

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
FACULTY SENATE
Minutes of the Senate Meeting of April 10, 2007
<http://www.facsenate.utoledo.edu>

Approved @ FS mtg. 4/24/07

HIGHLIGHTS

Undergraduate Curriculum update
Report on the proposed new constitution of FS
Chinese campus plans
Academic Programs update

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.

Chair Wilson called the meeting to order. **Alice Skeens, Executive Secretary** called the roll.

I. Roll Call –2006-2007 Senators

Present: Ariss, Barnes, Bischoff, Bopp, Byers, Chen, Edwards (for Baines), Fink, Floyd, Randolph, Funk, Horan, Humphrys, Johanson, Kennedy, King, Klein, Lambert, Lundquist, McInerney, Monsos, Moorhead (for Morrissey), Niamat, Olson, Peseckis, Piazza, Poling, Pope, Randolph (for Fridman), Ritchie, Schall, Skeens, Spongberg, Stoudt, Teclehaimanot, Templin, Thompson-Casado, Tramer, Wedding, Wilson, Wolff, Zallocco (42)

Excused: Bresnahan, Cluse-Tolar, Hamer, Hudson, Ott Rowland, Reid, Traband (7)

Unexcused: Barlowe, (1)

A quorum of incumbents was present.

II. Approval of Minutes

Approval of Minutes delayed.

III. Executive Committee Report

Chair Wilson

Faculty Senate Executive Committee Report

April 10, 2007

I have about five issues to report on as part of my Executive Committee Report.

First, as you know we are redoing our election. It is my hope we can put this issue behind us and move forward. We have more difficult issues to address.

As a result of both the election and constitutional issues, and this is the second issue, we will be scheduling a Faculty Senate meeting the week of finals, Tuesday, May 1. The A&S Council has a meeting scheduled the same day. I am making arrangements for us to have our meeting from 3-4.

Third, we have a third summit scheduled for Thursday. The agenda for the summit is as follows:

Review of Goals and Expected Outcomes

Determine Form of Document
Confirm Writing Team
Review Feedback Approval Path/Steps
Establish Timetable

Monday, I met briefly with Lloyd Jacobs and Larry Elmer. We talked about the merger issue. I had emailed a copy of the draft constitution to Jacobs, as well as Jeff Gold and Rob Sheehan, the two provosts. I explained to Jacobs that the Senate must write its own constitution and that we have our own approval process. At this point I am not clear on the document and timetable that this summit is to produce. I stated that many of the issues that we have to work out in our constitution were irrelevant to the summit: These issues included the size of the senate, the term of office, session, the form of representation, and election of officers. I pointed out that we now have a draft constitution. Issues such as committee structures will become part of the by-laws.

Jacobs said that he had no problems with what we had, except Article II, the senate jurisdiction. At the first and last shared governance summit, several contentious issues were raised:

- 1) Whether we have a faculty senate or a university senate or university council
- 2) Whether deans and other administrators would have permanently appointed positions on the senate or not
- 3) Whether deans can speak for the faculty or not
- 4) Whether colleges to the exclusion of the senate would have the right to set admission standards
- 5) Whether the deans or Senate would have the right to make appointments to university committees

We are adamant on these issues: First, the Senate will remain a Faculty Senate. Second, we would allow an ex-officio position on the senate for the provosts. The deans would have to run for office like other faculty members. The deans insist that they are faculty members, then insist on having permanent appointed positions. They cannot have it both ways. Third, the faculty senate is the voice of the faculty, but with this qualification, although there are other voices, the Faculty Senate is the elected, representative voice of the faculty. Fourth, we believe that colleges may set whatever admission standards they deem appropriate, but the senate sets minimum standards for the entire university. We have a proposal for raising the minimum standards for unconditional admission. This proposal will be presented shortly. Finally, we believe that both deans and the Senate should have the right to appoint representatives to university committees. We will hold fast to our principles and to the values that make The University of Toledo a strong institution. We will continue to struggle over these issues. We will insist on a senate as a strong voice for the faculty. We will write our own constitution.

We are beginning to get feedback on the constitution. I agree with most of the comments. What would be most helpful would be written counter proposals. We would have ongoing discussion of our constitution. We will be planning to have an open forum on our constitution, shortly after this next summit.

We have two major reports to come for the Senate: The Report from the Constitution Committee and the Report from the Academic Regulations Committee. I need to note that I had sent the senate proposal to the A&S Council. My understanding was that it was shared by the executive committee, with objections, except that some favored stronger minimum standards for unconditional admissions.

We have a resolution that we need to pass, there are a number of errors on the copies distributed. Rob Sheehan will comment on the resolution.

Provost Sheehan: This resolution is coming to you from the Senate Executive Committee. This resolution is consistent with the strategic plan of the University and consistent with the direction the University is going. A couple of years ago we went rather formally to an admission practice of establishing conditional and unconditional admission. You may recall that two or three years ago we declared that students who came to us without taking an entrance exam would be conditionally admitted and this admission status would in fact be a flag that would prevent students from being eligible for merit based aid, but it would also create a flag that would allow us to really make sure proper placement examinations were given for students who need them. The next year you asked and it went to the Board of Trustees as a second requirement that declared that the high school core curriculum must be taken by students to be unconditionally admitted. That requirement meant that students who came to us particularly without Mathematics, where we see the shortcomings for core curriculum, but students who came to us without that would be conditionally admitted and, again would not be eligible for merit based aid, and again would be flagged for serious scrutiny relative to placement and also a likely placement in a pre-major into the major. We think, the Executive Committee thinks that it is the right time and it is consistent with our strategic plan, and will now go a step further for the fall of '08 class. The resolution that is going to be brought to you which now extends a high school GPA *or* a minimum ACT score to this unconditional admission process.

This is a rather modest step for the fall of '08, as once it gets rolled out in a formal resolution, it is a step that would be for fall of '08. It would not affect many students, in fact the number is fewer than 50, and a resolution that puts us on a path to a discussion here for next year for fall of '09 and it would then be a bit more aggressive it would then suggest an ACT cut off for *and* a high school GPA as required for an unconditional admission.

Once this is accepted it will be the first time that the University has established admission standards overall. It will also set a floor for the College of Arts & Sciences and the University College. These colleges don't currently have formally establishing admission standards at a college level. So at this point once you have the floor determined by this body, you can then have a more useful conversation with colleges themselves relative to their own admission standards. Each college would establish what a pre-major admission standard is and a full major admission standard is. At this point in time all of the pre-major admission standards would be above the floor the Faculty Senate is being asked to establish at this meeting. And consistent with past practice if in fact you support continued movement in this direction, it would perhaps then be appropriate to move that resolution forward to my office as provost and I would be glad to introduce it on Monday at the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees seeking their approval and also confirming the role of Faculty Senate in establishing University wide admission standards.

Senator Randolph: Does this supersede or add to the current policy of having a college preparatory high school core?

Provost Sheehan: The resolution should speak to what I think the intent of the Executive Committee is which is to complement. So it would be adding a step. We are already putting a number of students in an official admission category because of the absence of the core, we should continue to do so, same is true for the entrance exam admission which is beginning to send a message. It also sends

a message that it is not just selectivity, in fact, students will still get admitted to the University under the resolution that is going to be proposed, but it's beginning to send an informative message that high school preparation does count as a measure of success or likely success. What is being introduced does not pre-empt any college and does not pre-empt any pre-major status and does not pre-empt students being placed into a high curriculum, the proper term is Academic Skills Enhancement Program. So none of what is being introduced pre-empts anything, it simply suggests where the University is likely going.

Senator Edwards: Can you give us some idea of the numbers of students that were affected by the last resolution that was accepted to have the high school core requirement?

Provost Sheehan: I will use the data from Fall of '06. In Fall of '06 we had only 26 direct from high school students coming without an ACT or an SAT. That number has precipitously dropped. When I first came to the University about 10% of the entering class did not have an ACT which would have been somewhere in the neighborhood of 300. Again in the Fall of '06 the students that were missing the core, new direct from high school students is 435. That number has also dropped. There are more students coming to us with a core curriculum in fall of '06 than was true for fall of '05.

Senator Edwards: What's the percentage of this?

Provost Sheehan: That's 435 on a base of 3165. Again the numbers of students that would be affected by the change proposed here by the Senate Executive Committee is 45. We are trying to accomplish several things: establish the principle of the Faculty Senate as the owner of the University admission standards and also attempting to affirm the direction the University is seeking to go while still preserving a portal of entry for under-prepared students.

Senator Barnes: My question is about the ACT score; my understanding was that conditional admission is the program for students who have an ACT of eighteen or lower. It looks now with this proposal that a student with an eighteen ACT would be an unconditional admit, so it appears that the admission standard is actually being lowered.

Provost Sheehan: Which program are you referring to?

Senator Barnes: The Academic Skills Enhancement, the students who are conditional.

Provost Sheehan: I need to ask Dennis Lettman relative to that.

Prof. Lettman: In order to be admitted as a pre-major student, you need an ACT score of 18 or less. So a student with 18 would maintain a full admit and not be admitted as a pre-major. So there is that one point difference.

Provost Sheehan: So you are suggesting this proposal should be a 19?

Prof. Lettman: Either that or a score greater or equal to 18 that would take care of it.

Provost Sheehan: The intent of the Executive Committee was to be consistent with our current practice. If you made that as a friendly amendment on the floor once that resolution is read I suspect that is what we will see. Other comments?

Prof. Jorgensen: A comment to support this. This helps to get the message to high school counselors who are talking to students. If you want to have an unconditional admit to the University of Toledo you need to aim for a core curriculum, to have good grades and an ACT score. We will still be an open admission school in giving a chance to students but offer the distinction that's important to high school students.

Provost Sheehan: If you are as visual as I am, you can take a look at the log item which suggests what might happen in Fall of '09 and if you were to accept it as written in the **or**, "...a GPA greater and equal to 2.0, or an ACT score greater than 18..." that is in fact the motion that is being made to you by the Senate Executive Committee effective Fall of '08. We have been clearly on the record according to the Log Item that a Fall of '09 conversation would then play out this coming Fall. One of the reasons why we are here today is that we will be going to press with admission materials in another month for recruiting in the Fall of '08 class. So it's important that the Senate goes along with this motion yet to be made by Carter. The motion would not impact at all students who are admitted to the academic skills center, but it would send a clear message where the University stands.

Chair Wilson: I want to add to the motion full unconditional admission, so the motion reads:

The Faculty Senate supports a minimum standard for full unconditional admission for the Fall Semester of 2008 of either a grade point average (GPA) greater or equal to 2.0 or an ACT test score greater than 18.

Senator Barnes: Does it matter that it says 2009?

Chair Wilson: No, that's a different motion you are looking at. The 2009 motion is a log item and it will go to the Academic Regulations Committee.

Senator Stoudt: Is there another typo on this log item, then?

Chair Wilson: Yes, there is.

Senator Stoudt: So it should not be "or", it should be "and"?

Chair Wilson: Right.

Senator McInerney: If there isn't any language problem, your transparency should say 19 or higher, so if the target should be 19 it should say 19.

Chair Wilson: Can we accept that as a friendly amendment?

Senator Edwards: Yes.

Provost Sheehan: Can I offer an observation that moving it to 19 moves the number of affected individuals from 435 to 53, so this is not a big change in terms of its impact.

Chair Wilson: Is this acceptable?

Senator Edwards: Yes.

Senator Wolff: A grade point average and an ACT score.

Senator Stoudt: No, the question of GPA and ACT score is the recommendation for 2006; that is a different document.

Senator Randolph: You might want to include, "...or equivalent SAT".

Chair Wilson: So it will now read "...ACT test score greater than or equal to 19 or the equivalent SAT." Other comments? If not, all those in favor, please say "aye", opposed, same sign. *Passed unanimously.*

Provost Sheehan: I want to take this opportunity to thank you all for your support over the years, particularly this past year. Each and everyone one of you has helped shape a positive relationship and I'm full of optimism that you will establish a similarly positive relationship with the new Provost. I spent about three hours with her and she comes to you with a lot of excitement and anticipation. So, thank you all for your time. I do believe this admission standards process is perhaps my last function. I enjoyed the past five years, it's been a lot of fun.

Chair Wilson: If there are no objections I would like to reverse the order on the agenda and ask John Barrett and Barb Floyd for their report on the constitution.

Senator Floyd: Thank you Carter. As you know since we began discussions about merging the two senates about a year ago, it became obvious there are some important issues to keep in mind, First, the two senates have very different cultures. Our senate can be described as a more activist senate than the senate on the HSC, although I believe they look to us as a model of a senate they would like to be. There are also differences in functions and purposes of the two senates.

One is that the Faculty Senate on the main campus does control the curriculum for undergraduate courses and establishes academic policies, not something the HSC Faculty Senate does for the courses offered on the HSC. Secondly, the HSC Senate deals with issues that we do not deal with because they are covered under the CBA. We do deal with these issues for people not covered under the CBA, like the Law faculty and superannuates. They deal with a lot of issues about grievances, working conditions, etc. They have that in their by-laws, but I'm not sure how active they are in pursuing those issues. Those are two very important differences that we've had to overcome as we began to merge these two constitutions together.

As you know we began discussions in December about what a new constitution might look like and we made some considerable headway. I reported those discussions to you at a previous meeting. Also at that time the BOT came forth with its resolution saying they would like to merge the senates by July 1, and established a series of discussions called “summits on shared governance”. I can say that in those discussions there has been some considerable push-backs from trustees and deans with aspect to responsibilities of the faculty senate, and that’s a battle which may yet unfold for us.

The President also requested that a committee be established to write our constitution. We already have a committee that is charged with writing our constitution and amending our constitution. So we are moving forward with the procedures that have been established in our current senate to draft this constitution. To that end, all of the recommendations we have made as joint executive committees were forwarded to John Barrett and this constitution writing committee consisting of our Constitution & Rules Committee – myself, John Barrett and Berhane Teclehaimanot, and the three people at the HSC. The HSC faculty senate doesn’t have a Constitution & Rules Committee Writing Committee, and they appointed three people to work with our committee. The product of these discussions was forwarded to you. I would like very publicly to thank John for all the work that he did. He sat down with the recommendations and with our current constitutions and did the first draft. I refer to him as the James Madison of Faculty Senate. He put many hours into this. Today we will present to you what we have come up with and we would very much like your feedback because we need to move quickly to get this to a vote by this body and then by the entire faculty hopefully before this semester is over. That is the process we believe we must follow. It requires a vote of the entire faculty with two-thirds of those returned mailed ballots, and that is the process we must follow regardless of what might be suggested to us this Thursday.

John Barrett: As a drafting matter I wanted something that would look familiar on both campuses so I basically started with our constitutional structure but certain provisions are extensively borrowed from the by-laws of the HSC, particularly Article II, which outlines specific responsibilities and the section dealing with officer duties. We really didn’t have anything like that. There needed to be a little bit of give and take in creating something that would be familiar and comfortable for everybody

Senator Floyd: Compromise is very much a product of what you see here. Hopefully between the two bodies we can come to an agreement and have a constitution that we feel will have a strong voice for the faculty. This was distributed to you earlier, but I wanted to point out a few things to you.

- Article I. The scope of the senate – there was a controversy at our last summit meeting about what the scope of the faculty senate should be, and who it represents and this is the statement that we have drafted:

“The Faculty Senate of the University of Toledo is an elected body of the faculty, with responsibility to promote the mission, function and interests of the University of Toledo and its faculty. As such, the Faculty Senate acts as the representative voice of the faculty.”

Any comments on that? Then moving to Article II. Responsibilities and Jurisdiction

Most of these are obvious. Paragraph C is the one that is there to provide for writing rules and appendices for faculty not covered by the CBA.

I must point out that we do not have rules and appendices in this particular constitution. That is something you must trust us to work out through the summer if this merger happens. We simply don’t have the time to do all the detail work required to draft the rules and appendices. Those will be brought back for vote by the senate and will require a two-thirds vote of the Senate to be amended to the constitution. Any concerns about paragraph C? Harvey, do you have any concerns?

Senator Wolff: When talking about the academics, are we talking about the undergraduate or graduate or both?

Senator Floyd: We are talking about the undergraduate and in the rules section that would be defined.

Senator Wolff: In paragraph G it talks about provost, vice-provost but not the president.

Senator Floyd: Right. I think that has been the offices we have traditionally evaluated, but not presidential evaluation. How do you feel about that? Would you like Faculty Senate to do the assessment of the president, or is that something you prefer, I think there is a requirement in the president's contract that that would be done by the BOT. I'm open to suggestions. Any strong feelings one way or the other on presidential evaluation?

Senator Barnes: I think it would be great and I would like to support that change.

Senator Floyd: Any other feedback? We will take that under advisement. Anything else on the Responsibilities and Jurisdiction section?

Senator Tramer: I wonder about the intent of article II, section H. Surely the Senate does not want to be involved in all faculty appointments. That needs to be clarified.

Senator Floyd: No, we are talking about the University-wide academic appointments, provosts, vice provosts, those kind of things. We will work on clarification of this. Certainly we don't want to involve the Senate in appointments to the deans.

Senator Wolff: What's envisioned here is similar to what we do now with curriculum.

Senator Floyd: Right. If I were to guess what point would be the most difficult one, it would be paragraph E. If we don't have these particular duties, what is the purpose of having faculty senate.

John Barrett: It's largely in the constitution, so it is not a major change for us.

Senator Stoult: I appreciate that point, but shouldn't it be more explicit, including the word 'curriculum'. Will this be clearly understood?

John Barrett: I think it is clear, but we can add 'curriculum' if people think it is necessary. I also added a provision on clarifying ambiguities, which we don't have in our current constitution.

Senator Wolff: The University administration means the central administration.

Senator Floyd: Yes. Any other comments?

Prof. Jorgensen: I wanted to comment on the general view from those on the HSC that colleges are independent. The College of Medicine is independent because it has to be accredited in its own way and their faculty sit and vote on which internships a medical student takes. So there is some hesitancy to expand authority beyond the college. But remember that the HSC includes now the College of Pharmacy and the College of HSHS as well as what has become part of the College of Nursing. So the purpose of this one aspect, which took a long time to agree to by the other Faculty Senate Executive Committee, was Senate review and approval of undergraduate curriculum matters. These items will still come to the Faculty Senate. What has been suggested is that curricular changes would appear on the web in advance and that the Curriculum Committee would commit to a 30-day turnaround to make a decision. It would be a consent agenda to the Senate that all Senators would be invited to raise an issue, but unless there is an objection in a Senate meeting, it is passed. So to facilitate it is fairly easy, but this is the sticking point and not everyone accepts this position, although the HSC Executive Committee does accept it.

John Barrett: At least from my perspective I think it is clear that the undergraduate curriculum is what is meant. When I drafted this, I also drafted an initial set of rules and initial appendix, part of which may have CBA issues that needed to be sorted out, I didn't know all those. But there is a detailed section in the rules that talks about curriculum specifically and talks about being undergraduate curriculum that you are not seeing here but that is certainly the scope at least in the current contemplation the people doing the drafting. If we get too explicit we risk push-back, which is something you have to think about.

Senator Floyd: At this point I'm going to wait on Article III, that one will likely have some discussion.

John Barrett: Putting aside the membership issues, I was instructed to use three-year terms in Article IV. We agreed to allow a senator to be re-elected for one term, and I modified our current provision dealing with appointment in mid-term, because of someone retiring to deal with whether that counts towards re-election or not, so the issue here is three-years, and whether re-election is acceptable. Any comments or feedback?

Article V has several significant changes worth pointing out. Our executive committee is going to be a little different in structure, as is our officers' structure. The biggest difference is we are going to have a president elect who becomes the president who becomes the past president. So three of the officers on the executive committee are in the process of serving a three year term. Additionally, we will have an elected person to the faculty advisory committee for the OBOR, we will have a secretary and then four representatives, two from each campus. Because it was a little hard to sort out which campus you might be from, we decided to define this according to which provost your college reports to as the clearest delineation. Because of this three-year presidential cycle and assuming that we are not always going to elect a president elect in the first year of that person's senate term, we had to deal with the notion of what to do if somebody is elected president elect in the second or third year, since they will run out of time on their senate term. There were several different options. The way we decided to go forward was the president elect will remain a senator during the president and past president years, if they happen to be re-elected that is fine because you're allowed to be re-elected. If they are not re-elected we will expand the senate by one spot, or as necessary by two. There will then be one, or two, additional people in senate for the remainder of their terms without deducting a slot from the college such person(s) came from. The alternative would have been to have them remain a senator from that college using one of the college's spots, or at least that's the alternative we discussed. There is a lot of technical language about making this stuff work but I think that a lot of it is just operative language. Any comments on Article V?

Senator Stoudt: Having served on the Executive Committee several times, I have seen what an incredible responsibility being chair of Faculty Senate is. What is being proposed is basically a three-year commitment, with the second year being the most demanding. This is quite an expectation of a faculty member.

John Barrett: Generally speaking if you have served on the executive committee you can immediately be re-elected to the senate at the end of your term, so it allows one to serve beyond two terms; that's something you might want to think about. And generally speaking an officer can be re-elected to another officer position, including the same position, with the exception of past president who cannot be re-elected to the position of President-Elect. Overall, this follows our current constitutional structure but I wanted to highlight these provisions because of the nature of the presidential change.

Prof. Jorgensen: I was a chair last year so I am a past chair now and I am an ex-officio on the Executive Committee. I am not a senator and, I chose not to run, and I don't get to vote on the senate. As of a few years ago the Senate chair has been given a reduced teaching load during that year. So the Senate Chair does get some consideration for the effort, but the vice chair and the past chair and the other officers do not and there were some time commitments. A person can still pick and choose what sort of things they want to get involved in. I think it is important to do this for the continuity. There needs to be a voice for the faculty with some experience and so that someone can raise their hands and say, 'wait a minute, we tried that and it didn't work'. The faculty has to have a consistent knowledge.

John Barrett: **Article VI** - We borrowed it from the medical college's by-laws because they outline specific officer duties. They are fairly standard and follow what we would expect. Article VIII of A says the president shall be one of the board of trustees reps, the other one would be president – elect as forth in **Article B**, and to reduce the burden on the president we chose under C to have the past president be the alternate to the OBOR in the even the representative can't make it. The rest of it is straight forward. Any comments

Senator Stoudt: One editorial comment under D: 3 should read "...ensure that Senators and all other faculty..."

John Barrett: Article VII is borrowed from the current constitution, same with Article VIII, Article IX, Article X and Article XI. I decided to add Article XII because some issues came up with the executive committee and we didn't have a court to go to to interpret the constitution so I decided to make up something. If there are any ambiguities we will hand it over to a majority vote of the faculty senate to decide.

Senator Edwards: Since the constitution itself requires a vote of the whole faculty, would there be different procedures for changes to the interpretations of the constitution verses the appendix to the rules.

John Barrett: We could do that if we wanted to, but if you have an interpretation issue, generally speaking you want to respond to it quickly. Sending it to the whole faculty for a vote is time consuming. This process isn't designed to deal with ambiguities. On the other hand, amendments to the constitution must be sent to the faculty. For example, we are adding in essentially a whole new group of people to vote and dealing with issues of who fits in it and who doesn't. There may be questions as to whether certain types of employees are entitled to vote, which would be covered by this provision. I felt that giving the senate this power, because anything that's set by the senate can be trumped by a university-wide vote anyway, would be a way to have an official resolution while not disempowering university faculty as a whole. But it is a compromise.

Senator Olson: Part of the problem is when the constitution was written in 1967 or 68 we did not have the language to cover the structure. As a result there was a debate, and it could have gone either way based on that language, so we had to have that resolved. I think this is an excellent article.

Senator Edwards: The rules and the by-laws and the appendices usually in an organization can be amended much more quickly than the constitution itself.

John Barrett: The difference is that even to amend the rules or appendix requires a two-thirds vote of the senate, at least that is the way it is currently in the rules and appendix, whereas this allows a majority vote to clarify an ambiguity for all three documents.

Article XIII. Shared Governance. This is just a reference to an item that will be set out in detail in the Appendix. I am not quite sure that it even belongs here, but it's something we're trying to add into our structure.

Senator Floyd: This is not an attempt to tell the colleges what their governance body should look like, or how many members, how it's selected. It's just stating that every college should have some governance body that coordinates its activities with the faculty senate because this is an issue with certain deans. This is the college centric model we have heard so much about and I wanted to address it somehow.

John Barrett: The concept is a college can decide to use a representative body or meet as a body of the whole. It is basically left to each college to lay out the details. The guidelines will be in the appendix and not in the constitution itself.

Article XIV. Transitional Provisions. We currently have two senates so we need to transition. Since both senates have their own rules, Section A essentially says the way we will adopt this constitution is by both senates following their own current provisions for an amendment as the validation process. The one caveat is that everyone who will be eligible to serve as a senator will be entitled to vote on the constitution, which includes the lecturers, on both campuses. If either side elects not to adopt the amendment, the vote for amendment of the other will have no effect. The amendment vote applies only if both sides approve it.

Section B was designed to talk about the creation of the appendix. The notion being that the faculty senate executive committee will appoint a group to do it, or do it themselves, then there would be open forums for feedback, then the appendix would be sent to the new senate for approval by a two-thirds vote, with the exact voting procedure to be determined by the executive committee.

Section C references the rules of the faculty senate. The process is the same as for adopting the appendix. The rules will cover how meetings are run, senate committees, and election of senate officers and representatives to university committees. I should add that the Appendix will cover elections to faculty senate, UCAP and UCS, and university wide votes, with college governance being added.

Section D. What happens to all the committees that are currently governed once we have a merged senate? We don't have the rules yet to create new committees nor an outline of the committees, because the committee structure is in the rules. I basically said everyone stays in their current positions until you elect somebody new or if the committee is to be phased out, and I gave the faculty senate executive committees the power to merge committees as they feel is appropriate. I will skip Section E and come back to it, because I noticed something I left out.

Section F. It says once we adopt the constitution, the appendix, the rules and elect the people in E, this article drops out so it doesn't become an eyesore for future constitutions. This article is designed merely as transition.

Section E. This is really the election process for electing senators and officers to the newly merged senate. For election of the senate, the current executive committees would jointly conduct elections and they will lay out the rules and procedures, because we don't have rules adopted. I decided as a practical matter everybody is up for election even if you are just finishing up a term. It is expected that these committees will generally follow the current rules for elections.

One of the problems with the transition that is new here is that if we elect everybody at once, everyone's term is going to expire at the same time and we won't have staggered offices, so I had to insert two sentences to create the stagger- one procedure if you have more than two representatives and a slightly different procedure if you have only two representatives. Quite frankly we will need to tweak this a little to get a third, a third, a third being elected each year. We can play with that as necessary. Once the senate is elected the senate is to conduct the officer elections. Once again the rules and procedures will be at the discretion of the current executive committees. If we elect the officers as written, we only elect the president elect, you don't elect the president and past president because they are supposed to be following up, so I created a procedure for a one time election for all three seats.

Senator Peseckis: Wouldn't it make sense to have the past president's position occupied by the two presidents of the current senates?

Senator Floyd: That's something that needs to be worked out.

Prof. Jorgensen: Referring back to Article II, the senate and both Senate Executive Committees have been invited to a meeting Thursday morning to meet with Board members, the deans and the provosts, and one of the agenda items is to create a committee to write the constitution for the faculty. This Senate's Executive Committee position is that we are working on our constitution. Does this Senate back up that position of the Executive Committee?

Senator Barnes: Wholeheartedly. And I think we can say we are done talking about it. We are already doing it and we don't need to go over it. It seems every time there is a report on shared governance they repeat the same thing as if they are not listening.

Senator Olson: Do we need a resolution to support it?

Senator Floyd: I don't think so, I think we need to vote on it.

Chair Wilson: We need to get a sense and will need to take appropriate step for our position. come back

Senator Floyd: Is there a sense of the senate that this is the document that we should work with and that you support? Send your comments with any specific questions to John or I, and Berhani, and we will get something to you,

John Barrett: Our committee will sit down with all the comments, compromise, and bring it back to everybody for a final vote.

Senator Floyd: We would like to do that in two weeks. This is the process established to amend the constitution.

John Barrett: I believe we will use pretty much our rules since the MUO bylaws don't have the detail our rules have. But we didn't want to shove those down the other campus's throat and force them to be familiar with them to get the constitution passed. If we need to tweak some things, we will do that. The notion is university-wide full inclusion, nominating process, etc.

Senator Stoudt: What's the envisioned timeline for Article XIV? If the new constitution is approved, will the executive committee work during the summer to hammer out the appendix and the rules with the expectation that new elections will take place already early in the fall semester?

Senator Floyd: Right.

Senator Stoudt: So the ballots we sent out again are not quite yet invalid?

Senator Floyd: Whether or not this constitution is approved, we still have our ducks in a row, we will have new officers and can go forward if it doesn't happen.

Senator Fink: Has the HSC agreed to when this is done because I'm wondering if the other campus has agreed to this breakdown. In past meetings, we talked about how some of the areas in Arts & Sciences had been moved to the Health Science Campus.

Senator Floyd: We are going to assume that our electorate is the correct electorate. Those colleges and individuals who are part of the senate electorate now will be a part of our voting process for approval on our campus.

Senator Fink: When they looked at representation, were the people on the HSC some of the faculty that's listed under Arts & Science category?

Senator Floyd: These totals you are looking at are actual numbers which Andy got from HR here and there, so these are actual numbers as they exist now.

Prof. Jorgensen: To answer your questions, no one from HSC moved between colleges over there. The only movement came from HSHS related to nursing. Some MC nursing faculty left HHS and went to the College of Nursing and some of the allied health from HSC came into new HSHS.

Faculty Senate Counts by College and Status Table

(next page)

UT Faculty Counts by College and Status

April, 2007

Source: Geof Tracy & Waffa Hanna

Compiled by: Andy Jorgensen

<u>Main Campus</u>	<u>T/TT</u>	<u>Lecturers</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>** 60 Senators **</u>		
				<u>*Prop</u>	<u>Min 2</u> <u>Max 12</u>	<u>#Calc</u>
Arts & Sciences	271	60	331	19.0	12	
Business	63	8	71	4.1	5	5.43
Education	54	3	57	3.3	4	4.36
Engineering	87	1	88	5.1	7	6.73
HSHS-total	81	10	91	5.2	7	6.96
- HSHS of MC=62+10						
- HSHS of HSC=19+0						
Law	21	7	28	1.6	2	
Library	17	0	17	1.0	2	
Pharmacy	32	3	35	2.0	3	2.68
University College	18	5	23	1.3	2	
<u>Health Science Campus (some uncertainty)</u>						
Health Sciences		See above				
Medicine	252		252	14.5	12	
Nursing	50		50	2.9	4	3.83
	<u>=====</u>	<u>=====</u>	<u>=====</u>	<u>=====</u>	<u>=====</u>	
	946	97	1043	60	60	

*Prop= strictly proportional

#Calc=calculation based on proportioning senators afer removing maximums and

Senator Fink: What would happen if the President decides to restructure, would that change those numbers?

Prof. Jorgensen: Restructure in terms of splitting the College of A & S?

Senator Fink: Yes, moving some to the HSC?

Prof. Jorgensen: I have not heard that on the table, but the one thing I heard is splitting A&S but would we retain the same people in it. Many of us are adamantly opposed to that, the President got that message loud and clear last year, but I have not heard the mix and match between the two campuses. That's a good question, but it has not been on the table at all.

Senator Stoudt: The College of Pharmacy, do they report to the HSC provost?

Prof. Jorgensen: Yes.

Senator Stoudt: Larry, the movement of Pharmacy was restructuring, moving the faculty under the HSC.

Senator Fink: I frankly don't care how it's done, but I want to make sure that when we do this that there is not a lot of disagreement on it.

Prof. Jorgensen: They have seen this sheet of paper and it has been shared with their Executive Committee. This is the compromise that has been worked out, the 12 maximum, the total number of 60, the minimum of 2.

Senator Floyd: Just to reiterate, a faculty senate of 60 people, a faculty senate of maximum 12 per college and a minimum of 2 per college and then proportionately therein. These are the allocations.

Unidentified speaker: Would a past president be a voting member of the faculty senate?

Senator Floyd: Yes.

Unidentified speaker: So it could be 61 or 62?

Senator Floyd: That's right. It could be slightly more.

Prof. Jorgensen: In the College of Medicine which has 252 faculty, they actually have faculty in seven different categories. Some of them are researchers as we have on this campus. They are not counted as faculty for faculty senate. Three of their seven categories are tenurable. And the number of 252 is the number of faculty we would consider affected, in the same sense we would represent faculty senate. If you look at their numbers, that actually represents 14.5%, they are maxed out at 12 even if 10 or 15 or 20 of those were not really faculty when we look at it more closely, they would still be at 12. So it would not change the distribution.

Senator McInerney: The numbers strike me, however, as distorted. If we look at a second level of constituents, student enrollment, and I understand this is Faculty Senate, I don't know what the enrollment in the College of Medicine might be. I suspect that enrollment is not nearly enough to justify what we traditionally consider for 252 faculty.

Prof. Jorgensen: Yes, but we never used that in the past.

Senator McInerney: I understand. I am in the College of Education, and I'm looking at representation of 4 senators versus 12 in the College of Medicine, and it seems to me once again, that while I am not privy to this faculty data at the HSC, it seems inherently and intuitively to be disproportioned representation.

Prof. Jorgensen: They have 252 people who are full time paid faculty.

Senator McInerney: I am still stuck on that.

Prof. Jorgensen: I hear your point.

Senator Klein: In the College of Law when I saw that number 21 it seemed very low. I checked with our Dean this week, and I don't know if that means live bodies teaching this year but I know that in 07-08 there will be 25 tenure/tenure track faculty and seven instructors.

Prof. Jorgensen: This is the number from the Provost's Office and Geoff Tracy, the assistant director. We found an error in one other college too, so it's possible it's an error.

Senator Floyd: I doubt that would make a difference.

Senator Niamat: Are the open lines considered as faculty?

Prof. Jorgensen: These are employees with Social Security numbers and paychecks, that's how we have always done this in the past – positions filled this year.

Senator Wolff: On the HSC they have a number of medical faculty and do they count?

Prof. Jorgensen: They do not count. They have seven categories and this only counts three of those seven, as I understand it. When it comes to the ballot, we check this very, very carefully, but as I said, even if 252 is high by 10 or 20, the senator number for medicine would not change.

Senator Zallocco: Under the current model this is very important to the lecturers. Were there any discussions?

Prof. Jorgensen: We did decide that here with this body, one or two meetings ago, we decided lecturers are a regular faculty.

Senator Olson: About Law, I was looking at the Law faculty on the Banner system for a different reason. There are a number of teaching categories listed that are different from the other departments when you look at the classification F codes. Therefore, it would be easy to make mistakes in categorizing the types of faculty if you do not know the faculty members and their academic ranks.

Senator Stoudt: Following up on a comment from Andy, I don't care whose list we are using, but we need to decide so that those of us trying to get the ballots out can have some guidance. We had complaints that some peoples names were on that shouldn't have been and vice-versa. Maybe the Colleges need to review the list Geoff Tracy has. I would ask whoever is going to get the appendix and rules in order to address where the data will come from. As chair of the Faculty Senate Elections Committee, I don't want to be caught in the middle making these judgments.

Senator Thompson-Casado: Barb, you need to double check on these data processes, even if you decide on the source of the administration. It needs to be double-checked and clean, because it's never clean.

Prof. Jorgensen: The list of lecturers is from the AAUP office.

Senator Zallocco: We have to settle on some of it. But beyond all that all the specifics we have discussed are reasonable.

Senator Floyd: It is moving towards a system where there is less representatives, less people per college.

Senator Edwards: If we took the cap off, why was the maximum number of 12 decided?

Senator Floyd: You think it's too big or too small?

Senator Edwards: I think it's too small. There should be more representation for the larger colleges.

Prof. Jorgensen: In our present Senate of 50 members, no more than 20, or 40% can be from A&S. If it was proportioned almost half of the Senate would be in A&S. We have a tradition of a cap of a certain number. We do hear a lot of comments that the Faculty Senate is dominated by A&S. Even at the 40% this is definitely under half. And exactly half of the present Executive Committee are in A&S. There is concern about too much domination by one particular college going from 20 down to 12. To have 40% you have to have a group bigger than 60, and the 60 was decided. We looked at 40, 50, 60 senators, and in fact we had the survey that the faculty filled out and 60 was about the biggest group you can get to be reasonable in terms of carrying on a business.

Senator Edwards: If we could go to 65 and have better proportionality I personally am from a smaller college than A&S. I think it's important given the faculty senate's role in governing undergraduate curriculum. It is critical that A&S have a big representation in faculty senate.

Senator Floyd: It is our intention to bring this back in about two weeks. And to keep us on track and for the mail ballot to be mailed out, it has to go out the week of finals.

Senator Stoudt: Has any consideration been given as to where the senate will meet?

Senator Floyd: No.

Chair Wilson: We will take all these comments to heart and have continuous discussions.

Senator Stoudt: Do you have a good enough sense of the Faculty Senate to move forward?

Senator Floyd: I think we do and we will present this on Thursday at the summit.

Senator Stoudt: Carter, does the summit deal only with Faculty Senate, or is it dealing with other entities and other documents?

Chair Wilson: We have had Board members that believe the Board is marginalized. Executive Committee comments on this?

Senator Olson: This is supposed to be dealing with all faculty organizations including the Graduate Council. We have Board members that believe they should be a part of the Constitution writing committee. However, I am very much interested in what happens on Thursday. I really feel that the meeting on the 12th will be difficult. The president has mentioned several times that he would intercede with the Board of Trustees on our behalf to delay the 1st of July deadline for our constitution on our behalf. We haven't accepted the offer. I would suggest we wait and see what happens on the 12th at the summit. I feel we need to continue the process and should not delay it any longer. I am very much upset that they want to write our Constitution for us.

Senator Peseckis: You all received by email the list of courses to consider today by the committee. Any questions regarding these courses? If not, I propose these courses be accepted. All those in favor please say "aye". Opposed, same sign.

Passed unanimously.

Course Modifications and New Courses Approved by the Faculty Senate on April 10, 2007

College of Arts and Sciences

New Course

ARBC 1080 Culture and Commerce in the Arabic-Speaking World 3 ch

ARBC 1090 Culture of the Arabic-Speaking World 3 ch

ARBC 2190 Study Abroad 1-3 ch

ARBC 3010 Conversation and Composition I 3 ch

ARBC 3020 Conversation and Composition II 3 ch

ARBC 4190 Study Abroad 1-12 ch

ART 1990 Special Topics in Art 3 ch

ART 2990 Special Topics in Art 3 ch

ART 3990 Special Topics in Art 3 ch

ARS 2980 Issues in Research and Scholarship 1 ch

PHYS 4430 Physics Applications in Medicine I 3 ch

PHYS 4440 Physics Applications in Medicine II 3 ch

PSC 4640 The European Union 3 ch

Course Modification

ECON 2120 Money and Banking 3 ch
Change course Alpha/Number to "ECON 3130"
Change prerequisite from "Econ 1150 or 1880" to "Econ 1150"

ECON 2640 Business and Economic Statistics 3 ch
Change course Alpha/Number to "ECON 2810"
Change course title to "Introduction to Econometrics"
Change prerequisite from "MATH 2630" to "MATH 2600 or MATH 2630 or MATH 3610 or BUAD 2060"

College of Health Sciences and Human Services

Course Modification

RCA 1010 Tae Kwon Do 1ch
Change course alpha/numeric to RCA 1030

University College

New Course

ACTG 1220 COMPUTERIZED ACCOUNTING WITH QUICKBOOKS 3 ch
ALS-2500 INTERDISCIPLINARY APPROACHES TO RESEARCH 2 ch

Course Modification

ACTG 1200 ACCOUNTING SYSTEMS APPLICATIONS 3 ch
Change title to "ACCOUNTING SOFTWARE"
Change pre-requisite from "ACTG:1040" to "ACTG:1040 OR BUAD:2040"
Update catalog description

ACTG 2310 COST ACCOUNTING FOR HEALTH CARE 3 ch
Change title to "FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT FOR THE HEALTH PROFESSIONS"
Update catalog description

Chair Wilson: Thanks, Steve. Next on the agenda is Bob Cryan and he will do a report on Yanshan University in China.

Prof. Cryan: Thanks, Carter, for having me. I was asked to speak about the Yanshan University agreement. I would like to talk about the history and what the agreement represents.

An outline:

1. Brief History of the UT/Yanshan University connection
 - a. 1997 YSU/Qinhuangdao offer
 - b. 2005 China trip by Dan Johnson – offer again made (August)
 - c. 2006 China Trade Mission by Dan Johnson – offer made again (April)
 - d. 2006 Concept of Reciprocal Campuses made to Yanshan University by Jacobs/Johnson (offer accepted in principle)
2. What is a Reciprocal Campus?
 - a. Concept
 - b. Two locations
3. Why consider a reciprocal campus?
 - a. In China open opportunities in face if visa issues
 - b. In US
 - i. internationalize our campus
 - ii. power of taking the lead
 - iii. maximize expertise in our location
4. What we have agreed to do?
 - a. Yanshan University will offer certificate courses (non-degree/credit) at UT starting in Fall 2007
 - b. UT will begin the process (first here at home) of looking at opening a campus in Qinhuangdao at the Yanshan University location
 - c. All space and other logistics will be offered on a “quid pro quo” basis so no excess funds are basically being committed

I would like to go back to 1997 when we at U.T. first had the opportunity with the university in China. Frank Horton was offered the opportunity to go to Qinhuangdao, our sister city, supported by Yanshan University and the Qinhuangdao Development Zone to build some sort of University of Toledo Campus. That invitation was received with interest by Frank Horton. Judy Hample looked at it and let it languish and nothing ever happened about its uniqueness and the opportunity. Nothing went any further with that concept of an American University, to move forward in China to open up a campus in China such as other institutions have done in other countries around the world until 2005. In August of 2005, Dan Johnson wanted to go to China and we finally got the word from the BOT and other groups that supported this and that Dan would go to China and find out some of the things that would be of interest. During that trip we went to Qinhuangdao and to Yanshan University and we were again offered an opportunity as an American University to come to Qinhuangdao and Yanshan University and consider establishing a UT campus there. That offer was made very clearly and openly and we were even shown the land that would be offered to us as a place to began to build. Upon return, unbeknownst to me and everybody else in the Fall of 2005, the UT/MUO merger was beginning to emerge. So the concept of going to China to do something there in the midst of a merger just didn't make any sense. So all of us gave up the thought to even pursue it.

In the summer of 2006 in the wake of our trade mission trip to China (which included several deans and BOT members), there was a lot of sentiment to reconsider that kind of thinking, that it would make sense for UT to go to China and offer courses in a university-authorized campus format. As the merger proceeded, Dan Johnson sat down with me and we put together a new proposal which Dan coined a “Reciprocal Campus” and the concept is right now just a simple concept. It hasn't gone very far in our thinking but the idea simply is that instead of the burden of the University of Toledo going to China to try to establish a campus with all the issues of finances, building, governance, assignment of faculty, development of curriculum, everything imaginable would be a part of this process. Instead of taking this single step of considering that, we thought, what if we talked at a much different level about having both universities think about a joint development of some entities on their campuses at the same time? This concept would allow for other ways of looking at dealing with the issues of financing and so on.

So Dan wrote a concept paper that basically said, let's talk about you coming here and we going there and maybe on a "quid pro quo" basis. We can talk about leasing space to each other and about ways in which programs on each campus might make sense in the midst of each other, etc. He went to President Jacobs with that notion, and President Jacobs thought it was an intriguing one and we ought to see what the President of Yanshan University would think of that as a concept. The letter was written and it was received by Yanshan University with welcome. It was suggested that there would be a visit to China again to Yanshan to talk about the specifics of how their university might come to Toledo and in what ways to do what and there was the sense that their president and faculty their representatives could come to Toledo to have the same conversation. Dan Johnson and I went back to China in February and shared some ideas by listening to their ideas about what they would do here. They reacted very favorably and proposed some ideas about how their campus might be established here and we arranged to have a delegation come here at the end of March. They came in an evening of March 26 and we talked at length in meetings and came up with an agreement which I'm sure many of you have seen represented in the media, and I can go over it with you if you have questions about it, to basically began the conversation here at UT, about having a campus in China. All the conversation to this point is about having a campus in China, how it might look, what we might do. With the caveat that agreeing to do that means nothing more than agreeing to start the conversation and initiate all of the processes that would be necessary to have that conversation go to a final point.

Secondly, that Yanshan University would come to UT and would begin to offer some certificate or diploma based courses here at UT as a small group, a faculty of three to five and one or two administrators to keep track and organize, and they would be offered space initially with the concept that when we go there, we would have the same offer. We are not talking about building buildings or tearing down walls or modifying structures. We are talking about offering some space and some time, for the Yanshan University staff to offer some courses for a diploma or a certificate or some non-official and not state sanctioned or university accepted credits in Chinese language and Chinese culture and other possibilities. Those courses would be offered for persons in the community who would like to learn some Chinese, but are not applying for University of Toledo credits, for example, courses in Chinese culture. Yanshan, in that regard, would send to UT their best instructors. That's where the agreement stands. I brought the agreement with me and we can walk through the specific language, if you wish. The intent is to start something that doesn't exist. There is no Chinese university on any American campus in any location in our country. There is no American university on any campus in any location in China. There is one British university called Nottingham University that has their British campus in Ningbo, which is south of Shanghai. It's going very well and I met personally with the former director/president of that program. He is now back in England and has been replaced. He has expressed the willingness to come here to UT and speak to bodies and groups that would be interested to know about his experience. But the experience that he had in China was favorable, successful, difficult and not without a huge amount of painstaking effort to get through the Chinese bureaucracy. So we are looking at something that's unique and that's where we stand.

Senator Olson: I would like to say that this is a wonderful opportunity for those who have never been to China. If you go to Shanghai, one of the things that you are going to be surprised at the number of GM cars on the streets. The number one car in Shanghai is a Buick. What is happening to the US industry today is the Chinese economy is growing extremely fast. Our engineers, our scientists and our business people really need to have knowledge of Chinese culture today to be able to interact effectively in China. To do that it does require time on the ground in China, and this would be an outstanding opportunity for us.

Senator Barnes: How are you dealing with the discrepancies between the Chinese vision of academic freedom and the visions of academic freedom here?

Prof. Cryan: That's a great question. I don't know how to answer that as it hasn't even come to the table. If your concern is will the Chinese here on our campus respect academic freedom, my guess is the answer would be 'yes.' But with no precedent, I don't know how to consider that question.

Senator Barnes: I think it would be important to consider it especially if we are going to be moving people around.

Prof. Cryan: I would ask you to help me understand the meaning of the question. What are the implications?

Senator Barnes: I am not really conversing but my sense is that the Chinese government is pretty restrictive of people's accessing information. Probably everyone has read the stuff in the chronicle about Google being manipulated by the Chinese government, and I think the academic freedom there is really restricted. Before you pair up with somebody you might want to know about their politics.

Prof. Cryan: I agree.

Senator Olson: The Chinese are very, very sensitive about anybody bringing anything of religious nature to their country. They will absolutely not allow it.

Senator Barnes: Which goes with the freedom of speech.

Senator Olson: It's deeper than the freedom of speech. As long as you do not talk about religion, you can talk about their former government, but religion is the only strictly forbidden item that I know of. If you go there and sign in your computer and attempt to perform a Google search, your Google is immediately replaced by the Chinese Google. You are correct; there are things that you cannot get at. However, I was surprised at what I could get at. I could get at most everything, including my poker sites, which is illegal in China. That really surprised me. In terms of academic freedom it pretty much extends to teaching your courses, and if you have courses relevant to religion or political thought I think you may have some problems.

Prof. Cryan: We all have lessons to learn. If you read the most recent *The Blade* rendition about the Sister cities group wanting to have an Easter service, I can't help but think if anybody had thought of it in advance that they were going to be in Qinhuangdao on Easter, and they knew that for three months, and had said to the right people, "would we be able to congregate and pray,?", it would have happened. But to catch everybody off guard is to put people in a bind and they are just not very good at thinking on their feet about these sensitive issues. Back to your question, we must think about these issues, look at the implications and ask the questions first before we get in situations. I respect your question very much.

Senator Teelehaimanot: I assume there might be some problems with getting students from China?

Prof. Cryan: If it's difficult getting students from China because of the visa problem, so why don't we just offer DL classes? But the Chinese culture has a different view of DL than we do, at least some people. And that is that it is a very free and independent self study activity that doesn't have the controls and quality assigned to it in face to face instruction, so the Chinese are not as receptive to DL learning as we would expect they might be. As we try to add DL and other E-learning opportunities to the mix of curriculum we will have to act slowly and expect a lot of push-back. Right now they don't allow it as a routine.

Senator Olson: Also there is twelve hours difference in time.

Senator Edwards: Were there any discussions in these arrangements about student exchanges?

Prof. Cryan: Yes, but the agreement that Yanshan and UT have had since 1989 actually as far back as 1985 has always talked about exchanges and the most recent version of that agreement was altered when Rob came up with the idea a year or so ago having a sister city scholarship. So we actually have a stronger relationship with Yanshan as a partner than any other of the ten universities in China. But the exchange of faculty and students will continue regardless of whether they are on the campus or not, and very strongly promoted. The recent trip to Qinhuangdao supported by the Sister Cities is going to create a whole new set of opportunities.

I also would like to share with you that as a result of the delegation coming here Maumee Valley Country Day School is going to develop some sort of sister relationship with the City of Qinhuangdao and Yanshan is going to help them find a partner in independent schools so that there can be an exchange of students at a high school level as well. This development is very exciting. Despite all the

concerns and worries that you have, I hope you feel free to find me to talk about it if there is no one else you think is better. I think this is the most exciting thing we have ever tried to initiate. I think it has potential. There are a lot of questions as to why would anybody want to come to Yanshan University at the University of Toledo to take a course, and who wants a Chinese degree. All those are very real questions. But given the ways we chose to put this in place it has to be one of the most exciting things that we can be doing. If we watch how we do it and anticipate the questions and keep them on a paying basis, it's a financially sound thing for us to be doing. I hope you will ask for more information and invite me to come and meet individually with your faculty, because we want to take a lot of people to China. Thank you very much.

Senator Monsos: The following program modifications are presented here for your approval: A new minor in Recreation & Leisure Studies, if you did not have a chance to see it online, it is 21 credits, they are all major courses, there is a good split between the upper and lower level classes, with nine credits at the 1000 - 2000 level, and 12 at the 3000 - 4000 level. Twelve credits are specified and the other nine credits to be chosen from a list of 9 courses.

If there are no questions, I move that these courses be approved. All those in favor say "aye", opposed, same sign.

Motion carries.

There is a minor modification to the recreational major studies program itself, which is simply to move one course from where it currently resides to the professional sequence. That means that students will take it a little bit later, and they will be more prepared for the material in this course. All those in favor, please say "aye", opposed, same sign.

Motion carries.

James Palmer is here to answer any questions on the New Concentration in Biomedical Physics within the BS in Physics. The courses listed below would be in addition to the regular Physics major. Any questions for James? All those in favor, please say "aye" opposed, same sign.

Motion carries.

Academic Program Committee business – 4/10/07

New Minor in Recreation and Leisure Studies

Modification to Recreation and Leisure Studies - Move RCRT 3710 from pre-Professional Sequence to Professional Sequence.

New Concentration: BS in Physics with concentration in Biomedical Physics

There are just a couple of meetings left and there is still some pending program business and curriculum business some of which is related so one can't move forward before the other. I request that we could be early on the agenda next time so the business can be done for the next academic year.

Chair Wilson: A motions was made to adjourn the meeting and it was seconded.

V. *Calendar Questions*

None

VI. *Other Business*

Old Business: None

New Business: None

VII. *Adjournment:* meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Alice Skeens
FS Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Kathy Gabel
Faculty Senate Office Admin. Secretary