

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of March 15, 2011
FACULTY SENATE

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

approved @ F.S. on 4-12-2011

HIGHLIGHTS

Dr. Paul Hewitt: Tribute to Professor Bill Thomas
Faculty Senate Action on Proposed Prior Learning Assessment Policy
Dr. Naganathan: Report on Provost Search
Dr. Penny Poplin Gosetti: Report on Program Reviews
Dr. Steve LeBlanc: Report on Faculty Senate Core Curriculum Committee
Faculty Senate Responses to S.B. 5

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 Mary Powers called the meeting to order, **Karen Hoblet**, Executive Secretary, called the roll.

I. Roll Call: 2010-2011 Senators:

Present: Anderson, Atwood, Barlowe, Barnes, Benjamin, Batten, Brickman, Carr, Caruso, Chiarelott, Cluse-Tolar, Dowd, Duhon, Eastop, Eisler, Fink, Fournier, Franchetti, Funk, Giovannucci, Hamer, Heberle, Hoblet, Hottell, Humphrys, Jorgensen, Kennedy, Kistner, LeBlanc, Lee, Lundquist, Malhotra, Moore, Moynihan, Olson, Patrick, Piazza, Powers, Randolph, Regimbal, Rooney, Rouillard, Sawicki, Shriner, Skeel, Stepkowski, Teclehaimanot, Thompson-Casado, Tinkel, Wedding, Weldy, Wilson,

Excused absences: Baumgartner, Hammersley, Hornbeck, Molitor, Nandkeolyar, Ohlinger, Sheldon, Yonker

Unexcused absences: Crist, Dismukes, Gardner, Laux, Rooney, Solocha

II. Approval of Minutes: Minutes of March 1, 2011 were ready for approval.

III. Executive Committee Report:

President Powers: I am calling the meeting to order. Welcome all to the twelfth Faculty Senate meeting of the academic year 2010-2011.

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

Minutes from the March 1st meeting were sent for your review. May I have a motion for approval of the minutes from the March 1st meeting? Second. All in favor? Any opposed. Please let the record show the minutes from the March 1st meeting have been approved.

The first update is about the work of the FY12 Budget Formulation and Reengineering Task Force. The group has met twice since the last Faculty Senate meeting.

I have been assigned to three work groups:

Under Reengineer Undergraduate Programs, I was assigned to Class Size (Dabney, Gaspar, and Powers). And under Increase Enrollment, I was assigned to New Programs (McMillen, Gold, and Powers), and Open Space in Existing Programs (McMillen, Burns, Gold, and Powers). The workgroups are to provide reports to President Jacobs at the meetings. Once the state budget is announced and understood, a

meeting with the FY 12 Budget Formulation and Reengineering Task Force and the Responsibility Group will take place and it is my understanding that decisions will be made at this meeting based on information gathered by the various work groups of the Task Force.

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee met with Provost McMillen and Chancellor Gold yesterday and will meet again Thursday morning. Additionally, the Executive Committee will meet with President Jacobs this Friday afternoon.

Dean assessments for the deans who were not assessed last year (and who are continuing deans) will start tomorrow and the assessment period will last for two weeks. The lists of faculty from last year's Faculty Senate elections were used to create the database of survey participants and participants will be notified by e-mail. Senators from the College of Nursing and the College previously known as HSHS, please inform your faculty of the importance of completing the surveys and of the need to complete the assessments within the next two weeks.

In response to a recommendation from the floor of the Senate at our last meeting, I sent an e-mail message to Board of Trustees Chairman Fall. The purpose of the message was to let him know that any trustees could get input from the Faculty Senate body on any board actions that have impact on faculty by attending our meetings and engaging in a discussion of the body. Furthermore, for issues that do not require the broad representation of the full body, meetings could be set up with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. I also requested the invitation to be forwarded to other members of the Board of Trustees along with the schedule for the remaining Faculty Senate meetings this session.

Lastly, the Ohio Faculty Council of the Ohio Board of Regents will meet this Friday. Through this group, we have learned about Faculty Senates throughout the state passing resolutions in response to Senate Bill 5. Specific concerns are about language within Senate Bill 5 relating to collective bargaining of faculty at state universities. Senate Bill 5 was introduced on February 1, 2011 and assigned to the Senate's Insurance, commerce & Labor Committee. A substitute version was approved by the committee and an amended version was passed by the Ohio Senate on March 2, 2011. The Senate Bill was introduced in the Ohio House of Representative on March 3, 2011 and has been assigned to the Commerce & Labor Committee of the House. The language of the amended bill as passed by the Ohio Senate can be found online at: http://www.legislature.state.oh.us/BillText129/129_SB_5_PS_N.html

At least five faculty senates have passed resolutions in response to this bill: Shawnee State University, University of Akron, Miami University, Cleveland State University, and the University of Cincinnati. Four of these resolutions were forwarded to our Senators yesterday. Additionally, it is on the agenda for the Ohio Faculty Council, at its meeting later this week, to consider a resolution in response to Senate Bill 5. Later today, under New Business, we will consider whether or not this body wishes to pass a resolution in response to Ohio Senate Bill 5.

That concludes the Executive Committee report for this week. Before moving forward, I will be happy to take any questions on the Executive Committee report.

At this time, I would like to introduce Dr. Paul Hewitt. Dr. Hewitt will provide a tribute for Professor Bill Thomas.

Dr. Hewitt: I would like to take a few moments to remember a very memorable colleague, Professor Bill Thomas. It was a blow to our Math Department when Bill decided to retire last year. He played a leading part in our department. He was a very large presence and not just because of his height! One of the innovative things that we were able to put into place this Fall was a Study Skills course to supplement the new Math 1200 course which was his brainchild. He worked very hard throughout the summer and fall working on it and tweaking it. He was scheduled to teach a section of it this Spring semester. It proved to

be a very successful course. Almost everyone that took the Study Skills course received a “C” or better in Math 1200; if you knew this population you would be quite amazed. Unfortunately Bill never had a chance to teach any of this because he was diagnosed with pancreatic cancer last Fall and he died in January at the age of sixty-four. If the phrase student-centered means anything, you would have learned a lot of its meaning from Bill. All of his life was informed by a deep faith. He lived his beliefs. He always kept everything at a very professional level. This is not to say that he was always easy to work with. He had very clear and definite ideas about things, but as my colleague Geoff Martin would say, “Working with Bill was at times difficult because Bill was often right.” I am not sure that there can be a replacement like Bill. Certainly our department was a lot better for having him in it. I think the University as a whole owes him thanks. Thank you.

President Powers: Before moving forward with the agenda, let’s take a moment of silence in remembrance.

[Memorial Silence]

Thank you Dr. Hewitt. Next, the Faculty Senate has been asked to provide its endorsement of the Proposed Prior Learning Assessment Policy. This policy was presented to the Senate in January and resent to Senators with the meeting agenda yesterday. The Executive Committee met additionally with Dr. Dennis Lettman and Beth Gerasimiak and recommended that they should be invited to also take additional questions from the Senate before the Senate would take action. I am happy that they were able to return at our last meeting and again today to address any additional questions.

Is there a motion to endorse this policy? Second? All in favor? Opposed? *Motion Granted.*

Dr. Lettman: Thank you all very much. I appreciate your support.

President Powers: Next, Dean Nagi Naganathan, chair of the Provost Search Committee, will provide a report on the status of the Provost Search.

Dr. Naganathan: Good afternoon. On behalf of the committee I am pleased to report there will be five finalists on campus between tomorrow and April 1st. As was shared at the last meeting, the search firm contacted over one thousand prospects by e-mail. They have also spoken with a great number of people out there. There were more than one hundred and twenty nominees and applicants. Our colleagues on the Search Committee- Mary is one of the members, Larry Fink is here, Alice Skeens in the back, and others have done an outstanding job. They evaluated the credentials in a very timely fashion. The discussions have been very cordial and very open and there was a clear consensus in identifying the five finalists. We have posted the biographies and CVs on line. They are available at utoledo.edu/provostsearch. The five candidates represent five different segments of the division of Academic Affairs: visual and performing arts, humanities, social sciences, natural sciences, and engineering. An open forum for the campus community is scheduled for each of the candidates in Student Union 2592, between 1:30 and 3:00 pm on the first day of each candidate’s visit. Normally each candidate is going to be on campus for two days or at least, a day and a half. So the open forums will be held on the 16th, 22nd, 24th, 28th, and the 31st of March. Obviously, your participation is very critical. Please do make the time to attend these sessions; it is going to happen right in this room. On behalf of the Committee, I want to thank you all. I want to thank you in advance for taking the time to meet the candidates. Remember, it is not just about listening to what they have to say, it is also about educating them and attracting them to our campus. So, I respectfully ask for your time and involvement in this process. At this time, I will be happy to answer any questions that you may have.

Senator Barnes: Were there any women on the short list before the short list?

Dr. Naganathan: Yes, there were, in the earlier stages of the review process.

Senator Barnes: I was sorry not to see one woman on the final list.

Dr. Naganathan: Right from the beginning, we have been very cognizant of the diversity of the pool. It was something that we identified early on with the search firm. It is certainly not due to lack of effort. Are there any other questions? Thank you very much.

President Powers: Thank you very much Dr. Naganathan. Next, we have Dr. Penny Poplin Gosetti, Heather Huntley and Professor Barbara Floyd to provide us with a report on Program Reviews.

Dr. Poplin Gosetti: For those of you that do not know, I was in a skiing accident and the grime won.

Senator Fink: You should have seen the other person.

Dr. Poplin Gosetti: Yes, it was one of those stupid accidents. I am going to give you an update on program review. I talked to you a couple of times about what we are doing with that. Actually, there have been some major developments over the past week or so. A lot of the questions that came up the last time I spoke had to do with a committee that the president had charged to look at departments and programs. I am sure several individuals were wondering what were the two groups doing; are they doing each other's work, or are they overlapping etc? We had several conversations and I think we've come up with a proposal about how to move forward. I asked Barbara Floyd to join me today because she is chairing that committee and I certainly want her to be able to answer questions as we move forward with this.

We found that there is an overlap with the program review process (which is what I have been working with) and the program viability process (which is coming out of the Ad Hoc Committee on academic departments.) The difference between those two is: although the program may include some financial pieces it focuses on quality measurements whereas viability tends to get more into some of the cost ratio analysis and is very challenging to do at a program level because we do not store our information in that way. We are doing a mini bench mark review for all of the undergraduate programs. I mentioned to you the first time I presented this to you that the last time we did program review was in the late 90's. As HLC is approaching that it is clearly a shortcoming for us. We've done other things like prioritization, but we do not have a systematic process for doing program review. It is essential that we set a bench mark for an ongoing process of program review. We will then develop a seven year cycle for ongoing program review. The Ad Hoc Committee on academic programs was addressing programs sustainability and liability. This is a Faculty Senate and Presidential Committee that's charged with developing data for evaluating the academic programs sustainability and viability. We immediately found that there was a lot of overlap and a lot of desire to include the data that each other had. The opportunities that collaboration includes: One, coordinating the data request to institutional research and not having them do the same data or is there a way to incorporate both of our requests and do less runs etc. Secondly, there was an opportunity because we had not finalized how the program review reports are going to be analyzed; there were a couple of options. We discussed how we were going to analyze those reports to evaluate the quality aspect of the program. There's a need from the Ad Hoc Committee to develop...for evaluating financial sustainability. Both of us were interested with how we reinstate that systematic and ongoing review of programs. Let's talk about the collaboration of program level data. Per PowerPoint, you will see some of the things that we were looking at in regards to data. They aren't just quantity but there's a quantitative aspect to it that tells us about program viability which gets into courses over a period of time, the enrollment by section and credit hours, the number of degrees that a program rewards, and some of the retention data. I believe some of you are still waiting on the retention data, but it has been a challenge to get it at the program level. The Ad Hoc Committee really wants to look at things that are related to cost

income ratios which have to do with faculty salary and over headed FTE generation. Again, we try not to be that granular with the data that collects and disseminates across the University. There's also a need for a timely, relevant, accurate and interpretable data regarding programs and their performance outcomes. Timeliness is very critical when we are talking about financial viability. We also had an opportunity for collaboration on the analysis on graduate program review reports. These are due on April 4, 2011. We have extended the deadline a couple of times, partially because some of the challenges with getting useful data for the programs. What we proposed is that we do a review by the Ad Hoc Committee on academic programs so that we can really make sure that we are reviewing those and getting the attention to the hard work that people are putting into them so they get the credit they deserve. They would use those metrics to identify the programs that are most vulnerable and then on that small numbers of programs run the viability data. We are trying to make this a manageable process that can be accomplished by this Spring and Summer. Then the collaboration to develop the ongoing program review process. This has to be completed by June 2011 because we have to include it into our HLC report and the final draft which will be able for people to see in August 2011. We thought about if we could combine our efforts to put together one committee that will put together the process for doing this review. When we talked we thought that this a way for supporting each other while making it partly administrated and partly faculty and coming up with something that is meaningful that we can use in a productive manner. Before I take any questions I would like to ask Professor Floyd was there something that she would like to add.

PowerPoint Slide.

Undergraduate Update

Dr. Penny Poplin Gosetti
Interim Vice Provost for Academic Innovation
Faculty Senate
March 15, 2011

Program

Review

Overlap of Undergraduate Program Review/ Viability Activities

1. Undergraduate Academic Program Review Process

- Benchmark "mini" review for all undergraduate programs
February – March 2011
- Seven-year cycle of ongoing, in-depth undergraduate program review
Fall 2011 forward

2. Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Departments addressing program sustainability and viability

- Faculty Senate and Presidential committee charged with developing data for evaluating academic programs' sustainability and viability

Undergraduate Program Review/ Viability Collaboration Opportunities

- Coordinate similar data requests to Institutional Research
- Analyze undergraduate program review reports to evaluate program quality
- Develop algorithms for evaluating financial sustainability
- Reinstate systematic, ongoing undergraduate program review

Collaboration on Program-Level Data

Undergraduate Program Review data needs:

- Faculty course summary for the program
- Class enrollment by section and credit hours by course number
- Degrees awarded by program
- Retention rates fall-to-fall

Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Departments data needs:

- Cost/income ratios (e.g., faculty salary, overhead, FTE generation)
- Timely, relevant, accurate, and interpretable data regarding programs and their performance outcomes

Collaboration on Analysis of Undergraduate Program Review Reports

Undergraduate Program Review reports due April 4th

Proposed Review by the Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Departments

- Establish metrics for reviewing reports
- Using metrics, identify those programs most vulnerable
- Run financial and sustainability data for those programs

Collaboration to Develop Ongoing Program Review Process

Develop process for seven-year cycle of ongoing, in-depth program review that includes sustainability and viability data - complete by June 2011

Combine efforts of Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Departments and proposed University Academic Program Review Committee by creating one committee to develop process defined above

Professor Floyd: One of the problems that we had when looking at program viability and sustainability is that there are no existing models that look strictly at sustainability and viability; they are all a part of program review with the qualitative and quantitative being together. When we really looked into this and we really tried to find models that worked for us, it was then when we realized that the two really belong together. Penny has been out for awhile and we really weren't aware of what she was doing, but once we were able to communicate it just seems to be a natural that the two efforts merge into one. We haven't discussed this among the committee members, although I did send this out to them yesterday as a suggestion and I hope they will be agreeable to put these two efforts together. One of the problems that we had was that the financial data does not go down to the program level. To try to run data on every single academic program that will allow us to assess sustainability and viability will be very hard

Dr. Poplin Gosetti: Are there any questions?

Senator Fink: I am on the Ad Hoc Committee and unless something is going to massively change, I do not think the data will be available by June 11th. Did they say it will take a long time to put this together?

Dr. Poplin Gosetti: Which data are you talking about?

Senator Fink: The viability and the sustainability, the economics. It is like you said; it is not normally recorded at this granule level.

Dr. Poplin Gosetti: Right.

Senator Fink: They said that they have been working multiple years just to give us something that wasn't quite accurate. I just don't know how in a month someone is going to get it all done.

Professor Floyd: I think what we want to do by June is to be able to look at the program review reports and narrow down the number of programs that need a more thorough analysis backed up by quantitative data. Hopefully that will be a small number of programs that we will have to get detailed data for. But you are absolutely right; it is going to be very difficult. I am not sure that this will be done by June, but at least we would have looked at the program review documents and be able to begin the analysis.

Senator Fink: Actually, that makes a lot of sense. We can narrow down a number of areas, then if they have to just focus and drill down on a few then they might be able to put that data together.

Professor Floyd: Absolutely, that is what we are hoping for.

Dr. Poplin Gosetti: I just want to clarify that the June 11th date is looking at the review reports and creating a process; it wasn't necessarily at a quantitative level.

Senator Dowd: You talked about establishing a seven year cycle. Is that going to be for undergraduate and graduate programs?

Dr. Poplin Gosetti: We talked about undergraduate, but the hope is to pull together a process that incorporates from a logistical stand point the graduate and undergraduate. But the timing of what we are doing and all of that would flow together so we would have a review process that makes sense for both of those: yes.

Senator Dowd: If there's going to be a seven year cycle for this process, do you have any thoughts about what this ad hoc group should look at for in terms of undergraduate program review and graduate program review documents? Also since a review will take place for Ph.D. programs during this semester and Masters program starting next fall semester, why are the activities of this ad hoc group being limited to undergraduate programs only?

Dr. Poplin Gosetti: Patsy, would you like to respond to that?

Dr. Komuniecki: I would be happy to respond. As a matter of fact I just got off of the telephone with Barry Cohen and discussed with him that the graduate program review process has already been initiated, we already have our data tables being completed by Institutional Research. We have streamlined the process for this one year 'mini review'. The Graduate Council has a standing committee for Program Review and that committee has been populated already and is getting ready to begin their review process. I explained to Barry that the graduate program review process is clearly aligned with a viability review, and explained that the Doctoral program review process is already underway this Spring and will be completed by summer when the Master's program review process will commence, following a similar pattern to the one for Doctoral program review. He said "your process sound fine" and he basically said that he was going to give me a call to let me know that we could just continue on with the process that we have already outlined to the colleges and the Board of Trustees. As a reminder, Faculty Senate does not have jurisdiction over graduate programs, the Graduate Council does, and the graduate program review process clearly involves the Graduate Faculty on the GC Program review Committee. Does that help you, Mike? does it get to the point?

Senator Dowd: Yes. I understand what you are saying about the review of the PhD Programs, but what's going to happen next academic year when the review of Master's Programs begins?

Dr. Komuniecki: What I have hoped for and since we now have templates already worked out for both the quantitative and the qualitative side for graduate programs generally speaking, that as soon as we finish populating the data tables for the doctoral programs then we can start populating those for the Masters program. The process would be jumpstarted basically for the summer with information going out to the college offices to address those issues from the qualitative side and the vetting side. By the time Fall comes around the Graduate Council and the GC Program Review Committee can jump right in and complete their review in the Fall so we can get that going in an expedited fashion. I think that sounds reasonable.

Dr. Poplin Gosetti: I am wondering Mike if what you are talking about is when the process is put together that it would be the same committee that would review? Are you talking about short term or long term?

Senator Dowd: I am talking long term. However, at some point the undergraduate and graduate program reviews have to come together and be conducted at the same time for a particular program. We do not want one department doing undergraduate review this year and then two years later conducting the review of their graduate program.

Dr. Poplin Gosetti: Absolutely, that is going to be part of the discussion. Mike, I thought you were talking about short term.

Senator Dowd: This is about short term too. The ad hoc committee is put together by the Senate and the president has been charged to examine the viability of programs. And given slashed 4000 and 5000 level

courses, early admissions programs, etc., it is difficult to understand how that committee could examine the viability of an undergraduate program without consideration of its graduate program.

Dr. Komuniecki: As I noted earlier, today was my first conversation with Barry Cohen about this whole idea. He agreed that we need to get the processes aligned. Of course we all understand that we do not want to have an individual department doing it for a doctoral program in year one, a Masters program in year three, and then a Undergraduate program in year four because that makes no sense, we want them to come together. So, my suggestion is that we try to expedite the Masters process. There are 44 Doctoral Programs and 157 Masters Programs, and I believe, about 111 undergraduate programs. Therefore the numbers will have to get into alignment as well.

Dr. Poplin Gosetti: This strikes me that this is part of the ongoing conversation this committee can have. Can I clarify something? I saw several eyebrows raised on one hundred and eleven and the other numbers. This is not the number of programs that we have. This is the number of programs we determined were assessable through an assessment process and reviewable based on definitions of programs for review and assessment accreditation. So, that number may not match any other number that you heard. It's not how many programs that we have at the University, its how many programs that we are going to review; there's a huge difference there.

Dr. Komuniecki: To your other point, Senator Dowd, about how processes come together on the review side. When we used to have a regular cycle of program review, there was a separate graduate portion of the self-study that the programs/departments prepared for their Masters, PhD Graduate Programs that was separate from the undergraduate portion of the self-study. The undergraduate information would go to committees appointed by Faculty Senate and then the graduate piece would go to the Graduate Council Program Review Committee. Then it would come back to a committee that I believe was called Academic Programs Advisory Committee (APAC).

Senator Dowd: That is what I was suggesting for the long term review.

Dr. Komuniecki: That's exactly what I envisioned that we would reestablish at some point.

Senator Dowd: However, that is what I was also suggesting that had to happen to some extent in the short term review as well.

Senator Barlowe: You mentioned the development of metrics beyond or beside economic viability, sustainability and quality. What metric would you be using or have you gotten to that point yet?

Dr. Poplin Gosetti: That would be discussion that I had presumed would come straight from the template.

Senator Barlowe: Okay.

Dr. Poplin Gosetti: That is something that we would ask people to review or something that they can contribute information for.

Senator Barlowe: But how specific will those metrics be? Because if we are just establishing a base line and this is a mini review we may not get down far enough to measure the kinds of issues and concerns that you have.

Dr. Poplin Gosetti: I think that's why we have to think carefully and understand that it was a mini review and about how deep the information will be. There will be very different matrixes and then we will have a full pledge program.

Senator Hottell: One of the things that we talked to you about when you attended the LLSS Chair's meeting was the importance of the longer process. A big part of what's suppose to be there is bringing in someone from the outside, outside experts, and of course we do not have time to do that for this mini review. We will certainly be putting that on our review and that is what we plan to do in the future.

Dr. Poplin Gosetti: I would expect that would probably be part of the process etc. We certainly did not have the time or the budget to do that.

President Powers: There was an understating that the Ad Hoc Committee was going to report back and have whatever the actions were as part of the discussion. With this latest change, is that still the case?

Prof. Floyd: I would believe that would be the case, yes the Faculty Senate appointed committee.

Senator Dowd: I would like to recommend that the committee refine its proposed actions and return to Senate at our next Senate meeting for additional discussion. Does that make sense, Professor Floyd?

Prof. Floyd: Absolutely.

Dr. Poplin Gosetti: I still think though that there's some ending process on how we collected the data for program review. But at some point I would envision that there will be a collaborative discussion and the committee would take it further.

Senator Anderson: I have a very brief question about academic programs. We talked about metrics of financial and numbers liability, but where are external forces, say for example, the fact that today's universities should be addressing certain issues, while maybe those issues are not viable particularly for this university. However, we would still have that program.

Prof. Floyd: Right, that's why this is so important that we are not just looking at the financial data. That is why it is really important and it became obvious that the two processes would have to be one. One is to look at those quality issues, including social value issues, and the other is looking at financial. We are hoping that the financial data would inform the qualitative data and the qualitative data would inform the financial. That is really why it's so important to be one.

Dr. Poplin Gosetti: Some of the things that are being asked for on the program review have to do with what is the impact of that program on the community, what is the impact on the university, what are the challenges that are being faced, where do you see yourself two or three years from now, and how are you going to go about doing that. That is where some of those pieces come in and what are the external forces? And how are you going to address those external forces? There are opportunities on the qualitative side to do those types of things. Thank you.

President Powers: Thank you. Next, Dr. Steve LeBlanc will provide a report from the Faculty Senate Core Curriculum Committee.

Senator LeBlanc: I would like to view this as a continuation of the discussion that started two weeks ago to talk about changes in the core curriculum. If you remember, these are the five competencies that we proposed for our new core competency model for curriculum classes. I guess I would like to throw it open for discussion. I can go through the different major areas and we can talk about each one of those if you

would like. The five competencies include: Communication, Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning and Literacy, Personal and Social Responsibility, Information Literacy and Critical and Integrative Thinking. These were what we were looking at for the number of courses in the different areas: Two courses in communication, three in scientific reasoning, one in quantitative and literacy, two or three in social and personal responsibility, two or three in critical and integrative thinking. So between those two competencies you have a total of fifteen hours, five classes, three in one and two in another. Information Literacy is an overarching competency that is gained throughout the curriculum. There wouldn't necessarily be a specific course targeted at information literacy.

Senator Fink: Senator LeBlanc, could I ask you a question?

Senator LeBlanc: Please.

Senator Fink: I do not have a problem with what you have there, but I am just curious, how did you decide how many courses will go to each area? Is there logic to that?

Senator LeBlanc: The two composition courses correspond to the two English courses we have now. There is currently a math, two sciences etc.

Senator Regimbal: I have a question Senator LeBlanc. In Personal and Social Responsibility the focus is on diversity.

Senator LeBlanc: I believe the minimum is one course that focuses on diversity.

Senator Regimbal: Could you expand on that notion of Personal and Social Responsibility and what was the thinking of the group?

Senator LeBlanc: Regarding?

Senator Regimbal: For example, I am a person that thinks about health issues. I would view personal responsibility as having some understanding of physical fitness and personal responsibility for being fit. Meaning, if you are not physically fit you are going to cost the nation a lot more for Health Care. So, are we looking at that kind of personal responsibility?

Senator LeBlanc: Yes, that would certainly fit under that category.

Senator Hottell: Currently under diversity we have US Diversity and non-Western, and looking at this I do not see both categories. Are you not planning to continue that?

Senator LeBlanc: We didn't discuss that. We just said one class has to focus on diversity, but there certainly could be a course that focuses on both or one or the other.

Senator Hottell: But your committee did not find it necessary to study both, diversity within the US and non-Western.

Senator LeBlanc: Perhaps it could be done in one place, I do not know. It could be a brand new class.

Senator Anderson: I don't think the committee reviewed it at this point.

Senator Hottell: I would request that you think about articulating it in that way because I think it is very important that we look at non-Western global Diversity as well as US Diversity. One of our most popular classes now is The History of Jazz.

Senator LeBlanc: I understand. I believe one of the sources of the popularity is probably because it is one of those double dip classes, it covers two categories.

Senator Hottell: We also have a number of classes that look at Chinese culture.

Senator LeBlanc: We do.

Senator Hottell: I think they both are very important and I don't think we can combine the two in one class.

Senator Barnes: I would like to side with Senator Hottell and to say we're increasingly globalized and diverse in terms of identity and multiple intersecting identities. To reduce diversity requirements seems to really do a disservice to our students. At least in my non-Western Diversity classes students regularly say, "I did not get enough exposure to this in my college education." So, I would also encourage you to put the focus on diversity. In my opinion, it doesn't do enough to simply say how significant diversity is to our curriculum. I think we need more diversity. In fact, if I could, I would love to see diversity requirements in the communication section, in the science section, and other sections so that it could actually include diversity across a range of the curriculum.

Senator LeBlanc: Are you arguing for a separate course?

Senator Barnes: I want diversity to be emphasized across the board more, particularly non-Western.

Senator LeBlanc: Are you recommending that it will be two of those classes would be a focus on diversity, is that what you are suggesting that we consider?

Senator Hottell: That is what I have suggested, but as Senator Barnes embedded in her remark is that "the only way we can really study diversity is to study it in all areas." So, I like her idea of saying diversity is important in each one of these areas.

Senator LeBlanc: I have a hard time saying that we would have to require diversity in math classes and all of the English classes etc.

Senator Barlowe: But you can encourage it.

Senator LeBlanc: Yes, we can encourage it.

Senator Barnes: That is something your committee can talk about.

Senator Heberle: I don't necessarily agree with it or not, but I understand that the proposal is not about content, but the core curriculum proposal does not even gesture toward globalization and international questions. I know content wise because it encourages various things, for example, advising classes etc. It does seem to me that there is something significant missing in the context of those two very broad content categories. I agree that diversity is a content category for personal and social responsibility competency.

Senator Sawicki: I think that it might be important to consider that this is about the core competencies and not necessarily everything that a student will take in their time with the University. This is addressing just those particular competencies. I would like to ask Barbara Schneider to make a comment.

Barbara Schneider: I think what I heard people say is how critical it is that the attention of diversity should be embedded in a number of places in our curriculum, which obviously is true. But, I think we need to back up to the competencies because there is a bit of a gap between our competencies and distribution across courses. I think the requirement is that courses should focus on a particular competency. However, they have to address all the competencies and have measurable outcomes in order to be included in the core. I believe that that might be a way to think about the difference between the competencies and the distributed course requirements.

Senator LeBlanc: What we are recommending is that each course that gets proposed for inclusion in the core curriculum addresses at least one competency in a major way and then at least one more.

Dr. Penny Poplin Gosetti: I think actually in rethinking this general education the way the committee is putting forward, (I'm on the committee) a part of what you are talking about is because we need to rethink what needs to be general education. If we want to embed this across the curriculum then this is the opportunity to do that. I think the idea here was to really think carefully about where we want those gen ed. courses to be as part of the student experience and really focus even on the content of the class. We have some specific classes that are assigned to purposely develop and assessing those particular competencies; Thea does that make sense?

Senator Sawicki: Yes.

Dr. Penny Poplin Gosetti: So, it may be that there's a Chinese class and a Business class, but let's think of a new class that will purposely start bringing some of these ideas together in a disciplinary way or some other way.

Senator Cluse-Tolar: Correct me if I am remembering this wrong because I serve on this committee too; we did have this discussion early on in the committee. I think Marcia advised us that the non-Western and Western Diversity classes were an UT created requirement. Part of the goal for looking at doing this is that courses that are designated as gen ed. will receive a lesser subsidy from the State. So, as we reorganize this and we label things gen ed. those courses will get a lesser subsidy. But it doesn't mean that we can't have other requirements that are UT requirements, but they just won't be labeled gen ed. So we could still have those.

Senator Heberle: Are we writing this for the State?

Senator Fink: In a way, we are because the gen ed. courses are the lowest paid courses. So, if we still have people taking these courses and do not designate them out of gen ed., we are economically cutting our throats. In this economic climate, I do not think we can maintain the status quo.

Senator LeBlanc: I think Senator Sawicki had a good point; these are not all of the classes that a student can take.

Senator Fink: I agree.

Senator LeBlanc: These are the thirty hours that you could take during your freshman or sophomore year. There are still ninety other hours in the curriculum to take and there are a lot of program requirements.

Senator Jorgensen: I want to speak to the diversity issue. I realize the shift of this emphasis of the core compared to the previous. Yes, there are ninety other hours that students are taking, but in a practical sense this changes the diversity minimum that a student would have from two courses to one. I know the technical programs here very well; those ninety hours in every engineering curriculum, every math curriculum, every science curriculum, and almost in every medical curriculum are not going to include anything else about diversity. It will be only 50% of the present level of diversity courses that our students that will be exposed to compared to the present, and I think that is the exact wrong way to go.

Senator LeBlanc: Right now there are thirty hours here and you can take thirty hours now providing a double-dip class. So, one diversity class can serve as humanity.

Senator Jorgensen: Right, but at least two must be in diversity.

Senator Batten: It is inherent in some curriculum because they are credit requirements. For example, Senator Jorgensen just mentioned nursing. I am going to tell you straight up that we talk a lot about diversity when we talk about medications. Certain things are being affected and it is not that it is racial determining, but it may be genetics. So, to say that diversity is more than one thing, it is not sufficient. An example, Jeannie Eastop (*who is sitting next to me*) teaches Mental Health and talks about diversity from a different perspective. So, I think programs are going to need to do some introspection to help piece it with diversity as well. But, it is not a one size fits all for any major.

Senator LeBlanc: If the sense of the Senate is that we come to a vote for two diversity classes then so be it; if that's the way that it turns out.

Senator Heberle: What if there was just an addition to the personal and social responsibility competency that included some language that gesture more strongly towards some of the concerns being raised?

Senator LeBlanc: So they indeed have to show their competency, correct?

Senator Heberle: Why not? I think all of our students do. What Senator Jorgensen said was right; it impacts half of all of our students.

Senator LeBlanc: If you can think of some good wording for that, write it in a sentence.

Senator Fink: It could be this, just any importance of diversity.

Senator Hamer: I think I agree with what Penny and Senator Jorgensen said that diversity needs to be important at UT. The way that we have it right now with the two courses that we would call "single group studies approach" in Multicultural Ed. If we did more in what Penny was talking about and said "in every course," just like we get information literacy in every course there will be a diversity component that will be moving to a more sophisticated level of multicultural education opposed to taking two gen ed. courses. So for instance, even in accounting, it wouldn't take a lot of time to point out that the Western accounting system is only one way for figuring out finances. You can also look at what happened to the Mexicans when Texas was taken over and everybody lost their farms that they had for hundreds of years because the tax system changed. It would be fairly simple just to throw in a few of those illustrations and it will actually be much stronger throughout diversity, but it will also need to go into their requirements for the each of these core courses.

Senator LeBlanc: I understand.

Senator Humpherys: There are two parts to this. One is determining what the categories will be. The other pertains to how many classes will be in the core. Getting back to one of the subjects that we talked about last time, are we still having fifty courses in the core? Will there be ten courses per category?

Senator LeBlanc: It is going to be some smaller number from what we have now, let's not get set on fifty.

Senator Humphreys: Secondly, we are coming at this from a faculty point-of-view without considering the people who will deal with this on a day-by-day basis—the advisors. We are looking at this saying “Students will be able to touch upon diversity through this method and that course content, etc,” but when push comes to shove there is going to have to be a list of courses just like there is now that states “...to satisfy the communication requirement you can take one of these seven courses.” I think that it is very important that we know before we would ever vote on this what those choices are going to be. Who is going to make that decision? Are we going to say “a department submits some sort of application” and then who's going to review that? Do we eliminate the maximum number of courses that will be in the core, etc? I think all of those things are very important to know before we make an overall decision on this.

Senator Jorgensen: Since we are talking about numbers, I just want to say thank you for providing us with the numbers; I know that you have provided us with them before. I looked at the list and considered those courses which enrollments of two hundred or more, which is 1% of the student body. I wanted to see how close this number of courses was to the proposed limit of just fifty courses was, and if it was any reasonable number. Right now there are seventy-four classes that are in the present core that have approximately two hundred students or more per year. So any number of courses in the ballpark of fifty would be reducing the classes that are currently capturing the interests of over two hundred students. That seems like a pretty significant cut.

Senator LeBlanc: I thought to myself what's logical here? So I took all of the 3000 and 4000 level classes out. I think there were twenty-eight courses in Foreign Languages and so I removed the ones that was Intermediate I & II, but I left Elementary I & II and five or six different languages, but I don't remember what they are. I am guessing that they are the third and fourth course that follows in the sequence; am I right?

Senator Hottell: Well depending on the semester, if you count the second semester the first year.

Senator LeBlanc: I mean there were courses called Elementary French I & Elementary French II and Intermediate French I & Intermediate French II. I assumed Intermediate French I & Intermediate French II are really courses three and four in the sequence.

Senator Hottell: Exactly.

Senator LeBlanc: So I removed those, but I left Elementary French I & Elementary French II. When I did that I think that I ended up with eighty-two classes. So, that is still a long way from two hundred and fifty.

Senator Barnes: I know you have told us before, but could you tell us the advantage again? I'm talking about the cut from two hundred and fifty to fifty.

Senator LeBlanc: Again, if you put them on the gen ed. list they will receive the lowest subsidy. So, I do not want to have two hundred and fifty on the list for that reason.

Senator Lundquist: It seems to me that almost every course would work on all of these competencies; perhaps fewer on Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning. But I think once it is advertised that departments need to put their courses forward for the core, you are just going to get an avalanche of courses. It is not a good way to cut it down. What's really important is: who is going to look at that avalanche and determine which will be core courses? We clearly have to be careful in what we do.

Senator LeBlanc: I understand that. Those are the courses that most freshman and sophomore students take. A lot of those courses provide additional credits that are going towards their program of study.

Senator Lundquist: Yes, but those courses are at the 3000 and 4000 level.

Senator LeBlanc: Yes.

Senator Lundquist: For instance, I teach literature courses and I wouldn't be doing my job if I do not include all of those competencies, except perhaps Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning. I think I can write a description of my course, actually I have written a description of my course that would make a good case for being a core course and I think most people could do that.

Senator LeBlanc: I would hope that departments would serve that purpose. The instructor would put courses forward and the departments could look at those and say are these really the ones that we want to come forward from our department to be part of the core curriculum; I think that would be the first level. Then it would go to the college or the college committee, then it would come to the Faculty Senate Core Curriculum Committee, and finally it goes to Faculty Senate.

Senator Lundquist: So are we going to have a good mixture of courses from various disciplines?

Senator LeBlanc: I think we would have to.

Senator Fink: The only difference is that the additional courses will be included instead of in the college plan of study, if I understand the plan correctly. We will still be taking diversity classes but we won't be designating them as gen ed. So, why would we cut our throats and get paid at the lowest subsidy? If you insist on this, then I would insist that you be there when we fire staff to make up for that decision.

Senator LeBlanc: I don't know if I agree that we require classes over and above for the gen ed. The other requirements will be program requirements. These are the University's requirements and the program requirements would be part of...

Senator Fink: We can encourage program requirements.

Senator Randolph: I thought when I read the proposal those departments that submit courses to satisfy the core requirements will ensure that they cover the advertised competencies. I understood the departments are also going to take on the responsibility of assessing the competencies that they plan to cover.

Senator LeBlanc: Right.

Senator Randolph: That may not be something that every department wants for every course they offer; that can actually be a burden.

Senator LeBlanc: Any course that would be in the core we would have to be able to assess that course for particular core competencies that they plan to be covered in the course.

Senator Thompson-Casado: I have a question on the funding model. If you have a 1000 level course that is currently listed as gen ed., I understand that the subsidy model is changing, but what is the subsidy difference if that course is taken out of gen ed. and is still a 1000 level course? How is the reimbursement different?

Senator LeBlanc: I believe it depends on what program of study it's in. Because the funding model as related to program of study.

Senator Thompson-Casado: Are we talking a three dollar difference here?

Senator LeBlanc: I don't know the answer, but it is a big difference between a 1000 level engineering class and a gen class.

Senator Thompson-Casado: But what about the 1000 level humanities course? If these courses are pulled from the gen ed. experience I don't see why these are being taught.

Senator LeBlanc: They can still be taught.

Senator Thompson-Casado: But who's going to take them?

Senator LeBlanc: Well, if the only reason students are taking them is because they are on the list then why are we doing that?

Senator Thompson-Casado: Because it might be an interesting course for them and they want to fulfill the requirement.

Senator LeBlanc: Then they will still take it.

Senator Thompson-Casado: But it doesn't eliminate the requirement and there is still ninety hours to take.

Senator Barnes: And they cannot afford it.

Senator LeBlanc: So, you think the program does not deem that course worthy of study if it's not in gen ed.?

Senator Thompson-Casado: If you don't have thirty-four credit hours in a major and you thought that you are limited to a certain amount of courses that you are interested in. For example, in Spanish we have 3000 level courses at thirty-four credit hours we cannot plug in 1000 level classes into our major. Right now students are taking Which is right now a Non-Western Diversity course and we have students taking that, but it doesn't fit under the Spanish major. So if it's not gen ed. and the other courses are filled, when do they take these courses?

Senator Lundquist: Going forward, it seems to me that there are courses that we should offer that our majors do not take.

Senator Jorgensen: Related to the question that Senator Thompson-Casado just mentioned, "What is the down side for having additional 1000 level low subsidy courses in the core because it's not going to lower the subsidy anyways."

Senator Thompson-Casado: I don't understand that.

Senator Jorgensen: Exactly, therefore students will not have an opportunity to broaden their education. That's why we teach a course that isn't on the list. But that is exactly why students take the course because it's on the list and that's the course they want. It is a process that we go through and they get excited about it that forces them to be a little bit broader. Looking at the front end of the question, what is the downside having most of the classes with the lowest subsidy in the core because they are already low subsidy and what is the advantage of cutting down the number?

Senator LeBlanc: I don't know the answer to that because I do not know the subsidy differential. It seems to populate what we call the University Core Curriculum with a lot of classes that have twenty or thirty students which don't make sense to me. There are a lot of classes in there that the total enrollment for the year is twenty or thirty students. To add those on the list to the core curriculum because one program wants it is not right; if they want it that badly let them put it in their program of study.

Senator Rouillard: There is one more wrinkle to this and it's bad. We may take a bunch of things out of the 1000 level, but the State may decide that is where it belongs to meet the assignment of those courses.

Senator LeBlanc: I'm not saying we renumber the class; I'm just saying no gen ed. classes. I am not saying taking a 1000 level class and then making it into a 3000 level class. I am just saying that that may not be appropriate for gen ed.

Senator Hamer: I think that I figured out what was making me uncomfortable in this and it could be wide spread. They are redefining the core in the six different terms that have nothing to do with disciplines. You will lose the students that are taking their humanities courses and their social science courses. For example, I could have a Social Responsibility of Education class that students will take instead of a Political Science class and I can engineer it into my program which is entirely in my college by placing my courses that I want to be taught as a core course and then advising my students that they would have to take it. In the old core where we have humanities, social sciences, science, and math they are deemed as disciplinary approaches. And for a well educated person you need to understand the variety of disciplinary approaches and not just the approach of your program, looking at a variety of topics. I think what we are talking about the disciplines in the University and what it is to be educated.

Senator LeBlanc: For example, if you limit the number of courses that you can take to one department.

Senator Hamer: Why couldn't you just go back and have math, humanities, social sciences, and science and say within each of those you have to have ten humanities courses that would count as core, and ten social sciences that would count, etc. Then the two composition classes you have are exactly the same thing as present, but you would have assured that students actually get educated outside of the one discipline of their one program. That's what's a university's education is about; otherwise you have a vo tech education.

Senator Anderson: I remember the previous meeting that we had with the committee and we discussed this. We did in fact have requirements that those competencies are distributed to other disciplines. It couldn't all be from the same department.

Senator LeBlanc: I believe the courses are taken from a minimum of three departments. We only have two classes that you can take and they can be in your same college.

Senator Hamer: But they can be in your same department or program. We have five departments for higher education. I tell you that if higher education students only take education classes they are not going

to be well educated. I believe every program pushes to keep as much FTE in their own programs as they possibly can. We are just setting it up so everybody can do that.

Senator Heberle: That is another way of saying that there was a reason the core was primarily handled by the College of Arts and Sciences.

Senator LeBlanc: I would suspect that it still will.

Senator Chiarelott: How are college advisors going to handle transfer students when they come in with thirty hours from Owens or North West and those courses may not match up to those competency areas from example, math, English, etc?

Senator LeBlanc: We would have to take it and accept it into the new requirements. So, for the remaining time that they are here we hope that they can focus on things in their portfolio that show if they obtain these competencies. Because they may not exactly match where we have it.

Senator Chiarelott: How do advisors make that distinction for a course that the community college or other universities outside Ohio has, but we do not have that course within the competency areas?

Senator LeBlanc: We would have to take it and accept it into the new requirements.

Senator Regimbal: I think that it is fair that our graduates should have these competencies. Maybe, the competency and courses are different. How do we judge that our students have these competencies, but not necessarily that they took two classes from here and one from there etc? I think another discussion needs to occur to determine the difference between competencies and courses.

Senator LeBlanc: That requires core distribution so they can get a broad education and they take classes that focus on those different areas and different competencies.

Senator Regimbal: I remember the discussion being “let’s get a class in the core because we will be able to increase the enrollment in our college.” Then I can direct my students to take a class that takes care of a core requirement. Then I have time in my program requirement for them to take additional courses that we added. When we changed from quarters to semesters we lost hours so it is somewhat of a “shell game” to give us hours that we have in our program. I like the idea of taking courses that are outside of my program so students will be introduced to jazz and literature etc. because that’s not something that I would be presenting to them as a class. I think that the conversation needs to continue to sort this out and come to an agreement on it.

Senator LeBlanc: That’s fine. If you have some ideas about how we can change this please send it to me.

Senator Teclhaimanot: I think we have too many University Core Curriculum courses that need to be addressed at the department and college level first before any decision is made to reduce the University Core Curriculum courses.

Senator Heberle: If there are courses that are offered now and do not have a home so to -speak in terms of the program and the core, but because students have the option to take them now for the core do contribute to diverse options on this campus. There may be other ways to think about how to keep that diversity of course options for particular programs.

Senator LeBlanc: We have course if you saw the enrollment numbers they are in the thousands and we have courses enrollments that are in the twenty's. Some areas we have to draw the line because it would go nine hundred, seven hundred, five hundred and then twenty.

Senator Dowd: Senator LeBlanc, I heard you state that there are some core classes that have an enrollment of two hundred and other classes might have twenty; what is wrong with a class that has twenty students in it?

Senator LeBlanc: There is nothing wrong with a class that has twenty, but why should it be in the core if only twenty people university wide take it for an entire year?

Senator Dowd: Because such a class benefits our students. They are choosing to be in that course. It is no cost to the university because if the instructor of that course didn't teach that course he/she will be teaching another course. If the issue is not the choices we provide students then it appears you are looking at it from a class size perspective only.

Senator LeBlanc: It is not the choices.

Senator Dowd: But it doesn't make a difference if you're talking about a class of twenty students, three hundred or two thousand.

Senator LeBlanc: I believe some of those courses are pretty specialized and we had to hire a part-timer to teach that class because no one else could teach it.

Senator Hamer: How many are those that we have to have a part-timer?

Senator LeBlanc: I don't know.

Senator Hamer: Well maybe we can just cut those.

Senator Dowd: Is this an issue of the cost of part-time instructors?

Senator LeBlanc: You just said that there wasn't an issue with money and I just said we had to pay for a part-timer to teach a class.

Senator Dowd: That's a fair point, but if that is the case the issue is whether departments have adequate full time faculty. This is an issue that the provost will have to answer to. We are providing options for students, so the idea of two hundred or twenty core courses doesn't matter when you consider it from a university perspective. Using a very blunt instrument for cutting the numbers core courses is just going to hurt students. That is, I do not believe that students will benefit if you reduce the number of options available to them.

Senator LeBlanc: Thank you.

Senator Heberle: Senator Leblanc, what is happening next here?

Senator LeBlanc: I guess I am coming back again.

Senator Heberle: Is the committee going to meet and consider these concerns and change things or are we going to continue to discuss the same proposal?

Senator LeBlanc: We are going to meet and discuss everything.

Senator Heberle: So we are going to have some changes next time.

Senator LeBlanc: Yes. The reason why I came back this time is because I don't think we finished the discussion two weeks ago.

Senator Sawicki: Senator LeBlanc, how is assessment going?

Senator LeBlanc: We have a lot of material that we have to go through for Fall semester.

President Powers: Thank you very much. The last item of executive business is to consider whether or not this body wishes to pass a resolution in response to Senate Bill 5. The following draft is provided as a starting place:

FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION

WHEREAS Evidence indicates collective bargaining in higher education has not contributed to the state's deficit;
WHEREAS Ohio Senate Bill 5 seeks to weaken or eliminate collective bargaining rights of state employees, including university faculty, without offering evidence that this plan will create jobs or reduce the budget deficit;
WHEREAS Ohio Senate Bill 5 will reduce the ability of departments to recruit and retain high quality faculty and subsequently have a negative effect on employment conditions as well as the quality of students' educational experiences;
WHEREAS Collective bargaining for faculty ensures institutional stability and contributes to a productive work environment where mutual respect and genuine collaboration occur;
WHEREAS Collective bargaining facilitates effective planning and a predictable budgeting process;
WHEREAS Collective bargaining provides important support for shared governance in higher education;
THEREFORE: The Faculty Senate of the University of Toledo strongly opposes Ohio Senate Bill 5 and affirms the importance of collective bargaining for faculty and other state employees.

Senator Heberle: Is there anything that weakens or eliminates?

President Powers: Doesn't the current version weaken or eliminate collective bargaining?

Senator Jorgensen: For faculty the bill eliminates collective bargaining. For state employees it weakens bargaining.

President Powers: Is there anything that anyone would like to be eliminated from the resolution?

Senator Wedding: Do we have a move on this?

President Powers: Yes. Is there anything that you would like to have added to the resolution?

Senator Cluse-Tolar: I do not have an addition to this, but I have a question. It was my understanding that when the Omnibus Bill went through, Collective Bargaining for faculty came back, but the problem is how we define faculty. They can respond to this and say you can collectively bargain. They say curriculum development, any personnel evaluation of peers, evaluation of deans, and serving on Faculty Senate can be viewed as activities that make you management. So I wondering are we coming at this as if Collective Bargaining is the issue, but at some point we need to put in here that faculty engage in all of those activities and it does not make us management.

President Powers: Then how do we state that?

Senator Wedding: I don't think we need to complicate things at this stage. I think that it will be too complicated to try to come up with that at this hour of 5:30 p.m.

Senator Heberle: I think if we can just add near the therefore part "all State employees...."

President Powers: Is there a motion for Faculty Senate endorsement of the proposed Resolution?
Second?

Senator Dowd: It was already moved.

Senator Wedding: Second.

Senator Wilson: Are we accepting this as a friendly amendment?

President Powers: Yes we are. If there is no further discussion, All in favor? Opposed? Let the record show the resolution is approved as amended. One other discussion item is about how the Senate would like this resolution communicated. Specifically, to whom and how?

Senator Olson: I move that this resolution be distributed in addition to the president, the chancellor, the Board of Trustees, to all local Senators, legislatures of this region, and as well as to the Governor.

Senator Wilson: Is that a motion?

Senator Olson: That is a motion.

Senator Wilson: Second.

President Powers: Is there any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? *Motion passed.*

Senator Heberle: Could we also send it to the press so it can get out?

President Powers: That concludes the executive business for this meeting. Is there any other business from the floor? We now have time for general questions and concerns that the Senate should address.

May I have a motion for adjournment?

IV. The meeting is adjourned at 5:36 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Hoblet
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard
Faculty Senate Office Administrative
Secretary