

**THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO**  
**FACULTY SENATE**  
**Minutes of the Senate Meeting of January 8, 2008**  
<http://www.facsenate.utoledo.edu>

Approved @FS mtg. on 1/22/08

---

**HIGHLIGHTS**

**Discussion of proposed policies on research**  
**Discussion of proposed rules & appendices**  
**Undergraduate Curriculum update**  
**Academic Programs update**  
**Core Curriculum update**  
**Experiential Learning Committee update**  
**General Ed Curriculum 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 Floyd** called the meeting to order. **Alice Skeens, Executive Secretary** called the roll.

***I. Roll Call –2007-2008 Senators:***

**Present:** Alexander (for Martin), Arris, Barden, Barlowe, Barnes, Beatty-Medina (for Jakobson), Chen, Cluse-Tolar, Edwards (for Baines), Fink, Floyd, Fritz, Funk, Greninger, Horan, Johanson, Kennedy, Kistner, Lambert, LeBlanc, Lipscomb, Lundquist, McInerney, Monsos, Morrissey, Olson, Peseckis, Piazza, Piotrowski, Skeens, Stierman, Teclehaimanot, Ventura, Wedding, Wikander, Wolff

**Excused absence:** Hamer, Hefzy, Hottell, Le, Moorhead, Thompson-Casado, Sundar (for Pope),

**Unexcused absence:** Ames (for Bischoff), Fournier, Hudson, Relue, Spongberg, Tierney (for Klein)

***II. Approval of Minutes:***

Minutes of November 27, 2007 were approved as distributed.

***III. Executive Committee Report:***

**Chair Barbara Floyd:**

I would like to welcome everyone back to the start of a new semester and the beginning of a new year. We have much to accomplish in the eight meetings that we have remaining for this Senate year, and I hope that we can make progress on several important issues.

First, an update on log items. We have several log items pending that we really need to make progress on resolving. I would like to urge committee chairs who have log items before your committees to work with all deliberate speed to bring your reports to the Senate as soon as possible. Please let Kathy Grabel know when you anticipate being completed with your assignments and ready to present your report, and she will get you on the agenda for an upcoming meeting. As are reminder, these are the issues that we are awaiting reports on:

**Student Affairs Committee:** Is looking into evaluations of the academic portion of Rocket Launch.

**Academic Regulations:** Is investigating methods for safeguarding academic honesty by students taking exams for distance learning classes; and the rights and responsibilities of the Student Grievance Council.

**Faculty Affairs Committee:** Is investigating and perhaps drafting a proposed policy regarding the required use of faculty-authored textbooks,

**University Affairs Committee:** Is looking at the issue of representation on the Research Council, particularly the lack of representation by some colleges; whether the university should have a policy regarding political rallies on campus and who can attend such rallies; and whether the university's public relations and marketing efforts adequately represent all aspects of the university.

**Academic Regulations:** Is investigating certificate programs and whether such programs should have Faculty Senate oversight.

As you can see, these issues are of great importance to the faculty, and we need to begin as a Senate to address the issues and debate the proposals brought forth by our committees. Also, if you have other issues you would like to see any of our Senate committees address, please bring them to the executive committee as soon as possible so that we can assign them to the appropriate committee and we have a chance to complete our discussion of them before the end of the year.

Update on the activities of the Executive Committee. Like the rest of you, the executive committee did not meet over the semester break, so we have little new to bring to you. Here is a brief update on some items that we did discuss before the semester break, and a few that we have discussed at an executive committee meeting last week.

1. Assessment of the deans and vice presidents: You may remember that in the past, the Faculty Senate has carried out the bi-annual evaluations of the deans. The Senate did not do so last year, which was our normal year in the cycle to do the evaluation, and the executive committee this year wanted to make sure this important activity was completed this year. After pushback from some in the administration when I raised the issue several months ago, a task force was put together to look at the evaluation instrument and process. The task force met once, reviewed the instrument used the last time the evaluations were carried out, and agreed to recommend the same instrument be used again this time. The recommendation of the task force was forwarded to the provosts in November, and we are waiting for their approval to move this forward. The proposal is to evaluate administrators (including vice presidents) who are in at least their second year of employment. I intend to continue to push for this process to be carried out early this semester.

2. Changes in our meetings with the administration: Since last spring, the FSEC has met with the president, senior leadership, provosts, and deans on a rotating schedule. As such, we met with the president approximately 2-3 times a month. That schedule has been restructured, so that we now meet with the provosts, senior leadership, and deans each month, and with the president once a month for one hour. We will work with this schedule to see if it provides an effective and sufficient communication time with the president. I am also hoping that the president will schedule one-on-one meetings with the chairs of the senates to supplement these meetings, but this has not been resolved. The president has agreed to come to the Senate's meeting on January 22, our next Faculty Senate meeting. So, please be prepared to ask the questions you want to hear him address.

3. Upcoming speakers for Senate meetings: The executive committee has discussed who we might want to come and give presentations to the Senate this semester. Suggestions include Charles Lehnert to give an update on facilities and construction projects; Bill McMillen, to give an update on the state's new higher education strategic plan, which I understand is nearly completed; and Kevin Kucera, to give an update on spring semester enrollment and plans for promoting enrollment growth in the fall; and Bob Cryan, who will talk on the new Global Initiatives report that he and Dr. Johnson prepared and recently presented to the Board of Trustees. Are there additional speakers you would like us to consider?

**Senator Barnes:** I had a couple of colleagues come with complaints about the bookstore, how their students are being treated, how they are being treated. In the past we've had a rep from the bookstore come in and talk to us, so maybe she could come back and address is issue. There must be a policy in place somewhere. The two stories I got today were not too good. I don't know if this is a wide-spread problem or just isolated incidents.

**Chair Floyd:** Does anyone have any comments, is this a common problem? I will contact the manager and have her come back. If people have specific problems, please send them to Kathy, our secretary, and we can compile a list of questions for the manager. Any more comments or questions?

4. Faculty Service Award: I received a request from one of our deans for the Senate to consider creating a faculty service award to yearly recognize faculty who have benefitted the university through outstanding service. The executive committee discussed this at our meeting last Friday, and thought it was an interesting idea, since we all agreed that service is one component of a faculty member's workload which is usually the least valued in terms of promotion, tenure, and merit. We will continue this discussion with the provost, and perhaps we can institute something similar to the programs we currently have to recognize faculty for outstanding research and outstanding teaching. Any comments from you as to whether this should be pursued? We will assume you want us to pursue this further.

5. Now we will move on to the two proposed policies on research. Copies were distributed to you last week. Our secretary will take some detailed notes of your concerns and questions and I will draft this into a memo and forward it to Doug Wilkerson as the official response from the Faculty Senate about these new proposed policies. These policies were distributed to me as part of an email that went out to the Senior Leadership Team on December 19<sup>th</sup> and we were asked to comment by December 28<sup>th</sup> with implementation scheduled for January 1<sup>st</sup>. I expressed my concern to the Provosts about the time schedule and that during Dec. 19<sup>th</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup> there is almost no faculty on campus, and the Provosts asked Dr. Wilkerson to give us a thirty day window to comment which means our comments are due by January 18<sup>th</sup>. After discussion of today, if you want I can ask Dr. Wilkerson to attend a Senate meeting, and perhaps try to schedule him for our next meeting. If not, I can just go with the process which I outlined as our suggested changes.

These policies were presented as minor or technical revisions of policies that already exist on the HSC. In many ways they are new policies for the main campus or at least significant changes. In my analysis I tried to overlay these two policies to see where there were similarities and differences and it was very hard because there are still our policies on research in our Policies Manual, and then these things that don't seem to correlate very well with the policies that we currently have on the Main Campus. I think this is a significant discussion and important that faculty weigh in and it's significant that we give the administration the feedback which they are asking for.

We will start with the Financial Conflict of Interest Policy for Sponsored Programs. This does correlate somewhat to the existing policy which is Section 7 of our Main Campus research policy and as I understand it this new policy would replace the Conflict of Interest Policy in our current Policy Manual. Any comments?

**Senator Olson:** Under *Disclosure is Required*, Section C, an annual disclosure of conflict of interest is required. We currently don't have a requirement to declare annually our conflict of interest. I think that is a significant change. I don't think it's necessarily oppressive, but it's definitely a change.

**Chair Floyd:** Does anyone know anything differently? I believe this is something you have to do when you submit a grant.

**Senator Olson:** That's correct.

**Chair Floyd:** And that's the only requirement. Any other comments on that? I did notice that in the policy statement preamble, in our current policy preamble it states that our policy is referenced to the American Council on Education in the American Association of University Professors Policy

Statement on Conflict of Interest in sponsored research. Those references are not in this policy, and if that's a concern for you, I will convey that.

**Senator Wedding:** What we are dealing with is a couple of documents that were generated on the HSC but not on this campus, and without any participation of this Senate or anybody on this campus. I think this is an example of what's to come.

**Senator Edwards:** Your point about the preamble and the reference to the American Council on Education in the American Association of University Professors, would be something that might be easily incorporated into and be with the tradition of what we had. I would like to see that in the preamble too.

**Senator Wikander:** I'm troubled by a sentence in the preamble to the second document that says, "...A separate university policy on misconduct, which is mandated by federal regulations, describes how the university handles issues of scientific misconduct..." The reason I am troubled by this is that in the Fall of 2003, I was a member of the Research Council and I was deputized by the Research Council to look into Section 3 Article 6, of our Policies & Procedures Manual dealing with research misconduct. One of the things I was urged to do is to compare our policy to our peer institutions, to federal regulations and also with our Collective Bargaining Agreement. I did that. One of the things that was conspicuous in the federal regulations was that somewhere in the 1980's the Feds stopped saying "scientific misconduct" and it started saying research misconduct

There is an office in the White House called the Office of Research Integrity, and they publish a document that talks about these matters. What troubles me is whether the separate statement in the Policy exists. My story is at the request of the Research Council I drafted a revised article on research misconduct and I checked this out on the Web today so I know my dates. I presented this in May 4, 2004 to the Graduate Council and they had no trouble with it. On October 5, 2004 I presented it to the Senate and the Senate agreed with some minor changes, and then the document was to be forwarded to the Provost for some sort of action. There was no action. What happened then, (I think I wrote to you about this in the Fall, Barbara), I checked Research Misconduct out on the Web and discovered that the existing research misconduct article in the Policies & Procedures Manual is the same policy as the one that had been declared not very useful by Research Council and was to be substituted by a new one. Today I looked at the Policy Manual online Section 3.3.4, Article 4, Section 3C, which said research misconduct and it said "See Section 3.2.6", which was intellectual property. I did find in 3.2.2 Section 6 the old version in the earlier draft, and most troubling when you go to the website and go to the Research at the University of Toledo and look at the compliance page, and it says, "Pardon our dust, it's under construction." I think it's weird that we are getting proposals from the Office of Research Administration regarding how we should conduct our research which allude to a policy dealing with research misconduct that we apparently do not have. That puts us at a much greater risk with regard to being sued and with regard to being unable to police ourselves because we cannot follow through and find these particular documents or particular regulations.

There is a big problem here: one of the reasons I was urged to look into this that prior to 2003 we had a couple of high profile cases in which outside arbitrators had pointed out the University didn't have an articulate and coherent policy on research misconduct and cases in which faculty members who have been accused of plagiarism were able to point out we didn't have a definition of plagiarism in our Policy & Procedures Manual. So it is easier to get a student on plagiarism than it is a faculty member on plagiarism. So this is a question in terms of where is our policy on misconduct in research and do we police ourselves.

**Chair Floyd:** It would be your contention that this policy on responsible conduct of scholarship research ought to do that?

**Senator Wikander:** It seems to me that that policy ought to be a subset of some sort of larger university policy on the conduct of research.

**Senator Olson:** I have a number of comments on the same document.

**Chair Floyd:** Let me just comment on what I saw in these documents. What I saw the change between our current policy on conflict of interest and the proposed new policy is that our current policy says what happens if you do not abide by this conflict of interest policy. I see no action or explanation as to what happens if you disobey in the proposed policy.

**Senator Wolff:** There is reference to something called the Conflict of Interest Review Committee (s), what is their function in all of this?

**Chair Floyd:** I don't know, in our current policy there is a very specified procedure that one goes through if you are accused of conflict of interest. There is a process spelled out. But this is much less clear.

Any other comments on the financial conflict of interest statement?

If not, let's move on to the second document. Walt, can you now make your comments?

**Senator Olson:** My first comment is, has the Research Council vetted this?

**Chair Floyd:** I asked that question and did not receive a response. Is there anybody here on the Research Council that could address this? No members of the Research Council?

**Senator Olson:** It seems to me that the Research Council should tackle this before it comes to our level. Furthermore, when I looked at the content of this document, there is a lot of philosophy, a lot of shoulds, a lot of intentions that really do not deserve to be in a policy and should not be in a policy. It's very hard to find a definite policy because of all the other literature that confuses the document. There is a specific section in D(2)a – *Establishing the quality of research*.

**Senator Barnes:** My colleague, Glenn Sheldon in Interdisciplinary Special Programs, had some concerns about the internal peer review. It doesn't look to me it's a formal process as it is laid out but he felt that people who did controversial research or inter disciplinary research might have some trouble with this internal peer review process. He felt the language was somewhat threatening, that it went a little too far, although it does say informal.

**Senator Olson:** While it says 'informal' what are they really intending here? People do read grants and peer review do review grants on an ad hoc basis. This sounds like it's something they suggest people establish.

**Senator Barnes:** It says 'procedures'. It sort of implies a standard even if it's informal.

**Chair Floyd:** This is one of those examples where it seems that best practice inserted into this document, and in my judgment it ought to be just policy, and not suggestions.

**Unidentified speaker:** I think it's very windy, and is really trumped by the second sentence, "...All faculty members are ultimately responsible for the scholarly care..."

**Senator Wikander:** Each college department and program should encourage such informal peer review procedure. Procedure is one thing, but encouragement and informal is another thing, but as a policy statement it's not clear what that means.

**Senator Olson:** I take it as a recommendation to a college that you will establish this.

**Senator Wikander:** We should encourage them, it's not even established.

**Senator Olson:** I realize that but if I am someone in a position of authority who wants to be the best at what it is that I do, how do I fulfill that statement given as policy?

**Senator Johanson:** Do we even know how to do such things, we all criticize each other in the way that criticizes what's been done, rather than who's done it.

**Senator Wedding:** This process is flawed. The documents have problems with ambiguity, we cannot here afford to patch this thing up piece by piece. We as the body need to stand up against Jacobs administration, that's where it's coming from, and reject this for flawed substance and its process. We have do that or we might as well give ourselves up as senators.

**Chair Floyd:** If we are going to reject this I think it's important for us to have some specific items.

**Senator Wedding:** We heard so much today, how much more can you go into? Walt and Matt have given great comments as well as others.

**Senator Edwards:** I have difficulty with second page, Section B under definition, 'trainee', and the definitions of 'trainee'. The last group in that definition is 'junior colleagues'. Does that mean any junior faculty member or tenure-track faculty member is considered a 'trainee'? Under supervision of

trainee scholarship, under supervision of senior faculty? And should 'trainee' be educated in research ethics and integrity? We have to make sure that junior faculty are not considered trainees.

**Chair Floyd:** I guess one of the concerns I had is that this document does not seem to address the Office of Undergraduate Research, which is a new initiative of this institution and if we are going to have an Office of Undergraduate Research then I think this proposed policy widens the responsibility considerably for all of .

**Senator Funk:** I wanted to amplify on Matt's comment, he read a portion of the preamble about scientific research, there is no research that isn't scientific as far as this document is concerned. From one end to the other it's all about scientific research.

**Senator Wikander:** The language is from the medical school, you can see that. Postdoctoral fellow residents, I don't think they mean the same thing about 'junior colleague.'

**Chair Floyd:** This applies to both campuses.

**Senator Wikander:** When we refer to 'junior colleague' we refer to tenure track assistant professors.

**Senator Barnes:** In section C, *Areas of Applicability* it also says, "...the issues addressed by this policy are essential to all scholarly activity within the University community..." Whether or not they are inclusive in their language, they are attempting to be inclusive in their policy. That's important too.

**Senator Kennedy:** With respect to the first policy only, there is a paragraph that says, "...the federal government requires that entities receiving federal funding maintain a written policy on financial conflict of interest..." We should have at least the bare bones policy statement that meets this specific federal law covering the whole campus.

**Senator Wikander:** This goes back to my original remarks on the misconduct in research section of the Policies & Procedures Manual which was mandated by federal law and which now is lost either in the ozone, or very hard to find on the policies & procedures website.

**Senator Johanson:** What would be the problem with sending this to the Research Council and have them look at it before we look at it?

**Chair Floyd:** I did forward it to Mike Dowd, who is on the Research Council, and asked him if he knew of its existence. I didn't get a response from him. What I would suggest we do in my response is state that the first review should be by the Research Council.

**Senator Wedding:** Are they looking at this?

**Chair Floyd:** I don't think they are looking at this.

**Senator Olson:** One of the reasons that we are even looking at this today is how this policy came to our knowledge. This came into existence during the break. We were given a week to review long before we would meet. I objected to that and others did too, and it was extended to January 18. If we don't review it how will the administration take our non-review? Clearly, this document is not a policy in structure or in content. There are numerous places for example, *Authorizations*, it would be good practice for each author to sign a statement of authorization attesting the authenticity of the manuscript. And then it says, "it shall be ....." It seems to me you have a conflict there between suggestion and a mandate. Furthermore, if you go deep enough you find that everybody is supposed to be keeping a lab notebook that's supposed to be signed and dated every day.

**Chair Floyd:** Actually I think that is the section that only refers to scientific research.

**Senator Olson:** When you are doing theoretical research you don't keep dated lab notebooks. You keep dated lab notebooks when you have data that you are collecting and you need to verify the data. The procedure is not to keep notebooks in other fields. Secondly, when you further read this you find that lab notebooks have to be kept for seven years. Where do we keep those lab notebooks? Right now I have an office and that's the only place I can keep this information. I don't have a separate storage room to keep this data. Just from one experimental day I have a lab note book that is 5 inches thick, each page is completely full. It is generated by computer, but when you multiply that over a period of a research grant and you are trying to keep all that for seven years, you better find another building the size of U. Hall to keep all that in.

**Senator Wikander:** At this point this is a waste of the Senate's time. I don't think this document should be coming to us in this way or in this form. What we tried to do back in 2003/04 was to generate policy and bring that policy forward and take it to the administration and expect the administration to do something with that policy, other than to present it to us in a incoherent, self-contradictory and full of holes policy manual.

**Senator Wedding:** I don't think we should be sending this back to the Research Council, it should be sent to a counsel or a committee of the Senate, as we have done with other controversial policies in the past. We cannot just send it somewhere. We have to weigh in on it and send a message that we are rejecting it as it is, and that we are going to study it with a special committee. If that isn't good enough for them and they want to send it to the Board, so be it.

**Chair Floyd:** Would this be agreeable if I relay this to Dr. Wilkerson that we have discussed this and we see some significant problems? I can outline some of those that we discussed here, what would you suggest the action to be? Frankly, I'm afraid of assigning this a Faculty Senate committee because the Senate committees that would be looking at this already have a considerable amount on their plate.

**Senator Wedding :** Create a special committee chaired and co-chaired by Walt and Matt and I will sit on it.

**Senator Wikander:** I think it should be remanded to the Research Council, this is their purview, this is their area of interest, this is what they are supposed to deal with.

**Senator Olson:** I think it should go to them then come back to us.

**Senator Wedding:** What if it comes back to us and they say it's ok.

**Chair Floyd:** I will assume if I relay to Dr. Wilkerson some of our concerns and copy Frank Calzonetti and the members of the Research Council, they will understand that is the process we want to see.

**Senator Wedding:** They are in contract negotiations right now. They are after the copyrights on this campus. They are after your copyrights. This is the kind of stuff they have been talking about in negotiations with us. They have a series of policies that they are generating on another campus that never comes to this body except in this form. What are we sitting here for? Why are we having meetings as a Senate and get this kind of stuff that didn't go to their Senate, and it is generated by some committee or administrators on another campus. We ought to reject this and send it to our own ad hoc committee and not send it anywhere else. We need to take control of it.

**Chair Floyd:** I think we have two conflicting concepts here, we all agree that this document is not acceptable. What is the action then? Do we send this to the Research Council or send it to a Faculty Senate committee? I need a motion to one of those respects.

**Senator Barnes:** I don't know much about the Research Council, do we have a good faculty representation on it?

**Senator Wedding:** It is run by Calzonetti.

**Chair Floyd:** I think there is representation from each of the colleges except the University College and University Libraries, which is represented by the dean. All other colleges are represented by faculty.

**Senator Wikander:** I don't know who is on it now but it's usually represented by faculty.

**Senator Olson:** I move that these policies are remanded to the Research Council for review and edification and following their further improvements that it be brought back to the Faculty Senate at that time.

**Chair Floyd:** Do we have a second?

**Senator Wikander:** I second it.

**Chair Floyd:** Any discussion?

**Senator Wedding:** I move for a secret ballot.

**Senator Barlowe:** Are these two policies revisions of the existing policies on the HSC?

**Chair Floyd:** That is what I understand.

**Senator Barlowe:** So the HSC had something similar to this? And are there language changes within this policy? Would their Faculty Senate have objections to this policy?

**Chair Floyd:** I have no idea.

**Senator Wedding:** We don't know that. Why don't we split this? We should reject this and then have a second motion to send it to the Research Council.

**Senator Wikander:** Propose that as an amendment.

**Senator Wedding:** I amend that we vote on these separately. One vote should be rejected or accepted, and then the second vote should be whether we should send it to the Research Council or not.

**Chair Floyd:** The motion on the floor is that the Faculty Senate reject these proposed policies on research. Is there a second to that?

**Senator Olson:** I second that.

**Chair Floyd:** Any other discussion?

**Senator Wedding:** I would like to have a secret ballot, please.

**Chair Floyd:** Ok, Kathy will distribute secret ballots, and we will continue with the next part of this discussion which is the second part of that, that we send this back to the Research Council. Do I have a second on that motion?

It was seconded.

**Chair Floyd:** Any other discussion?

**Senator Barnes:** Is it possible that we could get something that shows the changes? It sounded when you introduced this that it might not be possible because the documents are so different. When they get the new document together could they highlight the significant changes for us, especially people that have particular areas that will be affected, so they could see that?

**Chair Floyd:** We will send it to the Research Council and ask them to prepare some analysis between our current policy and the new policy. Is there a second to that?

It was seconded.

**Senator Piazza:** This is not a motion, but I would suggest that they use citations, there may be things in their requirements and we are unaware of it that would pertain to the college of medicine and so these policies might be different particularly from what we do here because of requirements that they have.

**Chair Floyd:** So in that analysis you would like to see some citations.

**Senator Piazza:** We know what we based our policy on originally, instead of just some vague reference to federal regulations. It would make me more inclined to support this if I knew that this in fact was tied to some specific federal regulation or requirement.

**Senator Wikander:** In the policy that I drafted we certainly were careful to indicate where we were quoting from, or plagiarism could be a problem. I think some of this language which is quite offensive may be bureaucratic language from Washington and some of it may be from our pals on Arlington Ave. I don't know

**Chair Floyd:** The secret ballot is for motion #1, which says the Faculty Senate rejects this policy, and you vote 'yes' in support of the motion. A vote of 'no' is against the motion, which would be in support of the policy.

Now the second motion, which is sending this to the Research Council. Let's collect the ballots for the first motion and distribute another ballot for the second motion. A vote of 'yes' is sending this back to the Research Council, a vote of 'no' is not to send it to the Research Council.

**Unidentified speaker :** I serve on the Research Council and there is a meeting on January 18<sup>th</sup> and that would be the earliest that this would be acted on.

**Chair Floyd:** And that would be the final day. We now want to move on to the rules and appendices.

06. Review of the proposed rules and appendices of the new Senate constitution: Just before the semester ended, I forwarded to all faculty on the main campus a draft of the proposed rules and



appendices for the new merged Senate. I would like to get your feedback on these documents. I also want to announce that there will be a series of open forums where we present the proposed rules and appendices and gather feedback from colleagues who are not senators.

We will take all of the comments into account as we attempt to revise the documents. As a reminder, the new constitution has not yet been approved by the Board of Trustees. It is my understanding that they wanted to wait to see what the rules and appendices say before voting on the constitution. It is my hope that the president and the Board will not see fit to become involved in the intricacies of the rules and appendices of the Senate, which I believe is the business of the Senate, not the administration. But I do not know how much they will find the need to revise what we do here.

In my review, I will try to point out what remains essentially unchanged from the existing rules and appendices of our current constitution (which I am assuming is acceptable to you), and what is new. Also, if you have specific comments or concerns you would not like to express today, please email them to me.

**Senator Fink:** Just one more question about the Research Council, who is on it?

**Chair Floyd:** I believe it is co-chaired by Dr. Wilkerson and Dr. Calzonetti and the rest of the Research Council consists of faculty with the exception of the Dean of the Libraries who is designated.

**Senator Fink:** Who appoints to the Research Council?

**Senator Wikander:** There are appointments by the Senate and appointments by the Graduate Council, the Provost's Office, so there are a number of bodies that appoint to that.

**Senator Wedding:** When I was involved in litigations we got three separate lists of a Research Council within a month of each other, none of which were the same.

**Chair Floyd:** While the votes are being counted, I would like to move on to the rules and appendices. As you know, the two Executive Committees of the Faculty Senates met repeatedly over the summer, and drafted these appendices and rules to the constitution with the assistance of John Barrett. Now we are bringing them forward and today we need your input. Not to vote on this, just to get your input, because after we gather your input, we will have a series of open forums on this where other faculty who are not senators will be able to present their input. We've already received input from the two Provosts. We will take all this information and try to amend these documents the way it will be suitable for both senates because these two documents do not have to be ratified by the entire faculty, only by the majority of the two senates. Because the Health Science Faculty Senate did not have rules, 80% of this document is the same as it currently is on the main campus. The first section is about defining what the elections are that we are talking about and who the electorate is and who are the people eligible to serve on the faculty senate. Note that this is only about the faculty senate elections because within another part of this document is UCAP and UCS committees are elected. Those are not bodies that apply to the HSC, but only to this campus to Collective Bargaining members and to the college of Law. So we needed to differentiate this that this particular section is to the election to the Senate. Any comments or questions about that?

**The Election Procedures** remains the same. The number of vacancies determines how many people are to be nominated for the final ballot.

**Conduct of Elections** continues the same as currently.

The next part is related to the UCAP and UCS elections and we pulled that section out because these do not apply to the HSC faculty, because they are not covered by UCAP and UCS, therefore, we needed to differentiate these election processes from other election processes. Any questions or comments?

**Section III. Implementation and Reconsideration of Action Taken by the Faculty Senate in the Name of the University Faculty.** I believe this is a continuation of the policy as it currently exists on our campus in our current rules and covers if the University faculty doesn't agree with an action of

the Senate, the University faculty can request that the action be recalled or reconsidered. Any comments on that?

I want to move primarily to the issues that are different and the Article IV is a major difference between our current constitution and this.

The results of the secret ballots are as follows:

- Motion #1 34 'yes' votes, and 1 'no' vote

I will convey this to the vice president that this Faculty Senate rejects this and that is our recommendation that this policy is not acceptable to us.

- Motion #2 28 'yes' votes, and 6 'no' votes

That is what I will convey to the vice president.

**Senator Olson:** The second motion requires it be remanded to the Research Council upon completion of their work and returned to the Faculty Senate.

**Chair Floyd:** Yes, thank you Walt, and highlighting the changes, the analysis of citations to the specific federal regulations that exist.

Continuing with the rules and appendices, Section IV College Governance. I will give you a little bit of a background. The message that the Executive Committee received over the past summer is that the administration wants to move to a governance structure which is more college centric. We are not sure exactly what college centric means so we attempted to define in this section a system of governance that gives some responsibility and authority to college governance bodies and outlines how the college governance bodies might relate to the Faculty Senate. This is brand new to the constitution and is somewhat controversial. What we are trying to outline here is a minimal governance structure that must exist within each college. This is the bare minimum that a college has to have to establish a college governance structure. Basically it has to have a constitution, it needs to be either a body of the whole or representational, there needs to be a way for meetings to be called, and there should be a number of meetings each year. We are not attempting to prescribe the Arts & Sciences Council model to any other college. We have heard that some colleges have governance structures that are not really governance structures in the way that we believe they ought to be. So this attempts to sketch out a minimal requirement for each college. Now I will open this up for discussion. Walt is one of the people that wrote this section so I will direct some of the comments to him.

**Senator Olson:** The whole intent in this is to give as much freedom as possible to setting up your own structure, your own offices, your own way of doing things, while at the same insuring that there is a faculty organization not an administrative organization. In order to do that you have to have meetings, without meetings it is ineffective. Someone besides the dean should be able to call meetings and it has to be run by people other than the administration of the college, and that was the basis of forming that.

**Senator Kennedy:** I have a question about the last sentence, "...The evaluation of the deans will be performed at the least once every two years through a process jointly administered by the respective Provost's office and the Faculty Senate..." Does that contemplate that the people would be evaluated by faculty members outside their own college?

**Chair Floyd:** No, they would be evaluated by faculty within their college. So, only the College of Law faculty would evaluate the College of Law Dean.

**Senator Peseckis:** Does this mean that these constitutions would be approved by the college and not to be approved by the provost's office or the Board of Trustees.

**Chair Floyd:** I do not believe that currently is a requirement. We made a lot of changes in the constitution of the Library and never forwarded it to anybody. Does anybody know, when the

changes in the College of Arts & Sciences constitution are made, does it go to a higher body for approval? No.

**Senator Olson:** In the past, changes in the constitution have not gone outside the college. Are you suggesting a new process? I hope not.

**Senator Peseckis:** I am not sure.

**Chair Floyd:** So this needs to be clarified and incorporated into the language. The faculty senate has no role in approval of this constitution.

**Senator Barlowe:** How can we have a college-centric model if the administration has to approve what the colleges put forth in their own constitutions? It seems to be a violation of the very nature of college-centric and as you said, it is not clear what is meant by college-centric.

**Senator Barden:** Basically what you meant is that all the Senate can do is say that you shall have one.

**Chair Floyd:** All the Senate is saying that every college has to have a minimum structure. Something that can be recognized as a college governance body. How it works is entirely up to you and outside of the realm of what is defined here.

**Senator Barden:** And only answerable to the faculty within each college.

**Chair Floyd:** That is our intent.

**Senator Peseckis:** Shouldn't constitutions of colleges fall under the Collective Bargaining Unit?

**Chair Floyd:** They would have to be consistent so you couldn't have a constitution which would be in conflict with.

**Senator Wikander:** The contract would supersede it.

**Chair Floyd:** We're just saying that every college has to have it.

**Senator Olson:** If your faculty meeting is called by your dean, your agenda is set by your dean or by associate dean then that does not fall under our concept of what a separate body would be that's faculty run. If your faculty calls the meetings and it is run by the faculty, then that would be acceptable. It's simple as that. Is it a faculty organization or is it an administrative organization?

**Kenneth Alexander (substituting for Senator Steve Martin):** Do you mean at the Deans Council where the Associate and Assistant deans plus the department chairs and major committees who are working with the dean to govern the college.

**Senator Olson:** That is not what I'm talking about.

**Senator Edwards:** In the second paragraph under Section IV. College Governance it reads, "...College governance bodies will be free to develop their own methods and procedures for conducting elections and their own definitions of those faculty members eligible for membership..." We had a situation in our College of Education where the visiting faculty appointments outnumbered the tenure, tenure-track faculty members and they were eligible to vote on the college constitution. They were the majority. What do we do in that situation?

**Chair Floyd:** I don't know except to try to define this situation. We had a great deal of communication concerning the College of Nursing which has a huge contingent of part timers, who have always been accepted as a part of their faculty. They have never had different responsibilities than full time faculty and they wanted to make sure that those people are defined as eligible for representation of this body.

Next section is the rules section. This is all very similar to the way it currently is. The very first statement about biweekly meetings has become a controversial topic on the HSC Faculty Senate who only meets once a month and see no reason to meet twice a month. This could possibly be a huge stumbling block. Also that the meetings should be held from 4:00-6:00 pm. That was a concession on our part. We thought that 4:00-6:00 pm was a reasonable compromise, however, they are mostly involved in clinical activities until 5:00 pm and they are not sure that will work for them. One change is that we are now requiring is to have a parliamentarian, which seems to be a good idea for us. The rest of this is pretty much the same how one votes, how log items are brought to the Senate, etc. One change is the committee structure.

What existed on the HSC campus identified as the Faculty Affairs committee deals with issues that for our faculty would be handled through a grievance process established within the Collective Bargaining procedures. We attempted to redefine this committee and say this committee will deal with issues of interest to all faculty, collective bargaining or not. In addition, on the HSC there will be a committee on Faculty Welfare which will deal with the traditional issues that they have always dealt with as the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Senate. So we are separating this out from the Senate, we have Faculty Affairs Committee that deals with issues concerning every body, and issues such as disputes over promotions and tenure, etc., on the HSC gets funneled to this Committee on Faculty Welfare.

**Senator Barlowe:** Doesn't their Faculty Affairs Committee also deal with tenure and promotions before it becomes a grievable issue?

**Chair Floyd:** Yes, they do. So things that we have in our Collective Bargaining Agreement are covered in this group.

**Senator Piazza:** A correction, I believe their tenure and promotion process goes primarily to the college dean and provost. Their senate doesn't have a lot to do with this and not much faculty involvement in that process between the dean and the provost.

**Senator Barlowe:** Doesn't it go to a committee first?

**Chair Floyd:** I don't think they have a University committee that reviews specific promotion and tenure cases, but sets general guidelines.

**Senator Wolff:** There is no UCAP equivalent?

**Chair Floyd:** There is no UCAP equivalent. The other committees are the same, Committee on Elections, Academic Programs, Undergraduate Curriculum. We have a new committee responsible to appoint people to Faculty Senate committees, making sure that these committees have enough people on them and the right representation. So we have created a Committee on Committees that will make recommendations to the executive committee for committee membership.

**Senator Teclhaimanot:** What about establishing a new Faculty Senate committee on technology?

**Chair Floyd:** A senate committee on technology. What do you think?

**Senator Wolff:** What would that committee be charged with?

**Chair Floyd:** This executive committee has been asking the administration to reconstruct the committee structure of this institution and have standing committees with identified membership, terms of office, etc. So if that should ever happen, the executive committee would be responsible for making recommendations for those committees.

Election of removal of officers, you might want to read this one carefully. Then there are two election processes that are still in place. One of them which will continue is the election for the representative on the Athletic Committee. The other one is the Academic Program Advisory Council, which I'm not sure still exists. One thing we may have to revise is whether or not this council is still in existence, but in our old set of rules we had to elect people to that.

So that is it for the rules and appendices. If you have a specific concern or comments please send them to me or to any other executive on the executive committee. Again, we are going to have open forums where you can come, and also encourage your colleagues to come to ask questions. It is our goal to wrap this up as soon as possible and get a vote on this with the senates, so that we can have a completed constitution which then can be sent to the BOT.

**Senator Piazza:** FYI, I attended on the HSC the Faculty Senate meeting last night and it is their intention to move forward with this as quickly as they can, and they would like to see the rules and appendices approved and adopted and on their way to the Board of Trustees by March, so that the Board of Trustees can act on this and so we can have spring elections for new faculty senate in the fall. For those of you who may remember, back in November, their faculty senate put the stop to this process so they could take their time and consider what was going on. Now they realize that this

looks good to them and they want to start moving forward. I think we need to move quickly with these, otherwise we're going to end up falling behind the Health Science Campus.

**Chair Floyd:** Right, and I think that it is very important to have these votes on the rules and appendices at the same time so that one doesn't influence the other in a positive or negative way.

**Senator Barlowe:** What kind of discussion ensued after this? Was it a discussion about the rules and appendices?

**Senator Piazza:** As far as the rules and appendices are concerned they have two comments:

1) They are difficult to read so they ask that we send out a bulleted or executive summary of the rules and appendices.

2) Their biggest area of concern is on the college governance language. That's an area probably still discussed. I'm sure even right now that we do not have the final draft of that. They don't necessarily have the college or shared governance's structures that we would recognize as shared governance structure. So there was some discussion about that, how it worked, what it looked like. To a certain extent I had a difficult time understanding it too because they really don't have the tradition of shared governance that we have. They tend to look more to their administration for that kind of leadership. This is going to be a little confusing for them, but that was the only point of discussion with college governance. They were quite happy with the meeting schedule; I think they think it starts at 4:30 and not 4:00. They also like the idea of alternating campuses.

**Chair Floyd:** That's good to hear. One of the things that we have discovered over the course of trying to draft these is they are very different cultures and we are still dealing with those differences and hopefully once the senate merges the cultures will find a way to merge as well. It will probably be a very slow process but I think we can learn a lot.

**Senator Fink:** In regards to the research rules that we have been discussing earlier, is it necessary that it has to be uniform across all colleges and programs? There are very different types of research that we do across the university. Why do we have to have a one size fits all approach?

**Chair Floyd:** I think that's what Matt was talking about, and one of the problems is that the proposed policy seems to require the same for all fields.

**Senator Wikander:** If there is a requirement that we have to have in place, a policy should cover it.

**Chair Floyd:** Next is Steve Peseckis and his update on Undergraduate Curriculum.

**Senator Peseckis:** The list of proposed course modifications and new courses recommendations was emailed to you. Any questions? All those in favor of these recommendations, please say 'aye', opposed, 'nay'. *Passed unanimously.*

## **Course Modifications and New Courses Approved by the Faculty Senate on January 8, 2008**

### **College of Arts and Sciences**

#### **New Course**

ANTH 3500 Cultural Diversity in Business      3 ch

ANTH 3520 Qualitative Approaches in Social Science Research      3 ch

ANTH 4200 History and Theory in Anthropology      3 ch

ANTH 4450 Exploring the City      3 ch

CHEM 3712 Recitation for Chem 3710      1 ch

(Note: CHEM 3710 is “Physical Chemistry for the Biosciences I” 3 ch)

CHEM 3722 Recitation for Chem 3720 1 ch

(Note: CHEM 3720 is “Physical Chemistry for the Biosciences II” 3 ch)

CHEM 3732 Recitation for Chem 3730 1 ch

(Note: CHEM 3730 is “Physical Chemistry I” 3 ch)

CHEM 3742 Recitation for Chem 3740 1 ch

(Note: CHEM 3740 is “Physical Chemistry II” 3 ch)

Efforts have been undertaken to permit students to be able to enroll into recitations CHEM 3722 and CHEM 3742 upon approval by the Senate.

SOC 3520 Qualitative Approaches in Social Science Research 3 ch

SOC 4200 History and Theory in Anthropology 3 ch

### **Course Modification**

CHEM 3610 Inorganic Chemistry I 3 ch

Change pre-requisite from “CHEM 3710 or 3730” to “CHEM 3710, 3730, or CHEE 2230 and 2330”.

CHEM 3740 Physical Chemistry II 3 ch

Change pre-requisite from “CHEM 3730” to “CHEM 3730, or CHEE 2230 and 2330”.

SOC 4450 Sociology of Cities 3 ch

Change title to “Exploring the City”

Change cross listing from “SOC 5450” to “SOC 5450, ANTH 4450, and ANTH 5450”

Change pre-requisite from 6 hours in Sociology or 9 hours in Social Science” to “3 hours in Social Science”

Update catalog description to “This course takes an interdisciplinary approach to life in cities around the world, with emphasis on the ethnographic exploration of how power, cultural difference, and social inequality in cities are produced and experienced.”

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

#### **New Course**

HIM 4240 Topics in HIM: Professional Domains 3 ch

#### **Course Modification**

COUN 1110 Fundamentals of Human Mental Health 4 ch

Change pre-requisite from “PSY 1010” to “None”

COUN 2120 Group and Therapeutic Approaches 4 ch

Change pre-requisite from “PSY 1010” to “None”

COUN 2220 Family Theories and Cultural Influences in Mental Health 3 ch  
Change pre-requisite from “PSY 1010 and 2<sup>nd</sup> year standing in major” to “None”

COUN 3110 Case Management in Mental Health 3 ch  
Change pre-requisite from “COUN 1010 or permission of instructor” to “None”

COUN 3140 Substance Abuse Prevention and Community Programming 3 ch  
Change pre-requisite from “COUN 1010 or permission of instructor” to “None”

**Senator Monsos:** The consent agenda was emailed to you prior to the meeting. Any questions?

**Academic Programs Committee  
Consent Agenda  
Faculty Senate meeting on Jan. 8, 2008**

Full information on each modification can be found at:

<http://curriculumtracking.utoledo.edu/>

1. Criminal Justice (BS)

Summary: Several changes in required courses, including the addition of a designated capstone course in order to meet certification requirements.

All those in favor, please say ‘aye’. Opposed, ‘nay’. *Approved unanimously.*

**Chair Floyd:** Next on the agenda are three reports and they are all related concerning core curriculum. Vice Provost Bresnahan will speak about her new committee that’s looking at the General Education courses, then Penny Poplin Gosetti, the Interim Vice Provost for Academic Innovation will speak about a new committee called Experiential Learning Committee, then Marcia King-Blandford will talk about our core curriculum committee as some suggested changes of courses that haven’t been taught for a while. Carol Bresnahan will start and then they will take your questions at the end.

**V. Provost Bresnahan:** The origins of curriculum here at UT go back years, but the origins of this committee, the General Education Committee, that I chair, date back to about a year ago, January 12, 2007, when the former Interim Provost, Rob Sheehan, convened a rather large committee, and charged the committee with reform of UT core and general ed curriculum. The original charges of a year ago to that single large committee asked the committee to try form a unique undergraduate experience by doing a number of things. First, recommending ways to implement five parts of learning to be shared by each undergraduate UT student, thus giving the UT education a distinct flavor:

- Learning through technology
- Learning through volunteerism
- Learning through doing research
- Internships and co-ops

- Learning through an International experience

These five were quickly supplemented by a sixth suggested by Elliot Tramer, who has since retired from UT, for a disciplinary course. This enterprise came to be known as the ‘Sheehan Plan’ or the 5+1 Plan. The second part of the charge was to “...reduce the perception that the breadth of the core makes it difficult for students to experience much in common.” You will recall there were a number of very useful discussions but when Summer came along, people scattered and the committee entered a hiatus. Then came the arrival of Rosemary Haggett as the current Provost. I know she agrees strongly that the UT core and general education curriculum is in need of reformation and transformation. She sees the roles of the Chief Academic Officer as including leadership and broad direction of UT’s curriculum while acknowledging the Faculty Senate as the elected voice of the University faculty. She, Penny and I very much see the Senate as a partner in bringing about constructive, positive curriculum changes. So when she arrived, Provost Haggett divided the task that I described earlier into two separate tasks, and she formed two smaller groups, the Experiential Learning Committee, which Penny Poplin Gosetti chairs, and the General Education Reform Committee, which I chair.

I want to make clear the definition of these two things. By general education, we refer to a smorgasbord of courses across areas like Humanities, Fine Arts, Mathematics, and so on, defined in UT’s catalog, for which all UT students regardless of their major or their college chose roughly 30 hrs. of work. The General Education Committee had its first meeting December 11, 2007, so it is a very new committee, and has had two meetings thus far. I chair this committee and also sitting on this committee from the Provost’s Office is Penny Poplin Gosetti and Marcia King-Blandford, who also chairs the Senate’s core curriculum committee, Chris Habrecht, Assistant Dean of Arts & Sciences, Barbara Schneider, faculty member in English and Director of English Composition. Mojisola Tihamiyu, a faculty member in Psychology representing Social Sciences, Jamie Barlowe, who sits on the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, and is also the Chair of Women’s & Gender Studies, Ben Pryor, faculty administrator in Arts & Sciences and Philosophy, Kathleen Fitzpatrick, faculty member in the College of Business. In addition, as a community member, Susan Palmer has been invited to these meetings, but she has not been able to attend. At the first meeting on December 11<sup>th</sup> the Provost charged this new committee and she raised a number of points for the committee to consider and make recommendations on.

- First was a question: does UT’s general education curriculum have coherence?
- Second, are we doing good maintenance of our general education courses; is the number of courses optimal?
- Third, discuss what general education at UT should be like;
- Fourth, how do we keep this fresh, how to keep the curriculum from getting stale?
- Fifth, to think about how best to assess how well our general education curriculum does what it says it will do. UT does have a separate assessment committee, which will take the bulk of this responsibility.

At the first meeting following the charges, the committee discussed a number of issues. It reviewed the competencies that general ed is supposed to develop, and briefly discussed how its efforts could be coordinated with the Faculty Senate Core Curriculum. The committee also acknowledged the need to assist with helping the Board of Trustees to gain a better understanding of the purpose of general education, and decided that general education needs a new name. As a faculty member, it sounds to me like when you are in high school if you are not taking college prep. The new name needs to better represent general curriculum as a true student experience. Finally we noted the restrictions placed on both general education curriculum by the state, the TAGs, or Transfer Assurance Guides, as well as transfer module, and what we can do is somewhat limited by the state in telling us what we must do in terms of the transferability of courses, either as groups in general education curriculum, or



as courses in a major. The next meeting took place on January 4, 2008, and the discussion at that meeting went along these lines: we agreed that curriculum reforms was a telescopic process with a long history, and we articulated the need to take a look again at a document that was updated last in July, 2004, by Bernie Bopp and some colleagues called The Ideal Student Experience. Also, we are in the process of reviewing other documents including the report by Geof Martin in spring, 2007, to the Arts & Science Council about the number of courses in the general ed curriculum, and some other issues as well. We also agreed to make the experience for students in general education more uniform across departments and colleges while at the same time we see the balance desired for coherence across colleges with individual choice. In addition we agreed that the syllabi as the Senate has proclaimed need to meet the general education requirements as the Senate has defined them. We also agreed that this committee would take a 30,000-foot view of the general ed curriculum reform. Those are the things that the committee has done so far. But I do want to emphasize that this committee very much sees itself as partners with the Senate and the Senate's curriculum committee in bringing about good outcomes for our students.

**Interim V. Provost Penny Poplin Gosetti:** The committee that I'm chairing has had several names and one day it will come down to one, probably as the Experiential Learning Committee, as it best describes what this group is looking at. The members of this committee come with backgrounds in some of the areas we are looking at, service learning, graduate research, internships and co-ops. The members are Sudershan Pasupuleti, service learning faculty member from HSHS, Tom Kvale, representing undergraduate research faculty in Arts & Sciences, Brian Randolph, who has a background in internships and co-ops, and is a faculty administrator in Engineering, David Meabon who has done international education and translating that into practice with students, he is a faculty administrator in Education, Susan Batten, College of Nursing with background in internships and co-ops, she is a faculty administrator in Nursing, Celia Williamson, undergraduate research, a faculty member in HSHS, Tammy Kinsey, working with undergraduate research and a faculty member in Arts & Sciences representing Arts & Humanities, Don Beeman who is into international education and co-ops, faculty in Business, Peggy Fritz, with background in service learning, faculty administrator in University College, Charlie Blatz representing several of these areas, faculty member in Arts & Sciences, representing the Arts & Humanities, Walt Olson, with background in internships and co-ops, faculty member in Engineering, Susan Palmer as a community member, although she has not attended General Education Committee meetings so far, she has attended the Experiential Learning Committee meetings. This committee had had three meetings, we were meeting weekly in December. The Provost presented at the first meeting a charge more in the sense of what are some of the things she would like us to think about. And the first and foremost was how can we implement this learning through experience initiative, taking the 5+1 plan and thinking about it in some different ways. Does this initiative have to be these five experiences? Can the experiences be blended and simplified without watering them down? Some of these questions had been raised by the previous committee about actually requiring all five or to do this with some overlap. She indicated that the initiative must be learning centered, in other words, the right thing to do for our students and to do it from their perspective. It must be able to be quickly implemented and it should not add any additional credits. The committee should not be constrained by process or resources. We did a little discussion at that meeting and questions raised by the committee for future consideration were: One experience versus several experiences? Is this initiative for DHS students or for all students? Is it a physical experience, is it a pedagogical experience? Is it interdisciplinary or college-centric? And these are not absolute opposites on a continuum. Are these an integrated approach versus a menu approach? and New initiatives versus pulling together existing programs? At our second meeting we reviewed some existing documents, and looked at the report from the work group Integration: STEMM and the Liberal Arts and we looked at some of the FYI information. At that point we discussed the principles guiding the learning from experience requirement -- Why implement this initiative? What would be the learning objectives of it? At the third meeting we discussed the forms

the experiential learning could take, starting from the framework of the initiatives that had been put forward. We talked a little about the developmental differences that students bring to the table and the relationship between the experiential learning and experience in the general education courses themselves, understanding that we don't want to look at these as independent questions but how they integrate and what is the synergy between them. In general some observations from these two committees would be:

1) the experiential learning committee is really looking at partnering with the Faculty Senate, 2) both committees are incredibly excited about the opportunity to work with curriculum changes and reform, 3) they are very clear that their work will not add credit hours to anybody's plans of study, and 4) we want to reiterate that the Provost is eager to work with the Faculty Senate as a supportive partner. The third committee is Marcia King-Blandford's committee and she will talk about that.

**Marcia King-Blandford:** I brought with me the actual guidelines that were voted on and approved by the Faculty Senate April 26, 2005. The members of the F. S. Core Curriculum Committee have been meeting every other week in the Fall Semester is to align our existing U.T. core/general education curriculum with the document that was created and approved by this body. Since this document was created we had the merger and other things going on so as a committee we have not had an opportunity to make this document align as it was created. So for the last few months through a series of meetings we went back and looked at our general education courses. We have contacted the chairs to make sure that the general education courses taught by their departments are aligned with this document, which requires a syllabus for every general education course, identifies specific key elements be included in the syllabus, and, requires that general education courses are reviewed regularly to insure that the course continues to meet the established guidelines.

In addition, we have put all this on the Provost's website under *Curriculum*. You can click on the template and download it as a Word document. Things are linked so you don't have to recreate anything. For example, Dr. Patterson's class Sociology 1750 has already been done, he took his course syllabus, loaded it into the template, put his learning objectives on his assessment, his general education statement, his learning outcomes aligned with the general education student outcomes, and his assessment into the body of the template. This is the work we have been doing this last semester. This document is now two years old, and we have identified gaps in it. So, thanks to Tom Barden, we have created a philosophical statement. We also noticed that we did not have student learning outcome in the composition and mathematics areas so we went back and contacted the Mathematics and the Composition Department to identify student learning outcomes for the Skills area of the Core/General Education curriculum. We also discovered courses still exist in our general education curriculum that are no longer being taught. What we are doing is what is directed for us to do in Guidelines. For example, this body agreed that for a course to be designated as general education, the course has to run on a regular basis. So, Russian is no longer being offered. We have no mechanism or procedure to remove that course from the general education designated core.

What we want to address now is this ongoing review where we can add courses to the core/general education curriculum but where we also have a way to remove courses no longer being offered. We have contacted the chairs and asked them to give us their intent for every core/general education course offered in their department. They must come back to us by February 15 with the intent of how often they plan to offer those courses. Our goal is, as the document directs us to do, insure a sort of 'truth in lending' that students can see that we are offering these courses on a regular ongoing basis, that courses come in and out of the general education curriculum, that they have a syllabus, a learning outcome, and assessment. Earlier, we had come before this body and talked about the need to align and be in compliance with the regulations from the Ohio Board of Regents. So that's the work that the Faculty Senate Core Curriculum Committee has been doing. We will continue to do this and use the guidelines established by this body.

Any questions?

**Senator Morrissey:** When you send those courses back to the departments for statements of intention regarding their continuing the instruction will you send copies of those notes or inventories to college offices.

**Marcia King-Blandford:** Yes, to you?

Senator Morrissey: To Chris Habrecht.

**Senator Barden:** We should clarify that we are not taking courses out of the inventory, just of the general ed.

**Marcia King-Blandford:** Right. We are about two years behind in this review and therefore we did not have the luxury of the time to thoroughly review.

**Senator Edwards:** One comment to Carol or Penny, the contradiction between having a coherent and cohesive general education core and student choice. This is a particular issue in professional programs that general education is really the only place where students have a choice to diversify their learning experiences and I want to make sure we preserve that for our students in professional programs.

**V. Provost Bresnahan:** Thank you, that's well taken.

**Senator Wolff:** For those two committees will there be a report given back to the Senate on whatever recommendations are made? Will it come back to the Senate for discussions, support or approval?

**V. Provost Bresnahan:** I don't think that any form can be successful without the Faculty Senate support and we plan to communicate often with the Senate.

**Chair Floyd:** I think that's one of the concerns the Executive Committee expressed last week with Carol is that we have a Core Curriculum Committee, and were confused with why two new committees have been created that are for general education issues because it says in our policy that oversight of University general education curriculum is the responsibility of the Faculty Senate.

**Marcia King-Blandford:** If any of you would want to chair this committee assessing the general education curriculum next year, please let us know. The guidelines call for the committee to assess the general education curriculum. This is a lot of work for a chair to take on as part of serving as the chair and would be an area where we could explore working in partnership with the Provost's Office.

Any questions?

**Chair Floyd:** Any other comments or questions? Any old or new business? If not, can we have a motion to adjourn?

*Motion was made and seconded.*

**V. Calendar Questions:**

None

**VI. Other Business:**

Old business:

New business:

**VII. Adjournment:** Meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Alice Skeens  
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Kathy Gabel  
Faculty Senate Office Admin. Secretary