

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of October 25, 2011
FACULTY SENATE

<http://www.utoledo.edu/facsenate> Approved @ FS on 11-08-2011

HIGHLIGHTS

Provost McMillen, Chancellor Gold, Vice-Provost Martin and Pryor

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 Lawrence Anderson called the meeting to order, **Lucy Duhon**, Executive Secretary, called the roll.

I. Roll Call: 2011-2012 Senators:

Present: Anderson, Brickman, Cappelletty, Cavalier , Cooper, Crist, Cuckovic, Dismukes, Dowd, Duggan, Duhon, Franchetti, Giovannucci, Hamer, Hewitt, Hey, Hill, Hornbeck, Humphrys, Kistner, Kranz, Langan, Lipman, Lundquist, Malhotra, Mason, Molitor, Moore, Moore, Nandkeolyar, Ohlinger, Peseckis, Plenefisch, Powers, Randolph, Regimbal, Rouillard, Solocha, Teclehaimanot, Templin, Thompson-Casado, Weck-Schwarz, Wedding, White, Yonker

Excused absences: Batten, Ellis, Hammersley, Hoblet, Hottell, LeBlanc, Lee, Moynihan, Piazza, Skeel, Slutsky, Thompson, Wilson

Unexcused absences: Heberle, Nazzal, Shriner, Willey, Tinkel,

II. Approval of Minutes: Minutes from the September 27th meeting are ready for approval.

III. Executive Committee Report:

President Anderson: I am calling the meeting to order. Welcome all to the fourth Faculty Senate meeting of academic year 2011-2012.

To start the meeting, I request Secretary Duhon to call the roll.

Minutes from the September 27th meeting were sent today for your review. May I have a motion for approval of the minutes? Second? All in favor? Any opposed? Please let the record show the Minutes from September 27th meeting have been approved.

Since our last Senate meeting, the Executive Committee has attended all the Board of Trustees committee meetings, had lunch with the President twice, and had two Executive Committee meetings. Here are a few highlights: At the Board Trusteeship, Governance and Audit Committee meeting, a process whereby sub-groups will examine the Board bylaws by reviewing the bylaws and other documents at comparable institutions was described. The same process is envisioned for reviewing the Faculty Senate Constitution. Both John Barrett and I will serve on that group, which is scheduled to begin work on 7 November. At the Academic Affairs Committee Meeting, Mr. Larry Burns reviewed enrollment and described an interesting proposed program and population-targeted recruitment effort. At our Executive Meeting three weeks ago, we had a lengthy discussion on how the Senate could serve the Medical Campus constituents better. We will continue that discussion at the executive level until we and/or the Constitution and Bylaws Committee have something formal to present for discussion. If we have time in intervening Senate sessions, we can have open discussion here as well. At our Executive Committee Meeting last

week, we invited CFO/VP for Finance David Dabney to discuss the budget with us. He described the fixed-rate bond for \$50 Million for Hospital projects. This bond will alleviate some of the variable rate debt, make use of low-cost insurance, and fund certain projects that would otherwise be funded by the operating budget(it is completely restricted to the hospital). In addition, Mr. Dabney briefly discussed the external audit recently conducted, and promised to place the data provided to the audit firm onto a shared computer drive. He also discussed the nature of our liability insurance with the Inter-University Council Insurance Consortium. When the Quarterly Report is finished, we will have Mr. Dabney come to Senate.

In closing, I have a few announcements:

We are hoping to have the next Senate meeting in the Simulation Center on the Health Science Campus. In any case, Dr. Susan Batten has promised that we will have flu shots available! You should also have received a message from her with a schedule of other venues for these shots. You also should have received a message from Executive Secretary Lucy Duhon stating that this week is *Open Access Week*. Lucy, would like to make a few comments? Thanks. We will have a more formal report on open access publishing at a later session.

Executive Secretary Duhon: Sure. I don't know if you had a chance to read your e-mail within the last hour. I put out a link to a survey to engage your understanding and perception of *Open Access* publishing as opposed to traditional forms of scholarly communication. There was no other reason but to get an idea of what the people on campus know about *Open Access* and how they feel about it. I think that it is just inevitable; it's the way of the future. If you don't know anything about it please become conversant with it because I am afraid that we will be left in the dust because other institutions are really grasping *Open Access*. Again, I am just hoping that you will learn something about it or let us know what questions you may have and what you know. There is a possibility that next spring or next year UT may collaborate with BG on some workshops. This is just the first phase so far and we would really appreciate your feedback.

President Anderson: We do envision that we will have a more formal description about Open Access in the near future. It is my understanding for example that Princeton University has it and it has declared that all institutional publication will use it. Alright, that concludes our Executive Committee report.

Senator Lipman: Could you tell us about Larry Burn's PowerPoint presentation?

President Anderson: Well, it was a very nicely presented PowerPoint. I think that it had some good points. He is proposing that units on campus target potential enrollees, and different colleges, and departments specifically. Recruiting efforts among our constituents somehow or another is also targeted. Furthermore, he mentioned targeting areas in Detroit.

Matthew Rubin: He stated that they are also targeting the Metro Detroit area because it is a dense population of students. It is a bigger group to look at to bring them in to proximity. There are simply more students there that are getting a better education than the in the Cleveland/Toledo areas which we currently target. He added that Mr. Burns' presentation pointed out the aim to make UT more of a destination school like Ohio State or the University of Michigan, rather than a school that is only sought after for its academic programs. We want students to want to attend UT because of everything the school encompasses.

President Anderson: Another part of that was to make an assertive effort to accept students out of the community colleges with an Associate's degree and help those students improve academically and bring them to the UT campus rather than to have them go out in the world with just an Associate's degree. That way the community college will still have them as a graduate on their programs. They will take that as the targeted group, those that have received an Associate's degree.

Senator Molitor: Just to follow-up on that, did he present any information about enrollment increases from Michigan within the past few years? They have devoted substantial resources advertising in Michigan. Did he provide any numbers about enrollment of students from Michigan? And what ways is our advertising strategy going to change?

Matthew Rubin: Yes, I think that he showed group numbers of students that have a higher GPA.

Senator Molitor: Did it show the number for enrollment increases?

Matthew Rubin: Yes. There were a number of schools that had a higher GPA than others.

Senator Molitor: Numbers meaning how many students enrolled?

Senator Lipman: Was the initiative to informally recruit specific?

Matthew Rubin: I don't think so.

President Anderson: I don't remember that being mentioned. Maybe Dr. Martin will have a little bit to say about the numbers.

Senator Ohlinger: Was there a mention of expanding the tuition to improve the Metropolitan area?

President Anderson: I don't recall that. It is certainly worth looking into. Provost McMillen has his hand up to help address your concerns.

Provost McMillen: Just a comment on the former role of government relation. It turns out and this is sort of "second hand" but I think that it is true. Michigan has a state law that allows for Michigan universities to recruit in all of Ohio and have instate tuition. However, that arrangement is not reciprocal for all of Michigan for Ohio schools. So there are some people working on the state legislature to at least have people in state, Ohio instate tuition for all of Michigan.

President Anderson: Are there any other questions? Dr Geoffrey Martin will now give a report on the enrollment figures for Fall Semester.

Dr. Martin: President Anderson asked me to give a short report regarding the situation with this fall enrollment. What we do is look at our situation basically in terms of programs ...and headcount. Then that information is reported to the Ohio Board of Regents as a head count for the semester. They then tabulate this and recently, just yesterday they got back to us with the preliminary report and they asked us to check the numbers that have been reported for institutions across the state. I will also present that in my last slide. In summary, there was a small enrollment decline at UT this fall. The decline is four hundred and seventy-five students who spread across both the undergraduate and graduate levels. The graduate and undergraduate decline was probably a bit more than it has been in the past years. The year before we had a very small enrollment decline and this year it was somewhat larger, 2.06%. You can look into where exactly the decline is coming from. the undergraduate can be broken down into a total of six categories. We talked about the continuing students. We talked about the high school students who taking courses with us, but who are not freshman students at our institution. We talked about our new first time students. These are any students who have obtained a high school degree and who have not attended an institution of higher education before. Then we talked about the new transfer students and these are

students who have had a previous higher education experience. We talked about the re-entering students, these are students who were out

President Anderson: I have a question.

Dr. Martin: Yes.

President Anderson: Can you define a re-entering student?

Dr. Martin: Let me go back. The re-entering students are students who have to re-apply. However, let me ask Terry.

Terry Romer: There are two types of re-entering students: The re-entering student who has to re-apply and pay the application fee again in the process of going through the office of undergraduate admissions. Then, there's a re-entering student that has been out two or three terms, who have stopped but comes back, but they did not have to re-apply and those are mixed in. Transfer re-admit students are students that left no matter how many semesters(it is probably more than a couple), but came back with transfer credits from another institution, but did not do so through some kind of agreement where they were being a guest student and is currently enrolled here. That is essentially the differentiation. But the re-entering students - TGR- not sure what exactly it was that was said but re-entering students go through the college not admissions and people who went to their college office and got back into the system.

President Anderson: My question was would those students coming back improve the retention?

Dr. Martin: No.

President Anderson: They don't, okay.

Dr. Martin: Retention is computed by finding the number of first time full time degree seeking students enrolled in a fall semester that were enrolled in the previous fall semester.

President Anderson: What I am saying here is that students who are not retained are students who have left.

Dr. Martin: Yes.

President Anderson: For how long?

Dr. Martin: No. When you think of retention you find new students who were enrolled in the fall and then you look to see if they come back. This is the one year retention rate and it is determined by whether the student comes back in the following fall.

President Anderson: If they come back the next spring after that?

Dr. Martin: Then they are not counted in retention. It is fall to fall. Let's look at our categories now. What we see here is that the large proportion of the decline was in fact by re-entering students; they were down by three hundred and sixty-eight students. For those of us who try to predict these numbers, this is some-what larger than what we guessed. We were asked in April what that number might look like, we didn't think that it would be quite that large. Also, to sort of tie it into that factor that we think that our retention rate, which is 65%, was somewhat larger than what we predicted the number to be back in April.

As you can see that there are certain colleges in which this decline was noted, The College of Education to some extent and The College of Arts and Sciences and the Gateway Programs.

Senator Wedding: I have a question.

Dr. Martin: Yes.

Senator Wedding: Would this chart be included in the Minutes because it is very difficult to read.

Dr. Martin: I apologize. I do have a copy here.

Senator Wedding: Could you read the percent that dropped in various colleges?

Dr. Martin: Yes, I can do that. This is the Main Campus preliminary preliminary estimate of what enrollment was overall the Main Campus. The state enrollment was up 1%. If you go down the list: Bowling Green was up 7%, Central State was down 4%, Cleveland State was up 27%, Kent State was 4.2%, Miami was up 1.4%, Northeast Ohio Medical University was up 1.42%, and the same for Ohio State University, Ohio University was up 2.79%, Akron was up 1.45%, Cincinnati was up 3.4%, The University of Toledo was down 2.06%., and Youngtown State was down 4.3%.

Senator Wedding: So we were one of two or three schools in the entire state that was down in enrollment?

Dr. Martin: Yes. The other factor that we want you to be aware of was that every school in Northwest Ohio was down in enrollment.

Senator Wedding: What about Bowling Green?

Dr. Martin: Bowling Green was down .7%. Owens was down approximately 15%. Northwest State was down 21% and we were down. Terra State was the closest one with the least amount of decline. Terra was down 0.8% in enrollment.

Senator Wedding: What about Lorrain?

Dr. Martin: I can't remember exactly about Lorrain. I think they were down also.

Senator Dowd: Is this head-count?

Dr. Martin: Yes, these are head-counts

Senator Wedding: They are not FTE's?

Dr. Martin: No.

Senator Wedding: Do we have FTE's numbers that are given?

Dr. Martin: Not across the state, no.

Senator Wedding: What kind of projection are we seeing in the spring?

Terry Romer: I think at this point spring may be a difficult number to project in terms of what you will get. Generally, we will have a certain percentage of what you have in fall and it is fairly stable, but at this

point in the game I would hesitate to make any kind of prediction for spring and for next fall simply because I think the amount of data that is available is not the quantity that you can use to make a good prediction and there are many things that can change between now and the end of the semester beginning in spring. It varies too much right now to make any predictions.

President Anderson: Are there any other questions for Dr. Martin?

Senator Wedding: Does this translate into a dollar downside for the University? Has anyone translated it in terms of the budget impact?

Dr. Martin: Not to a significant extent. In fact, OBOR have not publicly released the calculations at this point. They were on their site in the summer time but they were taken down.

Senator Wedding: Do we have retention data across the state?

Dr. Martin: Right. OBOR as far as I know may have done some calculations but not actually advertising the retention data that is something the federal government is involved in and they are usually two years behind.

Senator Wedding: You can get retention data online for all of the universities in the state.

Dr. Martin: The common data that is set I think is the source for all of that information.

Senator Wedding: Is it the common data set?

Dr. Martin: Yes, that has retention data.

Senator Wedding: Would you agree that our retention rate is one of the lowest in the state?

Dr. Martin: Public institutions, we are in the bottom four or five.

Senator Wedding: We are in the bottom two.

Senator Ohlinger: My understanding is that the retention rate for the... scholarships is lower than anticipated.

Dr. Martin: Well, there are various types of goals. I think that this year if we look at the retention rate it is related to changes in enrollment. I think it looks pretty much in line of what you aspect given the GPA of those students. I mean, the retention rate is coupled to academic assessment. So if we know about our student's academic strengths, the retention rate is pretty much in line with that. *The Following is the PowerPoint that was presented by Dr. Geoffrey Martin.*

| University of Toledo Fall 2011 Headcount by College and Level | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|--------|------|---------|----------------------------------|--------|------|---------|--------|--------|------|---------|
| 15 days after the start of the term | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Student College | Undergraduate Level | | | | Graduate Level, Law and Medicine | | | | Total | | | |
| | 201140 | 201040 | Diff | % Diff | 201140 | 201040 | Diff | % Diff | 201140 | 201040 | Diff | % Diff |
| College of Adult & Lifelong Learning | 419 | 448 | -29 | -6.47% | - | - | - | - | 419 | 448 | -29 | -6.47% |
| College of Arts & Sciences | 3,373 | 3,538 | -165 | -4.66% | 595 | 592 | 3 | 0.51% | 3,968 | 4,130 | -162 | -3.92% |
| College of Business Administration | 2,887 | 2,901 | -14 | -0.48% | 427 | 458 | -31 | -6.77% | 3,314 | 3,359 | -45 | -1.34% |
| Judith Herb College of Education | 1,256 | 1,522 | -266 | -17.48% | 759 | 891 | -132 | -14.81% | 2,015 | 2,413 | -398 | -16.49% |
| College of Engineering | 2,808 | 2,699 | 109 | 4.04% | 340 | 358 | -18 | -5.03% | 3,148 | 3,057 | 91 | 2.98% |
| Gateway Programs | 2,240 | 2,179 | 61 | 2.80% | 0 | - | - | - | 2,240 | 2,179 | 61 | 2.80% |
| Coll of Health Sci & Human Serv | 2,711 | 2,589 | 122 | 4.71% | 564 | 553 | 11 | 1.99% | 3,275 | 3,142 | 133 | 4.23% |
| College of Law | - | - | - | - | 439 | 464 | -25 | -5.39% | 439 | 464 | -25 | -5.39% |
| College of Medicine | - | - | - | - | 1,094 | 1,101 | -7 | -0.64% | 1,094 | 1,101 | -7 | -0.64% |
| College of Nursing | 1,002 | 1,006 | -4 | -0.40% | 287 | 274 | - | - | 1,289 | 1,280 | 9 | 0.70% |
| College of Pharmacy | 1,148 | 1,248 | -100 | -8.01% | 261 | 264 | -3 | -1.14% | 1,409 | 1,512 | -103 | -6.81% |
| total | 17,844 | 18,130 | -286 | -1.60% | 4,766 | 4,955 | -189 | -3.81% | 22,610 | 23,085 | -475 | -2.06% |

Undergraduate Breakdown

| Undergraduate Headcount By Enrollment Action and College | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|--------|------|---------|---------------|--------|------|---------|------------------|--------|------|----------|
| 15 days after the start of the term | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Student College | Continuing | | | | HS Concurrent | | | | New First Time | | | |
| | 201140 | 201040 | Diff | % Diff | 201140 | 201040 | Diff | % Diff | 201140 | 201040 | Diff | % Diff |
| College of Adult & Lifelong Learning | 314 | 372 | -58 | -15.59% | - | - | - | - | 9 | 0 | 9 | - |
| College of Arts & Sciences | 2318 | 2362 | -44 | -1.86% | - | - | - | - | 762 | 849 | -87 | -10.25% |
| College of Business Administration | 2131 | 2232 | -101 | -4.53% | - | - | - | - | 468 | 406 | 62 | 15.27% |
| Judith Herb College of Education | 1008 | 1172 | -164 | -13.99% | - | - | - | - | 154 | 232 | -78 | -33.62% |
| College of Engineering | 2093 | 1994 | 99 | 4.96% | - | - | - | - | 562 | 565 | -3 | -0.53% |
| Gateway Programs | 428 | 494 | -66 | -13.36% | 540 | 554 | -14 | -2.53% | 911 | 822 | 89 | 10.83% |
| Coll of Health Sci & Human Serv | 1935 | 1838 | 97 | 5.28% | - | - | - | - | 477 | 498 | -21 | -4.22% |
| College of Nursing | 670 | 761 | -91 | -11.96% | - | - | - | - | 229 | 178 | 51 | 28.65% |
| College of Pharmacy | 772 | 812 | -40 | -4.93% | - | - | - | - | 323 | 391 | -68 | -17.39% |
| Total | 11669 | 12037 | -368 | -3.06% | 540 | 554 | -14 | -2.53% | 3,895 | 3,941 | -46 | -1.17% |
| Student College | New Transfer | | | | Reentering | | | | Transfer Readmit | | | |
| | 201140 | 201040 | Diff | % Diff | 201140 | 201040 | Diff | % Diff | 201140 | 201040 | Diff | % Diff |
| College of Adult & Lifelong Learning | 36 | 41 | -5 | -12.20% | 38 | 19 | 19 | 100.00% | 20 | 16 | 4 | 25.00% |
| College of Arts & Sciences | 204 | 220 | -16 | -7.27% | 55 | 66 | -11 | -16.67% | 27 | 31 | -4 | -12.90% |
| College of Business Administration | 175 | 168 | 7 | 4.17% | 67 | 65 | 2 | 3.08% | 42 | 29 | 13 | 44.83% |
| Judith Herb College of Education | 77 | 87 | -10 | -11.49% | 11 | 23 | -12 | -52.17% | 5 | 8 | -3 | -37.50% |
| College of Engineering | 120 | 115 | 5 | 4.35% | 11 | 9 | 2 | 22.22% | 20 | 12 | 8 | 66.67% |
| Gateway Programs | 251 | 234 | 17 | 7.26% | 43 | 41 | 2 | 4.88% | 32 | 22 | 10 | 45.45% |
| Coll of Health Sci & Human Serv | 211 | 184 | 27 | 14.67% | 45 | 39 | 6 | 15.38% | 39 | 28 | 11 | 39.29% |
| College of Nursing | 62 | 41 | 21 | 51.22% | 24 | 17 | 7 | 41.18% | 17 | 9 | 8 | 88.89% |
| College of Pharmacy | 49 | 41 | 8 | 19.51% | 4 | 3 | 1 | 33.33% | 0 | 1 | -1 | -100.00% |
| Total | 1185 | 1131 | 54 | 4.77% | 298 | 282 | 16 | 5.67% | 202 | 156 | 46 | 29.49% |

HEI Preliminary Headcounts

| Sector Institution | Total Preliminary Headcount Fall 2010 | Fall 2011 | | | | | | Total Preliminary Headcount Fall 2011 | Percent Change 2010 - 2011 | Difference in Headcount 2010 - 2011 |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | | First-Time Ever Enrolled In College Undergraduates | | All Other Undergraduates | | Graduate and Professional Students | | | | |
| | | # | % of Total Headcount | # | % of Total Headcount | # | % of Total Headcount | | | |
| University Main Campuses | 280,352 | 46,130 | 16.26% | 177,723 | 62.65% | 59,807 | 21.08% | 283,730 | 1.20% | 3,378 |
| Bowling Green State University | 17,705 | 3,801 | 21.62% | 11,261 | 64.05% | 2,519 | 14.33% | 17,581 | -0.70% | (124) |
| Central State University | 2,288 | 722 | 28.89% | 1,736 | 69.36% | 45 | 1.80% | 2,503 | 9.40% | 215 |
| Cleveland State University | 17,323 | 1,375 | 7.88% | 10,354 | 59.35% | 5,717 | 32.77% | 17,646 | 0.71% | 323 |
| Kent State University | 25,848 | 4,131 | 16.00% | 17,020 | 63.18% | 5,587 | 20.74% | 26,938 | 4.22% | 1,090 |
| Miami University | 16,557 | 3,555 | 21.25% | 11,228 | 67.13% | 1,947 | 11.64% | 16,730 | 1.04% | 173 |
| Northwest Ohio Medical University | 767 | | N/A | | N/A | 778 | 100.00% | 778 | 1.43% | 11 |
| Ohio State University | 56,064 | 9,332 | 16.43% | 33,984 | 59.06% | 13,051 | 24.53% | 56,867 | 1.43% | 803 |
| Ohio University | 23,217 | 3,880 | 16.70% | 15,594 | 65.34% | 4,391 | 18.40% | 23,865 | 2.79% | 648 |
| Shawnee State University | 4,561 | 968 | 20.65% | 3,626 | 77.86% | 93 | 1.98% | 4,687 | 2.76% | 126 |
| University of Akron | 27,157 | 4,627 | 16.79% | 18,415 | 66.84% | 4,509 | 16.37% | 27,551 | 1.45% | 394 |
| University of Cincinnati | 32,283 | 4,300 | 13.90% | 18,593 | 55.79% | 10,436 | 31.31% | 33,329 | 3.24% | 1,046 |
| University of Toledo | 23,085 | 3,895 | 17.23% | 13,049 | 61.69% | 4,766 | 21.08% | 22,610 | -2.06% | (475) |
| Wright State University | 18,303 | 2,974 | 16.25% | 11,434 | 62.47% | 3,896 | 21.28% | 18,304 | 0.01% | 1 |
| Youngstown State University | 15,194 | 2,370 | 16.30% | 10,999 | 75.64% | 1,372 | 8.06% | 14,541 | -4.30% | (653) |

President Anderson: Thank you, Geoffrey. Next on the agenda as we move ahead I would now like to invite Provost McMillen and Chancellor Gold to the podium to make a few comments and participate in a Q&A with senators. They will go for twenty minutes or so because they have to leave for appointments later this evening.

Provost McMillen: We both apologize because we do have business, other meetings tonight. I just want to give President Anderson one thing that I promised from the meeting the last time I was here on September 27th. I ran off and printed the Act from the 126th General Assembly, which created The University of Toledo. That was an issue that came up, but I am not quite sure what context it was. However, it is a good document to have. Like I said there are about five pages that are pretty standard; all of the universities pretty much have the same rules and regulations established by the legislature. The only difference in this one is the wiping out of the two previous institutions. "...The separate existence of each of the constituent institutions shall continue as the combined university." The other difference in our bill is that there is a procedure to get the two separate Board of Trustees together and to make them into a smaller unit like other state universities' Boards. That process is continuing. I think that many of you saw in the paper, Friday that one of the Trustees to the Board was replaced because his term was up. There was another one who was replaced because he moved out of the state.

Chancellor Gold: [indecipherable]

President Anderson: I have one quick question. Last month you announced your very small faculty travel fund monies. I am wondering if you can tell us a little bit more about it.

Provost McMillen: We made awards of \$750 or \$1,000 depending if the travel is out of the country or in the country. There were a number of awards, three or four, which people asked for funding was less money for something specific. There were thirty-two awards made for just over \$25,000. Today I finalized thirteen additional awards and those awards are going out tomorrow with basically the same premise. I believe they were either thirteen or fourteen and they total \$12,000. There have been about forty-six awards at a price of about \$37,000 dollars. However, if a few more come in I will accept those. I would be happy to give you the exact statistics. Each award is listed in the award e-mail that was sent out.

President Anderson: So are you stating that there's still an opportunity?

Provost McMillen: Yes. I will talk with Brenda Grant and we can set aside a little bit more if needed.

President Anderson: Will that continue in the spring or is it a different set of money?

Provost McMillen: I don't know. That is a good question, I haven't thought ahead about that. A lot of the conferences are for the spring and there will be conferences that will come up throughout the summer and so on. There are actually some funded conferences for travel that will go all the way into the summer.

Senator Dowd: Regarding the data that Dr. Martin just presented, can you explain what dollar reduction in tuition revenue we can expect from the drop in University-wide enrollment? Is it approximately \$5 million dollars?

Provost McMillen: The common figure that is generally used before this fall is a million dollars per percentage point decrease. Mr. Dabney, the Chief Financial Officer has upped that a little bit because he had said that there (and I think he is right) was additional costs, but he had projected a budget shortfall for about \$4 million dollars.

Senator Dowd: Will this impact the budget hearings that you will have for colleges in the formation of fiscal 2013 budget?

Provost McMillen: I think that it is going to be impacted. There's going to be a budget shortfall and this will be part of the budget shortfall and he (David Dabney) has made that very clear. What he has done, and I don't disagree with his strategy and in fact I was a promoter of it is to have pre-budget hearings with Finance in the late fall starting in the middle of November and so on. We have more discussions to getting down to say "this item has to be used in this amount of hours etc." That includes an effort that he is making to analyze all of the indexes. The indexes as you know, because many of you have worked with budgets, are the places basically where the money is stored. They are just numbers and dollar amounts. We also work with indexes in the Provost Office. He feels that Finance should have a better understanding what indexes are and that is one of the projects that David Dabney has for fall. Essentially, I do not want to talk for David because he can always come and talk to you about the process himself. But then in the spring time it will be a more traditional budget hearing. I don't think that I mentioned this at the last Senate meeting about the idea that the president is thinking about is going to a two year budget that will coincide with the state budget. We know where the state budget is, obviously at mid budget. But the state hedges and does as many budget amendments as it wants. Revenues are still pretty strong month by month. There's talk in Columbus of doing a capital bill, which we've been lacking for three or four years now. The capital bill would really help us because some of the renovation money or emergency building money that we have to spend we can then spend on other items. Any money from the state will be an offset. Any jobs and job training money will be better for us right now. But at least I think the end is to look at the budget earlier. It will be to all of our advantage.

Senator Dowd: I ask this in the context of budget hearings. If colleges face budget cuts due to a drop in this year's enrollment, what will happen in the opposite case? For example was there an increase in enrollment in the College of Engineering?

Dr. Martin: Yes.

Senator Dowd: Does that mean that if a particular college's enrollment is down, say, for the College of Arts and Science, then they may face a budget cut? And if the Engineering College's enrollment is up, would they receive an increase in their budget?

Chancellor Gold: I would like to make a comment. To start, those factors are taken into account when the budgetary hearing occur. That is to say above all contribution... and program by program level are

calculated and looked at as part of the budgetary process. It is not necessarily being connected to the decision making as to the resource factor, but it is certainly considered. Particularly, if there's a bump in enrollment, or a new program, or the opposite of that would be elimination of programs (like the associate nursing degree program which was eliminated), that was reflected by the nursing school where enrollment was increased.

Provost McMillen: I would like to make a couple of comments about the enrollment decrease. One of the factors for example is the College of Education State Rule on graduates degrees for teachers. I think it is too bad because they lost some enrollment. Another odd factor about enrollment that Peg Traban was talking about and she figured it out. Apparently what happens every four or five years (those of you who have more experience know about this) that we normally have a very large graduating class in spring. Whenever that happens our enrollment falls. The fifth and sixth year students have decided to graduate. She figured that we will be up with more than one hundred and fifty. You can project that to be about one hundred and fifty of our decrease of students this fall.

Senator Dowd: That is about half of our students.

Provost McMillen: Apparently, this happens every three or four years for some reason.

Senator Dowd: I mentioned the College of Arts and Sciences a few minutes ago because Dr. Martin's presentation today included data for that college but did not provide data for the three colleges that were spun-off from A&S. Is there data for these new colleges? Similarly, data for the College of Education was separated from that of Health Science and Human Services. Do you know when the data from the new colleges will actually be presented for budgetary purposes or enrollment numbers?

Senator Lipman: That's exactly my question too.

Provost McMillen: Dr. Martin, would you like check in on that?

Terry Romer: I transmitted the college specific enrollment numbers to each of the former Arts and Sciences deans shortly after they were available so they have them.

Senator Dowd: Please excuse me for being rude and asking a blunt question, but why wasn't that data included in the presentation today? It is difficult to interpret the data presented today because the data for the new colleges were not included in Dr. Martin's presentation.

Terry Romer: I don't know. It wasn't asked for me to present them here. But I was asked by the deans to send them and so I sent them to the deans, okay. Now for the Judith Herb College of Education and HSHS, those were separated and Bev Schmoll has not requested them except under a couple of circumstances for a few things and we've been working with her to present this combined. To combine them, add the two numbers. There isn't much more to it than that. There is more work to accommodate the split of three colleges that came from the old one. But, all three deans and I believe the associate deans of those colleges have their college enrollment numbers.

Senator Dowd: Would you forward those numbers to the Faculty Senate Office?

Terry Romer: Yes, I will be happy to.

Provost McMillen: Just to make a positive about enrollment, our students that are signing up for study abroad has doubled according to Sammy Spann.

President Anderson: I guess there was a whole issue about faculty compensation; the issue of lecturer promotion to senior lecturer and promoting VAPs into lectureships. In addition, we talked about certain discrepancies regarding salary compensation particularly in Nursing, which seems to be under salary compared to other institutions. Is there anything that can be said about that?

Provost McMillen: I'm not doing anything right now, but I will be happy to look at it. We actually had a deans meeting on Thursday.

Chancellor Gold: As far as for nursing faculty, I am sorry because I do not know what the current statistics are. But periodically when you look at the mid western benchmarks for our region we do make adjustments for people who are in a lower percentile. I don't know where it stands right now, but it is an issue that was brought forth in the Health Science profession, and certainly in nursing and pharmacy. There are national benchmarks that are available for one to review. But the problem with these tables sometimes is that they don't include all sources in a sense that there are a lot of discrepancies. There are other sources for compensation in health education. In several institutions faculty received a separate check by separate sources. We try very hard to adjust the pay using benchmarks.

Senator Dowd: A couple years ago there were efforts to begin looking at gender salary equity. If I remember correctly there were unresolved issues with that initial study. Has there been any effort or discussion to either restart the discussion at gender salary equity?

Provost McMillen: That hasn't come up as a major concern. Well, no one has brought that up to me.

Senator Weck-Schwarz: It was brought up specifically in a meeting with the Women's Leadership Forum Council.

Provost McMillen: I will be happy to address it. We actually had a meeting with an associate dean today and we talked about hiring, so it was suggested that we initiate a program.

Senator Thompson-Casado: We recently got a memo and I am not sure if I understood it correctly, but it said the University had hired an outside firm to develop a plan for bonus pay for the staff. This memo came about two or three days ago and it stated that there was an unexpected pool of funds to fund this, could you talk about that?

Provost McMillen: The process is underway right now. The business managers throughout the institution were given a form to essentially work out a numerical decision for employees who have not gotten a raise for the past three or four years. The group that this money comes from is part of the money that was allocated to the University from the state as the last payment, from the past budget. It stated that you are not going to receive final payment but you will receive it two weeks later. Part of that is set aside to give raises to staff members who haven't gotten a raise. It is actually going to be given in a lump sum. Hopefully it will get distributed in November or the beginning of December. You are right, it was an outside firm that was hired. Not just for this reason, but the outside firm is to make HR's leadership more efficient and so on.

Senator Wedding: How much money did you pay the consultant, do you remember?

Provost McMillen: I have no idea.

Senator Wedding: You mentioned that the staff has not been given raises.

Provost McMillen: No. It wasn't either-or, but they did not receive a raise over this time while other unions at the University did receive raises.

Senator Wedding: I noticed in the announcement that they are going to pay out 4% to non-University personnel.

Provost McMillen: It is going to be unmerited.

Senator Wedding: I saw 4%.

Provost McMillen: Well, specifically it was arranged so it will not be across-the-board. It will have to be a supervised merit, so it could be as high as 8% and as low as 0%.

President Anderson: I do know that in my college there was a raise. I think all of the colleges got 4% of their employee salary total to distribute.

Senator Wedding: So they got it upfront.

President Anderson: It's a bonus.

Senator Thompson-Casado: The memo said that it was based on a process and the supervisor's evaluation.

President Anderson: At least in our college the department has the authority to set up the process for the employee.

Senator Thompson-Casado: Okay.

President Anderson: So, it not distributed across the colleges, it's only distributed to the employees who are non-union.

Thank you, Drs. McMillen and Gold.

We will now continue with our reports. The Executive Committee has invited Dr. Ben Pryor to review a few areas of concern about distance and web-assisted learning. These areas include monitoring academic dishonesty, the status of Blackboard as our platform, the status of Course Signals, and the distribution of DL course evaluation results. Ben?

Dean Pryor: Good afternoon. I have copies of my report, however there are not enough so you can raise your hand if you want one.

President Anderson: I will give one to each table.

Dean Pryor: I certainly will not be reading the entire report because I want to give you enough time to ask questions and talk about some things that are of some interest to you. President Anderson sent me an e-mail so I thought that at least I will address that in sort of a nutshell version of what I've written here. So, if anything stands out we can pursue it with your questions. First, available checks for academic dishonesty in DL, and the fraction of DL courses that use them: We approach academic dishonesty as a development issue. Knowing that the research shows us that students cheat less often in courses when they feel connected to the instructor, when they like the instructor, and when they feel confident that the instructor is giving them a learning opportunity to succeed in the classroom. So, to us that is a design issue. What we do then is try to design a course that is engaging to help and support faculty. We have all

types of resources available in our faculty research center which is in BlackBoard. We have technology and we work on training to use these technologies in courses that can help prevent and or detect cheating. One is SafeAssign, you may heard about this where a student submits a paper and you get back a report showing exactly how much of that paper appears elsewhere. SafeAssign is set up to hopefully catch plagiarism that way. We have respondents lock down so students who are taking a quiz cannot go and get answers when taking the quiz because you can stop students from getting out of the quiz until they are done.

Senator Thompson-Casado: Do they offer SafeAssign in other languages?

Dean Pryor: That's a good question; I will have to look into that.

Senator Thompson-Casado: I haven't heard about this and it sounds fabulous.

Senator Dowd: What data do you have for the number of UT faculty who attempt to verify the identity of students taking an online exam?

Dean Pryor: In a typical BlackBoard quiz where you have a student take it at home there is no way to do that from a typical outside procedure. So if it's true that he have more info with my data then "he" can take my exam and I can look great.

Senator Dowd: Was the issue not viewed as a problem because it is not a problem?

Dean Pryor: Well there are studies that talk about the types of severities for cheating in an online course. So, the data is available but we just have to find it. I am not sure about UT data, but obviously for the honest part we have to ask the students, i.e. survey. This includes asking them how many times you have had someone else take your exam. I believe in an honest survey people will tell you if they did it or not. How do we prevent that? Well, clearly we can't. Therefore, what you don't want to do is put out a very high stake exam online and tell students to take it at home whenever they want to if you want to make sure that there's little to no chance of academic dishonesty. We have proctoring sources available. If a student is off campus and cannot make it for an exam then we will arrange for a certified proctor, and that means that the student will find someone and usually that means somewhere in the library of military installation clergy at another institution and they will give us their data, who they are and why they should be a proctor for us and if we approve it, they will help the student while he/she takes the exam. But they will have to be certified. We cannot just let anyone do it. I know that there are people who would like to, but we have to be careful who we choose. Another option and it is one that I do not particularly like but we do support it, it is called proctoring criterion. It is an online proctoring solution whereby "Kryterion," the company (so we don't have to pay for it) sends the student a camera and the student plugs the camera in and they will sit it next to their computer while someone watches them.

President Anderson: The student can put the camera in a certain direction so another person can take the test.

Dean Pryor: Well, they actually tell you to show it around the room and they tell you randomly. Now apparently it works except I called the company because I was looking at the various options and I asked them "So, how do you do that? You must have thousands of students that are getting tested at any given time, so how do you check that our student is not cheating?" And they said "Well, we don't." They have a bank of monitors in a room and they go from one to the other just to do a spot check to see if someone is cheating. In my former life as a philosopher this is something that we would refer to as a Panalonic affect where a student knows that it is possible that he/she is being watched while they are taken the exam, but whether or not he/she is actually being watched we don't know. So, I don't know if I like that option and

particularly because they charge the student twenty-five dollars per exam fee to be not watched. Therefore, it is not my preferred option. Course Design is another approach that I would encourage to help minimize dishonesty. Most of this focuses on types of assessment. Dishonesty is much easier than on multiple choice exams when the numbers of answers are finite, or when you are not mixing up, or when you don't have a bank of questions and then randomizing the presentation to the student. So, even multiple choice answers quizzes go from easier to hard in terms of gain. But if you mix up assessments, if you do more essay questions and or have more short answers, or if you have a quiz that have multiples forms of assessment it is much more difficult for a student to cheat. Also, if you have high stake exams that are necessary for a course because it is for an accredited program for example, there is evidence that having one profitable exam in an entire semester reduces dishonesty. Let me talk a little about syllabus development, I think that it is a wise thing. I am getting more convinced of this especially within the last couple of weeks. I think that we should have talk on the syllabus about dishonesty and what are the consequences are. I have long promoted the idea that students should be invited to jointly write a dishonesty policy. We will give the argument, who are they hurting? They are hurting themselves and their fellow students. So, we should try to make them articulate to each other why to not cheat. Have them write a policy and put it on BlackBoard and then give them an assignment and it works. If they design their own policy and if they sign it they are less likely to cheat in your class. I also think that it is also by far the most prevalent kind of accusation of dishonesty. The case complaints or concerns that we get about dishonesty are mostly of when a student faults the faculty member and says that the exam froze, it stopped in the middle of the question and they can't go on and it is fifteen questions left, help. Well, we tell all of the students and we ask the faculty to tell all students to call us first so we can record and we can look at what's going on to make sure that it is indeed a technical problem. It will also be wise if students were asked to show some of the burden of proof. And I think that this should happen in the syllabus. Say in the syllabus "If you have a quiz that fail or a quiz that freezes then gives me a screen shot and show me what was happening on the screen the moment that the thing went down." So then we can correlate that with our log if we have to find out whether or not it was an error. Now, if a student can't prove that, you can come to us and Learning Ventures can go through the logs and can go through the test session and we can find out if there were any BlackBoard errors on our side during the exam(s). But, not all the errors that happen are on our side, some of them are computer errors and they are on the student side. So what do you do then? I do not like it when a student gives me what seems to be a compelling case that the computer froze, because it has happened to me; is there anyone in the room that never experienced it before? Alright. It happens every day and so I know it happens. I hate it when students fail courses because their computer froze and yet they cannot prove to the professor that something really did happen. On the other hand, what do you do? Because you can't just accept someone's word for it without any screen shots and without any evidence from us, so what I recommend that we do is that we give students another option. If it is a quiz that's worth fifteen points make it as odious enough so that a student really would rather make sure their computer is running from the right browser and hooked up to a good network and test it in advance so they are more likely to get through the quiz and they don't have to go through the burden of proof "thing" to make sure you know that they really had technical problems. Do you see what I am saying? It is kind of a motivational thing because if a student really does fail, they know in advanced because they saw it on the syllabus and they will have to do another project instead. I think that it is a much fairer approach to this. Now, there is one other type of problem when students take their exam one after another. We had a few cases when faculty came to us and said "I do really think that these guys have collaborated because they have exactly the same answers." Now, the students will say "because it was right." But we can go in through the files and find out where were they when they took the exam. We can look up their i.d.'s. If we see that they have the same i.d. and one student is done and the next student goes in to take the exam then we can conclude, what? Well, we can conclude that the students cheated, but the student can tell us that you do not have any evidence to deny that this is wrong. In fact, they can say in all honesty that the other student sat down and said "thank you, goodbye now. I will take this exam on my own," and I (Dean Pryor) don't know what to tell them. Did they fake it? Were they lying? To add to that problem, the IT address can be shared in the residence halls or in a department

complex. Depending on how the network configures, two machines can have the same IP address just because they are in the same area, and so what I am saying is that you can't conclude much. You could put it out on a syllabus that they better not have the same IP address, but then you have to help students try to figure out how to not overlap, right? They will have to go somewhere else and or use another network.

Dean Pryor: I am not sure. I will look into that. Written Responses to Inquiries from Lawrence Anderson-Huang:

Senator Wedding: Have you considered a possible honors system as they have in the Law and Engineering schools? In my opinion it is very simple; if you are going to cheat you will get kicked out of school.

Dean Pryor: I don't believe that they will get kicked out of school. Is this a University policy, right?

Senator Dowd: I believe University policies allow for the situation that if a student cheats that student can get kicked out of school.

Dean Pryor: I don't think that I have ever seen anyone expelled from a university for one offense. I think that it has to be a number of offenses.

Senator Dowd: I believe I have. It depends on the situation.

Dean Pryor: Oh, you have.

Senator Dowd: Would you like to see such a list?

Dean Pryor: I wouldn't expel someone from your class or college if I find someone cheating on my test.

Senator Wedding: It has to be university-wide so I can announce to my class that since this is based on the honor system if I catch you cheating I am going to flunk you. Students know because they are told upfront. We have been talking about ethics during the last couple of years which is something like the honor code so why not just have an honor code so that the university can flunk a student and kick them out?

Dean Pryor: Well, we do. You can have a similar code in your class, if you cheat then you are out. My only hesitation is that with that kind of high standard that we also have a high standard of proof.

Senator Wedding: Absolutely.

Dean Pryor: So I want to make sure that we respect that and we respect our students.

Senator Wedding: I chaired the Student Grievance Committee involving this and one of the factors is that you have to prove your case. The professor cannot just allege that a student is cheating.

Dean Pryor: That is why I am urging that we make the burden of proof explicit in our syllabus.

Senator Wedding: I don't know how you will do that.

Senator Dowd: You are describing the number of issues that your college advises. If faculty suspects a student to be cheating there are certain steps a faculty member can take. But those are more reactionary than anything else. Are there any proactive steps that a faculty member can take?

Dean Pryor: We have arranged for pre-arranged proctored exams so you can look at your own data for test taken exams, therefore you can find out if a student did or if two students did it at the same time. If that raises suspicion because of the quality of their answers then you can call us because we have a little more computer information. We had students who have been called in and sometimes immediately in the meeting they'll admit that they were cheating and sometimes they won't. But in many cases they are given another option. We don't really know if they were cheating and we don't really know if they weren't but the evidence points to the fact that they were and therefore we will assign them to do something else or just fail them on the exam, or fail them for the class.

Senator Dowd: Can I ask one more question? One is fair and one is not.

Dean Pryor: Yes.

Senator Dowd: The fair question is: how many students per semester or per year are caught cheating in distance learning courses? The other, perhaps unfair question is whether you know how that number corresponds to the general face-to-face courses?

Dean Pryor: There is data online and I stated it in one of my presentations. Nationwide there are some studies that show that cheating in online group sessions across the same course is lower than the face-to-face classes. Some faculty advisers don't know what to do because students come to them and say I didn't cheat on anything. In that case we work to a less cheatable approach. So the unfair question is we do not know. And the other is the evidence is our interpretation of it if someone was cheating in a course. In our case I can probably give you a number but it is going to be inaccurate because we do not get an academic dishonesty report through... We have the one that... is trying to resolve so if they come to us for data or advise what to do, we will pull that. So I can get that but it is not going to tell you much.

Senator Wedding: When I was the chair of that committee a few years back, we had appeals by students who felt they had been unfairly mistreated. We would get about five or six per year and we would sustain about half of them and reverse the other half because the professor did not prove his/her case.

Dean Pryor: Yes, I was reversed once. What happens often is this: the student will say I was wrongly accused and the professor would say there's evidence that makes me think that there is some academic dishonesty. Therefore, you (the student) have a choice to leave class, i.e. flunk or you can do another assignment to show me that you know the material then we will move on to the next one, but I better not catch you again. In every single case and students will say "I did not cheat" they will go into the office and take the assignment. Was their guilty conscious working there, I don't know. In my mind the student demonstrated that they got the knowledge that they have learned something. And the faculty member doesn't feel cheated and the student has a warning. When we do not have knock-out, drag down, solid evidence just like the cases where you were serving as chair, Senator Wedding then.

Senator Wedding: There were the cases when professors did not have supporting evidence.

Dean Pryor: That is why I would urge that faculty would put something about that on their syllabus stating "this is what I mean about cheating," and if what you mean is that you cannot have the same address where another student is taking a quiz at the same time then say it. Therefore, students will have to then know how to deal with it.

Senator Wedding: It is very difficult to put this on a syllabus given that there are so many other situations out there.

Dean Pryor: Yeah, but we have situations that are raised more often than others.

Senator Molitor: I just want to confirm that the online Blackboard quiz tool is now working and applaud our DL staff for their efforts in this regard. After initially having to delay my first exam and contacting DL, I have been able to give two in-class exams online without any problems. I consider this a worst-case scenario for online exams, with 50 students accessing the same site at the same time from two different computing facilities.

My only complaint is that the Blackboard exam tool does not provide a good question completion indicator. During exams, I present questions in random order one at a time to prevent cheating. WebCT would provide a question completion indicator that shows which questions have been answered and which have not. The Blackboard exam tool allows students to navigate directly to a question with a similar question indicator, but does not tell the student whether or not the question was answered already.

Dean Pryor: You are right. What time do you all get out of here?

Senators: 6:00 p.m.

Dean Pryor: Okay, why don't I go to the BlackBoard discussion because it relates to your question? The second issue: As you just heard and many of you experienced that we had terrible problems with the quiz tool in BlackBoard. We had terrible problems with other issues in BlackBoard such as glitches and trouble making it easier, legitimate bugs to...friendly issues that are kind of bonehead like the question compete indicator. In other words, a student can answer something and it doesn't do anything, it kind of sits there, even though the machine is already programmed before the exam. And the problem is that we are getting so many errors with the quizzes because the students will click, click, click and if they have it clicked at the same time the automatic save clicks, it freezes. Because the user interface is stupidity, they were creating the conditions of their own failure. So because of these issues we had done a couple of things. First, I had a phone conference with BlackBoard's vice president. We had an opportunity to go around the room and tell them what we thought, and we made the case quite clearly that the work that they were doing was making it difficult for us to inspire trust and confidence in the BlackBoard platform. We were having faculty wanting to abandon BlackBoard and faculty were mad at us for abandoning Web CT. Some of you who are in here wondered why we abandoned Web CT just because we wanted to fly off and do it, but we had to do it because they stopped supporting their license and we felt that we could not run unlicensed software that was criterion.

Senator Wedding: Is there any chance that you might switch away from BlackBoard in the future?

Dean Pryor: Yes. It is already here and we can talk quickly through the process.

Senator Wedding: Before you leave BlackBoard I just want to say that one of the problems that I have and it may be universal is that you cannot easily copy all exams. I make hardcopies of all of the exams, but it is very difficult to get copies.

Dean Pryor: That is absolutely true. The thing about BlackBoard is all of those things that we took for granted we now appreciate. So, what we are doing at the beginning of this week and in fact today we are sending out invitations for faculty across campus for participation in Task Force. Some of them are in Faculty Senate. If the Faculty Senate Executive Committee would like to nominate someone from the Senate to make sure that the faculty are represented will be great. Those faculty will be part of a task

force to evaluate the learning measurement systems, not just BlackBoard but whatever's out there. If you look at the last couple of pages you will see the charge that I wrote for the task force. It talks about technology, mobility, Banner, and assessment tools and so on. I do want to make a special point and say that the very point of this charge is to see that I encourage the committee to think creatively and outside bounds go to the management system. So if the committee comes back and says Learning Management System stinks then say rule of learning in which some people argue then we will not do one, we will do something else. We will put together what works for UT faculty, but it has to work for UT faculty and it has to be something that we think that we think works for students. Please look over the charge and if you have any comments about that please let me know. So if you have any nominations for someone to be on the task force or self nomination please submit them to me.

Senator Humphrys: I have two comments. First, I believe that my department delivers more online courses than any other. I want to make sure that at least one faculty member from my department is on that committee.

Dean Pryor: We do and I can give you the name, we have many initiatives and we made sure that everybody on that program will be recognized. I will double check. If you have nominations go ahead and send them. We are going to have a kickoff meeting for anybody. We are going to talk generally to everyone that has any ideas. We will breakup... then come back occasionally and then hopefully have some...by hopefully April of next year so we can begin if we want to a very fast pace of adoption. But if we want to we can hire in the summer and start slow with the adoption in the fall, learning from our mistakes in BlackBoard and then have full envision of the new plan and we will have the new system in the fall of 2013 approved.

Senator Humphrys: There are two topics related to online courses: one of which is technology. The other is the compensation aspect of it. I know last year you indicated that for a summer DL course to run inload it would have to have an enrollment cap equal to the highest cap for the same fall or spring DL course. In other words, if you had a DL cap for the fall of 40, you would have to have an enrollment cap of 40 for the summer. Is that rule something the provost developed? I have some definite issues with that rule. When can we have a discussion about this?

Dean Pryor: If we are talking about online courses one-to-another it is going to be very difficult to budge, not just me, the provost, but our office to approve. Someone had discussed and not just for this summer but the next summer, and this year we took some steps that helped us enroll courses for students in courses. We can't think of any reason and this is why I am leaving the door open for you to write me a memo that says "I got it" but I can't think of any reason why courses taught forty people in the spring and have forty people in the summer. The first argument that people give is that it is six people instead of nine or fifteen. Of course the response there is one, we will make the adjustments of needs and then teach something else. Or maybe it should not be that hard for three years or four year term if you are surer to get the right outcome. So we sent the librarian out and a lot of that was financial, I mean I won't lie, we don't have money. The collective bargaining agreement forces us into a certain compensation pack. It is very possible, I think if we were to rethink it and do it differently from an institutional perspective, but I don't know where we would end up. Research shows that there is a national firm that does research and I have various templates on what other institutions are doing. We will work with the Provost's Office. All of this really does work. What we want is money for our programs and you want to get more students in and you want to make your program more acceptable to more people. Therefore, there are practices that we can... about the difference. Given incentives that make it desirable for students to drop a course don't make sense, I don't know why we will do that. Because that then puts no pressure on the student to make the course engaging within the first two weeks and it keeps students grounded and enrolled. So why would we structure something that actually produce actions that are wrong? And what we have now hurts us. We have a model that will ask us to scale up an incentive based on the number of students in a course

that has an opposite effect. Sometimes people enter two-hundred students into a course. They will go higher than they probably should because they want to get more money, is that the right way to do it? Maybe or maybe not, but we need to ask these kinds of questions. But I do know that the incentives that are in place now, more often than not are motivators. Anything but learning centered, scheduling, and course practices they motivate people trying to maximize how much money they can make in the summer and while that is a nice thing it is not the best structure of our learning environment. So, we tried to do everything to make it better to motivate other things.

Senator Wedding: What is the minimum number of students that you require now in a class in the summer?

Dean Pryor: The problem is that it changes.

Senator Wedding: But those numbers ...

Dean Pryor: I am no finance expert. I don't know why they will do that.

Senator Wedding: Are you saying or suggesting that some professors try to reduce students from their classes in the summer?

Dean Pryor: No. I am not making that suggestion. But what I am saying is the best thing to do is put into place an incentive that motivates keeping students in.

Senator Teclehaimanot: I would like to acknowledge the Learning Ventures staff for their dedication, hard work and service for their support to faculty and students.

Dean Pryor: I deeply appreciate that and I will be passing that on. Thank you. The following is Dean Pryor's report:

**Faculty Senate--Learning Ventures
October 25, 2011**

1. Available checks for academic dishonesty in DL, and the fraction of DL courses that use them:

While anecdotal evidence might lead us to believe that cheating is more prevalent in online courses than in face-to-face courses, there is evidence that the rates of dishonesty are comparable. One study showed a significantly lower rate of dishonesty in online courses in comparison to the same course face-to-face. That said, academic dishonesty is pervasive on college campuses and we have an obligation to address it in each mode of instruction.

Learning Ventures approaches the issue of academic dishonesty from many directions:

- Faculty Development: while student dishonesty is a matter of personal responsibility on the part of the student, there are things that we can do to minimize cheating in all our classes. LV and COIL emphasize the adoption of many practices that reduce or eliminate dishonesty.
 - Students are less likely to cheat if they feel connected to their instructors, so we emphasize engagement and active learning in online courses to enhance connectedness.
 - Effective course design and assessment design can minimize cheating. See LV's "Faculty Resources" web site or the Faculty Resource Center in Blackboard for our presentation on academic dishonesty.
 - Technologies can help. Available tools:
 - SafeAssign: Integrated into Blackboard and available to all classes at UT. SafeAssign compares student writing to online database including work available on the web and all

other student writing submitted to SafeAssign. Reports back on percentage of paper matched to online sources, links to online material, highlighted passages of duplicated text.

- (Note: FERPA does not prohibit the use of SafeAssign, but instructors should include a version of this note on a syllabus (from Purdue University Information Technology): “Students must submit all papers written for this class to SafeAssign, a web-based plagiarism detection service, prior to submitting the papers to the instructor. Before submitting your paper to SafeAssign, please remove your title page and other personal information. (OPTIONAL: Any paper that is not submitted to SafeAssign prior to submission to the instructor will not be accepted by the instructor and will not be graded.)
- Respondus Lockdown: Browser prevents printing, web-surfing, etc. “Locks down” the computer during a test session. (Occasional problems with compatibility. See: http://www.utoledo.edu/dl/faculty/lv_services/fac_software.html and visit LV’s Blog and search tag “respondus” for more info).
- LV Exam Proctoring: Learning Ventures will manage exam proctoring by faculty request. Proctoring can be face-to-face, on-campus or remote. The form to request proctoring can be downloaded at LV’s site ([Request Proctored Testing for your Online Course: http://www.utoledo.edu/dl/pdf/InstructorRequestTestProctoring2.docx](http://www.utoledo.edu/dl/pdf/InstructorRequestTestProctoring2.docx)). Faculty can use a service called “Kryterion” for online proctoring. This is costly for students, but evidence shows that even a single proctored exam in a course can reduce dishonesty in all other course activities.
- **UPDATE, 10/27/2011:** LV received a report this morning that the company that manages Kryterion had its servers hacked yesterday, and that a student at another institution was improperly given an access code to an online exam. We are monitoring the situation and will be able to answer questions when asked. No UT exams or systems were compromised.
- Course Design: LV’s instructional designers in partnership with faculty can implement best-practices in course design that will minimize cheating. For example:
 - Assessments: there are ways of scheduling and conducting assessments that will both minimize dishonesty and maximize engagement and learning. Short, low-stakes assessments early and often in a course are strongly encouraged to familiarize students with test-taking software and as an early browser check, to enhance student learning through feedback and constant effort, and to reduce the student’s anxiety about success (the chief cause of cheating).
 - Different forms of assessment: using multiple forms of and approaches to assessment will minimize dishonesty. Instructional designers can help calibrate approaches to assessment to best support learning outcomes.
 - Syllabus development: we strongly recommend that all syllabuses in online courses address dishonesty, and that all instructors make procedures explicit. For example, professors should make clear how they will handle technical difficulties in online exams and how the burden of proof will be determined. Example: “Students who experience technical difficulties in the course of an exam must provide evidence of the nature of the difficulty in the form of a computer generated error log or screen shot, and must contact Student Support in Learning Ventures to attempt to resolve the issue. If evidence cannot be provided and if investigation through Learning Ventures is inconclusive, student who fail to complete an exam will have the following options: 1. Fail the exam; 2. Complete an *n*-Page paper or project addressing the learning outcomes associated with the exam, due *n* weeks after the exam due date.”
- Detection: Learning Ventures’ technical support staff can investigate suspected dishonesty and provide evidence to instructors. This evidence is often circumstantial (eg. two students take an exam with one beginning just after the other finishes, and they are taking the exam from the same IP address) and is not conclusive evidence of dishonesty. Again, however, syllabus development can mitigate (“Students may not take exams together”). (Note: IP addresses can be shared in a lab or dorm room depending on the configuration of a network. Two students taking an exam with the same IP address might be in two different rooms in the same residence hall). If you suspect dishonesty, contact LV and we will help assemble and interpret evidence available through our systems.

2. The status of blackboard as viewed by Learning Ventures.

Blackboard 9.2 was adopted campus-wide this year after evaluation in the spring of 2010, a small-scale adoption in the summer of 2010, incremental adoption over the course of the academic year, and full adoption in fall of 2011. The transition was announced frequently, and updates were posted on our blog on a regular basis. Some faculty are under the impression that we abandoned WebCT for Blackboard on a whim, but it is very important to understand that WebCT was purchased by Blackboard and its license discontinued. Staying with WebCT would have threatened our ability to provide the high level of protection and security that we promise to faculty and students. In short, we did not have a choice about whether to terminate WebCT, and we decided to move early and decisively to Blackboard 9, particularly after WebCT failed for three days in March of 2010.

Blackboard was evaluated by LV prior to adoption, and LV convened focus groups to assess faculty and student satisfaction with Blackboard throughout the adoption process. Informal polls of faculty and students are maddeningly inconclusive as a measure of satisfaction. Some students and faculty are friendly toward Blackboard as a platform, while others detest it. Students who are familiar with Blackboard from other institutions (Owens and BG are both using Blackboard 9) or from high school tend to have few problems. Faculty also play a role in facilitating student use and acceptance.

In recent months, Blackboard has issued a number of updates that have not gone well. Service Packs tend to be quite large, addressing errors that should have been resolved well before release and frequently creating problems that then need to be resolved in subsequent updates. Our problems with the quiz tool last month were caused by an update. I communicated these issues to the campus community when it was clear that the problem was systemic (and shared by all institutions using our particular version of Blackboard). The problems appear to have been resolved, but lingering and widely shared frustration with Blackboard's ability to respond to customer complaints and to provide updates that improve user experience have prompted us to begin a comprehensive reassessment of our Learning Management System.

The reassessment is underway. Nearly 40 faculty and instructional staff are now being invited to participate in a task force that will evaluate available systems and recommend a course of action. The charge to that task force, headed by John Gaboury, is attached as an addendum. They will meet this semester to engage in a broad discussion of technology assisted teaching and then will begin to evaluate individual LMS's. Using a rubric that we have provided and that the task force will revise to correspond to its own needs, they will be asked to recommend no more than three LMS's that LV will then pursue. We will pilot at least one of them in the summer of 2012 and depending on the results of the pilot, we will move toward adoption in the fall, with a full transition in place by the fall of 2013 if necessary or desirable. Many factors may affect that timeline, and it is our goal to move deliberately but swiftly. It is quite possible that the committee will recommend that we remain with Blackboard. But new and innovative systems are on the horizon and we will benefit from an examination of our LMS to ensure that we are providing the most effective online experience for our students. The last time we engaged in this kind of broad process was in 2006.

3. Status of "course signals":

Course Signals is a product developed by Purdue University and now sold and managed by Sungard Higher Education, which also makes Banner. Course Signals is an early warning system that uses student data from Banner and performance and activity measures in Blackboard to detect when a student is likely to fail a course based on very early assessments. A warning can be sent after only one exam. The warning is authored by the faculty member but sent automatically to the student, and it can provide suggestions and details about academic support or tutoring where appropriate. Reports from early adopters at other institutions are promising, showing course completion rates increasing by large percentages.

The adoption of Course Signals at UT has not been entirely successful. The program itself is not fully developed to begin with, and because we use the most up to date version of Blackboard, they encountered implementation issues that they did not anticipate. We were initially offered a free license as we piloted the system in the fall. In light of real difficulties with the program itself and in light of errors in communication that slowed our adoption, have asked to extend the period of the trial until the fall of 2012. We have not heard from them yet.

A very small number of courses employed course signals in the fall. Geoff Martin, who is heading the Course Signals project, will expand the pilot in the spring and if we sustain our relationship to Course Signals we hope to make it available to all courses in the fall of 2012. Note that all UT courses now have a Blackboard site available, which opens services such as Course Signals to all UT courses. LV will promote the use of Course Signals in all courses once it is clear that the system is stable and the signals are accurate.

4. Distribution of course evaluations

Earlier this year, I met with Faculty Senate Executive Committee to discuss concerns about how LV was handling student evaluations in online courses. Our practice had been to have the instructional designer assigned to the course review the data and suggest changes in course design when the data suggested there were design-related issues. This was an integral part of a new focus on continuous improvement in online courses. For example, if the evaluations reported problems with quizzes, designers were asked to check quiz settings and assessment routines to spot opportunities for improvement. If faculty were seen as disengaged, designers were asked to promote design features that would maximize engagement and interaction.

Faculty Senate Executive Committee argued that this was not consistent with historical use of these evaluations and asked that we reevaluate our procedures. After some discussion, we agreed to divide evaluation of all DL courses into two sections, one being the evaluation of teaching effectiveness and the other being an evaluation of course design. The design-related evaluation will be built into the Blackboard template and available to all courses that use Blackboard. The evaluation, a draft of which is available on the Faculty Resource Center, was the product of considerable effort by Peter You and the instructional design team who consulted with faculty and experts in assessment as well as our Quality Matters rubric to create a tool that will be useful to course designers as a basis for a conversation with faculty leading to improvements and new approaches. The data will be used to modify or redesign online courses and will be shared with faculty as part of a routine cycle of course assessment.

I should note that prior to our implementation of this design evaluation, only 20% of online courses offered an opportunity to students to engage in any form of end-of-term evaluation. While some courses follow our suggestion to include a discussion board devoted to course issues and student satisfaction, thus providing an ongoing opportunity for student evaluation, it is important that all courses give students the opportunity to evaluate teacher effectiveness. We strongly urge all departments to develop and require the use of a program-specific online evaluation in online courses. LV will work with faculty and chairs to manage the evaluations and to ensure the data is shared properly.

Finally, given the comprehensive implementation of Blackboard, it is now possible for all courses in a department to be evaluated online. This has the potential to save time and labor associated with the processing of student evaluations in paper form. While there are in some cases measurable declines in participation rates for online evaluations, that could be mitigated easily in a Web Assisted context through a program of reminders and communication as a term draws to a close.

President Anderson: Dean Pryor has given us a copy of his report and so we will be putting it into the Minutes. I just had a suggestion from Senator Dowd that we should invite Dean Pryor back in the spring to discuss the process of the re-envisioning of BlackBoard.

Alright, I would like to move on to the action items at this time. We have two and a half action items. The first Action item is the following:

According to our Constitution, the full Senate must approve non-Senator Chairs for our standing committees, if any. I am recommending Dr. Michael Caruso as Chair of the Elections Committee, in light of his familiarity with the process and electronic voting.

Senator Dowd: Point of Order. The Committee on Committees makes appointments to outstanding committees. The Senate President selects a committee chair from the members appointed by the Committee on Committees. However, if a chair nominee is not a Senator then the nominee must be approved by a vote of the full Senate.

President Anderson: That is what I am asking you. In the case of Mike Caruso for the Elections Committee, All in favor? Any Opposed? Thank you. *Motion Passed.* I am also recommending Dr. John Barrett as Chair for the Constitution and Bylaws Committee, in light of his continuing work on these documents. All in favor? Any opposed? Thank you again. *Motion Passed.*

Senator Wedding: Those were nice choices.

President Anderson: Right, that is what I thought.

Now we come to the resolution that the Senate instructed the Executive Committee to craft regarding the action of program elimination.

Resolution:

Whereas: The Senate Ad-hoc Committee on Programs was charged jointly by the President of the University and the President of the Faculty Senate in January of 2010. The charge as conveyed was "The fifth and final step of the reorganization plan will be to sort through the more than 100 departments, seeking synergies, possible redundancies, and alignment with the colleges in which they exist. This critical stage is still under development, but obviously will constitute a large project as it unfolds."

Be it resolved that: The Faculty Senate of the University of Toledo strongly recommends that no decisions on the future of existing programs be made without reference to the report from the Senate Ad-hoc Committee on Programs and without further opportunity for programs to demonstrate viability.

There's a little explanation necessary. The Ad hoc Committee was working under their charge and they were setting up benchmark processes that program evaluation will spring off of. The committee was not collecting data precisely for program review. In fact, the data that was collected reveals more about the strength of the program descriptions than about the programs themselves. So this resolution is meant to strongly recommend that "...no decisions on the future of existing programs be made without reference to the report from the Senate Ad-hoc Committee on Programs and without further opportunity for programs to demonstrate viability."

Senator Dowd: The "whereas" the 100 departments should read 100 programs

President Anderson: The initial charge was 100 departments but that changed. So we could change the language to "whereas 100 programs"

Senator Wedding: What about requiring that it come back to Senate for a review here? To the next to the last "and" add another one for programs to demonstrate and without returning to the Faculty Senate.

Senator Dowd: Senator Wedding, have you considered asking the Executive Committee reconsider this and return with a separate resolution?

Senator Wedding: This resolution is by us. It simply covers what the committee did but it doesn't stop us from going further.

Senator Dowd: I was just asking if you want the issues separated.

Senator Wedding: I don't know why it would be separated because it is just one issue? We start off with the fact that the president of the University stated that there are 100 departments and he misstated the number because we do not have that many, unless he is talking about all kinds of departments like the police or HR. We do not have near that many departments, programs we might have three hundred programs.

President Anderson: That sounds like a significantly important change that probably should be moved as an amendment.

Senator Thompson-Casado: President Anderson, didn't administration already cut one department without reference to the committee report? Did you point that out? What teeth does this resolution have? It seems like we are asking them when they have already made cuts without consultation. Let me explain my point, they already made their decision on three so what force does this have?

President Anderson: Ultimately it doesn't have any force unless we put some "or else" on there, and carry through on the "or else."

Senator Wedding: I don't think that we have to put a "where else," I think by simply going forward with the position of the Senate and nothing else Accreditation might be a good point.

President Anderson: That's a good point.

Senator Wedding: We have people who never went to college or graduated from college who are making decisions on academic programs on this campus.

Senator Dowd: Can I make another suggestion? We should note that this committee was told that the administration would not act on any program elimination without consideration from the committee. We can then enumerate the three programs that are being eliminated. If we want the Higher Learning Commission to be aware of this, we need to state exactly what happened. Further, contrary to promises made to the committee, the administration made its decisions without considering input from that committee.

Senator Wedding: I think we need to add another "whereas." I suggest that we take this back to the Executive Committee and they work on it for the next Faculty Senate meeting.

President Anderson: So are you willing to turn this resolution back to the Executive Committee?

Senator Wedding: I am not going to move, but it is a question. If you want to move it that way you can.

President Anderson: Alright, so it is a "sense of the Senate".

Senator Thompson-Casado: President Anderson is there a problem if we wait two more weeks? Does that change the situation?

President Anderson: No it doesn't.

Senator Thompson-Casado: So I don't see the need to rush.

President Anderson: Alright, so it is a "sense of the Senate".

Senators: Yes.

Senator Hornbeck: May we have it sent prior to the next Faculty Senate meeting so we can have time to really review? -- so it can reflect what we really want it to say.

President Anderson: Sure. My guess is that you will be receiving it immediately after the next Executive Committee meeting. Is there any discussion? Are there any items from the floor? Do I have a motion to adjourn? All in favor? Any opposed? Thank you!

IV. Meeting adjourned at 6:08 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted by:
Lucy Duhon
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape Summary: Quinetta Hubbard
Faculty Senate Office Administration Secretary