

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
FACULTY SENATE
Minutes of the Senate Meeting of November 28, 2006
<http://www.facsenate.utoledo.edu>

Approved @ FS mtg. 1/23/07

HIGHLIGHTS

Resolution on new Constitution
TECHS update
Prioritization Committee final report
Dance Marathon
Academic Programs Committee 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, Barlowe, Barnes, Barrett (Klein), Bopp, Bresnahan, Byers, Cave, Chen, Edwards (Baines), Fink, Floyd, Funk, Hamer, Horan, Humphrys, Johanson, Kennedy, King, Lambert, Lundquist, McInerney, Monsos, Morrissey, Olson, Peseckis, Piazza, Poling, Pope, Ritchie, Schall, Skeens, Spongberg, Stoudt, Teclehaimanot, Thompson-Casado, Traband, Tramer, Wilson, Wolff, Zallocco, (41)

Excused: Cluse-Tolar, Niamat, Ott Rowlands, Templin, (4)

Unexcused: Bischoff, Fridman, Hudson, Reid, Wedding, (5)

A quorum of incumbents was present.

II. *Approval of Minutes:* Minutes of November 7, 2006 approved as distributed.

III. *Executive Committee Report* by Chair, Carter Wilson

(copy of Chair Wilson's report)

Executive Committee Report
November 28, 2006

My Executive Committee report will cover three major issues: 1) core curriculum, 2) strategic planning, and 3) the Board resolution (which impacts the Senate).

Core Curriculum

At our last EC meeting we talked about moving forward with the ad hoc Core Committee. Our EC insisted that the chair of the Senate Core Committee be on this committee, that the committee be dominated by faculty and that a senate representative serve as co-chair. The chair of the A&S Council Core Committee also needs to be on this committee.

Last week, Monday, I was invited to a retreat with the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board. I learned about the meeting Monday morning, which raises questions about adequate notification of meetings.

The main item on the agenda was the Core Curriculum. It was more of an educational meeting. We had a constructive discussion. Rob Sheehan presented a report, with data that indicated that although over 300 courses are listed as core courses, 75 courses represent 75% of the core courses taken by UT students over the past 6 years. There are copies of the report available.

Provost Sheehan: One caveat. That report was done without the benefit of joining together the cross-listed courses. My staff is working right now. Once that is done, that number in five courses will probably go down greatly as we began to account for a larger proportion of the actual pattern of the four. So you might see courses you know somebody else has cross-listed. Please keep in mind we know that, too. Couldn't get it done in time for the report. I would rather you get that information in bits than trying to overwhelm them all at once. That's why the DRAFT on the document.

Chair Wilson:

I presented past Faculty Senate reports on the Core, which helped explain how the core was developed and listed the skills and competency areas. One report indicated that well over 90 percent of our upper level students who had completed the core scored at or above national averages on the math, reading and science sections of the Comprehensive Assessment Program (CAP) test. I pointed out that our accreditation body requires us to assess student outcomes. That is, we must evaluate whether students are achieving what we claim they should achieve. For the most part we are doing an excellent job in math, reading and science, but there is one area of concern and that is writing. Rob Sheehan noted that our emphasis had not been on developing a shared cohort experience for our students, but student attaining a common set of skills, competencies and knowledge. We pointed out that direct from high school students do get some shared experience in the FYI courses and that we had at one point encouraged the development of a capstone course.

One board member noted that the important issue should not be how many different classes we offer in the core, but rather the core is effective in teaching the skills and competencies. I said that is what we have been saying all along.

Strategic Planning Committee

The chairs of the Strategic Planning Committee were initially on our agenda for today's meeting. I talked to Jeff Gold who told me that they would love to be here, but there is a conflict of schedule. Jeff Gold, Tom Gutteridge, Sue Ott Rowlands, Mary Jo Waldock and others will be meeting this afternoon to work on the two recent planning documents: one is a revision of the first draft directions. Tom Gutteridge and Jeff Gold made the revisions. The other was written by Carol Bresnahan, Sue Ott Rowlands, Penny Poplin Gosetti, Mary Jo Waldock, and Kaye Patton Wallace. I don't know if you had a chance to read the Bresnahan et al document. If not, I would recommend that you do. If you have, I am sure you would agree with me in concluding that we owe these five administrators and faculty members a debt of gratitude.

The Resolution

Thursday afternoon, November 9, I accepted a phone call from Lloyd Jacobs informing me of a Board of Trustees resolution affecting the Faculty Senate. The resolution was scheduled to go to the board the following Monday. I thanked him for the "heads up" and picked up a copy of the board agenda. I was stunned by the resolution and forwarded parts of it to members of the Senate Executive Committee. They, too, were stunned.

Friday, morning, November 10, I emailed Lloyd Jacobs protesting the resolution. I stated that I cannot support this resolution. Parts of my message read:

Whereas the resolution directly impacts the Faculty Senate, it was developed without any consultation with any of the officers of the Senate...Whereas deans, provosts and department chairs are indeed faculty members and are allowed to serve on our faculty Senate and participate in efforts to change the constitution as any other faculty member; the establishment of a committee by the president, with members chosen by the president, and dominated by the president, contradicts all reasonable definitions of shared governance. This resolution is antithetical to shared governance and it is guaranteed to generate bad feelings among the faculty.

Sunday, November 12, I talked to Rick Stansley (BOT chair) about the resolution. I was hoping that it would be taken off the agenda. I suggested that there were two offensive aspects of the resolution: The first was the process. There was no consultation with the Senate Executive Committees. The chair of the Graduate Council was not even aware of the resolution. The second was the substance, the creation of an administrative committee to write the senate constitution.

Rick Stansley insisted that that was not the way the resolution read, nor was it the intent of the resolution. He said the resolution asked the senate executive committees, Grad Council and the university president to put together a task force. (The main issue was to have an open discussion, which included board members and administrators).

I said that the Senate Executive Committees had been working on the merger and discussing constitutional issues and that we have no problem having open discussions over the constitution (and we need to have those open discussions with board members and administrators), but we have a long history of the senate amending its own constitution, although we know and accept that the board has final approval.

Rick said that the intent was for us to proceed, but for us to work with the administration and board members. Finally he said he would look at the resolution again to see what could be amended to make it more acceptable.

Monday, November 13, I received an email from Jacobs responding to my email. It read: It certainly is not my intent, Carter, to be antithetical to the concept of shared governance. I just think we need to rethink the basis. As you can see from the proposed resolution, no specific outcome is anticipated, merely a re-consideration.

I responded by explaining the meaning of and the reason for shared governance. I said,

Hierarchical, autocratic administrative structures obstruct direct communications with the faculty, stifle academic freedom and free speech, and block the voices of the faculty members and students. The president, provost, deans ...are all part of the hierarchical administrative structure. To provide a vehicle for faculty voices, protect academic freedom and encourage free speech, universities allow faculty members to elect their representatives to faculty bodies at the three levels of the university... They are not part of the administrative structure. These faculty bodies at each level speak for the faculty. They do not make administrative decisions. They advise the administration...

I insisted that intentional or not, the resolution undermined shared governance (as there was no consultation with the senate executive committee over the resolution prior to its presentation to the

board and that it reduces the independence of the senate). I pointed out that the chair of the Graduate Council had not even been contacted. The real problem is with the administration choosing members of a task force to write the Senate Constitution.

Monday afternoon, I addressed the Board. I reiterated the two problems: that the resolution was developed with no consultation with the faculty and that it was a sledge hammer approach. There were some amendments added to the resolution to temper its impact. And I appreciated the efforts of board members to respond to our concerns.

Other issues were raised about this resolution. It appears that the resolution went to the board without effective committee hearings, as it seems to have by-passed the academic affairs committee.

Tuesday, November 14, I appeared before the Arts and Science Council and discussed the Board resolution. The Council passed a resolution objecting to the Board resolution. The council objected to the non-consultative process in which the resolution was developed and presented to the board, the failure to take into account the constitutional process of the two Senates, and the appointment of a task force to rewrite the Faculty Senate and Graduate Council constitutions for the new University. The resolution passed unanimously.

Friday, November 17, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee developed its resolution, passed it unanimously and forwarded it to you Wednesday, November 22.

This morning I met with Lloyd Jacobs. Before the meeting there was some effort to reach a compromise over the resolution issue.

At the meeting, I insisted that the way his resolution was presented to the board without consultation with the Senate had fractured trust with the faculty. However, Jacobs said that I was not being entirely fair and that he had called me the Thursday before the Board meeting to alert me of the resolution. I said I would mention that in the EC report. I told him again that we had no problem meeting with him, deans, other administrators or board members, but we have a long tradition of the senate working independent of the administration, revising its own constitution, while respecting the authority of the board.

He talked about his concerns that he wanted to move to a more college centric model of shared governance. He gave me a copy of a report written by David Adamany on UT's shared governance. Before getting the copy, I informed Jacobs that the chair of the Temple University Faculty Senate described the relationship between Adamany and the Temple faculty as poisonous. I glanced at the document and now understand the source of the poison: the document reflected an unhealthy obsession with autocratic administrative power.

I pointed out that it was unlikely that the senate would pull its resolution, but that we still needed to and would move past it. At the conclusion of the meeting there was somewhat of an agreement that the two faculty senate executive committees and graduate council will proceed independently. At some point, he wants to have input and to bring the board and other administrators in the process.

At this point before moving to the resolution, I want to share a few comments from members of the Executive Committee.

Barb (Barbara Floyd) makes this point: "The other important point to make is that we all know full well that the board will have the ultimate right to accept or reject our constitution. We are

not questioning this right. All we are asking for is that we have the freedom to work as a faculty body to write our own constitution without prior interference from the board or the president. “

(FS Resolution on new Constitution)

Resolution of the Main Campus Faculty Senate Regarding the Process for Preparing a New Faculty Senate Constitution

Whereas, The University of Toledo Board of Trustees unanimously approved Resolution No. 06-10-07 Replacement which dictates a procedure for writing a new Faculty Senate constitution at its meeting on November 13, 2006;

And Whereas, there were three meetings between the Main Campus Faculty Senate Executive Committee and President Lloyd Jacobs in the weeks leading up to this board meeting, but at no time did Dr. Jacobs indicate that such a resolution was to be submitted or discuss the resolution with the Faculty Senate;

And Whereas, according to the minutes, the resolution was not presented to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees for consideration prior to the full meeting of the board;

And Whereas, the Faculty Senate’s current constitution, which has served the University successfully for 40 years, was written by a faculty committee and submitted to the university’s faculty for approval;

And Whereas, the board’s resolution states that the “current distribution of decision rights and prerogatives warrants review;”

And Whereas, the current distribution of decision rights and prerogatives has allowed for the effective operation of the academic affairs of the institution, including Faculty Senate curriculum oversight which insures high academic excellence without unreasonable and costly duplication;

And Whereas, the Faculty Senate believes that the resolution that establishes a task force to create a constitution is a violation of the principles of shared governance and self-determination that have guided this institution throughout its history;

And Whereas, the principles embedded in constitutions describe the foundational relationships among the constituencies of the University and should transcend presidential administrations;

And Whereas, in presenting this resolution to the Board of Trustees without proper consultation with the Faculty Senate, the President has seriously undermined the trust that has been painstakingly restored between the faculty and the administration during the past five years;

Be it Resolved; that the Main Campus Faculty Senate, in accordance with historical precedent, holds that the writing of a new constitution for a merged Faculty Senate is the right of the senates of the two campuses, and is moving to draft such a document and will continue to work with its colleagues on the Health Sciences Campus to do so;

And Be It Further Resolved, that once completed, the constitution will be submitted to the two senates, and if approved by the faculty senates, will be submitted for ratification by the entire faculty on both campuses. If so ratified, it will be submitted to the Board of Trustees.

Chair Wilson: Any discussion on the resolution?

Senator Olson: I would like to voice a strong support for this resolution. I would like to remind you that constitutions are meant to be enduring documents. They are lasting documents that define relationships between people, between organizations, as ours does very well. The constitution is meant to transcend any given administration. It was meant to endure. What the resolution by the BOT affectively says that by next July we will have a new constitution. In history, constitutions go all the way back to the magna carta. The magna carta was a relationship between a king and his subjects, that endured in future law as fundamental relationships. It was embodied into the various constitutions of nations and into the various constitutions organizations. It brings people together for a common purpose. Our constitution is our fundamental definition of our faculty voice. That is our combined voice to the administration, to the board. We recognize the Board's right to approve or deny. On the other hand, if we were to move to other models, we would loose our unified faculty voice in all likelihood. So I am very much in favor of this resolution.

Senator Johanson: I read this very well and I do have a couple of suggestions of amendments. The first one is to move in the first article, starting with "at its meeting on November 13, 2006," to follow the words, "the University of Toledo Board of Trustees at its meeting on November 13, 2006..." The next amendments I recommend is that the articles be moved in the following order: 1, 3, 5, 4, 8, 6, 7, 2, 9, 10, 11.

Chair Wilson: The motion from the Executive Committee is to accept the changes as suggested.

Senator Zallocco: Will there be an effort to have the MUO faculty senate and the Graduate Council submit their resolutions, is it in the works already?

Chair Wilson: The Chair of Graduate Council is here, can you respond?

Chair of Graduate Council: A draft resolution is circulating among the members of the Executive Committee -right now.

Chair Wilson: So the Graduate Council will have a resolution as well.

Senator Stoudt: Have you spoken to Larry Elmer about this?

Chair Wilson: No, and they are not going to do a resolution.

Senator Zallocco: Are we not going to review anything?

Senator Floyd: That's a direct quote from the Board's resolution. The intent is important, that Dr. Jacobs has spoken often of a need to re-evaluate the way power is shared between what he sees as the three groups who share in power: deans and chairs, the Faculty Senate, and the AAUP. He has spoken of this repeatedly, and I believe the intention here is to perhaps change the way our Senate operates to give more power to deans and chairs, particularly over issues of curriculum. We can only extract based upon what the President has told us repeatedly. It does not specifically state that in the Board's resolution.

Senator Olson: Furthermore I would add that the executive committees of both campuses are meeting to review a constitution to determine how we are going to bring these bodies together.

Senator Zallocco: So are we contradicting ourselves by opposing the statement we should be reviewing.

Senator Olson: No, we are not contradicting ourselves.

Senator Barnes: We are not opposed to it, we are saying that that's what they said and we are pointing out that that's what they said because we know what they mean by that.

A. Jorgensen: The other part of the resolution directs the President to initiate a process to do this review. Whereas as we are saying is that it is the role of the Faculty Senate to initiates the process. When it gets beyond our work the administration will be involved in the discussion. In an early meeting with the president we were told by the president he did not want regular meetings with the

FS Executive Committee. He said that if we want to see him we should come to his door and we will talk about it. Both executive committees objected to that. We wanted to establish regular meetings. Also in our sessions he said that he wanted to examine the power of deans because some believe that deans do not have enough power. But even with all these discussions we were not aware this resolution was coming until two business days before it was on the Board's agenda. I do think that there are members of the board that are sensitive to this issue, such as the chair and Susan Palmer. We have to make it very clear that we are not ignoring the issues. We have a retreat this Friday with the issues. We have a retreat this Friday with the two Senate Executive Committees to look at pulling things together, which of course will come back to the senate, and to the full faculty for a vote, but it needs to be a faculty initiated and faculty directed process by those that were elected by the faculty, not administrators.

Senator McInerney: Is it the intent to be corrective and instructive and perhaps confrontational, or to assert the rights of Faculty Senate to write their own document. My suggestion is to edit it.

Chair Wilson: I don't think it is the intent to be conciliatory or confrontational, but to assert the faculty's right to construct its own constitution.

Senator McInerney: I believe that is addressed in the last two paragraphs very clearly. My suggestion is to edit those two paragraphs to be more precise and to the point.

Senator Zallocco: The old paragraph nine, the last phrase states, "the President has seriously undermined the trust that has been painstakingly restored between the faculty and the administration during the past five years." It is unnecessary?

Senator Stoudt: I would argue respectfully that it is necessary. The reason is because we have institutional memory – the memory of what happened on this campus seven years ago. I believe we are up against a similar situation right now. These individuals don't remember what it was like under the previous administration that ran roughshod over the faculty and everybody else. Because they don't have this institutional memory and they do not care to listen to people who try to impart this knowledge to them, they are going down the same path. That is why we believe it is very necessary not to be incendiary or to look for trouble but we need to be clear and point out what we are responding to. And we need to remind these people of what many of us in this room lived through and would prefer not to live through again. That's why I think that although this kind of language may seem inappropriate, it has its place here.

Senator Olson: Is there anybody in this room that would argue that the relationships that we've had with the administration have improved thousand-fold times from back in 1998 to the present? What this resolution does is basically cancel out that improvement in relationships. It trods on that. It basically says you are taking away from the faculty their sense of professionalism. You have to tell them what to do. They are employees. I insist that we are professionals, we have responsibilities, and part of our responsibilities is self government. We need to assert that.

A. Jorgensen: I am responding to Ron's suggestion. I would disagree that we should drop that point. I think assertive is the right word, not confrontational, per se. The audience is the Board. You really have to listen to what the members of the Board say. I was present for their recent meeting and there were some good discussion points and an amendment to the resolution which would specifically recognize the fact that the FSEC is actively working towards a merger. The point is if the board wants to see the University operate well and to see it move in a certain direction, such as educating and recruiting students, I think what we point out is over the past five years we have developed a relationship where the President and the Provost share with the Senate Executive Committee information a couple of weeks before items went to the board and we had a chance to discuss matters. Some things were moved and changed and in general we got many things done. The university operates even better than it did previously. There is the danger right now of shifting direction to a non-productive confrontation process and then we call it like it is. The relationship over the past five years has been very successful for this institution. And we want to return to that realizing that the board still controls, bottom line. I think that statement needs to be made.

Senator Edwards: I would like to support this resolution as it stands. Two other issues that haven't been brought up:

- One, the Board's resolution is undermining the authority of the President. The board's responsibility is to set policies and not to meddle in the day to day administration of the institution. By passing this resolution it also undermines the president because it says, "you can't do without them."
- Secondly, as a professor in the College of Education we teach our teachers even those who will be teaching in kindergarten, to let children vote on the rules that will govern the classroom. If we can do this with the kindergarten children, the faculty senate is certainly capable of deciding and voting on its own rules.

Chair Wilson: I met this morning with President Jacobs and the meeting was not confrontational. We have a situation that was created and I feel as the Chair of Faculty Senate it is my responsibility to on one hand, represent the faculty and to protect the interest of the faculty, but at the same time to work constructively with the administration and to understand that we have a new administration that does not understand this university. We have a responsibility to engage in constructive education. And if the new administration has a past practice of presenting resolutions without the faculty we have a responsibility to show it will have formal consequences on this campus. It's not to be confrontational, it's to be constructive.

Senator Barnes: All the members of my department, except one, that I was able to communicate with, we would be very happy to see more assertive approaches to the issues and we thank you for your willingness to engage in that kind of conversation. I was at the Board meeting and I have to say that I was so thoroughly discouraged by the glee with which the board members had an opportunity to stick it to the faculty. And I was also very disappointed with the lack of conversation that accompanied the vote that I witnessed, which was the core vote. There was not one question. As soon as the President said what he wanted they voted and that was the end of it. Despite you Dr. Wilson, telling them about the history of the success of the core and Rob doing the same thing with regard to the CAP, they simply did not question. I don't think that's good stewardship of the University. I really think that we should vote on this proposal. I think we are ready to vote on it.

Senator Bresnahan: Are we voting on amendments for this?

Chair Wilson: No, we are voting on the resolution as it has been done.

Senator Fink: I noticed in the fourth paragraph of their resolution it's pointed out that merged institutions would keep the respective policies, procedures, rules in place temporarily. How long do they have the ability to alter the rules etc., that are now in place for former UT and MUO faculty?

Chair Wilson: None of those things are in collective bargaining. Harvey can you respond to that?

Senator Wolff: The things you mentioned are part of the collective bargaining agreement. We are going to be negotiating a new agreement in June of 2007.

Senator Fink: The second thing, I was at these meetings, but after one of the meetings where the President came and after his presentation, I happen to walk out with him and have a conversation about some of his comments at the meeting. Things might have changed, but what I got from our conversation is that he is not looking to transfer power directly from the Faculty Senate to Deans and chairs in respective colleges, but instead would like the entire faculty within each college to have more say in determining the core requirements for their students. While I still feel there is a strong role for the Faculty to play on these matters, it seems reasonable to me to let faculty within each college have more say on these matters. I am not sure how this would work, maybe we need to go to some type of "inner core" and then a more flexible "out core" set of classes we have students take.

Chair Wilson: We are not objecting to some of his ideas, I personally think that all colleges should have A&S Council, like Arts & Sciences. I think it's a good model.

Senator Barlowe: I propose a vote on calling the questions.

Chair Wilson: All in favor of calling the questions, please say "aye". All opposed same sign?

Passed unanimously.

All in favor of the resolution, say “aye”. All opposed same sign. One objection.
Thank you, that concludes the Executive Committee report. Next on the agenda is Assoc. Dean, Dennis Lettman.

Assoc. Dean Lettman: Thank you very much. I am an Assoc. Dean in the University College and also serve as the University liaison and coordinator with the Toledo Early College High School, the TECHS program. A year ago in October I came before this Senate to introduce the High School, and promised that we would be back in a year to give a progress report. A lot of good things occurred last year and I would like to report on them. I did bring a number of people with me from the High School, I would like to introduce them and they will each have a part in this presentation.

- The principal of the High School, Jacqueline Quinn
- English Teacher, Paulette Dewey
- Our Social Sciences teacher, Randy Nissen
- One of our students, Amber Mitchell

There are a lot of people at the University of Toledo that I want to thank for their cooperation. Everybody that we talked to at this University, we got quite a bit of support. From the Provost’s office down to deans, chairs, associate deans and many others. One of the things that we established a year ago is that the early college high school now has a governance board, mandated by our sponsors - the Gates Foundation and the Knowledge Works Foundation. The governance board is a combination of individuals at the University of Toledo, the Toledo Public Schools, our Provost is part of the governance board, Prof. Andy Jorgensen is the Faculty Senate representative, Prof. Harvey Wolff of the AAUP, representative and we also have Dean Sue Ott Rowlands, and Tom Switzer. From the Toledo Public Schools we have the assistant superintendent of instruction, the assistant superintendent for high schools, and also their faculty union representatives and their administrative union representative. Jackie and myself serve as ex officio on the governance board, which meets on a monthly basis and we discuss issues, challenges and so forth, regarding the program.

One of the most important components of early college high school is the opportunity for high school students to earn college credit along the way in getting a high school diploma. There are a number of partnerships as you can see on the slides. It just wouldn’t work without partnerships that have been developed since then. In the Toledo Early College High School, a student can earn up to 60 credits towards a college degree. Out of those 60 credits that will apply to high school graduation will also apply towards a college degree, so a student can earn up to two years toward a college degree. We will talk about the progress that many of the students are making academically in pursuing their high school diploma as well as gaining college credits.

Jackie Quinn: To be eligible for this program the students have to be low income, minority, English language learners, or first generation to attend college. They don’t have to be all four, just one of those four criteria. The teachers at early high school are very unique to TPS. They are interviewed, there are four teachers, this year we have four more full-time teachers plus two part-time teachers. Our teachers teach English, Math, Science and Social Studies. Last year a team of teachers interviewed the new teachers that we have on staff now. Currently we have 150 students which is our second freshman class of 80 students, so we have a total of 150 students, 70 10th graders, 80% of those students are from the Toledo Public Schools, 53% of those are low income and they are basically eligible for free lunch. 63% are first generation to attend college. 70% female, 53% black, 34% white, 10% Latino. Some of our students had 97% attendance; some students are reaching 80% potential.

Assoc. Dean Lettman: Yes, which is no small feat that this high school beat the attendance record of all Toledo Public High Schools last year. They also had 100% parent conference participation.

Jackie Quinn: Last year 19 students earned a total of 68 U.T. credits. 59 college students are presently out this fall, and those are the sophomores. 90 college students in the spring will be freshman and they will be taking the FYI courses, they are now at the university taught by the University personnel.

Assoc. Dean Lettman: Last year also we got a group of U.T. faculty in the four subject areas of Math, Science, English and Social Sciences. Four faculty members in the College of Education of this high school working in teams on a curriculum plan in each of those given areas. On a five year area of study students move from 9th grade to 12th grade in college on a pathway that insures that they are on track taking the right courses, the right English, and so on, that will get them the credits as well as meeting the high school requirements. Also, this current semester, we have 59 students taking classes in the Spring semester. We did a mid-term progress report from the various instructors. Some of them maybe here in the room, some of you may have them in your classes. We receive response from all the instructors letting us know how the students are doing, and we have overwhelming positive comments. They're participating and keeping up with their work and they are getting good grades.

Paulette Dewey: Our curriculum is rooted in *rigor*. One of the aspects of our curriculum is that we are standards based. What we do is called backwards designing, that is first we look at what the standards are and the indicators that the kids need in order to pass the OGT and to be successful freshmen and sophomores, and then we plan our lessons based on the indicators that we are attempting to reach the students with.

We are interdisciplinary to the nth degree. This is my 35th year in the Toledo Public Schools and I have never been so involved with my colleagues and with teaching. So, what we do is work in interdisciplinary teams. Last year, Tim Bolin, our Science Teacher had the students put together a book, they wrote a book about Newton's Laws, and they had to do some research and it had to include specific things. I taught them how to look at books for 4th grade students. The book had to be geared toward a 4th grade student. I taught them how to put the book together, how to use APA method, how to identify with APA. Last year Randy and I did a number of interdisciplinary projects, probably the largest one was our multi-genre research project. It's a research based project. We used the Social Studies Ohio academic Content standards as indicators and we taught the various genres through the English class, so it was totally interdisciplinary. We do the same thing with Math, Science, Social Studies and English. Our research projects are geared to help our students understand how to maneuver themselves through a variety of the research based materials that are out there.

One of the things is to teach to separate junk online from what is hard core research. Some of it is rooted in value. Our kids, like most kids are much more savvy with equipment than you would ever suspect. Our students do PowerPoint presentations, they are putting together films and they have done a number of things. They are expected to be conversant with a lot of the technology that will help them be successful in your classes. One of the key elements, the second "R" in our school is *relationships*. We have 150 students, eight full time faculty members, a principal, a secretary, a part time counselor, two part time Math and Science teachers. In our school we know every student. So if I see someone who is not doing well, or someone who is doing something inappropriate, I don't have a problem in identifying that student and talking to him of what is expected of him. I know my students better than I have know students throughout my entire career. Personalized learning comes through a variety of ways. I spend a lot of time in the evening talking with parents and emailing parents. Randy has a wonderful system where every time he has a grade or an assignment that comes due he just batch-emails everyone, so that we know what our students are doing.

Today I made an assignment from Edgar Lee Masters Spoon River Anthology. I gave every student one of the "dead people on the hill" – each is a characterization poem written in first persons - and I was able to tell them, "I assigned you the individual, the character to get to know based on what I

know you are capable of doing.” Some of them got the simpler characters simply because they are reading at a level that would not fit them to take the more complex one. I know the kids, I’ve had them a year or year and a semester. We have daily advisories, 20 minutes long, two days a week we do sustained silent reading. It is a part of their Rocket stage they have to do outside reading. We identify what texts are appropriate for the students to read. During the rest of the advisory times we work on affective kinds of things, we talk about the way they become functioning young adults. We are a cohesive learning community. Our parents are as important as our faculty and our students, and we strive to work together as this moving unit. So we meet *rigor*, we meet *relationships*. I would like to introduce you to Amber Mitchell. Amber is one of our sophomores. She was in one of your classes last year as a second semester freshman.

Amber Mitchell: Good afternoon everybody. I am Amber Mitchell, a student at the Toledo to College High School. I really like the school. We come in the morning at 8:00 o’clock if we need somebody to ask a question before going to class and they are there until about 5:00 o’clock. They are there for us to talk about things. I’ve learned a lot, things that I normally would not. We go to cultural events and by doing that we learn and we get to reach out to the communities. Our general projects and the health projects that we do, we complaint about our projects, but we benefit from it and learn a whole lot. I love the school. Everybody knows each other. There is no fighting, no arguing. We have extra curriculum activities, like quiz bowls, chess, and drama club. The last play we did was “The Dancers”.

I really like Science and Math. For the most part my college experience has been good. Some family says if you are in college you are a genius. I am not a genius, you just have to get down to your studies and work hard. One problem that I did have in my health class we had to do a group project and my group procrastinated. It was hard because I said, you guys are older, you are in college you have been here and done this, but a member of my group who is a junior in college and I was trying to contact him because we needed to get this done. I contacted the professor and asked what tips can you give me so that I can talk to him. She spoke to the class this week and the group began to meet. I talked to her today and told her that we made progress. So I was happy about that. Some college students would get mad at us. They said, “I wish I had that opportunity.” We are at the Scott Park Campus; sometimes you get some students who are not very mature. Some of them actually want to fight us, and we report that to our teachers, and they tell us just ignore them. Overall it’s been a good experience. I like the freedom in the school. We don’t need a hall pass to go to the bathroom. One thing I want to say is that if I had to go to a regular high school, I don’t think I would fit in. We have rules, but we also have freedom, and there is a lot of trust. You have to be able to trust somebody to be in our school. That’s why I like the school.

Randy Nissen: My name is Randy Nissen and I am one of the two Social Studies teachers. Paulette has told you about the first two “R”s, the *rigor* and the *relationships*, and I am going to talk about the third “R”, *relatives*. First off, every day we try very hard to connect all the teaching and learning we do to the outside world, to let the kids know it’s meaningful. It’s been a big transition for students who were work-sheeted to death for many years in schools, and we don’t play that. Everything we do is solid and meaningful. One thing that we are still working on is developing community partners. Like Amber mentioned we have requirements, each student must do a certain number of verified service hours every semester and they can be established in many ways. You come to us with a proposal and we give it either a thumbs up or a thumbs down. A curriculum is meaningful as is the instruction, and what they are doing every day is important.

Paulette and I wrote a draft last year and we received \$2,000 toward a family history project for students next semester. They are really excited about that. For instance, today in American History we talked about the great migration of African-Americans from the South, and I had to remind these

kids that we are not just talking about American history and their families and how many students had relations in the South. Most all of them did. That's what we work for every day.

Due to some of the collaborations that we established here at the University, we started to work more closely with the College of Education and Dean Switzer, who came over earlier this semester and we talked about some projects that we are going to do. We worked with the Humanities Institute, Roger Ray retired so Dr. Blatz is running it now, and we just started to give him some proposals. Dr. Russ Reising worked with us through the Humanities Institute also. Career Services, Belinda Hawkins has been wonderful as far as scheduling to guide our kids towards their major and work with the Multicultural Center, and just this year we started working with tutoring services providing some tutoring for some kids.

We received a major grant from Lowe's Corporation for \$50,000 to create an outdoor classroom. Paulette has been spearheading this and we had a media kick-off a couple of weeks ago, and they have some really great plans for it at the Scott Park Campus. They will create a bird feed station, prairie restoration, composting, beautification around the campus, and we will start moving forward soon. We're also working with the Metro Parks. We have a very close relationship with the Art Museum and we are doing three trips this year and plan to see that the art we are seeing is matching with what we are studying.

Jackie Quinn: some of our challenges that we are facing to improve our school:

- There is parent communication involvement as you heard Mrs. Dewey and Mr. Nissen talk about using the computer. We are able to dispatch information to the parents so that they can access it too. Also there are two mandatory parent-teacher conferences to fill the parents in. This summer the students also asked their parents what areas they would be willing to work in volunteering, speaking or chaperoning trips. The parents are beginning to be more a part of the program. We are looking at creating PTO.
- Lunch is a challenge, most of our high school students qualify for free lunch but because we are on the University campus our district cannot meet the federal mandates. So far we have been paying for the lunches out of the grant. Starting next semester we will no longer be able to do that, because this money should be used for tuition.
- Transportation – we have students from all over the city, even outside of the district. These students have to take a bus downtown and transfer to get here. They have to get up early and get late home. That has become an issue. Unlike a regular high school where you have the buses lined up and they take you to the respective neighborhoods. They don't have to transfer. We may be getting more grants and we might qualify for bus transportation.

Assoc. Dean Lettman: Space is another issue because of limitations at the Scott Park campus. There really isn't much room to expand and grow the school on that campus as enrollment and needs increase, as well as interacting with the various college programs at the Scott Park Campus.

Jackie Quinn: Tailoring joint high school and college curriculum could be collaboration with the College of Education, so that will open some doors.

- Retention – we have students who are going back to their home schools just this year. I believe we've lost six students. Some freshmen just because they miss their friends and they wanted to be in their home school. Our students do participate in extra athletics at their home schools. Some students have moved out of the city, so there are a variety of reasons. We are working to have some support system so our retention stays high. All those parents of the students that left guaranteed us that it wasn't anything the school did, and they are really supportive of the teachers
- Funding – is always an issue. We are going to keep working at it and we hope more funding will be available to us.

Assoc. Dean Lettman: In my opinion the key to high school to college in all of Ohio and elsewhere is that the State needs to step up. You can't depend on the school district or the University, or the Gates Foundation, or if someone who walks through the door and wants to donate a million dollars, we will take it, but we really can't count on that. We need to convince the State legislature and the Governor that this is a very important and affective program, one that needs to continue with funding now and in the future. The collaboration we have between teachers and administration and the University people is very powerful. It's all based on relationships with our kids, with each other, with you, with the parents. We have high standards and our passing percentages are 75%. Some of the kids are used to sliding by with D's; we do not accept that. Finally, we are firm believers in this. It's more flexible, more personable and it works very well.

Paulette Dewey: We invite all of you to come and visit us at early college.

Senator Barrett: I would like to ask Amber in your college class, your freshman year, how hard did you find this, how much work was it and how hard was it for you?

Amber Mitchell: Actually, my high school classes were harder. In the first semester I took geology and I managed to pass the class but really I had to study hard for that class. But other than that I think it's pretty easy. You just have to read a lot. For me it wasn't so much studying, right now I am taking Personal Health and Comp I, the grammar, I feel like I know more than some of the college students, so I felt very prepared in my classes.

To view PowerPoint presentation on TECHS program - click this icon here:



\\

fss00cv02.utad.utole

Chair Wilson: Thank you. Next on our agenda is a report from the Prioritization Committee.

Jamie Barlowe: In October the Review Committee of the University Prioritization Committee: Barb Floyd, John Barrett, Mary Ellen Edwards, Harvey Wolff, Sonny Ariss, Subba Rao, and Camie Corrigan from student government began to review the six prioritization reports submitted by College Prioritization Committees from A&S, Business, Education, Engineering, Law and University College. Completion of the prioritization process was delayed for the Colleges of Pharmacy and HHS, the Carlson Library, and all non-academic units, including those that report to the Provost's Office, because of complications and changes caused by the merger. At the November 1st meeting of the UPC this review committee reported suggesting some revisions to the College Prioritization Committees. Also at the November 1st meeting Dr. Jacobs addressed the group explaining that despite his initial skepticism about prioritization, he now considers it to be one of the most important university initiatives that can inform the FY2008 budget and the Strategic Planning process. Also at that meeting the Final Report Committee was elected. Elected were Mary Ellen Edwards, Camie Corrigan, John Barrett, Harvey Wolff. The three co-chairs, Nagi Naganathan, Walt Olson and I are also members of this committee.

At the November 15th meeting of the UPC, the committee presented a draft of the Final Report. Since that time we have been receiving suggestions, comments and revisions which we have been incorporating into the document that you received by email yesterday. We are presenting the Final

Report to you today, because according to agreements made by Faculty Senate and Graduate Council with President Johnson in Spring of 2005, the UPC's Final Report would come to Faculty Senate and the Graduate Council for endorsement before delivery to the Provost and President. The report will be presented to the Graduate Council next week and will be delivered to the Provost shortly thereafter and to the President by the end of December.

Senator Olson: The final report is broken down to three documents.

- First part is the overall summary of the prioritization process and major findings and recommendations.
- Second part is the final report that reflects the major items from the CPC
- Third part is a Table 3 for the University which is broken down by college.

I don't think we need to read the entire report to you, copies are available here. These are the major findings that summarize the findings for the complete University and make some recommendations.

- Part of the recommendations reflect the fact that we believe in order for the prioritization to be effective on this campus, it has to include everybody. At this point it does not.
- Secondly, we believe that the prioritization has to include the HSC. So far they have not participated in the process.
- Thirdly, we believe in order for prioritization to have an impact it must be included into the strategic planning process.
- Fourthly, if prioritization is going to be effective, the deans need to report back to the President on a semi-annual basis of how well they are doing to meet the findings that were from the prioritization. This is extremely important that effective faculty consultation is included in this process. If the deans report to the President without taking into consideration their faculty, then that is business as usual for some deans.

Senator Barlowe: And the Provost.

Senator Olson: And the Provost too. And lastly, we envision prioritization as being a continuous process, not a one time shot. Any comments?

Senator Pope: We are supposed to have two documents, correct? One of them is contradicting.

Senator Barlowe: Where do you find the contradiction?

Senator Pope: The College of Business for example, one says we are supposed to increase the growth research strength in Manufacturing Management, and the other one says we are suppose to eliminate the program.

Senator Olson: There is a mistake in the Draft Report where it says EMB, it should actually be Health Sciences, Health Care Administration MBA. That was a typo and we will correct it.

Senator Olson: Other comments?

Senator Thompson-Casado: Regarding the resolution that we passed earlier today, perhaps on page two under recommendations number five the sentence might perhaps better read, "...because of the revisions of the constitutions, these bodies should be charged with the significant role in prioritization in the future," perhaps we should scratch, "as directed by the Board of Trustees."

Senator Olson: I take that as a friendly amendment.

Senator Barlowe: I think we might make it even stronger by saying that the Faculty Senate and Graduate Council should be charged with a significant role.

Senator Olson: There will be changes to the constitution as a result of the merger but we can't forecast it. But we really would like the process to be included into the processes of the university.

Senator Fink: As a result of your findings, were any programs that were cut as a result of the prioritization?

Senator Olson: This prioritization does not cut programs, it doesn't have that authority. There are some programs however that have been suggested for review for possible elimination including industrial engineering. There are some programs up for review in Business and other colleges.

Senator Barlowe: This information in the Final Report came directly from the colleges and in almost every college a number of programs are up for review, revision, assessment or elimination.

Senator Olson: In almost every College it is reported that the budget cuts in the past five years have impacted their programs. And some of those programs may be viable programs.

A. Jorgensen: This might be a good time to call attention to the fact that President Johnson invited the Faculty Senate to help establish the prioritization process with the Graduate Council. Faculty directed the program. They worked together with the administration to look at the institution and prepare a report. It was a collaborative process with the administration and this is how shared governance works. This was successful even under the extreme challenges induced by the merger and financial challenges among other things. This is how you do things, and I complement those involved.

Senator Barlowe: One of the most important outcomes of the prioritization process, which Walt mentioned is the integration of a continuous improvement model into the culture of the University of Toledo, which we need, and which can have the consequence of both self-assessment and self-prioritization. This will allow us to align our resources with our strategic initiatives and priorities.

Senator Olson: Any other comments? This is a committee report and we are seeking your endorsement. It does not require a motion, but it does require a vote for endorsement.

(Copy of Draft of University Prioritization Committee's Final Report)

(Draft – UT Prioritization Report)

DRAFT
The University of Toledo
Prioritization Report
December 2006

Background:

The University of Toledo Prioritization Process was performed under the authority of President Johnson's Request to Faculty: Conduct a Faculty-led Prioritization of Academic Programs Presented to the Joint Meeting of the University of Toledo's Faculty Senate and Graduate Council on January 18, 2005. Subsequent motions passed by the Faculty Senate and the Graduate Council on April 12, 2005 supported this process. On June 16, 2005, President Johnson formally charged the University Prioritization Committee "to develop and implement processes, criteria and measures to be used in setting priorities for academic programs (...) and university-wide support services." After serious inquiry into prioritization systems and methods at a number of universities, the UPC unanimously agreed on a prioritization adapted from the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Program.

The leadership structure of the Prioritization Committee consists of three Chairs, a sitting Dean of a College, a representative of the Faculty Senate and a representative of the Graduate Council. Two groups of elective bodies performed the prioritization efforts: in each college, an elected College Prioritization Committee (CPC) performed College internal prioritizations. At the University level, each college and

commensurate nonacademic area was represented in the University Prioritization Committee (UPC). The UPC received reports from the CPCs and performed a university level prioritization.

The University of Toledo was merged with the Medical University of Ohio during the critical periods the prioritization process. As a result several units including all units located on the Health Science Campus, the College of Pharmacy, the College of Health Science and Human Service, the Library and the nonacademic units did not complete the prioritization process due the disruption caused by the merger activities.

Major Findings:

A number of the issues cited by the CPC's were the direct result of the continuous stream of budgets cuts over the past five years. Table III, attached, graphically displays the areas that are currently successful and should be encouraged to grow, the areas that should be continued at present levels and the areas that should further reviewed and considered for viability. Significant findings include:

1. Several colleges have received external recognition for excellence including Education for results on Praxis teachers' examinations, Engineering in Princeton Review of Graduate Schools, and Law noted to be in the Best 100 Law Schools by the US News and World Report.
2. Several colleges report the need to re-examine for viability and reconsider the structures of programs and developmental courses.
3. Two Units (UC and A&S) stress difficulties arising from interim leadership that deters strategic planning initiation and implementation.
4. All units report a need for additional resources in given areas particularly for Graduate Programs.
5. Several colleges report the need for continuous improvement and unified assessment practices that help them to improve in the future.

Recommendations:

On the completion of this effort, the Prioritization Committee Leadership is making the following recommendations:

1. Units that initiated the prioritization process should complete the effort in the immediate upcoming year. This would include the College of Pharmacy, the College of Health Science and Human Service, the Library and the non academic units under the Provost and other Vice Presidents on the main campus.
2. Prioritization should be initiated and completed on the Health Sciences Campus.
3. In connection with effective faculty consultation, including the College Prioritization Committees, the College Deans should report formally to the Senior Leadership Team the progress on the areas identified in all columns of Table III on a six-month schedule.
4. The continuous improvement model needs to be incorporated into the university culture with a formal assessment every three years.

5. While the structure of the Faculty Senates and Graduate Council may change because of the revisions of the Constitutions as directed by the Board of Trustees, these bodies should be charged with a significant role in prioritization in the future.
 - a. Each college should elect a College Prioritization Committee.
 - b. The University Prioritization Committee should be an elective body with member terms of three years with 1/3 of the membership being elected in any given year. In addition there should be representatives from the Administration, the Staff and the Student Body.
6. Graduate education in all colleges should be strengthened and supported.
7. This report should inform the University Strategic Planning Process, as well as 2008 budgetary allocations.

Executive Summary of Six Colleges

The College of Arts & Sciences contains 28 reporting units, including 19 departments and 9 programs or centers. Significant findings of the College Prioritization Committee are summarized as follows:

- The College reports among its strengths its dedicated faculty, governance and administrative structures, internal communication, and college-wide cohesion and consensus
- The College has engaged in various outreach initiatives and has quality relationships with its beneficiaries and stakeholders, including outstanding, dedicated, visible alumni; endowed professorships; evolving research communities; improved undergraduate recruitment; college and department level student-centered initiatives; positive course evaluations; successful promotion of distinguished lecture series; and delivery of courses for other colleges.
- The College has also been successful in developing or obtaining external funding, innovative new program areas within and across disciplines, graduate school and professional placements, national departmental accreditation and support of corresponding external standards, quality and diversity of graduate students, able delivery of majors, minors and concentrations, capable direction of centers and institutes and development of C&I initiatives and impact, advising; and successful initiation and expansion of endowed chairs.
- The College faces inadequate and outdated facilities, difficulties arising from interim leadership, and over-reliance on part time and temporary faculty.
- Budgetary constraints and an uncertain university environment that lacks clear priorities and a comprehensive plan deter effective strategic planning and implementation and retention of faculty and students.
- Additional data is necessary for developing and marketing programs/disciplines and understanding the impact of international initiatives and distance learning.
- The college concludes that graduate programs will continue to enhance corresponding undergraduate programs, selected programs and interdisciplinary units will benefit from planned consolidation, and other programs, centers, and institutes will benefit from an examination of productive and cost effectiveness.

- The college also reports that it needs to develop additional endowed professorships, and to house and administer the Adult Liberal Studies [ALS] program together with the Master of Liberal Studies [MLS] program.
- The College prioritization process has not identified any programs for elimination; however, it did identify a number of programs for consolidation or further review and assessment.

The College of Business Administration is comprised of five academic departments and student services, including advising, recruiting, and information technology. Its 3,100 enrolled students major, minor, or complete graduate degrees (M.B.A., E.M.B.A., M.S., Ph.D.) in twenty program areas. Significant findings of the College Prioritization Committee are summarized as follows:

- Continuous improvement is part of the culture of the College, primarily because of accreditation requirements, but the College Prioritization Committee has recommended that the scope and depth of the assessment activities be broadened and relevant information more systematically gathered, evaluated, and used.
- Professional career development for undergraduate and graduate students, including internships and career placement programs, are reported as outstanding and as having a significant economic impact on the region and state.
- The College reports a significant need to increase instructional capacity.
- Although the College's outreach and engagement activities with local and global business communities continue to be successful, more activities are needed, as well as additional alliances and partnerships.
- To advance the College's regional reputation and status and to maintain a focus on core competencies, further investment must be made in successful key program areas—Sales, Entrepreneurship, Leadership, Accounting, and International Business—and less successful programs, for example, in BANS, OPTM/SCM, ECOMM, FSER, and EMBA, must be revised or eliminated.

The Judith Herb College of Education grants graduate and undergraduate degrees in education related fields from teacher education to higher education administration. The College has four departments: Educational Leadership, Curriculum and Instruction (including the Carver Learning Technology Support Center), Early Childhood, Physical and Special Education, and Foundations of Education. Significant findings of the College Prioritization Committee are summarized as follows:

- The College reports successful outcomes in various areas over the past few years, including increases in donations to the College, notably the fifteen million dollars given by Judith Herb and her family; increased funding obtained from external grants; success of their graduates on the Praxis II and the Praxis III teacher examinations, where they recorded a 93% and 99% respective passing rates; success in securing accreditation from National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), as well as 13 other accrediting agencies; and successful engagement with community and professional organizations.
- The College identifies several areas for increased support, including graduate programs in special education, educational administration, and early childhood; graduate and undergraduate teacher education programs related to STEMM areas, and funds to support recruiting undergraduate and graduate students for programs in mathematics education and educational administration.
- The College also recognizes a need for additional tuition and stipend support for all doctoral students.
- The College wants to develop a new program in Adapted Physical Education and expand awareness of the Center for Nonviolence and Democratic Education.

- The College points to the need for continued support for undergraduate teacher education licensure and the Carver Center.
- The College prioritization process has not identified any programs for revision or elimination.

The College of Engineering includes six academic departments, six support service areas, and two research centers, involving 22 degree programs. Significant findings of the College Prioritization Committee are summarized as follows:

- The strong co-op program for undergraduate studies must continue to be enhanced and provide high level, enriching co-op opportunities.
- The graduate programs, with an enrollment of nearly 300 students and recently ranked in the nation's top twenty by the Princeton Review, must define a comprehensive graduate enrollment and funding plan to sustain its excellence and global competitiveness.
- Although the College already reports a high level of student satisfaction with Engineering Computing, it must continue to be enhanced in order to remain at the forefront of technology delivery to students.
- The College must continue to build on its established, strong relationships with industrial advisory groups and on the synergies made possible by the merger with MUO.
- Although the Polymer Institute continues to be a consistent performer in conducting fundamental and applied research with industries, its marginal facilities must be addressed and its integration into a more comprehensive college-wide research center should be explored.
- The industrial engineering program must be reviewed in the context of available resources and student interest, with the possibility of changing its status from a separate major to a minor or concentration within mechanical engineering.
- The formal separation of the Ph.D. program in Manufacturing Management and Engineering and its relocation and reorientation in COBA should be considered.
- The College must address the retention of personnel and training/career advancement options and resources in the support units, which are currently understaffed.
- The performance and viability of the Precision Micro Machining Center should be further examined in the context of external grants and contracts.

The College of Law offers two graduate programs for full-time and part-time students. In addition, the College offers joint degree programs, and certificates of concentration. The college is under new leadership. The College is under new leadership, effective July 1, 2006. Significant findings of the College Prioritization Committee are summarized as follows:

- Consistent with its Strategic Plan (presented to BOT on Feb 23, 2000), the College has managed its enrollment in quality and quantity with an objective to improve bar passage rates and its national ranking. The college is now ranked among the top 100 law schools by the *U.S. News and World Report of America's Best Graduate Schools 2007*. UT Law graduates, who took the Ohio Bar Exam for the first time in July 2006, achieved a 94* percent passage rate, placing first in the state *. (see footnote)

- The College's current J.D. program is well poised for additional successes and requires additional investments such as scholarships for such an outcome.
- The new Master of Studies in Law (MSL) Program, which began in Fall 2006, is considered a valuable addition to the College that is too new to evaluate.
- The College needs to address assessment and information use regarding structure and systems. Mechanisms for assessment are in place and effective within specific sub-programs of the JD Program. However, there is a need to improve the collection, interpretation, publication, and utilization of data with respect to important activities and groups within and outside the College.
- The College should improve its communication of its contributions to our University's mission.
- Given that the College offers only two degree programs, one of them new, the College Prioritization Committee has not identified any program for revision or elimination.

University College is a multifaceted college with components whose responsibilities range from granting degrees and offering courses, to providing University-wide student services, to performing outreach functions. UC contains two academic departments, (Interdisciplinary and Special Programs (ISP) and the Business Technology Department (BT)), two divisions that provide academic and administrative support (Students Services and the Dean's Office), several outreach programs (the Division of Community and Economic Development, Workplace Credit, Workforce Programs, SkillsMAX Center, and Continuing Education) and several student support services to the entire University community (the Learning Enhancement Center, the Testing Center, the Student Development Program, and the Student Success Center). The College has 21 full-time faculty members. Significant findings of the College Prioritization Committee are summarized as follows:

- The College has a very diverse student population. 70 percent of UC's students are 25 years of age or older, 27 percent are African American, and 37 percent are of an ethnicity other than white.
- Faculty development would be enhanced by the College having a permanent tenured dean and a permanent tenured associate dean of instruction. The tenuousness of the College since the Kapoor presidency has resulted in an unclear definition of the overall responsibilities of the Dean's Office as it relates to the operation and structure of the College.
- The College's rate of success with the under-prepared student population exceeds that of any other area institution.
- ISP and BT have degree programs that successfully accommodate and serve the adult student population.
- Despite the lack of University-wide acknowledgement and promotion of associate degree programs, BT has over 450 student majors and generates 21,000 credit hours per academic year.
- Since the success of each unit depends upon serving the entire UT community, it would be beneficial to explore the possibility of locating such entities at the Learning Enhancement Center, the Testing Center, the Student Development Program, and the Student Success Center in a more centralized University venue.
- The College could benefit from an in-depth examination of its resources and perceived duplication of university student support services. Due to a decreased level of support from the University, many of these entities appear to lack direction, which could be reversed by a comprehensive assessment and appropriate follow-up actions.

Chair Wilson: This vote is endorsing the committee report. All those in favor say, “aye”, opposed same sign. *Passed unanimously.*

Senator Barlowe: Please email any suggestions for revision to me as soon as possible, and I will incorporate them into the document.

Chair Wilson: Next on the agenda is Holly Monsos, chair of the Academic Programs Committee.

Senator Monsos: Email was sent to you for your consideration of today’s business. I would like you to look at the five modifications under New Business. They are all modifications to programs. Are there any questions on those five items? If there are none, I would like to move those as a group, all those in favor of approving items one through five under New Business, please indicate by saying “aye”. Opposed? None. *Passed unanimously.*

The new proposal from Education - Early Childhood you saw at the previous meeting and we have some people today to show you some updated transparencies and to answer any questions you might have.

Ruslan Slutsky: One of the reasons we wanted to introduce this new program in the College of Education is because we found the need in our students who only wanted to get a degree in education without licensure. Right now the current program offers licensure and no alternative option exists. There is a need in Head Start and other agencies that only work with teachers that don’t require a licensure or want to work in primary schools. Their goal is to only focus on early childhood education at the pre-K level. They don’t want to go through student teaching and other practicum experiences. They want to work with kids ages 3-5.

Our goal is to introduce a program that would allow this. Since last time, we made several changes, we had a course incorrectly listed as Social Welfare. Another course, American Sign language II, should be listed as American Sign language I. In the electives section, we added two courses that were recommended by Arts & Sciences so that students would get a stronger foundation in English, particularly writing and reading. We’re offering students 5 options in terms of reading course selection, and three options in terms of writing courses, so all students would have to take that option. Everything else has not changed.. Any questions?

Senator Stoudt: Will somebody speak to the pre-requisites for those courses listed in the catalog?

Ruslan Slutsky: I think some of those pre-requisites are incorrect. They were supposed to be removed and I think they will be removed as they are incorrect. We are working on getting them off the records.

Senator Edwards: I was confused, in the catalog it talks about the Bachelor of Arts in Education or Bachelor of Science in Education, people will have to have a specialty in the major areas in Arts & Sciences. Where is that done?

Ruslan Slutsky: That general area of concentration, I don’t think is necessary because it’s not part of a licensure program and doesn’t have to meet that requirement. We have created 31 hrs electives, which students can take and we thought that would be an appropriate requirement.

Senator Edwards: Why it is not Bachelor of Education not a Bachelor of Arts in Education? Does the degree read Bachelor of Arts?

Ruslan Slutsky: When we met with the undergraduate Dean in education, that was the degree option that was recommended and thought to be appropriate.

Laurie Dinnebeil: I’m not sure why it is supposed to be a Bachelor of Arts in Education.

Senator Edwards: I don’t understand why it is Bachelor of Arts in Education, rather than Bachelor of Education.

Laurie Dinnebeil: The Bachelor of Education that we have is a licensure based program. The Bachelor of Arts in Education is a program that had been inactive. We want to resurrect it for this program.

Senator Edwards: According to the catalog it's supposed to have a major field requirement in Arts & Sciences. That's why it's called Arts or Science Degree.

Laurie Dinnebeil: From historical perspective we met with the Dean's office and the Provost's office and we thought we had everything ironed out. I honestly am not sure how to respond to your question.

Senator Wolff: Do all your undergraduate programs need licensure?

Ruslan Slutsky: Right now in our department, yes. We have an undergraduate program where students get a license.

Senator Edwards: What is in the catalog reads, Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science in Education. However, normally they were for a single degree, people teaching in high school, majoring in English or Math. I don't understand why you try to put it in as a Bachelor of Arts or Science in the Arts & Sciences College. I think that's problematic for students.

Laurie Dinnebeil: We have talked about this in the college and it was approved by the college.

Ruslan Slutsky: Also, the 31 hours of electives, most of them are very open for transfer students. A lot of the students will be coming from Owens. In order for them to come here and not B.G. or other schools, we need to give them flexibility for transferring their credits to U.T., otherwise, they will choose not to come here. By allowing the 31 hours of flexibility it helps them with the decision to come here.

Senator Edwards: What is the problem, why we can't offer them Bachelor of Education, then we won't have to worry about this Arts & Sciences requirement.

Laurie Dinnebeil: That's the question that we will have to take back to the Provost's Office.

Senator Edwards: By tradition, a Bachelor of Arts means something and Bachelor of Science means something, whether it's in Education or other field. You have to meet certain core requirements to get a Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science degrees. This degree doesn't add the core requirement.

Senator Monsos: I believe the choice to go to the B.A. would have to do with the Head Start requirement. The committee did ask that they look again at core requirements that are indicated in the catalog. Laurie emailed me back that it could be done in these 31 hours but they did not want to specify and that's where it's left.

A. Jorgensen: A couple of points. Is there a possibility to specify an intermediate level of courses in certain areas? The second, the competition is not sufficient to drive to do something to lower our standards. We can get lots of students if we just lower our standards to graduate. You have every reason for doing it. Also, we talked about college-centric curriculum decisions. In the future if the Faculty Senate by some means doesn't review curriculum at University level a program like this that a college thinks is a wonderful thing but which makes a statement in the name of the University, the Faculty Senate may not think that it should be approved. This is a classic case for the need or review above the college-level.

Chair Wilson: Do you know whether at BGSU their early childhood program is a Bachelor of Education or Bachelor of Arts?

Ruslan Slutsky: I know they have a similar licensure program as we do. They don't have a non-licensure program.

A. Jorgensen: Where are these students going then, if not Bowling Green?

Laurie Dinnebeil: We certainly are interested in enrollment and in bringing the student here to the University of Toledo. We are also interested in meeting the demands of the professional fields, and this program absolutely meets those demands in way that other programs can't. Recent activities in the field of early childhood suggest that more and more a bachelor's degree, not a teaching license is required to do things, like provide professional development to preschool

teachers and child care providers. In addition Head Start teachers are required by the federal government to receive a bachelor's degree, not a teaching license, by the year 2008.

Ruslan Slutsky: It's being revised to possibly 2010, but right now it's 2008.

Laurie Dinnebeil: We are responding to the needs of primarily women who work full time during the day and can't afford to be full time students and can't afford to take time off for a semester to do student teaching and other types of practica, but want to be able to earn that bachelor's degree. We in no way have diminished the quality of the degree, the standards for the program remain the same. Students will still get a background in Arts and Science, they will be required to complete the core curriculum and so on. I have every confidence that this program is going to be in demand for students and it's going to be a good thing for the university.

Senator Edwards: We had in the past had bachelor of education degrees, for example the old Public Affairs and Community Services (PACS) program gave students bachelor of education degrees that were non licensure programs. That's where this belongs, not in the Bachelor of Arts program.

Laurie Dinnebeil: I am perfectly willing to think about what kind of degree program it is.

Senator Edwards: It will just confuse people who are in the bachelor of arts or science programs.

Laurie Dinnebeil: It was approved by our College's Academic Affairs and faculty in the College of Education as well so it has gone through all the channels. We will be happy to look at some other possibilities that make more sense.

Senator Monsos: We will take this back under consideration and submit later.

The last item under New Business, item #6 is post baccalaureate degree certificate, there is an updated sheet that was emailed to you this afternoon, please refer to this copy. Marie Janes is here to answer any questions you might have. The previous draft did not include listing of the pre-prerequisites for the courses and after some consultation it was decided to add those.

Marie Janes: Students who would come to take this certificate would be doing it with a baccalaureate degree and take these credits that go along with the health information program. They receive a certificate and their baccalaureate degree will allow them to sit for the American Health Information Management Assoc., Registered Health Information Administrator (RHIA).

Accreditation started in the year 2002/2003, so it's very, very new program. What this will do for example is I know three or four individuals who are at the University Medical Center with baccalaureate degrees who work in health information who would love to have the credential but they don't want to take the second baccalaureate degree because it's redundant. We are trying to get rid of the redundancy. We take everything they had before by giving them the specifics that they need to take towards passing the certification exams for a national organization. If they took their credentials hopefully they would make more money. That's the purpose of this.

Senator Stoudt: I would like some clarification regarding the addition of the permission of instructor in the catalog.

Marie Janes: I filled out the course modifications with Peg Traband and we have it all set to go.

Senator Stoudt: Would permission of instructor only be applicable to certificate students or would it also apply to baccalaureate students enrolled in these courses?

Marie Janes: I realize when they built this program from the ground up, I had no students in the program and no idea of the flow. It won't affect my program in any way, in fact it will probably allow students a little more flexibility with their scheduling. If somebody joins us in the spring as opposed to fall, it will give them a little more flexibility in scheduling and they may be able not spend so many semesters here because they fall in sequence.

Peg Traband: To clarify this, in some of the original pre-requisites that were used initially as they put the program together the sequencing rather than instructional pre-requisites, in other

words it wasn't used as a building block of instructional units rather as a technique for sequencing, that's what we have been able to eliminate.

Senator Monsos: All those in favor of approving the new post-baccalaureate certificate program in the HIA, please say "aye." Opposed? None. *Passed unanimously.*

Senator Pope: Last time we had a call in the College of Business as the explanations were a little confusing,

Senator Monsos: I have not been able to meet with the representative from Business that we needed to talk to because the committee is confused. It's two different issues: one is clear and one is not.

(Copy of Prof. Holly Monsos report)

Academic Program Committee business – 11/28/06

Old Business

Item 1 – New Proposal from Education – Early Childhood – Summary: program would provide a BA in Education that is degree-only (no licensure) in early childhood education.
Representatives – Ruslan Slutsky and Laurie Dinnebeil

New Business

Item 1 – Modification to BA and BS in Environmental Studies – Summary: replace ECON 4240 with ECON 3240 as more appropriate related requirement for the degree. Approved by ECON.
Representative – Elliot Tramer

Item 2 – Modification to BSPS PTOX degree – Summary: Move Toxicology I & II (PHCL 4730 & 4750) from recommended electives to required courses.
Representative – Ezdihar Hassoun

Item 3 – Modification to Forensic Science Investigation Minor – Summary: Replace current requirement of BIOL 2020 with BIOL 2150. Recommended by BIOL.
Representative – Eric Lambert

Item 4 – Modification to Associate of Applied Science in Paralegal Studies - Summary: Add the new course LGL 4330 Mediation: Topics & Techniques to be used as a law elective or general elective

Modification to Bachelor of Science in paralegal Studies - Summary: Add the new course LGL 4330 Mediation: Topics & Techniques to be used as a general elective or as an elective course in the three legal specialty tracks.

Modification to Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in Paralegal Studies – Summary: Add the new course LGL 4330 Mediation: Topics & Techniques to be used as a law elective.
Representative: Margaret Traband

Item 5 – Modification to Health Information Management program – Summary: to provide alternatives to 4 required classes in order to better accommodate distance learning students.

Current	Change
BUAD 3030	BUAD 3030 or BMGT 2030
BUAD 3050	BUAD 3050 or CNET 2150
INFS 3250	INFS 3250 or CMPT 2460
INFS 3370	INFS 3370 or CNET 2200

Representative: Marie Janes

Item 6 – New Post-Baccalaureate Degree Certificate in Health Information Administration

Summary: 32 credit certificate, possible to earn in one year, or over time on a part time basis. Aimed at individuals interested in advancing in their current position, achieving a new career goal, or changing a career path.

Representative: Marie Janes

Fall

HIM 2210 Medical Linguistics in Ancillary Services HEAL 1800 or permission of instructor	3 credits
HIM 3210 Acute Care Clinical Classification Systems and Services HEAL 1800 or permission of instructor	3 credits
HIM 3220 Ambulatory Care Clinical Classification Systems and Services Pre/Co requisite of HIM 2210 and HIM 3210	3 credits
HIM 3230 HC Documentation Requirements Pre/Co requisite of HIM 2210	3 credits
HIM 4260 Legal and Ethical Issues in Healthcare Service HIM 3200 or permission of instructor	<u>3 credits</u> 15 Credits

Spring

HIM 3240 Health Information Administration Practices BUAD 1020, HIM 3200 or permission of instructor	4 credits
HIM 4200 Reimbursement Methodologies HIM 3220 or permission of instructor, HIM 3240-concurrent	2 credits
HIM 4210 Healthcare Statistics, Registries, and Research MATH 2600-or related math, HIM 3220	3 credits
HCAR 4500 Health Care Informatics	<u>4 credits</u> 13 credits

Summer

HIM 4940 PPE II	<u>4 credits</u>
-----------------	------------------

Total Certificate Credits **32 credits**

Students must complete 25% of the program hours and the last 12 hours in residency.

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

* **Footnote:** Correction on page 19. Report originally stated "... 93 percent rate, tying for the first place in the state."