

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of November 22, 2011
FACULTY SENATE

<http://www.utoledo.edu/facsenate> Approved @FS on 12-06-2011

HIGHLIGHTS

Provost McMillen and the Amelioration Committee

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, Cappelletty, Caruso, Dismukes, Dowd, Duhon, Franchetti, Hamer, Heberle, Hewitt, Hill, Hottell, Humphrys, Kistner, Kranz, Lee, Langan, Lipman, Lundquist, Mason, Molitor, Moore, Moore, Nandkeolyar, Ohlinger, Peseckis, Piazza, Plenefisch, Regimbal, Rouillard, Sheldon, Teclehaimanot, Templin, Thompson, Thompson-Casado, Weck-Schwarz, Wedding, White

Excused absences: Batten, Brickman, Cavalieri, Duggan, Ellis, Hey, Hoblet, Hornbeck, Malhotra, Moynihan, Powers, Randolph, Shriner, Skeel, Slutsky, Yonker

Unexcused absences: Cooper, Crist, Cuckovic, Giovannucci, Hammersley, LeBlanc, Nazzal, Solocha, Tinkel, Willey, Wilson

II. Approval of Minutes: Minutes from the November 8th meeting are ready for approval.

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

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

You all have received the minutes for our last meeting, on 08 November. The recording of the proceedings was very flaky, and difficult to transcribe. I remind all speakers to use the portable microphone, and begin with your name. I also remind all speakers to return corrected transcriptions to Quinetta within three days of when she sends them out, so she can send us minutes a day before the next meeting. From now on, minutes will be published for Senate approval on Monday, with or without corrections. Be that as it may, may I hear a motion to accept the minutes of 08 November? All in favor? Any opposed? Please let the record show the Minutes from November 8th meeting have been approved.

III. Executive Committee Report:

My executive report today is again fairly short. First, I want to express my deep condolences to the family of Dean Alice Skeens, and to all of us at UT who knew her well and always appreciated her respect and concern for students and the academic mission, while maintaining a joyful sense of humor. She will be missed. At our next meeting in December we will have a formal Remembrance.

At our Executive Committee meeting last week, Dean Pryor reported on the status of journal subscriptions and OhioLINK, both of which are facing budget shortfalls. As it is, UT is among the lowest contributors to OhioLINK. These issues are still under discussion. Please make your wishes known to as many administrators as you can. We also discussed the construction in Carlson Library. The first phase of converting the second floor into a center for interactive design and technology, plus learning spaces for

collaboration, and library faculty office space will be complete in early June. Dr. Pryor was reticent to discuss issues concerning the participation of COIL in the curriculum; however we did just receive a message from Provost McMillen explaining the introduction of the COIL attribute in course tracking. We will report further as necessary.

We also met with the Provost and Chancellor last Thursday. We began our conversation expressing concern for the state of student advising on both campuses. Dr. McMillen reported that he had just had a fruitful meeting with all advisers two days before. He understands that the budget process cut way too many advisers last year; these positions are being restored one-by-one. This discussion led to talk of the work of the "Budget Shortfall Amelioration Committee", which we will hear from later on the agenda. One comment was about the need to have advisers "planted" in the Community Colleges to advise students there about the most efficient programs to follow if they are intending to transfer to UT. On a related note, Dr. McMillen admitted that previous budget processes that came out of the financial side of UT were not suitably informed by the academic mission. In the fiscal 2013 budget discussions, Drs. Gold and McMillen will have much more control over what happens, and pass some of that control on to colleges.

Finally, Dr. Dowd and I had a long conversation with Dr. McMillen about the program review process. Most of this conversation was "off the record", but again, colleges will be more involved with decisions concerning programs. Both of us strongly recommended that College Councils be part of the process. Next Monday, I will present to the Board of Trustees a discussion of our progress revising the University Core to a competency-based model. Here is a DRAFT PowerPoint that I will use. Any comments or suggestions will be appreciated. The first slide: we are going to make some comments here about the chain of authority that eventually ends up with a set of curriculum. We are going to talk about the core competencies versus the general education set of classes.

Per the PowerPoint, general education is a set of courses offered at the 1000 and 2000 level that is designed to provide students with a breadth of knowledge and intentionally designed to address and access at least two of the core competencies. Therefore, on graduation day every UT student will be able to communicate effectively and clearly, understand scientific and mathematical reasoning, make informed ethical decisions in a diverse community, and turn information and data into useful knowledge, i.e. think critically; those core competencies will continue all the way through. However, tracking how these competencies develop in the upper division has yet to be recorded. All UT General Education courses will contribute intentionally to the core competencies which include the following: course descriptions and syllabuses will address one or more of the core competencies. Courses will contain assignments that assess the competencies that then can be included in students' electronic portfolios. Courses will align with Ohio General Education and Transfer Module guidelines. And the number of courses will be selected in a limited number on the basis of their special contribution to the core. Okay, here's the schedule of achievements: last spring the Faculty Senate endorsed core curriculum work and approved the core competencies. Earlier this fall we agreed to use the assessment rubrics and the course submission process. Competency-based general education courses are being piloted in English Composition this semester and Mathematics in the fall semester. General education course recommendations are in process now. The Curriculum Committee will be presenting the first list of courses at our next Faculty Senate meeting in two weeks. The list of courses will then go to the Registrar's Office to be ready for fall 2012. Those courses will be furthered tweaked to ensure appropriate assessment. These numbers are to show how things have progressed since the merger. The Board was very interested with a limited number of general education courses, so we are trying to show that there's a little bit of a cushion. At the time of the merger there were approximately three hundred courses that were decreased to between 206 and 209. Phase three to 2011 is now and in the fall of 2012 the number will go down to one-hundred or so. Phase four is some time in the future and its intention is to keep the numbers somewhere above fifty-two. Fifty-two is the lower limit. That is the number that we say must be in the Ohio Transfer Module

PowerPoint Slides (1)

Core Competencies Update

Dr. William McMillen

Provost

Dr. Lawrence Anderson-Huang

President, Faculty Senate

Professor of Physics and Astronomy

Board of Trustees

November 28, 2011

Terminology (PP slide 2.)

Core Competencies:

Skills or qualities characteristic of a UT graduate that can be measured against a standard and developed over the student's academic experience through general education courses, learning communities, out-of-class experiences, and courses in the program major.

General Education (aka core curriculum):

A set of courses offered at the 1000 and 2000 level; designed to provide students with a breadth of knowledge; intentionally designed to address and assess at least two of the core competencies.

Upon graduation, every UT student will be able to:

1. Communicate effectively and clearly
2. Understand scientific and mathematical reasoning
3. Make informed ethical decisions in a diverse community
4. Turn information and data into useful knowledge. Think critically

The Core Experience

All UT General Education courses will contribute intentionally to core competencies

1. Course descriptions and syllabi will address one or more of the core competencies
 2. Courses will contain assignments that assess the competencies
 3. Courses will align with Ohio General Education and Transfer Module guidelines
- Number of courses will be limited.
- i. All UT General Education courses will contribute intentionally to core competencies
 - ii. Course descriptions and syllabuses will address one or more of the core competencies
 - iii. Courses will contain assignments that assess the competencies that then can be included in students' electronic portfolios
 - iv. Courses will align with Ohio General Education and Transfer Module guidelines
 - v. Courses will be selected in a limited number on the basis of their special contribution to the core

Achievements – General Education

- Faculty Senate endorsed core curriculum work and approved for recommendation core competencies, assessment rubrics, and course submission process
- Competency-based general education courses piloted in English Composition and Mathematics, fall semester
- General education course recommendations to be made from Faculty Senate to Provost's Office for implementation with new students fall 2012
- Continued development of selected courses during spring term to ensure appropriate learning objectives and assessment methods

Course Reduction Timeline

Phase 1 Merger

Core curriculum numbered XXX courses

Phase 2 2006 – 2009

Identified XXX courses that were above the 3000 level, had not been offered for X years or did not have student learning objectives.

Phase 3 2011

100 courses or less

Phase 4 Fall 2013

52 – 75 courses

- i. Phase 1: Number of courses at the time of the merger
- ii. Phase 2: During the 2010 – 2011 AY, the number of general education courses was xxxxx. (Checking on numbers and actions.)
- iii. Phase 3: By Fall 2012, offerings in the core will decrease to less than 100 through the review of proposals for courses to be included in what is now "general education"
- iv. Phase 4: By Fall 2013, offerings in the core will decrease to a range of 52 – 75 courses through a systematic process of review and revitalization to be instituted by Faculty Senate. The state requires a minimum of 52 courses to meet Ohio Transfer Module commitments.

Values-Driven Outcomes

- Upward mobility for students
 - Career preparation
 - Revenue impact
 - Needs of employers
 - Student success within the major/plan of study
- i. Values are:
 - ii. Needs of businesses/CEOs/employers (customer)
 - iii. Uncluttered-ness
 - iv. Budget/frugality

Provost McMillen: Fifty-two is the minimum.

President Anderson: Yes, fifty-two is the minimum. So the outcomes will not be presented in that order, but the upper mobility for a student career preparation is going to be impacted, so we are trying to have it at the lower level. Apparently, Dr. Jacobs went to a conference where there was a lot of discussion about employers who was dissatisfied with students coming out of universities.

Senator Thompson-Casado: So, if a course makes it into the first cut into the one-hundred even if that course makes it into that first cut is it still a possibility that it will be eliminated? And what is the decision purview for eliminating that course? Is it strictly revenue? Because a lot of us are in disciplines where numbers are something we can't play with.

President Anderson: No. There will be a continued review process as part of the HLC commitment. Courses will be reviewed on an every two or three year cycle to look at the results of the assessment to see if there's any feedback from that assessment on the course to improve it.

Senator Thompson-Casado: I am very concerned because with foreign languages, MLA which is our governing body sets the class limit with twenty-two students and we are seeing that revenue perhaps is going to be something in the decision making.

President Anderson: I want to put revenue at the lowest priority. There will be some consideration about revenue. In cases as you are pointing out there are obviously other considerations that have to be considered. I should also point out that the state has not considered foreign languages as general education. But they do consider it as satisfying the humanities requirement, but they don't consider it as part of general education. So there is some conflict here.

Senator Thompson-Casado: So there's some conflict about if foreign languages should even be in the core competencies?

President Anderson: There's some discussion to that point. We are hoping very well that it will stay there because we are going to be a global society and we are going to be participating in world betterment of the human condition and foreign languages is a very large part of that.

Senator Lipman: It seems that all of the colleges in one way or another would need creativity or imagination to some aspect in the core competency. It seems in oversight that words like that aren't part of the five fundamentals which makes me ask the question, is this something that has been overlooked? What is the common shared competency agreement about and will the core competencies be looked at at some regular interval so that in oversight it can be addressed and corrected?

President Anderson: Yes, the core competencies as well as the courses themselves will always be reviewed. We admit that when we put this together in a very hurried manner that there are aspects that can be changed. The rubrics should always be available to revision and if they don't work the way they're working then we are going to have to change them. One can ask whether creativity is a competency, I think that's a philosophical discussion and the answer maybe yes.

Senator Peseckis: Are these competencies being driven by the definition of the state and if we want to change them in some way do we need to interact directly with the state somehow and kind of lobby them for changes or can we do them ourselves?

President Anderson: The competencies are entirely up to us; we develop the competencies and we can change them. The state is not interested in competencies at this point.

Senator Hamer: I know last spring there was some discussion about why there should be a limited number of core courses and I have not yet heard any rationale from the committee members. We all know that the money makers are the sections of about two-hundred courses where the kids take multiple choice tests, but do not know how to write a decent sentence. I think President Jacobs has up there the outcomes that employers want, which is to be able to at least construct a paragraph, let alone a five paragraph essay seems like something people want. So, I guess that I have two questions or at least one: Have we heard yet what the rationale for limiting the number of courses is? If we do not have a standard rationale the obvious rationale is to make the most money off of these “poor ignorant kids” as we can.

President Anderson: I just received an email from one our committee members with that exact question. Senator Lingan, do you have a comment about that?

Senator Lingan: I was just going back to what Senator Lipman said because Senator Lipman just repeated something that I pointed out when we first saw these competencies. As far as creativity I do want to urge you whoever is involved to go back and look at the research concerning “*Creative Economy*,” “*Creative Culture*” and other matters discussed in the discipline of Creativity Studies. Solid research shows that creativity is a competency that is learned and it actually diminishes depending upon the process of education. I want to urge them to look at that. Creative problem solving is very important to students because graduates are going to have to deal with tasks in jobs that don’t even exist yet. We cannot possibly prepare them for the specifics of a changing employment landscape. There is a lot of research regarding creativity as a learned and marketable skill that leads to employment and we should appoint someone to study that research, because it is interesting and relevant.

President Anderson: We will keep you in mind.

Senator Wedding: Can you put the five points back up there.

President Anderson: Do you mean five competencies, which you have seen over a thousand times, but we can put them back up? Those are the generic words for the academic titles.

Senator Wedding: Doesn’t number two sort of slant this in a different direction “...understanding scientific and mathematical reasoning?”

President Anderson: Yes.

Senator Wedding: Is that a sort of spin approach?

President Anderson: On the other hand do we not want that to be a competency?

Senator Wedding: I think I want something else to accompany it.

President Anderson: Well, we had this discussion before and as I said these things are always removable and always changeable.

Senator Heberle: I’m sorry that I came in late, but I am not just quite sure of the purpose for Senate constantly revisiting these discussions that we’ve been having for the last year and a half. Some of us think we lost the battle. Some of us think we need to keep fighting the battle. President Anderson seems to be encouraging us to stay on top of this and review these standards, and review these problems and issues with the numbers. We talked about the numbers last year and it was extensively discussed to be an issue, and it is. To also add to your question, the numbers are the courses that the students are actually

enrolling in—we offered hundreds of “core” courses but students only actually enrolled in significant numbers in about 60 of them. This is one substantive reason for the request for the cutback. So, I am not quite sure where the discussion is going. I would like to ask my colleagues to start strategizing about how to fix this problem right now at this stage so we can talk about that and start strategizing about how to move forward and make sure the new core is workable and solid rather than this.

President Anderson: Thank you. I also point out that this is a short presentation that is supposed to go to the Board. The input that I would like is about changing this slideshow. So, I do want to encourage us to continue this discussion if it comes out of the Core Curriculum Committee as issues to be resolved on or another group of people that continues to look at this, I certainly want to encourage that.

Senator Hammer: I just have some confusion then. It seems that all of the suggestions so far encourage making changes up there. What kind of changes are we looking for suggestions about? I guess if you want me to state mine as a suggestion I would suggest that we not limit the number of core courses and that we do not move towards fifty-two in 2015, that would be my suggestion.

President Anderson: Yes. I think that is something that we will need to do in a very careful manner. It is being suggested that we say what our intentions are and then come back and modify those intentions if they are not feasible, and this could be such a situation.

Senator Regimbal: I said this before and I would like to point it out again. I believe that we need to keep in mind that there’s a difference between a core competency and a core course and that the language gets mixed up all the time. So, I hope when you go to the Board of Trustees that you would differentiate those things because it shows up there that we have courses going up at the 4000 level and I don’t see that we have core courses that go to the 4000 level. So, we need to clarify the language particularly for the Board.

President Anderson: Yes, we talked about that quite a bit in smaller groups and indeed that is why we want to use the word “general education” which is the 1000 and some 2000 level courses that have a broad range. Then the core competencies will travel throughout the curriculum, but start with the general education.

Senator Hewitt: Number five is actually two competencies bolted together, think critically and learning integratively so we probably should adjust the slide to accommodate both of them. Also, in the previous slide it states “...these are supposed to be things that are measurable” and “understand” is not measureable. Therefore, I suggest that you should probably rephrase number two with something like “reason scientifically and mathematically.”

Senator Sheldon: I don’t understand why number five can’t say “think critically and/or creatively” because to think creatively is to think critically.

President Anderson: That’s a very simple change.

Senator Hill: I was looking at all those competencies up there and I am an artist, and do you know something? You would have to have all those competencies to be a creative artist. In some aspect we are on the right track, but I do think once we review this process a year or two years from now that we might be adding more, it’s possible. But I don’t think the floor of the Senate is the place to argue this out, so we should probably move on.

President Anderson: Okay, is there any other commentary? Thank you very much and I would like to move on past this point because we do have some other things to cover. That concludes my report. We

have some other undergraduate business, Dr. Peseckis. Please note that every table has a course proposal on it.

Senator Peseckis: The Curriculum Committee over the last two weeks reviewed courses from Adult and Lifelong Learning, the College of Business, and Judith Herb College of Education and Health Science and Human Services. It is a recommendation from the committee that these course proposals be approved. If I have a vote for your approval please say “aye.” Any opposed? Any abstentions? ***Motion approved.*** Thank you. The following are the courses that were approved.

President Anderson: Thank you very much. Next, we have Professor Humphrys who will inform us about the Core Curriculum Committee and the Committee plans.

Senator Humphrys: Thank you President Anderson. There are some members from the committee who are not here today so I thought that I would introduce them when we make our presentation that President Anderson stated a few moments ago on December 6th: Mark Templin, Diane, Susan Batten, John Napp, Dian Cappelletty, Kristen Keith, David Krantz, and Scott Molitor. I am going to give a brief overview on the things that we done thus far in the Core Curriculum Committee and if you have any questions I would be happy to answer those.

We had one-hundred and ten submissions for courses to be included in the new general education list. I am trying not to say the word “core”. What the Committee is doing and has done is review those submissions and we reviewed them based on the criteria that was developed by the Faculty Senate and approved by the Faculty Senate as well as the state’s general education guidelines. We will be presenting a list of courses that we have determined that meet those criteria(s) at the December 6th Faculty Senate meeting for a preliminary approval. If you can remember there’s a two step process that was approved by the Faculty Senate. One of the deadlines was in October and the other deadline for the courses that have been included or deemed as meeting the criteria going forward that will be produced and will need some additional information by March 4th, which is the second deadline. So, we will be bringing that information to the Faculty Senate on December 6th. Also, if a course that we felt did not meet the criteria what I would do is contact the course contact person, basically whose name was on the proposal to let them know. The Committee would be meeting again before December 6th so in case they would like to come and meet with the committee I would be happy to speak with them if they have some additional issues or questions they can come and meet with us as a Committee. On December 6th we are also going to make a recommendation to the Faculty Senate as a Committee that we do not accept any additional courses into the current core curriculum. And actually the reason that we did that, it may seem kind of bizarre to request that but there had been a preliminary request for a course to be included in the current core curriculum. We decided as a Committee that if this transfers to the new system that it would be best if we not entertain any official courses for the “old” core that is currently in existence. So, that kind of gives you an overview, are there any questions?

President Anderson: One other thing, this was endorsed by the Executive Committee.

Senator Humphrys: We will make it official on December 6th from our list of proposals that you have received.

Senator Lundquist: So you are not accepting new courses to the old core?

Senator Humphrys: Right.

Senator Lundquist: But are you accepting new courses into the new core?

Senator Humphrys: We discussed that preliminarily as a committee mainly because that hasn't been kind of the major things on the front since we had all these existing polls that have been given to us. But I think the general feeling is that there's probably no reason not to accept on an ongoing basis proposals. The only thing that I can say at this point is that if someone will come forward and say that they would want to put a proposal in for the new general education courses that they would have to submit all the information by the March 4th deadline. As opposed to the two-step process that we had where initially the information is about five categories of information that we needed by October and the remainder would be by March. So, I think it is a long answer, but yes, I think we would. I would have to consult with the Committee first, but if someone gives all information to us by March 4th we would certainly consider it.

Senator Lundquist: I guess I need a longer answer than that. So, if a department wants to propose a new course.

Senator Humphrys: A brand new course?

Senator Lundquist: Yes, a brand new course that would eventually be in the core, should they be putting it through all of the levels to get approved, the old ones, are we jumping over those for the new general educational courses?

Senator Humphrys: Well, the portions of the course will go through Senator Peseckis' committee for an approval and then yes they would have to go through the process for getting into the general education list of courses. So, the answer is yes they will have to. Those are basically as they are now. Those are simultaneousness processes. We can go through to get it approved as a new course then we can indicate that you also want it to be considered, so sure you can do that. But what we will be bringing up as a resolution at the December 6th meeting is we are saying that we are not approving any courses for the pre-existing core. I should also mention that the next step as a committee is we are going to make decisions on those courses that meet the criteria and that's going forth to the March 4th deadline. We will be contacting everybody as well as the people that we feel don't meet the criteria. Also, we will be letting everyone know what is going to be required by the March 4th deadline. I imagine that will be something that we will be looking on at beginning of next semester.

President Anderson: I just want to comment here; any new courses will be going through the same curriculum review process all the way from departments and colleges. We are trying to find out at this moment if the curriculum tracking system is yet up, apparently not. It's supposed to be up tomorrow, but maybe in the next three or four weeks it will be up. There are issues with it so it is not entirely one person's fault or any personal fault. Maybe it is Banner's fault, we can all blame on it on Banner. Are there any other comments or questions?

Senator Lundquist: I am sorry if this was already asked, but did you say over one-hundred courses that are going to be proposed?

Senator Humphrys: We received one-hundred and ten proposals, yes.

Senator Lundquist: So, in the event that every single one of them meets the criteria does that mean that every single one of them will become part of the new core?

Senator Humphrys: Well, that is a good question. I cannot assure you that every single one of them will be a part of the new core, but if the person who proposes the course provides the required information and it all seems to fit with the criteria then I would guess that basically the second step is more of an assurance step, sort of speak. So it could be a possibility that something can go forward. We did have courses might I add that were kind of "on the line" and those courses would probably be courses that are

either going to benefit from or maybe confirm our doubts in what we found to be an issue in the original proposal. So yes, but there are no guarantees if you already missed the first grouping that you would be assured that you will be part of the final list.

Senator Lundquist: Do you have a list of criteria by which you are judging?

Senator Humphrys: I do. I actually brought some copies. This is a list that Faculty Senate approved on September 13th according to this. You will see that there are two parts to this. Although it says “draft” I think that was the version that we recently received. Those are the two steps: there’s a grouping that was due by October and those are the two proposals that we are currently looking at. Then there’s the March 4th deadline which will be a second grouping that we will be looking at. And those were developed by various committees. I am not sure about exactly who did, but my committee did not develop these sets of criteria.

President Anderson: The latest message in--the curriculum tracking is ready!

Senator Dowd: With regard to the information that you handed out, is it correct that it can be altered and amended?

Senator Humphrys: I would assume so, yes. That was approved by the Faculty Senate in the fall, President Anderson am I right?

President Anderson: Yes. This is a continuing process and I do want to say to keep giving advice to your committees to submit courses. Time will go on, but you are expected to submit your course and the various courses that Senator Humphrys’ committee approves will be the final answers.

Senator Dowd: I believe the Faculty Senate should offer its continuing appreciation for the very hard work that you and your committee are doing.

Senator Humphrys: Thank you. We are fortunate that we have a great committee and the people are very committed to this have taken this work with importance.

President Anderson: Thank you very much, Professor Humphrys. Next, we have Matt Rubin to report to us about student affairs.

Matthew Rubin: Good afternoon everyone, my name is Matt Rubin and I am the current president of Student Government. I am very happy to be here today. I would like to introduce to you Heather Ingle who is the current chair of our Student Senate which is our legislative branch of Student Government.

Heather Ingle: Hello everyone, my name is Heather Ingle and I am the current chair of our Student Senate. This is my first meeting and I am hoping to have more experiences this year to become more familiar.

Matthew Rubin: I would like to first mention our loss, Dr. Alice Skeens. The program on Friday was very fitting. For us who knew her I think it was very moving. She played such an important role for students because that is exactly who she was. I think looking at the way that Dr. Skeens prioritized putting students first, then the institution, then her position here at UT. I think we all want to be remembered especially by students in the same way she was. I think it is important that our faculty, staff, and administration everyone from the top down has those same priorities instead of flipped the other way around. So, I think that it is important to keep in mind in the memory of what Dr. Skeens did. This past Friday we held a... for the basket game against central Michigan at the *Savage Arena*. We had over two-

hundred students that came out to watch the game. We also passed a legislation in regards to the library hours. We have a resolution that we are saying that we would like for the library hours to be open until 2 a.m. It will be selected floors that will be... so we will be talking to Dr. Pryor about that. We should bring up the student impact award which Student Government and UT Event Association has passed...I want to take an opportunity for Monday and Tuesday and nominations will be extended until that Tuesday evening, so please encourage your students to nominate your colleagues and professors to make sure that people can be recognized for their extraordinary work. It is great to hear the update on advising because that was something that was brought up from the provost back to students. We are very interested in fixing it. It should be some type of standard for when you see your advisor. The advisory council of the provost talked greatly about this yesterday and that is something we would like to cooperate on to make sure who is appointed. Students should respect the faculty and faculty should respect students when they show up to class. Through our reports I want to give you some ideas on what events that are going on that you can support your students: we have Relay for Life coming up on December 2nd and the 3rd, which goes to cancer research. That is going to be held at the Reck Center and it starts at 6 a.m. Also, we have women's and men's basketball going on right now. Tonight there is a women's basketball game going on at 7 p.m. against Albany and I hope everyone shows up. So if you guys practice your cheers and get them ready to go we would appreciate your support. That is all I have, are there any questions? Have a happy and safe Thanksgiving. Thank you.

President Anderson: I guess we are going to move on now to the budget shortfall presented by Provost McMillen.

Provost McMillen: Thank you President Anderson. Hello everybody, let me first say have a happy Thanksgiving so I won't forget afterwards. I am here to update the Faculty Senate on "The Budget Shortfall Amelioration Project" initiated earlier this fall by President Jacobs. I am the chair of the committee with David Dabney serving as the Vice Chair. The committee has met four times and there are now seven sub-committees. The committee met at 3:00 p.m. this afternoon, so it was just one hour before you started. The purpose of the committee per Dr. Jacobs' charge is to develop new revenue streams that may help offset a projected Fiscal Year 13 revenue shortfall of upwards of \$15 million. It is illustrative to show what I mean by revenue streams by listing the sub-committee names. I will also list the sub-committee chairs and a short description of each sub-committee:

1. Discount Review and Redeployment. Dean Thomas Gutteridge. This includes scholarship reallocation.
2. Enrollment Growth. Vice President Lawrence Burns. This includes a new emphasis on transfer students and also growth in community college students.
 - Larry who many of you know will speak afterwards and he will also be available after I get done for questions.
3. Dual Enrollment/Admissions Programs with Community Colleges. Dr. Charlene Gilbert. This includes other aspects of community colleges, part of an effort that we are going to make with community colleges to partner with them more aggressively.
 - Let me tell you a statistic that many of you may not know if you count our undergraduate enrollment it is about eighteen thousand, three thousand of those students at any given time, right now have had one course or more including an Associate's Degree from Owens Community College. So, one out of every six (1/6) of our students have at some time been at Owens; of course we have enrollment from other community colleges. Our second highest enrollment from any community college is Monroe Community College. Then, there are two or three community colleges near Cleveland, Ohio. We also get a number of students from Terra State Community College in Tiffin, Ohio.
4. State Share of Instruction Maximization. Vice Provost Marcia King Blandford. This includes CIP codes, but also includes other financial relationships with the Ohio Board of Regents.

5. Decreased Attrition. Vice President Kaye Patten Wallace. This is the “hassle” committee which is assigned to make a better service environment for students.
6. Efficiencies. Associate Vice President Brenda Grant.
 - Two committees were added after the first meeting. One committee is the efficiencies committee which doesn’t necessarily have to do with enrollment. It is just finding some of the ways in processes that we can be more cost effective.

Last Friday I met with ten male African American faculty members to discuss a report about African American male graduation rates at UT authored by Professor Patterson and Professor McKether. It is an excellent report and I recommend that you all review it. You may be able to get it from Professor Patterson or Professor McKether, but if you cannot I will certainly provide you with the report. It is extremely well done. It talks about the fact that African American male attendees at the University of Toledo’s graduation rate for five years is approximately 10.8% and African American females have a graduation rate at approximately 17%. The average overall graduation rate as you may know it is approximately 46%. These are students that are already here. Professor Patterson and Professor McKether have outlined a two-page program that addresses this issue with some very positive recommendations. I said to the group last Friday afternoon that we should go ahead with some of these recommendations immediately. I shared the report with Dr. Jacobs.

The idea of these sub-committees is really two-fold, although Dr. Jacobs’ original charge was very precise. He stated that we should explore immediate revenue fixes that will have an impact this year and therefore will reduce the shortfall for next year. For example, we are in discussions with Owens and I am meeting next Tuesday morning with Owens’ provost Renay Scott to increase transfers to UT from their fall graduating class.

But obviously we almost immediately discovered that there will also be longer term revenue issues that we need to explore such as fall 2012 enrollment. I would be willing to speak again on this topic at the December 6 Faculty Senate meeting to discuss some specific ideas. Also, I would repeat that I encourage faculty participation in the committee and the sharing of any ideas that you may have. Larry came over with me after the Committee of Four talked, and if I can ask President Anderson if Larry can come up and make a couple of comments.

President Anderson: Yes. Could you provide the report to us after you provide it to Dr. Jacobs so we can attach it to the Minutes?

Provost McMillen: Sure.

Vice President Burns: Thank you Provost McMillen. The group that I am chairing consists of faculty members and staff. Provost McMillen wanted me to mention probably the most important events that we have on campus is the recruitment of the direct from high school students at the “experience days.” These are the days where we invite students that are already admitted to the University to come back and meet in particular with the college they are interested in entering. They begin on February 4th and what we are hoping to do this year is to involve the colleges even more than they have been in the past to involve faculty members. Again, students have applied and they have been accepted and they have already visited once or twice, and they really don’t want to meet with somebody like me again or a recruiter. They want to look and talk to faculty members that are really going to be teaching them before they decide they are coming to UT or some other university. So, this year we are really going to try to reach out to all of you and your colleagues to try to engage you even more in these important days. These days primarily the event takes place within the college building versus the Union like a lot of our recruiting activities. There are five dates and most colleges participate in two of the five days. So we will be approaching your dean and tell other people to get involved. So that is one of the things that Provost McMillen wanted me to

mention. As he indicated I will be around if anyone has any questions for me about these activities or anything else. Thank you.

Senator Dowd: Provost McMillen if you can come back at the next Senate meeting will it be possible that Dave Dabney can accompany you? You mentioned that there's a \$ 15 million dollar projected shortfall and perhaps Dave Dabney can give a brief description on where exactly the \$15 million dollar shortfalls are, where is it coming from in the University, and which divisions? This is just for general information. Is it coming from academic affairs because \$15 million dollars from academic affairs is an unbelievable amount?

Provost McMillen: I will be certainly happy to mention it, but of course the invitation will come from you. Yes, I think that it is a large number at this early date. It certainly will not come off with our new budget processing, .i.e. academics. It is a moving target. If you follow you may have seen that there have been a couple little tiny articles in the press over the last couple days out of Columbus and it appears that there probably will be a capital bill which we have not budgeted for. For those of you who don't know the way the Ohio System runs, it is a two-year budget bill. In the off years the tradition was, that in the off years of the budget there would be a capital bill. So one year would be the capital bill and the next will be the budget and so on. So, this is the off year for the budget and apparently, there is going to be a capital bill. We cannot take it to the bank yet of course and it is not going to be very large and it is not going to be for building, but if it provides \$3 or \$4 million dollars for us for renovations and so on that will be money that will be helpful because we do not have enough money for the upkeep and so on. Revenue seems to be holding very strongly for the state of Ohio so there may be a correction bill and the other specific money that comes out of Columbus such as the internship money that is still sitting down there, \$15 million dollars that has not been allocated yet.

Senator Rouillard: Could you talk about the first subgroup of new revenues, and the scholarship redeployment?

Provost McMillen: It is Thomas Gutteridge's subgroup. Dean Gutteridge is not here to report, but we heard about five or six reports. Basically, it has to do with tuition fees subsidy and so on. Larry, would you like to add anything to that?

Vice President Burns: Yes. One of the biggest initiatives that I am scoring is out-of-state tuition. In fact, tonight if you are in the car or home WJR will dedicate a full hour to talk about the topic. Our out-of-state tuition is over twice as much as our in-state tuition. And as a border state I personally feel that we are at a disadvantage. So in talking with other major universities around the country I found that most border colleges and universities have very favorable out-of-state tuition to the border states. So tonight I am going to interview the people from the University of Minnesota, the chancellor from North Dakota, a writer from the Council of Higher Education. Minnesota basically has an in-state tuition for the students in Wisconsin, actually it goes both ways. North Dakota has very favorable rates for their surrounding states. They have shown not only does it increase the number of students and more diversity in backgrounds, but the academic development in their states and in their cities has been enormous. Minnesota indicated that most of the big ten schools have an agreement that they won't charge more than one and a half times regardless. Again, we charge over twice as much. When you are fifty miles away and you are being charged twice as much the only way we have been able to recruit recently is through scholarships. So, I am hoping to convince the president, this committee, the provost, and the Board that we need to reduce our out-of-state tuition for our border state, not only to Michigan, but Pennsylvania, Indiana, and maybe Canada. Then that would impact the amount of money of scholarship that we need to use to try to recruit students like Matt Rubin who's from Michigan and others. So, that is probably the most involved project from this subcommittee. I know many of you know more than I do because you worked in other places, but the fact that we don't treat our border states, particularly Michigan, any

differently really is a disadvantage to us for us to recruit more students for you to teach. Our Michigan students' retention rate is 80% from freshmen to sophomores, so the students that do come are doing quite well.

President Anderson: I have a question and that is to what extent is this a state problem? Does the state have to have a ruling?

Vice President Burns: That's a great question. That is kind of where I started. Interestingly enough, one of the community people that I know connected me with someone from the numbers office but it was Economic Development Department and I asked that question, who sets that policy? I think we all know that our reciprocity agreements that the Board of Regents has, for example, Eastern Michigan has reciprocity for the whole state of Ohio and in return we get Monroe county. So I said "Well, that doesn't seem fair, so what's the logic" and I was told that they try to, in the reciprocity agreements, Eastern requires the whole state to get somewhere near what we get from Monroe County in student population, so that is how they set that. My second question was who's responsible for out-of-state tuition rates and they got back to me and said that the Board of Trustees at the universities are. In fact, many state universities in Ohio have tiered tuition based upon their location. Therefore, the answer is we do as a university can set the rate.

President Anderson: That is very interesting.

Vice President Burns: I think it is.

Senator Lipman: Can we operate face-to-face classrooms in Monroe County?

Vice President Burns: If the institution wants to invest there, yes. We have looked at Monroe County and at a few other locations.

Senator Dowd: The work that you are doing here does it apply to graduate students as well or are you only looking at undergraduate students only?

Vice President Burns: Senator Dowd, the only one that I am looking at right now is undergrad, but certainly I can look at graduate as well. I just haven't been involved in that.

Senator Dowd: I think that is important.

Vice President Burns: Absolutely.

Provost McMillen: This committee tendency is to be an undergraduate committee for right now. I think that it might be faculty input that helps with some graduate issues. Maybe we should have a subcommittee for graduate.

Senator Dowd: If you wish, I can speak to the current Chair of Graduate Council and ask him to look into this issue.

Provost McMillen: Dr. Gold and I have financed and released the scholarship money so that graduate faculty and graduate administrators can go after more graduate students.

Senator Dowd: That will be very helpful.

President Anderson: Thank you very much Provost McMillen. We will look forward to your next report.

As reported at the last meeting, the Board of Trustees Best Practices Subcommittee met for the first time to receive its charge and plan later meetings. The intent of the subcommittee is to explore the creation of a “University Senate” model of constituency representation. Several questions were raised, and many more need to be raised. The Executive Committee feels it is necessary to form an ad hoc working group to do research on exemplary cases of faculty governance in order to inform both us and the Board subcommittee. At this point I am going to open the floor up to all volunteers who would like to serve on this special committee. The task will be to look at a variety of aspirational institutions and see what their governance structure is; looking at those that have a faculty senate, plus look at their constitutions, and also look at the few that have a university senate and their constitutions. And I think the Board suggested this at the subcommittee meeting is that we should look at the Minutes of such deliberative bodies, even though I have a feeling that it is not going to happen. And maybe even interview a few faculty members, or presidents of faculty senates, or presidents of university senates to get a feel about how things are going. So, it is a very long and a very intensive process with a short deadline.

Senator Molitor: Can I make a suggestion? We should have the Constitutional and Bylaws Committee look at that.

President Anderson: The committee should be looking at it?

Senator Molitor: Right. They should be looking at other models.

Senator Dowd: If I may? Given their backgrounds and expertise, the Constitution and Bylaws Committee members may be appropriate individuals to look into this issue. However, there are two issues to consider. First, it may be a stretch for the Executive Committee to charge the Constitution and Bylaws Committee to look at that issue. That is, such a charge should come from the Senate itself, not the Executive Committee. The second point is that we may want much broader representation on such an ad hoc group. I am not speaking from the Executive Committee I am only speaking for myself.

Senator Heberle: What was the deadline again that the administration is opposing on this process?

President Anderson: By spring. No one knows the exact date.

Senator Heberle: So, March or April?

President Anderson: Yes, around March or April.

Senator Heberle: Is the Board of Trustees charging this or is it a recommendation?

President Anderson: Yes, it is the Board of Trustees. Partly because certain members of the Board of Trustees are leaving the Board and they want to leave a legacy.

Senator Lipman: Senator Dowd, I am thinking of the meeting that the Committee on Committees held with the broad spectrum of who fit in what groups. Maybe this should be turned over to that group to come up with a recommendation and send it to the Executive Committee of the Senate.

Senator Dowd: That is a good idea. The Committee on Committees can look at it, but the committee charge would have to come from the Senate and not the Executive Committee. I say this because in normal situations the Committee on Committees only makes appointments to standing committees.

Senator Lipman: I realize that.

Senator Dowd: And if the Executive Committee asks the Committee on Committees.

Senator Lipman: It's just that it was a lot of logistics in the way that you organized the grouping for that.

Senator Dowd: If that is the desire of Senate, then the Executive Committee could charge the Committee on Committees. This is just logistics. The Executive Committee works for Senate. So if Senate gives us that instruction then the EC will charge the committee. Again, Senator Lipman has a good idea.

Senator Lipman: I would move that the Executive Committee would consult the Committee on Committees to charge that group.

Senator Dowd: Just charge the Committee on Committees to staff that group.

Senator Heberle: I'm sorry, is the motion to have the Committee on Committees to staff this ad hoc committee? I just want to reiterate Senator Dowd's point. I think that it is a good idea to have this committee with a broader representation from folks that have been on Senate for a while and from those who have not been on Senate for a while. Therefore, we can look at it from a lot of different ways thinking about our faculty governance.

President Anderson: It has been moved Executively, right?

Senator Dowd: It has not been moved by the Executive Committee. It therefore needs a second.

Senator Hewitt: Second.

President Anderson: Is there any further discussion about that?

Senator Thompson-Casado: President Anderson, if the faculty and numbers of the Faculty Senate are happy with the current composition of Faculty Senate why are we doing this? I am sorry to be upfront about this, but this is part of our contract.

President Anderson: Is this part of our contract?

Senator Rouillard: Yes.

Senator Dowd: What exactly does the contract language specify?

Senator Thompson-Casado: It says the Faculty Senate is the official voice for the faculty. If the composition of the Faculty Senate changes then I assume that has to be overlooked again.

Senator Dowd: But there's nothing stopping establishing a university senate above the Faculty Senate. So they can still have a Faculty Senate, but we would simply be a subcommittee of the university senate.

Senator Thompson-Casado: But the contract says that we are "the official voice."

Senator Dowd: I am not arguing, really I am not. But it is possible that we can be a subcommittee of a subcommittee under the university senate and still be the "official" voice.

Senator Thompson-Casado: Anything is possible.

Senator Wedding: What is the reason why we the Senate would cooperate to try to create a “super body” that they would call a university senate? Why would we do that?

President Anderson: I can only think of two reasons for that and I am playing “devil’s advocate” here. One is that it should be a voice for the students and the staff and it doesn’t have to be from the Faculty Senate. Who knows if what we have is the ideal situation. I would suggest for us to try to find out what the “ideal” situation is. Maybe this is it; again that is a “devil’s advocate” kind of answer.

Senator Rouillard: I would like to point out that the Faculty Senate Constitution has an article that allows all nonmembers of the Faculty Senate to speak. They can voice their concerns, but they just cannot vote. So, there’s always been that mechanism for students and for staff to address the Faculty Senate and make their issues known.

Senator Thompson-Casado: Why is the Board of Trustees so worried about the Faculty Senate? Have they given us a reason why they want to do this?

Senator Rouillard: Senator Thompson-Casado, when I was at the meeting I remember three people who asked the question: “what is broken?” and they couldn’t answer. Finally, Dr. Jacobs or Carroll Ashley said “well, we just want to be excellent, so we just want to look at models from excellent institutions that we might imitate.” That was the best reason that they could come up with for doing this.

Senator Wedding: They are in negotiations. Administration has proposed that the Senate be abolished. To some people on the Board of Trustees the Senate is an impediment to the Board of Trustees for doing the things that they want to do, they feel like the Senate is in the way. There have been recent members of the Board who have expressed openly at various functions and I (personally) heard them say that they did not like the Senate. Now, I would like to go back to my first question, why would we want to cooperate with them and try to create this “super senate?” If we are talking about students they do have their own senate and as Matt Rubin said here at the last Faculty Senate meeting out of fifty senators apparently they only have about thirty-five. We have student members on committees. Our Senate Committee has student members who do not frequently show up. Students come and students go, but the faculty stays. We are responsible for the academics and that is our mission and I don’t know why we would be bringing in to this body other members; let them speak, but they should not vote.

Senator Heberle: I have a counter proposal; if we should be “excellent” then perhaps we should establish a committee that would look at excellent public universities that have a university structure and how they appoint their Board of Trustees. I’m serious, because nine year terms, what is that about? Where do these people come from? What are the qualifications? What is the process? There’s no reason why the AAUP in the state of Ohio should not take up these questions, how the Board of Trustees are appointed and if that’s the best way for our institution?

President Anderson: Very clever.

Matthew Rubin: I am currently on the committee and I am not for certain how the structure goes; I just thought that we only have a Student Senate and a Faculty Senate so I did a bit of research. If you are interested to see how the other Minutes read and how other organizations work it is on a website, www.Senate.OSU.edu, but that is just one example. If you have some questions in mind that is a really good site and it explains it, www.Senate.OSU.edu.

Senator Dowd: To respond to Senator Wedding’s question, I think one of Faculty Senate’s responsibilities is to provide as much information to that BOT committee as we can about other

university's faculty senate versus a university senate. The notion is there are pros and cons to each structure and this will simply be providing information so that they can make a more informed decision.

Senator Wedding: I don't need you to speak. It would not matter what we present to them because they are going to do what they please. They are not going to listen to this body. So, to make up a committee and spend a lot of time gathering a lot of information at the end of the day they are going to do what they please. I think the other idea here today was excellent. I think we ought to have a committee to investigate ways of appointing Trustees because we seem to have a collection of them that do not always want to do their job. They delegated their judiciary responsibilities to a president who I have described as "fire, ready, aim" and that is what we are doing here. It is all the same. So, why cooperate with them? If they want to appoint a "super" committee or a "super" senate let them do it, but they will have to do some of this at the negotiation table which starts after January 1st, Senate Bill 5 has been defeated.

Senator Ohlinger: I am sorry that I missed the first part of the discussion, so I just want to ask for clarification. Was this a proposal for someone to look into getting rid of the Faculty Senate to establish a larger group?

President Anderson: There are six or seven different models out including an overarching group with a sub faculty senate, which is a faculty senate that would report through different layers, to having one body that does the work of a faculty senate but is also composed of other members of the university community. I did think of another reason that the Board gave for doing this. I think after someone made a comment it jarred my memory that it also has to do with the way we react to changes in the educational environment. Of course that just means "fadism" to most of us. But, the intention would be to create a university senate that only meets a few times a year and the actual work is done by the an executive committee, and in some cases the presiding officer is the president of the university. So, if those types of models are presented by this committee I really do think at that point we can certainly walk out the door. However, I also think that it will help if we do some of our own research so some of us who are sitting on that committee can at least make some closing arguments.

Senator Wedding: Could we not do that research without creating a formal committee?

President Anderson: Yes, I suppose we can do that.

Matthew Rubin: As a member sitting in the committee who doesn't have allegiance one side or the other I would be very interested to see a report that would come from the Faculty Senate to see if whether or not the structures that we have now are successful. I feel that it can be persuaded in any way. If there is a group that is pushing for one way then I would like to get information from this body since you disagree with the idea of this committee. I think that you would be very helpful.

President Anderson: Okay, we do have a motion on the floor so is there any other discussion about the motion?

Senator Wedding: I move that we table the motion.

President Anderson: Robert's Rules states that we vote on that.

Senator Thompson-Casado: Second.

President Anderson: If you want to have a one minute discussion on that motion we can. All in favor for tabling this discussion please signify by saying "aye."

Group of Senators: “Aye”

President Anderson: Any opposed say “aye.”

Group of Senators: “Aye”

President Anderson: It seems like we are pretty well split..

Senator Krantz: To be specific can we restate what the original motion was?

Senator Lipman: The following is the original motion: to have the Executive Committee consult with the Committee on Committees roster to come up with recommendations to the Senate as a whole.

Senator Dowd: As a friendly amendment I would suggest that the Senate instruct the Executive Committee to instruct the Committee on Committees to simply make the appointments.

President Anderson: So I want a show of hands that are in favor of tabling this discussion please raise your hands. *Motion Defeated. There were eleven votes in favor for tabling the discussion and eighteen votes opposed.*

Senator Wedding: What was the count?

President Anderson: Eleven to eighteen. Okay, let’s move on to the motion of the floor.

Senator Molitor: Should we count abstentions?

Senator Dowd: There aren’t any abstentions on that vote; it is either “yay” or “nay.”

Senator Molitor: Because it is either twenty-seven or twenty-nine that we got from that vote.

Senator Thompson-Casado: Can I make a suggestion? Can we make suggestions instead of being appointed because there may be people appointed to that committee that do not want to be on it? Secondly, look around the room at the faces that are here - this is the merged Senate. Look at the faces of the people who are here as a merged Senate and think about it as a university-wide senate.

Senator Dowd: May I respond to your first point?

Senator Thompson-Casado: Let me add this, those are people who are able to be here. But this is a merged Senate, but if you look around this room this is not a merged Senate.

Senator Dowd: To your first point, anyone who sits on this committee would have to agree to serve on it. We’re not going to force anyone to serve on a committee they do not want to serve on.

Senator Ohlinger: I guess there was a point that was raised, if we do not have quorum do we vote on anything?

Senator Dowd: If you call for quorum then there needs to be a roll call vote. If quorum is maintained then Senate business would continue, but if we do not have quorum then all business stops immediately.

Senator Wedding: Senator Dowd, could you repeat your point.

Senator Dowd: If someone calls for quorum then there must be a roll call vote. If we maintain quorum then Senator Lipman's motion can proceed.

Senator Wedding: Call for a quorum.

[Senate called for Quorum. The roll call was under quorum, and the meeting was adjourned.]

Respectfully submitted by:

Lucy Duhon
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard

Faculty Senate Office Administrative Secretary.