

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

Approved @FS mtg. 4/22/08

HIGHLIGHTS

V.P. for Institutional Advancement
Chair of Academic Programs
Chair of Undergraduate Curriculum
Chair of Core Curriculum
V.P. for Governmental Relations & Chief of Staff

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), Ariss, Barlowe, Barden, Barnes, Beatty-Medina (for Jakobson), Cluse-Tolar, Edwards (for Baines), Fink, Floyd, Greninger, Evans (for Olson), Fournier, Fritz (for Humphrys), Hamer, Horan, Hottell, Hudson, Johanson, Kennedy, Kistner, Lambert, Le (for Zallocco), LeBlanc, Lipscomb, Lundquist, Monsos, Moorhead, Morrissey, Peseckis, Piazza, Piotrowski, Relue, Schall, Skeens, Stierman, Teclehaimanot, Thompson-Casado, Ventura, Wikander, Wolff,

Excused absence: Chen, Hefzy, Spongberg, Tierney (for Klein),

Unexcused absence: Ames, Funk, McInerney, Sundar (for Pope), Wedding

II. Approval of Minutes:

Minutes of 3/11/08 were approved as distributed.

III. Executive Committee Report:

Chair Floyd: First, I have a couple of announcements. As you may know, we tried much of this year to get evaluations of our deans completed, and the process kept getting delayed. I am pleased to report that yesterday I was told that the evaluations will go out by April 15, and the faculty and staff will have a week and a half to complete the evaluation. It will be the same instrument that we used last time. The last time the deans were evaluated was three years ago. It will be done on online and it will be in a format that ensures it is an anonymous evaluation. Those deans that have been in their positions more than three years will be evaluated, and those included are: Early, Gaboury, Gutteridge, Naganathan, Switzer and Gold.

The UT Faculty Forum on Service Learning is scheduled on Wednesday April 16, from 12:00-1:30 pm and Penny Poplin Gosetti will be the presenter. All faculty, instructors, administrators and TAs are encouraged to attend.

The last thing I want to touch on is the elections and I want to ask Bruce Kennedy and Mark Horan for an update on how it is proceeding.

Senator Kennedy: We have divided the colleges on the Main Campus between us and my responsibility was to form a final slate of nominees for the Law School and College of Arts & Sciences. In Law School we were looking for seven nominees, but only five were willing to be on the final ballot for the two spots on the senate. In Arts & Sciences we needed 28 nominees for 14 spots, but only 22 agreed to be on the final ballot. We were given 28 highest vote getters, and we discovered that many mid range people in the pool had the same number of votes, so we invited all of them to be on the final ballot. Arts & Sciences will have 14 slots to fill and we received 22 willing to be on the final ballot.

Chair Floyd: What I have from Kathy is the following final ballots that have been mailed out: University Libraries, University College, College of Nursing, College of HSHS, College of Medicine and College of Law, and now College of Arts & Sciences has been completed. We are still waiting on Engineering, Business, Education and Pharmacy. The problem we are running into is that not enough people are committing to be on the final ballot. Some of the ballots are going out with less nominees than suggested under our constitution.

Senator Horan: There is really only one college that is on the edge of need and that is Business. All the others are at a reasonable level. College of Business right now is at the same level of nominees as required seats for the Senate, and that is six. Twelve people that I haven't called yet, three that I haven't heard from. I just sent an email to the twelve hoping for a quick response. The constitution says that within 48 hours those contacted should respond. So we can say technically those that haven't responded, don't intend to run. UCAP is coming up in Education and Engineering and UCS is coming up in Pharmacy, University College and I will be contacting some of you again for UCAP.

Chair Floyd: Thank you again to the Elections Committee and Kathy for all the work, because this year it is two-thirds more work because all the seats are open. It has been a difficult process and I would like to thank those people directly involved with it. As you receive the ballots, I would urge you to consider people for leadership positions, like the president, and other positions. It will be very important to have the right person leading this organization next year and we need a strong pool of candidates for these positions.

Now I would like to introduce Vern Snyder, Vice President for Institutional Advancement and he will talk to us about the Faculty/Staff Campaign.

V.P. Snyder: Good afternoon. We are here today to talk about the faculty, staff campaign. Five, six years ago we were in the beginning of the capital campaign. We were seeking support from those who are blest with the financial capability, and those of us who are the closest to the institution, the Board of Trustees, faculty, staff. This time, with the merger, it's time to expand the campaign to faculty and staff and make a gift to this institution. Our goal is \$100 million, I am happy to report we are at \$96 million today. 72% of the money raised in this campaign has come from our alumni, which I think is a very impressive number. Those who succeed, they give back. Everyone in this campaign has the opportunity to support and what we are asking for is 100% participation. Everyone gives at the level of their ability. Not all of us are capable of being Bill Gates. But we want 100% participation, because when we go out across the country, that helps our alumni decide to support us when they see that we have 100% participation. In the past, cash and gifts combined were at about \$24 million. It's a phenomenal support. As we go forward that number must grow to \$30 million. Jen Schaefer will talk to you more about this, she has joined our staff from the Medical Campus, and has been a wonderful asset in the annual fund and she will explain how the faculty staff campaign is implemented. If you made your gift already, thank you very much.

Jennifer Schaefer: We kicked off the faculty staff campaign on March 11 and we had coffee and muffins served in the Student Union and at the Cafeteria at the Medical Campus and also at Rocket Hall on this campus. We had over 1,100 people stop in. By now, everyone should have received

a pledge card, and as Vern said, our goal is for 100% participation from faculty and staff. We don't care what fund you give to, we just would like to tell our donors that 100% of our faculty and staff give back to the university. We have 1,800 funds. We support athletics, research, patient care, campus beautification, scholarships and we encourage you from the development side, give to what you are passionate about. There are a couple of ways to give, I have pledge cards if you misplaced yours, and I passed out to everyone cards with a website on them. The website shows some pie graphs and charts showing where the money goes. Also all our funds at The University of Toledo are listed there. You can use the search tool to find the fund that interests you. Also on the website you can specify if you want your gift to be through payroll deduction, and you will have to designate which classification you are in, if you do payroll deduction. We would like to tell our donors when we go out and ask for millions, we tell those donors that we already believe in ourselves because we give 100%.

Unidentified speaker: Is it correct to say that this is separate from the annual family campaign?

Vern Snyder: If you have given to the family campaign, you are fine. Thank you for your time, we appreciate the opportunity.

Chair Floyd: If you remember last meeting I said that if we have no business for our agenda for the April 22 Senate meeting, it would be cancelled. Following the President's address last week, clearly there are issues to discuss before adjourning as a body forever.

I have been contacted by Rick Stansley, Chair of Board of Trustees, who has asked to come to our April 22 meeting and to have a dialogue with the senators about issues of concern to the faculty. I had contacted Mr. Stansley following the President's Address to the University to express my frustration about the lack of faculty input to the President's proposals to radically revise the undergraduate curriculum and experience. Mr. Stansley emailed me and said he believes the process to transform the undergraduate experience will be open and inclusive process that will include faculty. His email to me states, "My fellow Board members, Dr. Jacobs and myself certainly recognize the importance of faculty input and the faculty's role as it relates to the undergraduate curriculum. Implementation of the plan will begin immediately as stated. This includes substantial changes to the administrative structure in the organization, which is clearly the first step towards accomplishing defined objectives. During this period of reorganization more details of the plan will be articulated, and the faculty's role will become clear as will the means for providing consultation and input to the administration and the Board concerning this matter."

One of the frustrations I expressed to Mr. Stansley was that the plans to transform the undergraduate experience was announced at a public meeting before any part of it was conveyed to the faculty. This has not been the first time that such sweeping changes were announced and the faculty were left only to react, usually negatively, rather than have a positive input into the plans. You may remember a similar experience with the distribution of the now infamous "White Paper." The result of such a communication process is, as you saw in The Blade article last week, the faculty were left only as the "naysayers" in opposition to many very public cheerleaders. I don't believe this is fair to faculty. If the faculty had been engaged previous to the public meeting, perhaps one of the times that Dr. Jacobs came and spoke to the Senate, we may have responded more positively to the proposals put forth. To this criticism Mr. Stansley responded, "The method by which this plan has been delivered to the public is representative of an open process that should be embraced. A transparent process comes with certain problems such as defining the proper time to engage the stakeholders in the details of the plan. How can a process be open if discussions concerning the matter happen before the announcement? This is one of many issues of this nature that as part of our governance process may need to be addressed in our ongoing dialogue. One thing is for sure, we all have an obligation and desire to address any identified pitfalls that would jeopardize the success and initiative of this nature, and I'm confident that we will. Please note that

the Board is committed to a combined effort to continue the progress that has been made by working together with you and your colleagues for the purpose of improving the University.”

In our meeting of the Executive Committee last Friday, we spoke to Dr. Haggett about our concerns. These included the changes in the administrative structure, about which many faculty were left in the dark. They had no idea they were being moved to new reporting lines until the day before or even the morning of the speech. Some faculty currently in the University College may still not have a clear idea where they will be. Will the **New Entity** be headed by a dean? If not, who will serve as the evaluators for these faculty, and who will carry out functions normally associated with the dean? We also expressed concern about the ramifications of allowing students who are admitted conditionally to take only 11 hours, as this could adversely affect their eligibility for their parents’ health insurance, their ability to get full time financial aid, and if they are athletes, to remain eligible for their sports. We also pointed out that in shifting Individualized and Special Programs to the College of Arts & Sciences would mean that these students would now have a foreign language requirement that they do not have currently. For some of the students who are pursuing special program degrees, there may not be much alignment with Arts & Sciences degrees.

One major concern I had is that we are at the end of the academic calendar. The Senate will not be meeting over the summer, and obtaining faculty input will be difficult. Among the items to be implemented immediately is the proposal for the 11th hour requirement, which I suggested to the Provost needs to come to the Academic Regulations Committee of the Senate for recommendation, and we have one meeting left in this calendar year. The Executive Committee drafted a response that expresses how we believe the Senate should make its concerns known. So we proposed a motion on behalf of the Executive Committee for your consideration today.

“The Main Campus Faculty Senate listened to the president’s State of the University Address last week, and is intrigued by some of his ideas put forth for reengineering the undergraduate experience. Some may have merit, but others clearly present problems that have the potential to adversely affect the very students they are meant to help. In keeping with the provisions of the Senate’s constitution, the Senate hereby reminds the president and the provosts that any proposals for changing the undergraduate curriculum or academic policies relating to undergraduate education that cut across colleges must come before the Senate’s Academic Regulations, Undergraduate Curriculum, Core Curriculum, and Academic Programs committees for review, and then on to the entire Senate for a recommendation before being implemented. We urge the administration to embrace a transparent process for discussing the president’s proposals, including actively seeking input from the faculty, as these proposals are further developed.”

It comes from the Executive Committee and needs no second, and is open for discussion.

Senator Barden: Thank you for the work you put in on this motion. This seems deliberate and right to the point. I was wondering how we as faculty should respond to this, and I think you have drafted a good response. Can you give us more information about the timeline the administration has declared for the implementation of this “re-engineering?” If it is as short as I heard the president say, then there is no way anything thoughtful can come of this. We as senators need to discuss here and now what to do. We also need to hear from the AAUP. A lot of these proposals are in direct violation of the bargaining contract. As far as BOT Chair Stanley’s response, we are not being allowed input. We are given something and then we are told to give input.

Chair Floyd: Dr. Haggett is here maybe she can tell us if the administrative changes are being implemented now.

Provost Haggett: Thank you for the opportunity to respond. Clearly there is much work to be done to implement the plans outlined in the President's speech. Some of it will have protracted time period because it will need time for us to discuss and have a dialogue around the implementation strategies. Regarding the organizational restructuring that was described under something called **New Entity**, we anticipate those changes to occur July 1st, beginning of the new fiscal year. As soon as we finalize an organizational chart I will be very happy to share it with everyone at the next Senate meeting.

Senator Johanson: I'm puzzled by the word "finalized", and then we will let you have input, again it's the same old story. We've seen beyond this very narrow track here. This is the University, it's a blob, not a narrow track.

Senator Stierman: I am disappointed that such great changes are being made by people who have been on the campus a relatively short time, rather than involve people with institutional memory and people who will probably be here long after today's leadership has moved on.

Senator Cluse-Tolar: The sad part about not having an input that as a public university we can at least get the information that is being discussed and maybe what we need to do is do an ongoing public records request just so we know what's going to happen to us in the future, before it's announced at a public meeting.

Senator Thompson-Casado: I am absolutely astounded that the constitution of the Faculty Senate and the CBA is being violated. I don't understand how we can do this at his institution, violate two standard documents in plain site of everyone.

Chair Floyd: I think technically until curriculum changes are implemented, our constitution has not been violated yet.

Senator Thompson-Casado: Why do we have to get to the point of a grievance? Why can't we work together as faculty and administration?

Chair Floyd: I think that's what we all wish. This motion is intended merely to address the very important processes that needs to take place.

Senator Thompson-Casado: We have already seen this. We are having problems getting nominees on the final ballot. It seems that people don't believe in Faculty Senate any more and this is a slap in the face for Faculty Senate.

Chair Floyd: I agree.

Senator Wikander: I am troubled by the implication in the President's talk that somehow the undergraduate education on this campus is broken and needs to be fixed. I would like to know from the President, who apparently never taught undergraduate classes I would like to know what's wrong with our undergraduate curriculum before I'm instructed that I need to fix it.

Provost Haggett: The amount of time that we need to discuss this is far more than we have available to us right now. I'm not on your agenda for today and I would be very happy to have an extended conversation with you. There is no implication and saying that this is broken, that this institution is broken.

Senator Barden: That's not true. You can't just say untruths without being challenged.

Provost Haggett: The President's speech spoke to higher education in general. He didn't say there was a problem specifically here at The University of Toledo, or that we don't provide a good undergraduate education. I believe we provide excellent undergraduate education here. That's not what this is about. This is about being willing to look at this from the students' perspective and having student's experience here to allow a broader interpretation of what an undergraduate education is supposed to look like, so that they may have the richest possible education. And you and I can debate without you calling me a liar about the President's speech. I would be very happy to do this with the Faculty Senate but I would like to do it when I have had some time to prepare for this discussion.

Senator Barden: I would like to respond to that. We should have the Senate's minutes reprint the president's speech into the record because no matter what the provost might say, the speech itself said that undergraduate education is broken. You are not entitled to your own facts.

Chair Floyd: I don't have that speech with me. I will find it.

Back to the matter of the motion, which we believe is a reasonable response asking the Provost and the President to bring any curricular changes that come across the colleges to the Senate. Any more discussion on that motion?

Senator Moorhead: It's a fine scholarly statement but as a public relations statement it's a nightmare. How many people understand the reasons for our concerns? This statement again suggests that we are dragging our feet. For example, I heard that advisors didn't have access to the Banner system to help students register this week and weren't trained to even use Banner. Is this correct? How many people know this? Maybe we worry too much, but that's because we care too much. We take on the responsibilities for the problems that students bring to us, even if those problems aren't really ours to fix. Maybe we should simply send the students to the people or offices that created their problems, like not being able to register. Maybe our problem is that it's hard to work with students every day and not care about them, and try to help them.

Chair Floyd: I don't think this statement is meant to be a public relations statement. It's a motion that will be forwarded to the Provost and the President to remind them that the Faculty Senate has a very important role in this process.

Senator Cluse-Tolar: I suggest a friendly amendment in the last sentence, where it says "urge" I suggest "demand".

Senator Johanson: I also propose a friendly amendment in the last sentence replace "...as these proposals..." with " ...before these proposals..."

Chair Floyd: Any other discussions on this amendment? If you are prepared to vote, all those in favor, please say "aye." Opposed. None. *Motion passes.*

I will forward it on to the Provost and the President. On the April 22nd meeting I will be presenting an extended Executive Committee report and we will touch on this issue as well as some others, to make sure the new senate is aware of some of our concerns. So Rick Stansley will be attending it also, and I believe the Provost expressed a desire to continue the discussion about the President's proposals. Next time we will have one more proposal from our Core Curriculum Committee and that is on the issue of reporting mid-term grades.

Senator Thompson-Casado: A question regarding evaluation of the deans. You did say that those deans working here for at least three years, is this the way it was done in the past?

Chair Floyd: Yes.

Senator Relue: Don't all course changes and program changes have to come through this process whether or not they cut across colleges?

Chair Floyd: The new Constitution says only those things which cut across colleges come to our committee. Which is almost everything.

Senator Horan: In terms of the elections, I think if we had more time, I think we could do better with the nominees.

Chair Floyd: Thank you. Next on the agenda is Holly Monsos, Chair of the Academic Programs Committee.

Senator Monsos: The agenda below was emailed to you previously.

Academic Program Committee business – 4/8/08

Item 1 – Modification to BS in Respiratory Care

Changes to pre-reqs

Item 2 – Admission Standards in the College of Arts and Sciences

Implementation of Stage Two admission standards.

Item 3 – Adolescent and Young Adult ed – Single degree program B.Ed. Sciences

These changes are required for accreditation.

Item 4 – Bachelor of Science in Pharmaceutical Science

These changes are required for accreditation.

Item 5 - Log Item 0708-9

Draft Undergraduate Certificate policy

All new programs and program modifications are posted at

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

I move that items 1, 2 and 4 be approved. All those in favor, please say “aye.” Opposed? None.

Motion carries.

Item 3, there is no objection to the proposal, but Daryl Moorhead wanted to make a statement.

Senator Moorhead:

Memo

To: Faculty Senate at the University of Toledo

From: Daryl Moorhead, Senator

Date: 8 April 2008

RE: Expression of Concern, in response to the College of Education’s curriculum change request

I would like to enter into record a statement of concern regarding the proposed changes in curriculum by the College of Education. As a member of the Faculty Senate, I realize that I represent the broad interests of the University of Toledo. It is in this context that I register my concerns as a professional biologist familiar with the biological, environmental, and life science requirements for teacher education.

To be brief, there are several basic requirements for teacher competence in these areas that are met only by the course EEES 2150 Biodiversity and its laboratory (EEES 2160) and are not components of any other introductory course offered at UT. This is not surprising because course content should not be substantially duplicated between academic units. The College of Education proposes to accept either EEES 2150 and 2160 or BIOL 2150 (Life Science I) and laboratory (BIOL 2160) as meeting these needs. My concern is simply that students who do not have the opportunity to take EEES 2150 and 2160 will not gain the required competence in these areas.

Despite my concerns, it is not my intention to impede efforts by the College of Education to develop its curriculum. Moreover, the issue of significant overlap between courses offered by two departments within the College of Arts and Sciences is not a logical topic for discussion by the Faculty Senate or an issue that can be resolved by the College of Education. For these reasons, I will not ask that the proposal be withdrawn or otherwise delayed. However, I suggest the College of Education seek broader input to information about course content in the future. I believe that this proposal, in particular, will soon require revision.

Senator Monsos: As Daryl indicated in consultation with the department of EEES education did make a slight modification to the proposal that you all saw. Either Biology or EEES 2150 and 2160 will be acceptable. Given that, the Committee recommends that this be accepted, all those in favor please say “aye.” Opposed? Thank you. I’m sure that in our college we will be following up on that issue. Item 5 is the log item Draft Undergraduate Certificate Policy, I have distributed this policy to the deans on the Main Campus, the Senate and as well as several curriculum identified people within those colleges, as well as Mary Humphrys who oversees the two year technical certificates in the College of Business. I have incorporated their suggestions for revisions, if there were any, and have heard no others. Are there any questions? If none, all those in favor please say “aye”. Opposed? None. Thank you. *Motion passed.*

You can download the Guidelines for Developing a New Undergraduate Certificate of Study on the Faculty Senate website: www.facsenate.utoledo.edu

Chair Floyd: And now the Chair of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee.

Senator Peseckis: The agenda was emailed to you previously. We had just a few courses, one from the Health Science and Human Services and five from Pharmacy. No objections were noted. Any questions? All in favor please say “aye”. Opposed? None. Thank you. *Motion passed.*

Course Modifications and New Courses Approved by the Faculty Senate on April 8, 2008

College of Health Science and Human Services **Course Modification**

RCBS 4800 Issues in Professional Practice 3 ch

College of Pharmacy **New Course**

MBC 3330 Applied Drug Design 1 ch

PHPR 3920 Introductory Pharmacy Practice Experience I 1 ch

PHPR 4920 Introductory Pharmacy Practice Experience II 1 ch

Course Modification

MBC 3310 Medicinal Chemistry I: Drug Action and Design 3 ch

Chair Floyd: Marcia King-Blandford, Chair of Core Curriculum is next.

Marcia King-Blandford: First of all there is a change in the agenda. The log item that was supposed to be presented to you today has been moved back to the April 22nd meeting and my gratitude to Barb and Kathy for allowing us to bring business back to the Faculty Senate committee. I wanted some additional time before I bring the log item report to you. I asked Barb to step in here, to give an update of the status of the faculty senate work that was being done before the syllabi project. If you remember the guidelines that were adopted by this body required that every general education class that is a part of this institution have a syllabi and that the syllabi have specific key components in order for the course to remain designated in the general education/core curriculum. The Faculty Senate Core Committee has been working on this diligently and I'm a bit dismayed to report to you that the response back from faculty to submit their syllabi in the prescribed format has been very low. Of the 289 gen. ed. classes that are designated as gen. ed. classes, we have received to date less than 52 classes back. This of course was our year long project; we have used every channel of communication, the faculty senate core curriculum will be going to the faculty senate staff with some recommendations about how to proceed. If you have suggestions and want to send your suggestions directly to me or to any of the committee members Sharron Barnes, Tom Barden, Mark Coventry, Mary Humphrys; or if you want to send them directly to Barb or the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, we will gladly take them.

Senator Fink: I have no suggestions, I was just curious when you did all these communications was there any feedback as to why people are resisting this?

Marcia King-Blandford: No, we offered to meet individually with faculty to type, input them, cut and paste them, and we are really at a loss as members of Faculty Senate Core Curriculum Committee on how to get this to be implemented. We feel that this is a really important project. We'd like to see this project continue to move forward and have some positive reflection, we really are at our wits end at how to get faculty to comply with these guidelines.

Senator Relue: It seems like it would be in each departments best interest to have the syllabi on file so that the courses can stay within general education course grouping. I don't know if this is something you've talked about to individual departments, but I would think that relaying this information to chairs would be effective.

Senator Ariss: I have a feeling that a lot of those faculty members are not aware of the implications of not having what it takes for their syllabus to be in the general education format, so if you educate the faculty with the next e-mail you send with copying the department chairs, you'll get to see a totally different reaction because they don't know what would be the implication of them not following the rules.

Marcia King-Blandford: I think that the other committee members that are here from the faculty senate core can speak up to this too but the recommendation we are going to ask Faculty Senate Executive Committee is to remove courses for the spring semester. Students are already registering for fall so we can't have the implications for fall.

Senator Ariss: Without being threatening to the faculty just by saying that the implications of you not following of what we have asked might lead to us removing your course. Simple and no threats.

Marcia King-Blandford: I just wanted to come before this body and update you with where we stood with this project.

Senator Barnes: I think that resistance also comes because people don't like the implication that somebody can dictate what's on their syllabus. It infringes on a sense of people's academic freedom and I think that's a legitimate issue that we could very well take it up as a faculty at large

and I think that other faculties around the state are also bucking under these restrictions and need to respond collaboratively as people interested in academic freedom.

Senator Relue: Is this syllabus simply to have on file and available so people can understand what the course content is or is this what the faculty member has to give their class?

Marcia King-Blandford: It's like a master file for the course. Sharon and I had lots of conversations about academic freedom. We are not trying to infringe on anyone's academic freedom, that's why we have made the offer to individual faculty to come and work with us. We are not trying to take the intellectual content of the course, it's a format, it's taking the learning objectives that you already put on your syllabus and maybe putting them at the start of the syllabi instead of at the end. We are not trying to change anyone's content; it's more a visual representation of our gen ed curriculum.

Senator Barnes: I'm not suggesting that we are trying to do that; I'm wondering if maybe that's why people have been reluctant to respond.

Senator Cluse-Tolar: When was the request made? I teach a gen ed course and I don't ever remember being asked for the syllabus.

Marcia King-Blandford: The emails started going out in January after a couple of weeks of classes.

Senator Cluse-Tolar: I'm from Social Work and we have one gen ed class but we have five or six different faculty teach it so how did you select who you sent this to?

Marcia King-Blandford: Everything went through the chairs.

Senator Cluse-Tolar: I'm a department chair and I didn't get anything.

Marcia King-Blandford: I will resend it.

Senator Ariss: Sounds like a breakdown in communication, so maybe you can resend it with an additional message why we need this.

Marcia King-Blandford: Ok, I will do that.

Senator Hottell: Please don't send it only through chairs. Chairs receive an enormous amount of emails and they don't always know what they are supposed to forward. I don't remember receiving this request. I remember that, last year, our dean told us that we were required to post our syllabi online, but this is not the same issue, is it? What about classes that we have not taught for two years, such as my class that carries Non-European multi-cultural core credit. Do you still want a sample syllabus for that?

Marcia King-Blandford: Yes. The guidelines created by the Faculty Senate require an ongoing annual review of the gen ed curriculum. The document was authored and passed by this body in 2005, we are yet to do an annual review. Even if the courses are not currently being offered we want a syllabi.

Senator Schall: So what is the purpose of the syllabus, is it for content or are you using it to evaluate gen ed curriculum?

Marcia King-Blandford: No, it is not for evaluating.

Senator Schall: I'm in Engineering and this does not apply to Engineering, no gen ed courses, but to me it gives a student an idea what the course is about, it doesn't seem they necessarily need to know the details, like grading, the assessment. To me, if you put out a syllabi and update it once a year, it may not be a current syllabi, especially if multiple instructors are teaching it.

Marcia King-Blandford: The syllabi template you were given reflects what was developed in the guidelines.

Senator Hottell: You are not saying that all the things listed must be there, right, for example, the grading scale? If we use the traditional 10 point/percentage system, do you need that specified? I have a suggestion for getting the word out that we are supposed to send you syllabi. A suggestion for the College of Arts & Sciences, for example. We have something that comes out of the college office and replaces the former UT News that everybody received. If you could send an announcement/call for syllabi to the College of Arts & Sciences and ask them to send it out to us, that would help.

Marcia King-Blandford: I will take your suggestions and will act on those.

Senator Skeens: Those of us who sent them in can you tell us if they have been accepted?

Marcia King-Blandford: Yes, the 52 sent in were good.

Chair Floyd: Thank you Marcia. Next is Bill McMillen, Vice President for Government Relations & Chief of Staff and he will talk to us about the Chancellor's new Strategic Plan.

V.P. McMillen: Today, the second Tuesday of the months was the traditional Inter University Council meeting with the presidents. Today's meeting included guest appearance by Chancellor Fingerhut and our Governor, Strickland, to have an open forum for an hour with the fourteen university presidents of higher education in the State to talk about Chancellor's strategic plan, which has been made public just eight days. Last time I was here I think I passed out the 4-5 page draft. We were sort of surprised when the final draft came out without any further input in it and it turned out to be 140 pages. The Governor came in and he made a statement, "Education is essential to everything the State government wants and needs to do." I don't think there is any question of the sincerity of the Governor and the sincerity of Eric Fingerhut, the Chancellor. The change in higher education is dramatic. The legislative allegations from the other party in supporting both the transformation of higher education and the budget which came out about six months later and the budget included a huge increase to the higher education especially benefitting universities such as ours that had a couple years of growth in student population. I am going to show you a PP, an example of a typical university professor position here. Sara Lundquist helped me with this, and then I will show you what could be a reasonable projection for the same professor five years from now. This is the ten year strategic plan.

You may view the PowerPoint presentation in its entirety on the Faculty Senate website: www.facsenate.utoledo.edu or click on this icon below



\\
fss00cv02.utad.utole

Typically, U.T. professor, 45 years old. Tenured English professor, teaching five undergraduate classes, workload 2-junior level introduction to major courses, 1-junior-level introduction to literature survey course, 1-senior-level course in contemporary world literature, 1senior-level/graduate course on Thomas Pynchon, serves on 2 department committees including merit & curriculum, serves on Faculty Senate. This is an exaggeration.

We are supposed to enroll 230,000 more students in the university system of Ohio over the next 10 years. This year, first of the 10 years we enrolled 9,000 more students, we are already 114,000 behind. Essentially The University of Toledo will be the same University five years from now with essentially the same majors. It will not be a radical change.

- Next slide, 1-junior level composition course taught at U.T. Center of Excellence on the Main Campus. One junior-level introduction to literature survey course in the evening at Northwest State Community College in Archbold.
- One senior-level course in contemporary world literature once a week on Saturday morning on the Scott Park campus. One senior level/graduate course on Thomas Pynchon.
- Serves on an ad hoc department committee investigating how to integrate older students into credit programs. Serves on a statewide Articulation & Transfer Course Approval Panel.

Everything will be transferrable across the board. This process is already well on the way.

- Spends six weeks teaching at UT/Ohio Northern University, European campus in Avignon, France. Teaches a course on contemporary French literature to USO students studying abroad and teaches a course on contemporary American literature to French students planning to study at UT or Ohio Northern in the Fall.

Senator Hottell: I am confused: This sample “typical” professor of English is supposed to teach a class on contemporary French literature at another university in France? How will he/she be qualified to teach French? Also, concerning the hypothetical UT/ONU campus in Avignon. I am study abroad advisor in French and nobody has told me about this possible collaboration. Furthermore, we already belong to a consortium of universities (called USAC, University Study Abroad Consortium). So, we already participate in a similar program in which predecessors can apply to teach (and a subject for which they are qualified, so English literature in this case, not French literature). NOTE: While proofreading these comments, Senator Hottell checked the USAC catalogue. In fact, Ohio Northern is already a member of the USAC Consortium. The French program is in Pau, not Avignon. For information, please see the Study Abroad Office at UT.

V.P. McMillen: No one has told me about it and I admit my ignorance, but in their plan there will be a partnership with private universities.

Senator Hottell: You might want to talk to us in foreign languages, or someone in Study Abroad or Global Initiatives because we are a member of ten universities around the country, and your PowerPoint says that part of your goal is to make study abroad affordable. That’s the beauty of our USAC consortium. The students get grants from this university, (\$1.00 comes out of the students’ fees for international issues), and the consortium offers scholarships. Also, our study abroad director sits on the Board that chooses who will teach in the programs; we all can apply to teach in them. The students also get scholarships.

V.P. McMillen: That’s why this is a valuable thing. Obviously in this 140 page document, there is a real lack of knowledge on some things, and that is not saying he is not a smart guy. That kind of interaction information can be very useful.

Senator Hottell: We have several members universities in Ohio, and programs all over the world.

V.P. McMillen: In the strategic plan there is a huge emphasis on Centers of Excellence. All 13 universities have to have a distinct Center of Excellence. Distinct means not duplicate, so if we have a great English department, does everybody else have to dissolve their English Dept.? The Chancellor said ‘No.’ We have for example the solar panels center that no one else is doing, and that’s where that is going. There will be money directed at that from the State according to the Chancellor. Universities will have to support Centers of Excellence. It is not determined how many there will be. This is one of the changes that will be implemented.

Senator Wikander: Will a 50-year-old faculty member be trained to teach in the Center of Excellence?

V.P. McMillen: Here is the dilemma. Is this something that a lecturer can do, or a junior or senior faculty? There are changes ahead and approach in what needs to satisfy some of these requirements.

Senator Wikander: I’m troubled by this in the same way I’m troubled by the President’s address last week. There seems to be assumptions about curriculum changes, assumptions about expertise. I’m from the English Department and I’m a senator, and there seems to be an assumption about the sort of things we teach and the kind of expertise that we have that is being altered here.

Senator Relue: What is the Center for Excellence, can you define it?

V.P. McMillen: This question hasn’t been answered. It’s an emphasis and we can shape it. Faculty can shape what a center of excellence will be, coming out of the University of Toledo, The University of Cincinnati, etc. “Centers of Excellence will be nationally and internationally recognized that will be drivers of regional and state economies, that will compliment the

comprehensive, quality education available at each institution. Each institution will delineate these Centers of Excellence together with specific goals and measurements by which the goals can be evaluated.” This comes from the executive summary and I have copies for everybody.

Senator Fritz: Will those be traditional classes or online classes? We know that the direct from high school student population will be shrinking which means the growth of people coming to the universities will be from the adult population, and I’m wondering if they would prefer our experience or the one online.

V.P. McMillen: Yes, and I’m quoting from the Executive Summary, “A number of community colleges have adopted a ‘University Center’ model, where they invite colleges and universities to offer the 3rd and 4th year of a bachelor’s degree program on their campus, with the stipulating that these programs accept the associate degree earned in full as transfer credits.” The University center model is already being done in Lorraine Community College and we are participating in it. It is proposed to widen this and I have it on my PP Northwest Tech, but it could very well be done online. I think it will only grow. This raises other issues, one of them is if you can get 3rd and 4th year courses over there a student doesn’t need Northwest State. First of all how much are you paying for those courses? And, where is the degree going to be from, how broadly are the courses going to be offered?

Senator Barlowe: Some of us have the same concerns about the UT Strategic Plan that you are expressing about the State Strategic Plan.. You are using the example of a hypothetical professor of English to demonstrate your concerns. But, since UT has already announced a commitment to STEM as our primary focus, that same hypothetical English professor could be asked to function only in the service of STEM professions. Our focus on STEM has the potential to drastically change the way the Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences are taught, and it has already devalued research in non-STEM areas. The State Strategic Plan includes a section called “Beyond STEM” that addresses the necessity for a comprehensive liberal education. The Plan does discuss Centers of Excellence as a way for a university to differentiate itself from other institutions, but these centers do not negate the liberal arts or an institution’s mission. The Plan also states that the Centers of Excellence “ can and will be established” in the liberal arts.

V.P. McMillen: That is beyond my knowledge. There is a paragraph in the summary called Beyond STEM. These skills are required to study, “In a wide range of disciplines including Arts and Humanities, Law as well as Science and Math among basic concerns reading and writing and oral communication skills of a work force ...as well as concerns over the technical skills what this will bring to the job.” This plan brings comprehensive quality to education.

Senator Johanson: I have read the Chancellor’s plan, and heard the President’s speech. College faculty are not doing their job; these people can’t read, can’t follow directions, can’t put together a sentence. What we get will not change much over the four years.

V.P. McMillen: The plan addresses that, but the way it addresses is a controversial way. Three years ago before Taft left office, it was proposed in the last State of the State speech and that was the core curriculum. The core curriculum was for high school and in order to graduate from high school there is all sorts of directions on which classes they must take in K-12 to come up with better education to turn out better students. What’s different in the Strategic Plan it never mentions core, what it does do is throws the burden on universities and university faculty to reach out to high schools and help out. The only college that is mentioned a number of times is College of Education around the state. There is an emphasis on helping to train teachers going to schools to help the education process. The senior to sophomore program. There is a great emphasis on the universities helping the students not drop out of high school. Students can’t drop out of high school. The premise is that until a student reached the age 21, they are technically in school in the eye of the State. They have to go back to school and take some classes, or high school equivalent. They are wiping out the term drop out. Part of the overall premise is to enroll 230,000 students no matter what in ten years.

Senator Barden: Is there a universal pre-K proposal in the Chancellor's document? The College of Education was talking about that issue at its conference on the "Will to Improve Education" last fall. Even before they start kindergarten, many children are already lost as potential learners and lovers of learning.

V.P. McMillen: Most of you know that the Governor of the State said he is going to do the same thing in K-12 that has happened with higher education. The State Board of Education would be made advisory, the superintendent of K-12 state-wide would be made direct report to the Chancellor, and the same transition would be made that was made in higher education. A quote from the Executive Summary, "A key element of cost-efficiency is the ability to offer students low-cost educational opportunities. It also includes offering discounts on the university main campuses for students who take courses during off-hours, on weekends, and in the summer, or online where the online material is deemed equal in academic value to the live version of the same course." In other words the whole idea of being much broader and when students can take classes it will draw in more adult students, more businesses, more dropouts and get them into college.

Senator Thompson-Casado: In my college where I teach Spanish we only offer each course once a semester and often only once a year. We would love to be more flexible and offer more sections but we have been starved with regard to faculty and cannot teach more courses, is there a component for hiring more faculty in areas that are non-STEMM?

V.P. McMillen: In the plan faculty members are mentioned in relationship to teaching. Faculty members are not a topic in the plan at all. It's not an issue of faculty being recruited and coming in from outside, except in a research scholar area. There is no mention of faculty on tenure, or faculty union, or faculty recruitment, or faculty workload at all. Just not part of the plan.

Senator Barlowe: Is it a general assumption that the institutions - whether private, or community college, four-year or research institutions - would make those decisions about hiring and recruiting?

V.P. McMillen: Yes. And part of the dilemma that this has to be the university has to have faculty help shape this. Even today Chancellor Fingerhut did not give us indication what wants we should consider. We are classified as an urban research university along with Cincinnati, Akron, Wright State, Cleveland State. We don't know which one of these things we should be following and which we shouldn't. Certainly foreign language is a winner in this.

Senator Thompson-Casado: We keep hearing this but I'm not seeing it. We have only three full-time tenured faculty teaching all our upper level Spanish majors.

V.P. McMillen: Not only that but back in high school there was a huge emphasis on foreign language.

Senator Fournier: About the Governor's plan does the economic study and demographic support that and is there going to be value in college education seeing the economic mess?

V.P. McMillen: Yes.

Senator Fournier: The reality is that in this country and in this state with the large number of manufacturing jobs that have left the country, the types of jobs remaining at places for which we now get so excited about in terms of economic development like a COSTCO or a BassPro for the type of jobs we now have, people probably don't need higher education. I was talking to a young lady at Beaner's yesterday, she is graduating from The University of Toledo in May and can't find a job. She works at Beaner's at \$8.00/hr. This is the reality the Governor needs to think about, how are you going to change this around and how do you convince potential students and their parents that a college degree even has value.

V.P. McMillen: The Governor would say exactly what I quoted, "Education is the key..." I don't think you heard that from the previous administration. The previous administration did not devote that much money to this. This is a play that on one hand it's going to be difficult, on the other hand it might be a real opportunity for universities too.

The production of graduate degrees is an important component, and means the overall education goes in this plan while keeping track of graduate degree holders. There has not been any talk about

eliminating graduate degrees. There is a commitment to graduate education. Reaching out to older Ohioans and increase the overall education for credit recruitment activities in order to grow their enrollment. The next slide might be more controversial, I quote, “After a date to be established in consultation with chief academic officers, no new courses appropriate to the statewide Articulation & Transfer System will be listed or offered at any University System of Ohio School before they are reviewed by statewide faculty and included in the Ohio Credit Transfer System.” You can draw your own conclusion on this, and take the leap that all courses will be a part of the Articulation & Transfer System. This statement was already edited from the rough draft.

Senator Fink: If I understand what you are saying correctly, if you complete all your credits at one type of school but decide to graduate from another more “prestigious” university, that university must accept all credits and potentially award a degree from that institution without that person ever attending it. Is this correct?

V.P. McMillen: That is a crucial question. The reason they are doing this is because these things haven’t been worked out. How will they be worked out? This has only been out for eight days, people are not reading this around the state, but it’s not going to be sitting on a shelf. This is in place and it has the whole Board of Regents, the Chancellor of the Board of Regents had been appointed by the Governor and there is no place to fall back on to, he is a social, liberal Democrat who has a PhD in Psychology who is a Governor. The issue is how are we going to get the act together, make recommendations, understand what is in the report and deal with it.

Senator Wolff: Is there any sense that there will be uniformity in these courses? Are there going to be common textbooks?

V.P. McMillen: I just don’t know that.

Senator Kennedy: Who is going to hash out the details?

V.P. McMillen: There was a working group Articulation Transfer already that has been working for a couple of years now, to get the community colleges credits to be transferable. There is a lot of work to be done, for example, and it’s something that Northwest Ohio got over a couple of decades ago. There are four universities that are still on quarter system, everybody else is on semester system. Out of those four universities, three are the largest, Ohio State, Cincinnati, Wright State and Ohio University. Those presidents said it will be 3-4 years before they are converted. So Articulation Transfer can’t happen until everybody gets on a semester system. But now it becomes a political thing because a parent who has their student in a community college who wants to go to Shawnee State and they paid for 28 credits, and Shawnee State accepts only 21 credits and the parents call their legislator and complain about the state system, then the legislator calls up the Chancellor. That is the issue in front of all of us over the next few years. Fortunately Northwest Ohio is a little ahead of everyone else. We are ahead of the curve because of a number of factors, we don’t have competing universities a few miles from each other like in Northeast Ohio. Our two universities, Bowling Green and us are fairly complimentary in this report. We only have three state community colleges and two of them are quite small and we just don’t have the issues other universities in the Northeast are facing.

Senator Barden: I think this is pretty good state of affairs for Ohio; at least we have money coming from the State for higher education again. In the last administration, there was not a lot of faith or investment in higher education. What I’m worried about is that these good ideas will go to all the university presidents in the state and, in some cases, the faculty won’t be at the table to develop the ideas into curricular developments. Also, the problems that we would identify immediately, upper administrators may not know. We clearly have a situation here at The University of Toledo where the faculty’s input is not sought and is not considered important.

Provost Haggett: Bill, you should touch on the funding formula.

V.P. McMillen: If there is ever a document where the devil is in the detail, it is this one. I hope you will all go to the web and download that document and read it.

The website is: www.universitysystem.ohio.gov

I would like to introduce Aaron Baker who joined our office two months ago and is helping on the policy committee and a number of other projects in the Office of the President as well as some Government Relations and some city stuff.

Senator Lipscomb: Why aren't more students pursuing a degree from a university? The core of it is that they don't value it. They don't see the value in making the investment in time and money. If we try to encourage more people that will drive the growth in community colleges over a four-year school. It will force us to move toward being a two-year completion as opposed to be a full university.

V.P. McMillen: There is no question that there is a view of being a two-year completion university. A lot of factors weigh against it, for example, there are statistics regarding graduation rates. Owens and U.T. enroll about the same number of students. They graduate 1,000 students and we graduate 4,000 students. We are a long ways from being the Pennsylvania State University system where you have to go because they don't allow anyone on a regular campus except athletes and merit scholars and you have to go to one of the Penn State branches in order to go to Penn. We are a long ways from that. I don't think the concept of our university will change five years or ten years.

Senator Lipscomb: Shouldn't this address what is the reason not to pursue a higher education degree?

V.P. McMillen: It tries to but it doesn't sound very effective. There is one thing on the slide I wanted to point out, the University system will work with Ohio private colleges to develop shared programs to stay more affordable for Ohio students. There is a whole section in the report about private universities. Private universities get money from two basic sources public money, one of them is for research grants, and the other is you got scholarship. If you are an Ohio citizens and went to a private university then you got tuition money. That's been a dirty little private secret that has been promoted by Regents and certain legislators for many years. The Chancellor has brought this out on the table, and there is some accountability that private universities will have to have. And that's going to change and they are aware of this.

Globalization measure. On page 104 of the Chancellor's Strategic Plan there is a chart and our current level on one of these, total international students today is 13,538, Ohio students studying abroad 6,328. In 2017 they are projecting 35,134/16,413. They left out of this chart nine empty column and next year we will have to show, and every year after that, what we contributed to the 13,538 and the 6,328 in order to reach that goal. Right now we have about 1,200 foreign students on our campus and we need to increase that by 200. Next year we will be measure by how many more graduates we have done. Until the Chancellor tells us what we can ignore we can't just say that we aren't interested in foreign students or study abroad.

Senator Wolff: The funding mechanism, how is that going to work and how will it change?

V.P. McMillen: The last budget cycle a year ago before Fingerhut, the Board of Regents did the formula for student SSI. But it wasn't changed dramatically, just weak and categories were reduced. Now they are proposing, starting Friday, a new funding formula based on quality and not enrollment. The presidents had all kinds of questions. Fortunately Scott Scarborough is on the panel and it will be a major change. It can't be totally implemented, but it will be based on the fact that we all will have to adopt the BSA, and there will be national accountability.

Senator Barden: You think it will involve those nine columns, how many students we send abroad and how many we have here?

V.P. McMillen: Yes. And I think if you are not teaming up, you will be penalized.

Senator Barnes: This is the no child will be left behind concept.

Senator Lipscomb: Is there a discussion on differential tuition? That's an important issue too.

V.P. McMillen: Yes, there is that discussion on differential tuition.

Senator Thompson-Casado: Is the emphasis still on the STEMM area funding or has that been shifted?

V.P. McMillen: There is no separate emphasis on STEMM funding.

Senator Barden: That would be under the Center for Excellence.

Senator Lipscomb: Indirectly, being that higher education as being the driver of the economy, there is some measure of STEMM as a source of economic development.

Senator Barden: Not necessarily, it can be creative as well.

V.P. McMillen: There is no dramatic emphasis on STEMM funding as people thought.

Senator Hudson: I have a comment and a question at the end. The group in Columbus are like generals who are absent from the front lines—and this is where we are. They are making policy decisions based on the way they believe things ought to look without taking much into consideration much of what's happening in the trenches. I'm reminded of a story from WWII where two groups of soldiers under General Patton's command were arguing over which way to head (to Antwerp or to Cologne) General Patton came along looked at them and pointed in the direction they hadn't considered and said "we're headed Bastogne." They all immediately followed General Patton since they trusted him. He'd been in the trenches with them, not making battle decisions from 200 miles away. So, if any of the generals in Columbus would go out and talk to real faculty making real decisions, and say this is the way things ought to go and have dialogue about it, we might get somewhere. Whereas, if they are going to remain separate and the generals in Columbus are going to pontificate up on high producing a document like this where some of the discussion sounds realistic and some doesn't, then you don't get anywhere. The troops in the field to constantly try to correct the general's in Columbus in their lack knowledge of conditions on the ground. So the generals in Columbus should try to get closer to the reality of the situation? My question: is there any appreciation in Columbus that it might now be valuable to actually find out what is going on as we move forward?

V.P. McMillen: The Regents' Office is under change. There is a lack of general knowledge. Chancellor Fingerhut is a smart guy, he has travelled around and has talked to people and still has some sense of what's going on. Ironically one of the allies that we have is Ohio State University. This is sending ripples through Ohio State, the write up about Ohio State is very interesting and it ends by saying, "The Ohio State University will help the other universities in areas of expertise where it can." Literally, it warns Ohio State not to trump other universities and take away from other universities. The Ohio State has another problem which we don't have, Bowling Green only marginally has this, and that is what to do with regional campuses and how those regional campuses will be worked into the university setting. It has problems with co-locate...(?) campuses and Ohio State is involved with most of them. The Chancellor announced he wants to get rid of them. I think the Chancellor is a real smart guy and will be real allies in getting perhaps modified changes and will become a more effective.

Chair Floyd: Thank you Bill. Any other business, old business or new business? If not, can we have a motion to adjourn?

Motion was made and seconded.

V. Calendar Questions:

Log item 0708-6, Faculty Authored Textbook Policy

VI. Other Business:

Old business: None

New business: None

VII. Adjournment: Meeting was adjourned at 5:05 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Alice Skeens
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Kathy Gabel
Faculty Senate Office Admin. Secretary