get that in play, it will help the overall budget of this year by a lot. It would be like Summer, although administration sometimes tries to tell us otherwise.

Senator Kilmer: Are we going to approve this in December?

President Humphrys: Yes. If Senate feels like it is the time to do it. December will be our final meeting, which will be the next scheduled meeting. We will definitely put it as a major topic of conversation and then we will certainly make that decision. But in the meantime, you might want to go back and talk to your colleagues.

Senator Relue: Can we have a couple of town hall meeting for faculty who are interested in understanding this? Can we have it before the next Faculty Senate meeting, is that a possibility?

President Humphrys: I think it could be. This would probably be something for the Provost's Office.

All right, do we have any business from the floor? Hearing none. May I have a motion to adjourn? 6:06 p.m.

IV. Meeting adjourned at 6:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:
Lucy Duhon

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard
Faculty Senate Office Administrative Secretary.

Faculty Senate Executive Secretary