

**THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO**  
**FACULTY SENATE**  
**Minutes of the Senate Meeting of November 7, 2006**  
**<http://www.facsenate.utoledo.edu>**

Approved @FS mtg. 11/28/06

---

---

**HIGHLIGHTS**

**Budget Updates**  
**Undergraduate Curriculum Committee**  
**Academic Program 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.

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

***I. Roll Call –2006-2007 Senators***

**Present:** Ariss, Barnes, Barrett (Klein), Bischoff, Bopp, Bresnahan, Byers, Cave, Chen, Edwards (Baines), Cluse-Tolar, Fink, Floyd, Funk, Hudson, Humphrys, Johanson, King, Lambert, McInerney, Monsos, Morrissey, Niamat, Olson, Ott Rowlands, Peseckis, Piazza, Pope, Ritchie, Schall, Skeens, Stoudt, Teclhaimanot, Templin, Thompson-Casado, Traband, Tramer, Wedding, Wilson, Wolff, Zallocco, (41)

**Excused:** Fridman, Kennedy (2)

**Unexcused:** Barlowe, Hamer, Horan, Lundquist, Poling, Reid, Spongberg, (7)

A quorum of incumbents was present.

***II. Approval of Minutes***

Minutes of October 24, 2006 approved as distributed.

***III. Executive Committee Report***

Report by Chair, Carter Wilson

(copy of Chair Wilson's report)

**Faculty Senate Executive Committee Report**  
**November 7, 2006**

Before I begin my Executive Committee Report, I want to acknowledge a distinguished guest, Susan Palmer, our board member and chair of the academic affairs committee.

<**Susan Palmer Here**>

**Susan Palmer:** Thank you for having me and I just wanted to let you know that the Academic Affairs Committee is very much connected with what you are doing and very interested in what you are doing, and we hope to be working together.

**Chair Wilson:** You are welcome to come back any time.

## **Ad Hoc Core Curriculum Committee**

I need to also announce that at our last Executive Committee meeting we agreed to create an ad hoc committee to look at the university core at other universities, to re-examine our core and to look for ways to streamline our core curriculum. We will work with Susan Palmer and Rob Sheehan and with other Faculty Senate members. I've asked the chair of our Core Curriculum Committee to serve on this ad hoc committee.

I believe we have a strong core curriculum. A great deal of work and history is behind it. The original philosophy behind our core is to provide all UT undergraduate students with a set of unifying skills, competencies and knowledge; that all of our students will be skilled in writing and mathematics; knowledgeable in the natural sciences, social sciences, humanities, arts and multiculturalism; experienced in scientific inquiry and intellectually developed to make better-informed and humane decisions. We expect that our students will have the potential for creative expression and thinking and be able to function well in a democratic and tolerant society. I believe that we can maintain this philosophy as we look for ways to streamline or consolidate our course offerings. We also need to be clear in identifying student outcomes and assessing whether we are achieving these outcomes.

## **Forum**

I took copious notes on the Open Forum. They are posted on the Senate Website. After listening to many faculty members, I wrote an executive summary, with seven bullet points. Please let me know if any of these are off base. I wanted to get feedback before I forward them to the Strategic Planning Committee.

## **Executive Summary**

The following is an attempt to provide a brief summary of the faculty's view point expressed at the forum. This is an edited and composite view of faculty voices as I heard and understood them:

1. As we emphasize the STEM and professional areas, we must not neglect teaching, student centeredness, and research support in the arts, humanities and social sciences.
2. While we should increase support for areas of strength throughout the university, especially in the STEM and professional programs, we should recognize and support areas of strength in the arts, humanities and social sciences as well.
3. Our greatest potential for rapidly growing the student population is not in the STEM areas. It is in the non-STEM areas. As the major source of university revenue is from student tuition, attempting to grow the university exclusively in the STEM areas would hurt the university financially. We should grow enrollment in all colleges and programs.
4. Defining the university as a science and technology university, instead of a comprehensive university, demoralizes non-STEM faculty, generates concerns among students in non-STEM majors and sends the wrong message to prospective students.

5. Enrollment increased because of an increase in adult students. These students tend to be in the non-STEMM areas and to include significant proportions of women with children and minorities. There seems to be little effort put into addressing these issues.
6. Whereas demand for research productivity has increased, it appears that financial support for research has decreased, especially in the non-STEMM areas and especially in support for travel to professional conferences.
7. Whereas we have areas of strength in the humanities, particularly in our doctoral program in history, with world renowned scholars and with doctoral graduates attracting national recognition for their outstanding research; the draft directions document proposes to eliminate this program. This proposal diminishes the university and demoralizes faculty.

I am happy to report that faculty voices are being heard. Rather than commenting on this, let me turn the floor over to our provost, Dr. Rob Sheehan.

**Provost Sheehan:** I had a conversation with Dr. Jacobs following that forum, and it became clear that there is a misperception in the Town Hall Forum. The student that was there who was questioning so ardently whether or not there would continue to be support for majors in the non-STEMM areas, he didn't hear arousing support at that time, and the reason for that is because of a mistaken impression that "majors" meant academic degree programs. The question was interpreted to mean, "are we going to be increasing degree programs in the non-STEMM areas?" We must grow majors and we must grow students in the majors in all those areas. I confirmed with president Jacobs that it was not his intent to restrict growth of students in majors, and he said, "yes, absolutely." Does that not mean that we want more art majors, more language majors, more history majors and the answer was, "yes, we do want them." We need resources to bring those additional students, is it reasonable that we would have those resources flow? President Jacobs' answer to that was, "yes." I reflected on the strategic directions of the document and how we got to where we are, and I think I have a little better understanding of the initial choice A and choice B that some of you may have seen in the directions document.

- Choice A suggested that we throw all our eggs, so to speak, into the Humanities and Liberal Arts basket in our efforts to grow. In this choice we would grow in the Humanities and Liberal Arts and the Social Sciences side without corresponding growth on the very expensive STEMM discipline. We could in fact do that. We could grow this University by expanding English, Art and the programs in University College and never touch or get near the STEMM discipline with regard to additional resources.
- Choice B is to expand them all. If we are to expand the STEMM students on this campus in science, technology, engineering, math and medicine, we must do so with at least two non-STEMM students for each STEMM student, because the STEMM students will never pay for themselves. The STEMM students pay exactly the same tuition as the non-STEMM students. They are very expensive students to recruit. We would need a lot of scholarship programs to do that.

What Choice B is referring to is that we would in fact grow this university, including Science and Technology, we commit to put the resources into that, and we will fund some of those resources as the result of the growth in the non-STEMM areas. That's Choice B. Choice B is not for us to become a technical university. Choice B is for us to become more robust as a full university with all

our graduate and undergraduate degree programs. In speaking with the President, this is really what we meant.

We absolutely must get that word out. We cannot wait for another Town Hall forum to communicate that. That's one reason why I have been going around to a couple of different venues, the Research Council earlier today and the Senior Leadership Team. We really need to acknowledge and recognize all the points that Carter has made in his opening remarks that we have strength, and that to grow to 20,000 undergraduates that we must in fact grow in many of our areas to afford the growth that we want. Now that we have merged and we have more resources in science and technology, we must in fact grow in Education, English and all the other disciplines that are out there, and I think once we begin to get this clarification among us and get it in writing, it will make a lot more sense in support for our growth strategy as a University.

That's the best I can get today as a quote from the President who cannot be here today, he is not even in town today. This is really his position. If we are going to get more music majors, we will try to address that with the subjects of resources through responsibility based budget. We have to also acknowledge that it takes fewer resources to grow some of those revenue producing areas, than it does some of those other areas. But if we are going to step up to the task and make the most of this merger it is by growing in the STEMM disciplines and supporting in the non-STEMM areas.

**Chair Wilson:** Can you comment on the doctoral program in History?

**Provost Sheehan:** I needed to do some probing with regard to the doctoral program in History and in my conversation with the President the probing went like this, "are you aware that the Board of Regents' elimination of subsidy for the History doctoral program had nothing to do with the quality in the History doctoral program?" And I also said, "are you also aware that years ago, this was the Board of Regents' first shot at attempting to frame itself as the group that was articulating the economic development of the State and the State's resources?"

This was the first effort of the Board of Regents to begin to say we don't want the State subsidy to be going into some of the expensive disciplines that are not necessarily contributing to the economic growth in the region. Whether you believe the OBOR or not, that really was their reasoning. They have come a long way in attempting to articulate economic development in the role of higher education. President Jacobs was aware of that but it was the symbolism of continuing to fund a program that was not receiving State subsidy that was the most troubling. The conversation then went, are you aware this is the program that is resource neutral, if not resource enriching. We had to quibble a little and I said you really have to understand that our doctoral students in History are not taught in cohorts of students in sections that just History students are in. That was the model I was familiar with all the way back to my own doctoral days earlier at other universities I'd been at, which is how I got myself snarled up here a few years ago in masters in foreign languages.

I can tell you that this doctoral model in History and whether it is resource neutral or has enough tuition paying students, there is no question about the quality of the graduates, so it resulted in, let's get those figures and take a look at. Dr. Jacobs said, "what I really want from this point forward, I want no new doctoral programs that fall outside of the subsidy level." I can't speak more definitively on that. I'd be unpacking my bags if I were a History professor. I would get that information out and recognize that the real intent is for the University to establish itself from this point going outward, as opposed to undo something that may have been done in the past. So, don't think of majors as degree programs. Think of them as students. Think of them as something that we can afford in quality as something we know we need to do in all of our areas. Think of science and technology as something we want to step up and meet our responsibility on. Given the merger, because we wouldn't have to

do that, we could have gone in another direction. Think of ourselves as yet having some more topics to discuss, in particular the Ph.D. in History.

**Senator Barrett:** I understand that there is a certain State pressure for STEMM if the state wants it, but if you all acknowledge that STEMM is much more expensive than non-STEMM and STEMM does not pay for itself, and if the State is not going to pony up money to help us pay for **increased STEMM** in the era of declining subsidy, why would you make the decision to commit **to** that **as** the area we would want to spend much resources **on** as opposed to the other choice. Why not build up the Arts and Humanities and Sciences if it's that much cheaper to do it if we are not going to get money either way.

**Provost Sheehan:** Because Northwest Ohio will go down the tubes economically. If we in fact do not change the Economy of Northwest Ohio dramatically, we won't be able to afford the Arts, the Humanities in schools, which is why we should stop talking about selective admission that is harmful too to our economy. We owe it to our region and to the State to do this. Whether the State is going to pony up or not, we need to realize that by having a thriving economy within all the other areas in which people survive is our best hope for survivor. I'm convinced by that that we have a responsibility.

The General Assembly may not be living up to their responsibility, but we have a responsibility as public servants, as faculty living on public dollars, to assist this region from which our students come. If we don't need that region more enriched than we found it, then we haven't done the job. We will have to do the job given the economics and reality that we live with. The truth is that you have always funded your graduate programs at the expense of the undergraduate programs. You have always funded your more expensive programs at the expense of the least expensive programs. You have had undifferentiated tuition at the undergraduate level for years by State law. We are really not engaging in a different pattern if we are committed to the growth and support of this economy. I believe that's what this public institution should do. We are not a private institution whose goal is to educate a small selected group of people. My argument is that it's a responsibility that we have.

**Senator Pope:** We have undifferentiated tuition, but I don't believe we have undifferentiated fees.

**Provost Sheehan:** The undifferentiated fees that we have are lab fees which pay for consumables in classes, there are technology fees which pay for some of the technology, that's pretty much it with the exception of and very recently, the Pharmacy of some upper division fees. But we have not gone full force to attempt to pick up a whole other fee structure that is tied back to the cost of the discipline. We do have differentiated subsidy but that's only 29% of our general fund. So that's not necessarily the only tail to be chasing in this mix. We have to make it up on tuition.

**Senator Olson:** You said that we get only 29% of our revenue from subsidy, out of that 29% how much is there of differentiation between the STEMM area and the non-STEMM area? What is the maximum difference in percentages.

**Provost Sheehan:** It's a complicated question that I would prefer to get back with you on, because in order to answer it you also have to look at the differentiation between the general studies coursework, upper division and graduate coursework. For the lowest level of general course work we are paying for is the privilege of teaching some students.

**Senator Olson:** You are saying that overall the University which got the most from STEMM is University of Akron last year? And they only got 2.5% over the other Universities?

**Provost Sheehan:** What you are speaking to is a rather complex set of formulas however disastrous the thought of tweaking them seems to be and often times it is a miniscule re-direction of resources.

**Senator Barnes:** This clarification that you just provided, that we need to grow in all areas, was that clarification on issues that came up at the Senate Town Hall meeting or the clarification of the white paper?

**Provost Sheehan:** It's a clarification of both. It's a recognition that the term and major which is on the tips of all the conversations we had in the Strategic Planning Sessions. It's an attempt to clarify them both. I have spoken to Tom Gutteridge who is co-chair of the Strategic Planning Committee. He agrees that this interpretation I have given you is indeed the interpretation. It's the only interpretation we could give to grow this place to 20,000 undergraduates. Sometimes I'm too quick to go to the bottom line and I will admit that is a personal failure, but I have to tell you we can't get there any other way than this.

**A. Jorgensen:** On this election day, is there any hint from the state or the federal government that they really are going to come up with some other means to support the STEMM area? I think it's a competitive idea but it's not funded yet. Also the state is talking about some other subsidy, any idea on what is happening?

**Provost Sheehan:** The state is tweaking the formula and we hear an occasional reference to federal dollars. One of our concerns is that if the state changes the Governor's core proposal which will be introduced by the Governor's office in the next few days after the election, we will have better prepared students in the entry class of 2012, and there will have to be resources put in place to staff the high school Math classes and science classes which will definitely increase. But other than commenting on the gubernatorial election which if it will be Democratic, it will greatly accelerate the movement of the core proposal to the passage in this lame duck session, but will also extend by one year instead of the entry class of 2011 it will be 2012. And unfortunately, those of you who are foreign language folks, it will eliminate foreign language.

**Chair Wilson:** Thank you Dr. Sheehan. Continuing with my executive report.

### **Meeting with the Deans and Jacobs**

Last week Thursday, the Main Campus EC and HSC EC meet with Lloyd Jacobs and the deans. We talked about governance issues and the issue of devolving Senate authority the deans and colleges. We explained the role of the Senate in implementing the university core curriculum and developing university-wide academic regulations. We explained how courses offered in one college impact programs in other colleges that depend on these courses. Dr. Andy Jorgensen was most forceful in making the point that deans already have considerable power in curriculum, finance and personnel (hiring, tenure and promotion) matters and that there is no good reason for making any changes in governance arrangements.

### **Strategic Planning Committee**

At a meeting last week Monday, Lloyd Jacobs asked a few EC members to explain faculty make-up on the Strategic Planning Committee. Over the summer when Dr. Jacobs announced that the Executive Leadership Team involved with coordinating the merger would become the Strategic Planning Committee, I sent a strong message to Dr. Jacobs complaining about the unacceptably low faculty representation on the committee. Jacobs replied saying the he agreed with me and that he would appoint additional faculty members. Subsequently, we added John Barrett, Max Funk, Curt Black and Glenn Lipscomb. When I raised the issue of the absence of faculty in the arts and humanities, it was pointed out to me that Dean Sue Ott Rowlands and Associate Vice Provost Carol Bresnahan are on the Committee. Whereas I believe there still is insufficient faculty representation on this committee, the membership of this committee is not going to change.

**Chair Wilson:** This concludes my report.

Now we will move on to the **Reports** on the agenda, and Sr. VP for Finance & Strategy, Dan Morissette is first.

**D. Morissette:** Thank you for having me. There was a question of when this clarification went through. I have been involved in the core group of people that looked at this document after Dr. Jacobs had originally drafted it. Rob was there as well, and that day we walked out believing what Rob just said. Sometimes when we are trying to move an organization, people will believe the worst. There was never a day when I didn't believe that we wanted more non-STEMM students in this University. That's probably true of Rob as well, and we need to clarify this and I wanted to point out that the original intent of the document was along the same lines.

Carter Wilson asked me to come today and speak on budget matters. I try to be a bit of an opportunist and thought I would cover a few additional topics. Our financial quarterly statement is available here, hopefully you picked up a copy. I am not planning on talking about that today, but I will gladly answer any questions you might have.

I wanted to spend a moment, since this is the first time I am addressing this group, talking about some strategic issues: what are our major fiscal drivers, the growth strategies that we are attempting to deploy and to utilize at the new, combined University of Toledo, and also about the September 30 financial report, and finally briefly touch on responsibility based budget.

The strategic issues: what is the size of our mixed enrollment that we are trying to accomplish? The 20,000 undergraduate students everyone is talking about, also what is the role relationship between the community colleges and the University of Toledo. What types of programs could better serve the citizens of Ohio by either offering or allowing others to offer. So as we look at this document there are subsets of this in a bunch of other layers including some of the state and political pressures that we face by including places like Owens, Bowling Green, Northwest Tech and other partners that we have. So what is the size and mix enrollment?

We have to fundamentally ask ourselves do we like our situation. On this election day, who said it, are you better off today than you were four years ago? Truthfully we have to face the facts that when we talked about reducing the budget on the main campus by \$29 million over the last five years, it is largely caused by our enrollment declines. We need to maximize our hospitals' performance - we will mostly brush through this today. If we were on the HSC I would spend more time on that. We need to develop other revenue sources: increase our philanthropy, our grants and contracts indirect income, technology transfer, and still develop some form of process for incentives to align the resources with where the needs are and responsibility based budgeting is one way get to that point.

I want to talk about what our sources of revenue are and as the slide reflects combining the HSC with the Main Campus for the FY ending June 2006.

- On this slide you see that the first three items, our tuition, our State support and our auxiliary income which is directly related to tuition itself constitutes 49% of the combined University's revenue base.
- It is small because of the Health Science Campus and the combined entities patient care revenue is about 30%. From a fiscal stand point enrollment growth and growth in the hospital margins are critical to us.
- This is the graph that I don't know if you have seen before, probably seen it in different forms - the State budget index to 1998 base year. The green line represents the general fund of the

State of Ohio. You see it growing from 1998 to 2007. The red line represents overall funding for higher education. If you split up four-year versus two-year colleges it would be even lower than this graph. The blue line is the State fund for medical education. So you can see that on an index basis it has actually shrunk from 1998 to 2007.

- Skipping to the theme of what our major fiscal drivers are, these numbers are meant to be approximations. On the average each one percent growth in enrollment equates to about \$1.3 million in additional tuition and fees for the institution. In addition to that, the State's Share Instruction if we had one percent more it would be another \$700,000. I talk more on this to the Faculty Senate at the HSC, the hospital's activity and the inpatient activity is very important fiscally. Finally, the realization how expensive STEMM is. Not all of it, but much of it is very expensive. A lot of it has to do with how well we utilize the big infrastructure that we put in place for STEMM related research.
- I acknowledge that this is an oversimplification but if we were in fact to add 500 FTE 's give or take, to the main campus our net tuition dollars would increase somewhere in the area of \$8,000. The increase in general from State Share Instruction would be another \$4,000 for a total of \$12,000 per FTE. It's about \$6 million in additional resources, if we were to be successful in growing to just 500 FTE's on this campus.
- This slide is called Enrollment Sensitivity Analysis, if this were stretched over time you would see it going in a band. This slide represents the cumulative affect of the base 2006 enrollment. If we were to grow enrollment 2 percent per year for the next four years, (and I believe we can grow more and our enrollment people think we can grow more, not only from recruiting but from retention as well), in the fourth year of this we would have about \$20 million more in resources available to us than what we would have otherwise.
- Going back to the Fall enrollment for the main campus this slide shows 2002-2005, we had about 21,000 students in 2002, and we were down to about 19,300 in 2005. It's clear that the way out of these cycles of budget cuts and budget reductions is clearly through growth in enrollment. I am pleased to say in 2006 we did level off enrollment.
- We are planning on working with the faculty to grow enrollment, we are going to work on the health system volume margins and it's been a very good year thus far. We are going to capitalize on the merger and the fact that we are larger than any university in the area and if we assume this position we will be to Northwest Ohio, what Ohio State is to Columbus. There are some very interesting analogies to that. Our capital campaign has been increased from \$75 Million to \$100 Million as a result of the merger. We will attempt to make wise investments and try to take advantage of the brain power that we bring in to this institution.
- We intend fully to grow our FTE student base in all of our colleges in our existing programs. So if we have one hundred Art majors today, we would like to have 150 or 200 two years from now. We intend to grow across the board regardless of where we are and where we are putting our emphasis with the science and technology. Obviously this is all driven with retention, student centeredness and more growth in non-traditional students, branding institution. I hope you have seen some of the ads, hope the results show and that we can say that our efforts are successful.
- You have in front of you a handout which is a new format of the financial statement. Please look at them and I can answer any questions. It's a little bit of work in progress, it's probably

about 95% there, you will see a couple of questionable items, like the fact that as a technical matter the main campus did not budget for depreciation, so you won't see it in the budget column but it is in the actual column. So to give you the short version, the main campus is at budget for the first quarter and projected to be at budget for the full year, and our HSC and the hospitals are both favorable budget.

- This is the main campus. The main campus has a marginally favorable budget on the revenue side. Expenses are marginally unfavorable, there are some timing differences included in this into quarterly performance, but the full year margin is projected right at budget.
- On this slide I can briefly say the Health Science Colleges are quite favorable for the first quarter, I remind everybody, including the HSC Provost that the months of July and August there is not much activity going on so these things do tend to even themselves out over the year, even with a reasonably sophisticated budget process. Nonetheless, enrollment was up well above projection and we do expect to have a favorable year overall.
- On this slide - our hospitals - I am pleased to report we are actually doing quite well for the first quarter. The revenue is substantially above budget, our expenses are slightly unfavorable in the budget. In the hospital business, if you have more patients, you are also doing more expenses for nursing care, etc.

**Senator Stoudt:** You speak of hospitals plural. Is there more than one hospital?

**D. Morissette:** Yes, there are three hospitals: acute care hospital, rehabilitation hospital and child psychiatric hospital. It so happens that from a purely numerical stand point that 80% or so, is the acute care hospital. But we do have three accredited hospitals. The financial statements include investment earnings and the HSC does have a balanced portfolio.

- My last topic is the responsibility based budget. UT has done a very good job of very detailed reports over the last four or five fiscal years of the actual revenues, scholarships generated by programs, direct expenses and indirect expenses. So we are going to use this as a key piece of implementation of responsibility based budget. Our deans and chairs in colleges will own the process, technically they own it now. But we are attempting to make the entire process much more decentralized and transparent.
- This slide says the same thing. What we will attempt to do here is align our resources with our strategy. We want to make the real reason as transparent as possible because it's still a little complicated. We want to make it fairly easy to implement. We are looking at national benchmark studies, there are so called Delaware Studies, that refers to faculty ratios. One of the purposes in this is if somebody is growing by 50 FTEs in the Fall, that the resources needed to teach those 50 students would be benchmarked initially and provided based on need.
- I also wanted to mention that Standard & Poor's gave us a rating upgrade for our bonds recently, and that we have implemented some \$4 million in merger opportunities. For the first year we have a lot of merger costs associated with bringing the two systems together, such as the legal fees for the merger. So it ends up to be almost a fiscal wash for year one, but it does put us in a better position as we move forward to the next year. We are soon to issue, subject to Board approval, an additional bond amount of \$50 million. The Finance Committee did approve this last week and it will be on the Board agenda next Monday (11/13/06). The projects included in this Bond issue are the Field House Project that essentially will become the Classroom and Lab Building. We expect to speed up the time

that was anticipated to build that building and have it opened by Fall of 2008. The Information Commons Project is also going to be expedited; it should be completed in 2007.

There are two committees– Fiscal Advisory Committee – the name will not necessarily remain the same, and we are in the process of forming this committee and we will include Carter or his designee. The actual function and structure of that committee and the first meeting will be either December 8 or December 15. I also wanted to mention that Chuck Lehnert is spearheading the Facilities Committee and that committee is also in the process of being formed and the first meeting is being planned for December 1.

I wanted to conclude, we did receive a favorable rating from Moody's as well and this rating does in fact tell us something about where we stand in the world from the benchmark stand point. They expect that the new University will maintain to improve its student market position and that it will maintain its balance operations and grow resources.

What could change our rating up? We are not here to give finance lessons, but if the rating gets better, our cost of borrowing goes down. If the rating goes down, our cost of borrowing goes up. A significant improvement in our market position could raise our rating coupled with growth in financial resources to provide better cushion and to balance operations. What would take our rating down would be a significant drop in enrollment.

We need to find a way to grow in enrollment and we need to work together to do that. That fundamentally could fund a whole lot of things in the STEMM areas and non-STEMM areas.

I can now answer any questions.

**Senator Thompson-Casado:** Thank you for the presentation, what you have here appears very clear, the problem I am having understanding is that this is very different from what we have been hearing the last couple of years. For the past couple of years the Faculty Senate has been hearing that we can't grow our way out of the fiscal constraints, especially when we talk about State's cap on tuition, the State's subsidy, and the medical education subsidy which is even lower. How has this merger changed that and how are we able to grow our way out?

**D. Morissette:** First of all it's hard for me to speak of what and how things were thought of before the merger. The State has essentially a fixed pool of resources so right now the UT main campus qualifies for about 5% of the State's total State Share Instruction pool. If we were 6% of that pool we would in fact get more money. We would be doing this at the expense of others, and we would not be getting as much per student, but we would in fact, for every single student we get, we receive thousands more from the State's subsidy. There are certain programs that may in fact cost more to add students, that is if you had to set up big laboratories or hire very expensive faculty of thousands, growth may not be fiscally advantageous. In about 98.3% cases that would not be true. The fact is that right now if we have 40 or 50 more students we would collect from on the average the margin would be quite substantial. Let me put it in a different way. The faculty cost is about 51% of our total budget. It wouldn't cost as much as what 40 students would pay to come and sit in this room.

I'm sorry I cannot speak to the contrast with the past, but I can only say that I will just call it purely simple finance in the sense that it's the only thing we get paid to do. By far the biggest thing we get paid to do. I assure you, if we get the 500 students or a 1,000 more students you will see that the margins will be dramatically higher. Hopefully we will be able to pour more resources back into our

mission. That's one of the differences between a non-profit and a for-profit. We fulfill our mission, we get money, so that next year we can do our mission again.

**Senator Thompson-Casado:** Do you have percentages calculated for those students coming in that are taking remedial courses?

**D. Morissette:** First of all we believe that remedial students are positive for our margin. This does not mean that we should try and get more - we are trying to balance what the real desires are in the institution. There is plenty we can do to get money. There are a lot of ways to slice and dice the direct cost, but remedial in general clearly has positive margins. Functionally speaking if we were to look at the components, we would clearly have more resources. In the mid 1990's this campus had 24,000 students, and we have more buildings than we had then, and we have less students. So we do have the ability to grow. The State of Ohio pays about 45% of our annual depreciation in our State capital. There is no way we can keep up with that. We have to figure out a way to get the resources and try to be transparent in how we use them.

**Senator Pope:** I heard that our ERP system that we spend three years on, doesn't work at the HSC, is this correct?

**D. Morissette:** It is not the same system as the HSC. We have got some concessions with banner system, and banner system is what the former UT had. Lawson is the system that the former MUO had. Both parties had to make some concessions. But the incremental costs of the system to get it on a one platform is not cheap. It's about \$1.7 million. There were merger savings but there were also merger costs - this is clearly one of the merger costs.

**Senator Pope:** But will it work?

**D. Morissette:** Yes, it has to.

**Senator Olson:** I have two questions: I realize you presented a very optimistic view here, but when we look at the demographics, the number of people in the Mid west is shrinking. That also says the number of students available is shrinking as well.

The second question is the high school core requirements in the State of Ohio. I have no doubt the core requirement is going to pass the legislation. This thing requires that all students not having a core requirement going to one of three universities, Cleveland State, Shawnee State, or Youngstown State. That means we will no longer have any remedial students. A large number of our students who in the past would not meet the core requirement cannot be admitted. So how can we increase our enrollment when we are facing these two major obstacles?

**D. Morissette:** They are both major obstacles. The number of high school graduates will go down I believe they say in the year 2012 and clearly Ohio is not growing. I believe that we can reach out more to non-traditional students with distance learning. I believe that we can make the University of Toledo a place of choice. Not necessarily a place of choice for everybody. I was at the General Motors plant recently and they said that it's easier to enroll students at Bowling Green, Owens, and Monroe Community College than it is at UT. We put late fees on people, we attach fines, and tell them they can't register. There is a lot more we could do by just organizing ourselves to pay attention to corporate relations. How many people in this room have gone to Rocket Launch? Go to Rocket Launch and see if this University represents itself with parents the way we should. We don't. If we make a concerted effort to be a place of choice we can do better than our competition. Our future will be better.

**Senator Olson:** I do believe our strategy needs to be consistent.

**D. Morissette:** No question. Our enrollment people believe that we have not done enough. We have to implement some real changes. We are trying to get our alums more able to help facilitate enrollment. We are attempting more out of state tuition and make it easier for out of state tuition waivers. With the standards of UT, we are talking about people who will be successful. We are going to have to be aggressive and be transparent. This is a wonderful place. The analogy between UT and MUO is very interesting because I believe that we both have understated assets. Most people who know these institutions know that that's a fact. And that it's either under appreciated or

understated, but the clear value of what we deliver here, mostly through faculty, is better than what is believed out there.

**Senator Olson:** The second question I had which is minor, but if somebody read your slides, who is in the Business School or Engineering, or somebody who is in business on the outside, they are going to believe that you are going to compute a Return on Investment for each faculty. I don't think you really mean that.

**D. Morissette:** What I meant is if you do bring somebody to do research, you support them fully to achieve the funding of that research. And we should expect also that they will be successful.

**Senator Olson:** If you were to compute ROI and faculty what that means is you compare their salary and their use of supplies, resource compared to what they bring in to this University and then compute either the positive ROI or negative ROI based on percentages.

**D. Morissette:** I do recognize that.

**Senator Niamat:** What is the return on the University's assets?

**D. Morissette:** I will get back with you on that; it's actually small. But I can get you those numbers and what the benchmark numbers are.

**Senator Morrissey:** I realize you are not here to talk about enrollment services but I think there are some issues with students out there and many of us have been here a while and watched our enrollment drop, and I wondered why the university did not get more aggressive and differentiate for the Northwest Ohio community and the difference between a two-year and four-year degree. There are political arrangements that we need to respect but there is a pool of potential students being drawn to the existing institutions in this area, we wonder if they get their monies worth and why they don't come here.

**D. Morissette:** I see ads that say that people can make more money and go faster at a two year institution. Owens has a role, Northwest Tech has a role, and we have a role and so on. We also need to take advantage of the fact that we have a coherent network here. What is the value of their education? Some of the value is clearly in the classroom but much of it is with the people I went to class with. I don't think you get that in a community college. I think we should accentuate the value of our four-year institution here. I think we should focus on our faculty more. This is not about just saturating the market with a bunch of stuff, but trying to teach people some of the things that make this place special. In many circumstances a child would be better off paying the double amount here, even if they have to pay the full fare for four years, than going to a community college and transferring. I believe we have to get that out.

**Senator Zallocco:** A lot has been discussed here. Some of us have been screaming, stomping, yelling for ten years for some of these things to occur and we have basically been ignored. What new would this administration want us to believe that maybe this time something would change? Maybe you have more forceful powers than we have.

**D. Morissette:** I can't speak to what the prior administration did or why they did it. All I know is that this year, for right or for wrong, the president of this institution shook the hand of every person at Rocket Launch. He also tried to go to a dozen or more of some of the biggest classes here the first week of school. How much of an impact will this have? A lot of it is window dressing if you don't follow through and I recognize that. So all I can say is, help us, so that all of us will succeed. It's all about paying attention to what the students want, and what is reasonable to provide to them. Many of these things we are talking about do not cost much money. We need to figure out a way to not create so much bureaucracy and get things so muddled up that we can't even sort out what's really important. We have to focus on the positive.

**Senator Fink:** I would like to see a coherent communication strategy that will make people appreciate UT more. Other area universities and schools are much more communicative and much more consistent in their targeted messages. However, I realize that we have just merged and it takes time to work out how we can best position ourselves. It is essential that we start to receive recognition for the quality programs actually provided at UT and that top employers and graduate schools are

interested in our students when they graduate. In the long run, I believe our survival depends on our being as the “quality” choice for education in this section of the state.

Also, I wanted to make one other point, it’s not just the numbers of students that we bring in, but also what numbers we retain. Today, I spoke to our student worker in the management office, and she said that she and a number of people she hangs out with at her dorm are strongly considering leaving the university and transferring because there is perceived to be little to do on or near the campus. I am not being critical, I know a number of people who are working on this matter but we need to do much more to improve social opportunities on campus, whether it is through support of fraternities/sororities, student groups, on campus theatre, movies, barbeques etc. This student suggested that it would be great if there was some type of “cabaret” opened on campus on weekend, not alcoholic, that would have comedians, guitar players/bands etc. and people could order snacks, sodas etc. and hang out and talk or dance

**D. Morissette:** I totally agree. Thank you.

**Chair Wilson:** Thank you Dan. Next on the agenda is Steve Peseckis, Chair of the Undergraduate Curriculum.

**Senator Peseckis:** These course modifications that I will be presenting here were emailed to all senators last week.

(copy of Dr. Steve Peseckis’ report of approved courses)

**Course Modifications and New Courses Approved by the Faculty Senate on  
November 7, 2006**

**College of Arts and Sciences**  
**New Course (2)**

ECON 3240 Environmental Economics and Policy 3 ch

EEES 1170 Microbes and Society 3 ch

**Course Modification (22)**

ART 4540 Ceramics III 3 ch  
Change catalog description

ART 4550 Ceramics IV 3 ch  
Change catalog description

ARTH 3110 Topics in Ancient Art 3 ch  
Change pre-requisites from “ARTH 1500, 2000, or permission of instructor” to  
“None”.

ARTH 3130 Topics in Medieval Art 3 ch

Change pre-requisites from “ARTH 1500, 2020, or permission of instructor” to “None”.

ARTH 3150 Topics in Renaissance Art 3 ch

Change pre-requisites from “ARTH 1500, 2040, or permission of instructor” to “None”.

ARTH 3170 Topics in Baroque Art 3 ch

Change pre-requisites from “ARTH 1500, 2040, or permission of instructor” to “None”.

ARTH 3190 Topics in 19<sup>th</sup>-Century Art 3 ch

Change pre-requisites from “ARTH 1500, 2080, or permission of instructor” to “None”.

ARTH 3210 Topics in 20<sup>th</sup>-Century Art 3 ch

Change pre-requisites from “ARTH 1500, 2080, or permission of instructor” to “None”.

ARTH 3230 Topics in American Art 3 ch

Change pre-requisites from “ARTH 1500, 2080, or permission of instructor” to “None”.

ARTH 3250 Topics in Asian Art 3 ch

Change pre-requisites from “ARTH 1500, 2100, or permission of instructor” to “None”.

ARTH 3290 Topics in Architecture 3 ch

Change pre-requisites from “ARTH 1500, 2300, or permission of instructor” to “None”.

ARTH 3500 History of 20<sup>th</sup>-Century Photography 3 ch

Change course title to “History of Photography”

Change pre-requisites from “ARTH 1500, ART 2050, or permission of instructor” to “None”.

Change course description from “An in-depth study of the history of 20<sup>th</sup>-Century Photography” to “An in-depth study of the history of photography”

ARTH 3600 History of New Media 3 ch

Change pre-requisite from “ARTH 1500” to “ARTH 2000 or 2020 or 2040”

ARTH 3980 Special Studies 3-5 ch

Change pre-requisite from “Permission of instructor” to “None”.

ARTH 4980 Special Topics 1-5 ch

Change pre-requisite from “Permission of instructor” to “Sophomore or higher standing or Permission of instructor”.

ECON 4240 Environmental and Natural Resource Economics 3 ch  
Change title to “Advanced Environmental Economics”  
Change pre-requisite from “ECON 1150 or 1200 or major in env. sciences or env. studies” to “ECON 3200 or consent of instructor”  
Update catalog description

PHYS 2100 Physics with Calculus 2 ch  
Change pre-requisites from “PHYS 2080, MATH 1860” to “PHYS 2080, one of MATH 1840, 1860, 1880, or 1930”

PHYS 2130 Physics for Science and Engineering Major I 5 ch  
Change pre-requisite from “MATH 1850 (with C or better) to “one of MATH 1830, 1850 or 1920 (with C or better)  
Change co-requisite from “MATH 1860” to “one of MATH 1840, 1860 or 1930”.

PHYS 3310 Quantum Physics I 3 ch  
Change pre-requisites from “PHYS 1910, 2140, MATH 1860” to “PHYS 2140, one of MATH 1840, 1860, 1880, or 1930”

PHYS 4210 Theoretical Mechanics 3 ch  
Change pre-requisites from “PHYS 2140, MATH 1890, 3860” to “PHYS 2140, one of MATH 1890 or 2890, one of MATH 3820, 3860 or 3880”

PHYS 4230 Electricity and Magnetism I 3 ch  
Change pre-requisites from “PHYS 2140, MATH 1890, 3860” to “PHYS 2140, one of MATH 1890 or 2890, one of MATH 3820, 3860 or 3880”

PHYS 4310 Quantum Mechanics 3 ch  
Change pre-requisites from “PHYS 3320, MATH 1890, 3860” to “PHYS 3320, one of MATH 1890 or 2890, one of MATH 3820, 3860 or 3880”

**Senator Peseckis:** Any questions at this point?  
Senator Zallocco: Any core courses?  
Senator Peseckis: None of these are core courses. The core committee will report separately on core courses.

*Approved by voice vote.*

## **College of Business**

### **Course Modification (9)**

BUAD 2060 Data Analysis for Business 3 ch  
Update catalog description (add topic of “forecasting”)

BUAD 2070 Application of Statistics in Business Decision Making 3 ch  
Update catalog description (remove topic of “forecasting”)

BUAD 2000 Career Development I 1 ch  
Change pre-requisite from “BUAD 1000 and business major” to “BUAD 1000 and business major with sophomore rank”

BUAD 3000 Career Development II 1 ch  
Change pre-requisite from “BUAD 1000 and BUAD 2000 and business major” to “BUAD 1000 and BUAD 2000 and business major with junior rank”

EFSB 3590 Entrepreneurship 3 ch  
Change course title to “Entrepreneurship and Small Business Management”  
Change pre-requisite from “Junior Standing” to “Pre-requisite or Co-requisite: EFSB 3480 or BUAD 3040”  
Update catalog description

EFSB 4010 Dynamics of Family Business 3 ch  
Change course title to “Growing Family and Entrepreneurial Businesses”  
Change pre-requisite from “Senior Standing” to “EFSB 3480 or BUAD 3040, and EFSB 3590”  
Update catalog description

INFS 3980 Contemporary Topics in Information Systems 3 ch  
Change course title to ”  
Change pre-requisites from “INFS 3150” to “BUAD 3050 & Jr. Standing”

INFS 4810 Installation of Computer Systems 3 ch  
Change course title to “Enterprise Database Administration”  
Change pre-requisite from “BUAD 1020” to “INFS 3770, INFS 4510, INFS 4620”  
Update catalog description

PSLS 4940 Sales Internship 3 ch  
Change pre-requisite from “none” to “PSLS 3440”

*Approved by voice vote*

## **College of Education**

### **New Course (1)**

CIEC 4460 Science Methods for Early Childhood Education 3 ch

### **Course Modification (11)**

CIEC 4770 Practicum: Kindergarten 2 ch

Change course title to "Practicum: Primary Grades"

Change credit hours from "2" to "3"

Change from "Pre-requisites CIEC 4750, 4760, Adv Prof Stand; Co-requisite CIEC 4790" to "Pre-requisite Advanced Prof. Standing"

Update catalog description

RESM 4200 Classroom Assessment 3 ch

Change pre-requisite from "none" to "Admission to professional education or approval of instructor"

RESM 4990 Independent Study in Educational Research 1-4 ch

Change pre-requisite to "Instructor Consent"

TSOC 3000 Schooling and Democratic Society

Change pre-requisite from "none" to "Admission to Professional Education"

Change co-requisite from "none" to "CIEC 3390, CIEC 3350"

TSOC 4990 Independent Study in Educational Theory 1-4 ch

Change pre-requisite from "none" to "Permission of Instructor"

EDP 3230 Human Development for P-12 Educators 3 ch

Change pre-requisites from "none" to "EDP 3200, Admission to Multi-age Licensure Program"

EDP 3240 Child and Adolescent Development for Middle Grades Educators

Change pre-requisites from "none" to "Admission to Middle-Grades Licensure Program"

Change co-requisite from "none" to "CI 4280 or 4250 or 4260 or 4270, and CI 4290"

EDP 3250 Adolescent Development and Learning

Change pre-requisite from "none" to "Admission to Professional Education"

EDP 3280 Foundations of Teaching and Learning 3 ch

Change pre-requisite from "none" to "Admission to Special Education Program"

EDP 3290 Life Span Development 3 ch

Change pre-requisite from "none" to "Admission to Special Education Program"

EDP 4990 Independent Study in Education Psychology 1-3 ch  
Change pre-requisite from “none” to “Permission of Instructor”

**Senator Peseckis:** Some of those courses are being added back which were dropped by the Registrar’s Office.

**Senator Olson:** Why were they dropped and why is the Registrar’s Office making curriculum decisions?

**Senator Peseckis:** It could be as a result of proof-reading, I’m not sure where. There could be a number of reasons.

**Senator Edwards:** A lot of times it’s the Admissions Office, and if the verbiage is too long, they will drop it because you can only have something like 37 words, or something like that.

**Senator Olson:** We are looking at some significant things, like prerequisites. If it’s important to the course and if there is a reason they got dropped we should at least be notified of that.

**Senator Edwards:** They made us change all the numbers on all independent studies. For some reason it wasn’t in the catalog before this one and it got dropped. I don’t know why it was dropped.

**Senator Olson:** I don’t want it delayed but I am very concerned that the Registrar is making decisions in the curriculum areas.

**Senator Edwards:** We were notified of the changes before it went to press but it was past the deadline.

**Unidentified speaker:** We wouldn’t change anything without proper authorization. I believe it had to do with upper or lower division and the students were supposed to be able to get in those classes.

**Senator Peseckis:** All in favor of the changes presented here, please say ‘aye’.

*Approved by voice vote*

### **College of Health Science and Human Service**

#### **New Course (1)**

LGL 4330 Mediation: Topics and Techniques 3 ch

#### **Course Modification (3)**

CRIM 4990 Independent Study 3 ch  
Change credit hours from “3 ch” to 1-3 ch”

SOCW 4120 Social Work Practice II 3 ch  
Change pre-requisite from “SOCW 3120” to “Permission of Instructor, SOCW 3120”

SOCW 4130 Social Work Practice III 3 ch  
Change pre-requisite from “SOCW 4120” to “Permission of Instructor, SOCW 4120”

**Senator Cluse-Tolar:** I’m from Social Work. The permission from the instructor does override the course, we want to be sure of the student’s progression, and so we don’t want the students to be encouraged to take 4130 before they take 4120. That’s why we list the courses that way. These are practice classes that go along with the senior field classes and all of our senior field

lab sections are by permission only and what we try to do is to group students together to separate students in the same or similar field placements. So if we have several students in a child welfare setting we'll put one child welfare in one section and the other in a different section in order for students to gain a variety of the experiences.

*Approved by voice vote*

**Chair Wilson:** Thank you. Next is Holly Monsos, chair of the Academic Programs Committee.  
**Senator Monsos:** All of these modifications were submitted on paper; in the Spring they will be available electronically.

(Prof. Holly Monsos' report)

### **Academic Program Committee business – 11/7/06**

**Item 1 – Modification from College of Business** – summary: currently DHS are admitted into the College of Business only if they have a GPA of 2.25 or higher. The proposed modification is to extend that requirement to transfer students, AND to require that they complete 12 graded credits at UT with a GPA of 2.25 or higher prior to transferring into the College of Business.

**Item 2 – Modification from College of Pharmacy** – summary: Given that CHEM 3510 and CHEM 3520 are essentially equivalent to (and have been cross-listed in the past with) MBC 3550 and MBC 3560, the modification is to accept EITHER sequence (instead of just the MBC sequence) for the BSPS PTOX major in Medicinal and Biological Chemistry.

Note – Reviewed and approved by Department of Chemistry.

**Item 3 – New Proposal from Education – Early Childhood** – Summary: program would provide a degree-only (no licensure) in early childhood education.

**Item 4 – New Proposal from Education – Integrated Social Studies Single Degree** – Summary: The current dual degree in History and Education will remain intact – this would be a separate, single degree in Social Studies. Rational: losing students to other programs (esp. BGSU) where they can get a single degree in less time/fewer credits.

**Senator Monsos:** The first proposal states that currently direct from high school students are admitted into the College of Business only if they have GPA of 2.25 or higher. This is to extend that requirement of 2.25 GPA to transfer students, and to require that they complete 12 hours at UT.

**A. Jorgensen:** Where would they be located in the University if they were to come and study business?

**Senator Monsos:** Somewhere else.

**A. Jorgensen:** It seems like a competitive thing.

**Senator Barrett:** What happens if you are at UT generally and **then** decide where you want to go, let's say you want to go **into** the College of Business. Do you have to have 2.25 for that?

**Senator Monsos:** I don't think it specifies that here.

**Senator King:** A change of college.

**Senator Monsos:** It would be a change of college.

**Senator Pope:** You can't impose different requirements for internal student and external students.

**Senator Edwards:** Are the direct from high school students admitted only if they have a high school GPA of 2.25?

**Senator Monsos:** Yes.

**Senator Edwards:** Not a college GPA.

**Senator Pope:** For transfer students, yes. You can't have transfer students lower standards than direct from high school. The State says you have to treat everybody equal.

**Senator Morrissey:** Most students coming directly to UT are admitted directly to the College of Business but as pre-majors. Then we have students who have come as transfers from other colleges internally in the University of Toledo. So this proposal is meant, I believe, to equalize the situation between those students who come in from within the University or college, and the people who come from other colleges and Universities into the College of Business.

**Senator Monsos:** The parallel cases are not direct from high school students.

**Senator Edwards:** Even so, why couldn't we count their college work from other universities, their GPAs. Where would they go then, if they wanted to be in Business? Why would you transfer to Business here if you had a two-year degree from Owens and a 3.0 GPA. If we are looking for students and up the enrollment, this seems to be a road block there.

**Senator Monsos:** I will have to go back to the Committee and ask these questions.

**Senator Edwards:** It seems an extra burden on transfer students.

**Senator Humphrys:** My department houses the pre-business degree, and how it works is direct from high school students must have 2.25 on certain ACT scores and if they don't, they come to our pre-business program in the University College. Then after a semester here of 12 hours and if they are direct from high school students in business, technically, those students could go to any program in the entire university if they don't meet the College of Business requirements and get 2.25 in whatever the major. Obviously they have to meet the standards for the program that they want to get in. If it's open admission, it doesn't matter where they are. They could be in any place, it's just that they must have 2.25 before they get in the College of Business. That's what they are attempting to do here.

**Senator Edwards:** If we can't understand this, how can the students?

**Senator Monsos:** I will take it back to the committee.

**Senator Stoudt:** On page 99 of the current catalog there already is a College of Business Administration policy regarding transfer students. It states that transfer students must have a GPA of 2.25 to be accepted into the college, with reference to the higher education GPA. The proposed policy seems to be attempting to treat our "native" student population fairly vis-à-vis transfer students; this is what Senator Pope was referring to.

**Senator Monsos:** We are going to take it back.

**Senator Barrett:** I thought that we were under some **sort of** State mandate to have **credits for courses taken at other colleges transfer as seamlessly as possible**. **Requiring transfers** to take 12 course credit hours at UT before they can fully transfer **into the Business School** doesn't seem remotely seamless to me. If that's what the law talks **allows**, I don't have a problem **with it**, but are we in compliance **by** requiring these people to take general courses outside of the College they want to go into?

**Senator Traband:** What we are talking about is what is on that sheet of paper. There are two issues here. The second one, there are internal transfer students and the top one that is typed allows students transferring from another institution with a 2.25 to transfer into the College of Business. It doesn't say that they have to earn the 2.25 GPA at U.T. The bottom one that's hand written says the change of college students must have 12 hrs. to transfer into the College of Business. I think if they change from CHSHS to the College of Business they need to have 2.25 and 12 credit hours. That's what we are talking about here. We are not saying that transfer students must have 12 hrs of UT credit.

**Senator Monsos:** We were confused by this at first and we thought we understood. But after this discussion, it's clear we did not.

**Senator Olson:** The top one makes sense.

**Senator Barnes:** Doesn't the top one include the bottom one? It does say change of college in the typed section. Doesn't it say change of college on the bottom one.

**Senator Monsos:** The typed section refers to transfer students. The bottom part simply refers to the College. I think we can clarify this in the language.

**Senator Pope:** If they come in and they don't need the requirements to be admitted to the University College we transfer them into the College of Business. If they come in and meet the requirements they get admitted. We want to make it easier for them, not harder. Part of the problem is that we have to count everything equally now, so a student coming in from a community college or from anywhere doesn't automatically lose all the D's and F's. They come in with them. So it may be harder for them to bring in a qualifying average.

**Senator Monsos:** Do you want us to find a clearer language and come back, or do you want to approve contingent on it?

**Senator King:** Bring clearer language and simplify the process.

**Senator Monsos:** Ok. The next proposal is modification from College of Pharmacy. Department of Chemistry has reviewed it and approved it. They are asking that CHEM 3510 and 3520 be accepted as either sequence for the major in Medicinal and Biological Chemistry, since they are essentially equivalent to MBC 3550 and MBC 3560.

*Approved by voice vote.*

**Senator Monsos:** This new proposal from Education is dealing with a new requirement, that all head start teachers will need a B.A. by 2010. There are a lot of people there who will need a B.A. and who will have some coursework toward it in Education and don't need licensure. This would be a similar degree that already exists for early childhood education, but not requiring licensure. At present there are 84 teachers with head start who will need their bachelor's degree, five of them are enrolled at Owens and in the process of getting at least the first part, and if we have this program in place they will be transferring to UT to finish their bachelor's degree. The other 79 will be doing this at another community college or at a University. UT would like to have this program in place ready for them.

**Unidentified speaker:** You said 2010 and on the slide it says 2008.

**Senator Monsos:** My email says 2010. Ok, I will check on this.

**Senator Stoudt:** The degree proposed is a B.A., but the degrees offered by the College are B.E. and the Bachelor of Arts in Education. Can you clarify?

**Senator Monsos:** Early Childhood Education, Bachelor of Arts in Education – a B.A. in education

**Senator Cluse-Tolar:** The Social Work 1030 class, it should be Social Welfare and not Child Welfare. Child Welfare courses are junior level courses.

**Senator Stoudt:** Is this a totally new program? The description of the current program on page 117 of the catalog includes an “Area of Concentration,” which seems to be missing from this proposal. That Area of Concentration consist of a minimum of 15 hours of mathematics or science or language arts, etc.

**Senator Monsos:** Is anyone from Education here?

**Senator Teclhaimonot:** Yes, I think the intention here is they are trying to give them another opportunity so they don’t have to go through the licensure.

**Senator Monsos:** I will take it back to the Committee.

The next proposal is a new degree proposed by the College of Education, it is the Integrated Social Studies Single Degree. It has been approved by the various bodies that reviewed it.

The current dual degree in History and Education will remain intact and will be of interest to some students. But there are other students who don’t want to stay for five years, and they don’t have to if they don’t want to. This is to capture and not lose that particular population.

**Senator Wolff:** Is there any evidence that we are losing students, or is it that we just think we are losing students?

**Senator Teclhaimonot:** Yes, a significant number.

**Prof. G. Zam:** Before I came here, I was a visiting professor at B.G. and a third of my class was from Toledo and I asked them why they came here to B.G. instead of U.T. Almost all of them said they would gladly travel 50 miles to shorten their academic tenure by one year. And also regarding the Social Studies, I have contacted some B.G. people, and the last comment I heard from one of them was would you like to have some of ours? We have too many.

**Senator Bresnahan:** I am not speaking against this, but I wanted to let you that when the dual program was put in place it was trumpeted by the University and the College of Education as superior preparation in the Social Studies, especially in History, for teachers who would graduate from U.T. with licensure. Graduates would be more marketable because they had a far deeper grounding in a subject matter they were going to teach along with pedagogical training that Education gave them. I will also add that some departments, including my home department of History, worked closely with the College of Education to be sure to schedule adequate courses, so the education students now also majoring in History got the classes they needed to complete their degree in a timely way. Now, as you just heard, students are saying, why should I take the dual-degree program when I can get licensure and do it in one year fewer? So what we are looking at is the marketplace of ideas favoring a less rigorous preparation, and that is the proposal before you.

**Prof. G. Zam:** Everything that she just said is true, but I wanted to add that having worked on this for two and a half years, we met the Chair of the History Department at least a half a dozen times and also met with a variety of deans, (including Marietta Morrissey). I came up with a close parallel for the choice of courses in the non-Western, Western and the American History sections for both programs. There is much continuity there in terms of choices between the dual and the single degree. The dual degree remains an important option and it is true that the content preparation is very important and that’s why I parallel the two programs.

**Senator Wolff:** Has the amount in History been reduced in this program or something else? Do they still require the same amount of History courses?

**Chair Wilson:** I am in favor of the proposal because at Wayne State University they give students a choice either dual degrees or the educational degree with concentration in Social Studies, and I think we should give our students the same choice that Wayne State University gives their students, so I am speaking in favor of this proposal.

**Senator Morrissey:** I wanted to say that we have been working with the College of Education for a couple of years now. We have been aware of the circumstances -- that single degrees programs are being accepted by the Senate and are popular among students. Representatives from History, Sociology, Political Science and Geography have met with Education representatives, including Professor Zam, and agreed to a single degree program that maintains a high level of social science content.

**Senator Wolff:** How many student are actually in this program?

**Senator Mansos:** In the dual degree program? Does anyone know?

**Prof. G. Zam:** I have about 70-75 students.

**Senator Teclhaimonot:** We have the Science Education single degree program, English Education single degree program, so we can't deny this. We have to be consistent.

**Senator Skeens:** Let's vote on it.

**Senator Monsos:** All in favor please say 'aye'.

*Approved by voice vote*

**V. Calendar Questions:**

None.

**VI. Other Business**

Old Business: None

New Business: None

**VII. Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Alice Skeens  
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Kathy Gabel  
Faculty Senate Office Admin. Secretary