

**THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO**  
**Minutes of the Senate Meeting of March 30, 2010**  
**FACULTY SENATE**

<http://www.utoledo.edu/facsenate>    Approved @ FS mtg. on 4/13/10

---

**HIGHLIGHTS**

**Dr. Ben Pryor's proxy, Dr. Pryor, Assist. V. Provost of Learning Ventures**  
**Prof. Steve Peseckis, Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee**  
**Prof. Celia Regimbal, Chair, Academic Programs Committee**  
**Dr. Thomas Kvale, Director, Undergraduate Research**  
**Dr. Jeffrey Busch, Research Compliance Officer**  
**Panel discussion – Bill Logie, VP Human Resource & Campus Safety**  
**Scott Scarborough, VP, Finance & Administration**  
**William McMillen, Chief of Staff & VP Government Relations**

---

---

**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.

**President John Barrett** called the meeting to order, **Nick Piazza**, Executive Secretary, called the roll.

**I.      *Roll Call –2009-2010 Senators:***

**Present:**    Anderson, Barnes, Barrett, Baumgartner, Brickman, Caruso, Chiarelott, Coventry, Crosetto, Dismukes, Dowd, Dupuy, Fink, Giovannucci, Gunning, Heberle, Horan, Hornbeck, Hottell, Humphrys, Jenkins, Jorgensen, Kennedy, Kistner, Lee, Lundquist, Malhotra, McSweeny, Moore, Niamat, Nims, Olson, Peseckis, Piazza, Plenefish, Powers, Randolph, Regimbal, Rouillard, Sheldon, Shriner, Skeel, Solocha, Stepkowski, Thompson-Casado, Wedding, Wolff,

**Excused absences:**    Ankele, Barlowe, Denyer, Elmer, Grothaus, Hoblet, Laux, LeBlanc, Metting, Powless, Teclhaimanot, Tietz,

**Unexcused absences:**    Fournier, Nandkeolyar,  
A quorum was present.

**II.      *Approval of Minutes:*** Minutes of 3/2/2010 were approved as distributed.

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

**Executive Secretary Nick Piazza** is asking the Senators and guests to introduce themselves before speaking to get the speakers' names recorded accurately in the minutes.

**President John Barrett:**

**President's Report - 3/30/10**

It is good to see you all back after our extended break. As you can see, we have a busy itinerary, so let's jump right in. As I am sure you all know, we have only two more meetings after today, and the final meeting is largely taken up with electing next year's officers. Unless there is an objection, I am planning to use clicker voting to elect our new officers. I have also asked the chair of the elections committee to give a report at that time. We have had a number of problems with getting correct ballots this year, and our process seems out of date in this brave new era of clickers and

other forms of electronic voting, so I asked the elections committee to look at ways to improve the process for next year. Although we can change our election process by a 2/3 senate vote, since it is in the Appendix, it is not my intention to do so at this meeting. Rather, I hope that we can give the committee feedback on its report and charge it or the Constitution and Rules Committee with drafting an amendment to our Appendix based on this report and feedback for us to vote on at the beginning of next year.

On the assessment front, I believe the deans assessments closed Sunday. Other than the College of law assessment, which had about a 60% return rate, the other assessments were running very low as of late last week, so we sent out a note to encourage those in colleges assessing deans to do so before the process closed. I am sorry about all the confusion this caused. Unfortunately, not everyone knew which deans were being assessed, which led to a follow up notice listing the deans being assessed. The absence of Dean Gold raised a further issue since he has been in that position for over two years. However, as I understand it, since we are planning to assess him as provost, and since the assessments break down responses by colleges, it was felt that having the COM faculty assess him twice would be redundant, even though technically it is in two different capacities. It is anticipated that it will take a couple of weeks to sort through the results and then, hopefully, the next set of assessments can proceed. To help make sure no delay occurs from our end, I asked the Assessment Committee to make any necessary adjustments to the dean tool so that it could be used for upper level administrators. This has been returned to me. I asked if it would also work for the president, and the chair indicated a few additional tweaks might be necessary, so I have asked the committee to prepare these as well.

On the transformational change front, there is a delegation meeting with people at Arizona State Univ. today. The people at ASU are Jamie Barlowe (A&S), Debra Davis (A&S), Miggie Hopkins (COBA), Ann Krause (A&S), Steve LeBlanc (COEng), Kevin west and the Provost. Nick Piazza, Berhane Teclehaimanot, Rick Komuniecki and I were also invited but declined.

On the dean search front, several search firms have been brought in and interviewed. Provost Hagggett tells me the JHCOE visioning process should be ready to transition to the search phase soon. The A&S roundtable report was submitted to Provost Hagggett and the president last week. When the provost returns, they will need to discuss whether this concludes the visioning stage or whether more is required, but once again she hopes this will move to the search phase soon.

I assume most of you know that Kathy Grabel, the senate secretary, is retiring at the end of this school year. I have sent in the paperwork to request a replacement, so that hopefully we will have someone in time for Kathy to train him or her before retiring.

There has been some concern about the vacation policy applicable to Chairs and other lower level administrators. Apparently, the wrong policy was sent out and a new letter will be forthcoming outlining the details of the correct policy.

I know some faculty going through the renewal, promotion and tenure process have received letters from Provost Hagggett containing a statement of the recommendation she is making to the President, and an attached form evaluating said person's innovations in teaching and his/her University and Community engagement. I know these forms have given rise to some hallway discussions and the exact purpose of this form is a matter I will invite Provost Hagggett to address on her return. In the meantime, please feel free to bring any concerns you have regarding this matter to my attention.

As we all know, there was a DL/Blackboard meltdown last week. Ben Pryor sent me a memorandum about this early today, which has been distributed to you all and will be posted on the screen in a bit, and John Gaboury will be available to answer any questions about this.

We also have a couple of short reports and consent agenda items from the Curriculum Committee and the Academic Programs Committee. Additionally, Thomas Kvale and Jeffrey Busch are going to give us a brief update on Research Intensive Courses, which we approved earlier this year. The issue has arisen as to how student research fits in to IRB policies and processes, so they will tell us about this. Final, we have a panel discussion with Bill Logie, Bill McMillan and Scott Scarborough. The plan is for the Bills to give us a relatively detailed report on changes happening with STRS and for Scott to give a brief budget update. We will then allow considerable time (hopefully) for Q&A about any questions within their respective areas of competence- budget, finance, HR, furloughs, STRS, what is happening in Columbus, etc. I do want to make one request though. With regard to furloughs, let's keep the questions focused on how things are going to work if furloughs are implemented. Having sat on the Furlough Committee, I can tell you that numerous other options and approaches we considered and suggested, both at the committee level and with regard to what was recommended to the President, so asking Bill why the program is the way it is, is a pointless undertaking since the final form of the program was not decided by him.

I now invite Provost Gold to the podium for the provost's report.

**Provost Gold:** I have a few informational item and one that is last Friday a group of us engaged in a strategic planning session and it was exciting to see the elements of the 2010 Strategic Planning come together. The reason of mentioning it today is to try and stay involved particularly faculty involvement in each section. That section that I am most involved in, Section 5, relates to the delivery of health care. All the sections in the current version are on the website. I would ask all the undergraduate and graduate research or other areas to make sure that all your voices are heard. This is the time to be informed by as many voices as possible. Saturday was a great celebratory day on the Health Science Campus, not only the recognition in the Hall of Fame where we inducted three new international medical missionaries called FABE(?), but it was also a first College of Medicine research day. It was a day for the College of Medicine faculty to gathered together and review over a 100 different poster presentations as well a number of different platform presentations as well. It was a remarkable gathering of tremendously powerful research and individuals.

The diabetes day is going to occur beginning tomorrow. What we have done, Mr. Logie and others, is identify in one way, shape or form a number of employees at the University who are a hard core "diabetic". It could mean a lot of different things, but what it probably means is treatment in one form or another with injectable therapy. We will be doing an educational program and will be giving away equipment and supplies on two different days, one, on March 31 in Pharmacy on the Health Science Campus, and the other is on April 7 in the Pharmacy here on this campus. If you are in that category or if you know somebody in that category and would like some patient information and would like to work with pharmacists and others who are knowledgeable and could possibly improve the treatment of diabetes with better medication management, these are wonderful sessions and I encourage you to go to all of them.

The item of substance that I want to touch on relates to a legislation that has been brewing in Washington which relates to our healthcare system. We all know that a week ago on Sunday it passed in the House of Representatives passed a bill and a resolution and either it already is or in the near future will become the law of the land. This legislation is having at least as much impact as when Medicare passed and it is probably of the power level to when social security passed. It has had similar effect on the country as it polarized the country and it has torn physician groups apart, it has torn providers from insurers, hospitals from insurers and many others. It is not my role to stand here and comment on whether or not it is good or bad or indifferent, it is what it is. But it is my role that you as members of the faculty, and our employee, staff and students really understand what is in this legislation. In the interest of reducing a lot of ambiguity, I have taken from the website a single page of information that has been produced that answers three simple questions, what is going to take effect in 2010, what is going to take effect in the next four years

and what is specific to Medicare, Medicaid programs and eligibility. In this document there are also a number of websites, and I wanted you to have this as a resource that you might want to use to keep track of not only the discussion that is going on, but what is in this legislation. The whole document is over 2,500 pages, it is extremely complex, regulations that will be generated from this bill it will take years to implement. There are some things relating to young children, young adults, it's all there on this one page.

**The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (H.R. 3590)-health system reform legislation signed into law by President Obama on March 23-contains a number of key provisions for you and your patients. Some provisions may have an immediate impact on your practice and patients, while others will not take effect for some time.**

**Given the new direction for the nation's health system, the AMA has developed Health System Reform Insight to help you understand the new law and how it will affect you, when certain provisions are scheduled to take effect, how you can be ready when the regulations go into effect and what your patients need to know. The first issue of the series explained how health system reform will affect physician practices <<http://enews.ama-assn.org/t/1251010/14913439/78277/0/>> . Today we focus on information for your patients. We encourage you to visit the AMA's health system reform Web site <<http://enews.ama-assn.org/t/1251010/14913439/78352/0/>> (PDF) and print copies to share with them.**

#### **How health system reform affects patients**

**H.R. 3590 has many significant benefits for patients-those who already have health insurance and those who don't. While some benefits take effect in 2010, many others will be phased in over several years to allow the health care system to absorb the changes ahead. Here's a snapshot of those benefits.**

#### **Patient benefits that take effect in 2010**

**For patients with private health insurance:**

- **Your insurer can no longer drop you from your plan if you get sick.**
- **Children ages 18 and younger can no longer be denied private insurance coverage if they have a pre-existing medical condition.**
- **For adults with pre-existing medical conditions who cannot obtain private insurance coverage, a temporary national "high-risk pool" will be established to provide coverage, with financial subsidies to make premiums more affordable, until all insurers are required to cover people with pre-existing conditions in 2014.**
- **Young adults up to age 26 can remain as a dependent on their parents' private health insurance plan.**
- **Your health insurance benefits can no longer run out because of a long or expensive illness because insurers can no longer impose lifetime financial limits on benefits.**
- **Preventive services for women, such as mammograms, and immunizations for children must be covered by insurers, with no co-payments or deductibles required.**

**In addition, Medicare patients who will hit the coverage gap known as the "doughnut hole" this year under the prescription drug benefit will receive a \$250 rebate from Medicare.**

**Patient benefits that take effect during the next four years  
In the private health insurance market:**

- **U.S. citizens and legal residents cannot be denied private health insurance coverage for any reason, beginning in 2014. All U.S. citizens and legal residents must obtain health insurance coverage or pay a minor tax penalty (although there are some exemptions). This is to ensure that everyone is in the insurance pool so no one can get a "free ride" by not having affordable coverage and then going to an emergency room for care.**
- **State-based health insurance exchanges will begin operating in 2014, where people who do not have access to employer-based insurance can shop and compare the benefits and costs of private health insurance plans. These exchanges will create insurance pools that will allow people to choose among affordable coverage options. All insurance companies in the exchange must provide at least a minimum benefit package, as well as additional coverage options beyond a basic plan.**
- **Federal subsidies through tax credits or vouchers will be provided in 2014 to people who cannot afford the full cost to help them purchase coverage through the exchanges.**
- **Beginning in 2011, states can require insurance companies to submit justification for premium increases and can impose penalties for excessive increases.**

**For patients enrolled in Medicare or Medicaid:**

- **You no longer will pay any cost-sharing for a number of preventive services, effective Jan. 1, 2011.**
- **If you are subject to the "doughnut hole" for your Medicare drug coverage, you will receive a 50 percent discount on those prescription drugs beginning Jan. 1, 2011.**
- **A series of pilot programs will be implemented during the next four years to help find new ways to improve quality and lower the cost of the care you receive from your doctors, hospitals and nursing homes in the Medicare and Medicaid programs.**
- **Medicaid coverage will be expanded in 2014 to all eligible children, pregnant women, parents and childless adults under age 65 who have incomes at or below 133 percent of the federal poverty level.**

Rather than take anymore time from your busy program, I will just take some questions at this time.

There are ramifications for recipients of health care, ramifications for hospital systems, for physicians, there are also ramifications for small and large employers. So we are in the process now trying to pull together (selling) points that we need to deal with in the immediate future, and we will commit to you and we are in the process of building a webpage with information for

faculty, students and employees of the University as it relates at this time, and we are talking about doing some Town Hall meetings, a question and answer session.

**Senator Anderson:** Are there any ramifications for our own pharmacies that operate here?

**V.P. Logie:** At this point I am not aware of any, but there could be impact with the pharmacy.

**Provost Gold:** My guess is that we will do less but pay more.

**President Barrett:** We have three health insurance plans: two traditional and a high deductible plan. Sections of the bill talk about parts with no deductibles. Are there changes that will affect the high deductible plan, things would normally have to be paid, because you are getting money towards covering it?

**V.P. Logie:** I don't know the answer to that question.

**Provost Gold:** One of the things that are interesting is that academic health centers would be allowed to form independent insurance exchanges. The insurance exchange modality which people would purchase private insurance, so it is very likely that University Medical Center will go ahead and form an insurance exchange, if nothing else, to serve our employees and students, and to control the cost. We in Northwest Ohio are the only legitimate academic health center, meaning you need to run a hospital in combination with a medical school plus a pharmacy, nursing, etc., and have an outpatient service of a certain size. All of that is work in progress. It's going to be awhile before we know the impact immediately and thereafter. There are some websites that we will try to pull together that will give you more facts. I think it's important to educate our faculty and our students as quickly as possible. Any other questions?

**President Barrett:** Thank you Provost Gold. Now Steve Peseckis will give a report from the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee.

**Senator Peseckis:** Yesterday you were sent a list of courses from the Curriculum Committee.

### **Course Modifications and New Courses To Be Considered for Recommendation for Approval by the Faculty Senate on March 30, 2010**

#### **College of Arts and Sciences (ARS)**

##### **New Courses**

#### **EEES 4770 Agroecology 3 ch**

- Lecture: 3, 25 students/semester, 25/section; Semester offered: Fall, Alternate Years

- Catalog Description: "Agroecology links ecology, economics, and society to sustain agriculture. Through lectures and field trips, agroecology covers ecology, environmental impacts of agriculture, and forces relating to food distribution, transportation, and consumption."

-Reason: EEES 4770 - Agroecology will be an upper level elective course for the BIOM and ENSC (Biology concentration) programs. As a special topics course in Fall 2009, the course enrolled 6 undergraduates. There are no other classes on campus that cover ecological issues relating to agriculture. The course will help prepare students for graduate school and will be seen as an asset when applying. Further, the class may attract students in other departments (e.g. GEPL, WGST) and will be an elective for students in the proposed Sustainability major and minor.

#### **WMST 4590 Law, Policy, and the Politics of Sexuality 3 ch**

- Seminar: 3, 20 students/semester, 20/section; Semester offered: Spring, Alternate years

- Catalog Description: "This course explores law, policymaking, and public attitudes that affect gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered individuals in the U.S. Topics include hate crimes legislation, discrimination law, and same-sex marriage."

-Reason: This course will provide an additional American politics option for undergraduate and graduate students. It will also be cross-listed with Women's and Gender Studies and the Law and Social Thought Program.

- Fit: This course covers existing law in the areas of same-sex marriage, discrimination, adoption, identity recognition, and hate crimes. It investigates partisan alignment, public attitudes, and the positions of religious communities. It also examines tensions within LGBT political advocacy. As such, it complements courses like the political theory focused PSC 3800/WGST 3800-Sexual Politics and the multidisciplinary WGST 3200-Issues in Lesbian, Transgender, Bisexual and Gay Communities.

### **Course Modifications**

**ENGL 1020** Writing and Grammar for Students of English as a Second Language 3 ch

- Update catalog description to “Course work focuses on the major grammatical patterns of academic writing in English as well as accuracy in the mechanics of academic writing. The primary emphasis is on these features in the context of the students' own written work. Eligibility by placement exam only. A maximum of 3 semester hours in ENGL 1020 may be counted toward fulfilling the 124 hour requirement for graduation.”

Reason: To delete the reference in the catalog description to the course "English 1120" since English 1120 is being dropped.

**ENGL 1120** College Composition I Laboratory for Students of English as a Second Language 2 ch

Fit: Course is being dropped.

Reason: To align course catalog with current practice

**THR 2610** Acting I 3 ch

- Change prerequisite from “THR 1010 (OR PERMISSION OF INSTRUCTOR) AND 2200” to “NO PREREQUISITE.”
- Reason: Present prerequisites do not serve students' timely access to required courses in the major. Elimination of the requirement will create better and more balanced enrollments each semester. Focused advising will accomplish the objectives of the old prerequisite.

This is an agenda item and unless anyone has any objections, all in favor please say “aye.”  
Opposed? None. *Motion passed unanimously.*

**Senator Peseckis:** I wanted to give you heads up on some very important courses that we are working on from the Art Dept. It will be a little complex. These Art courses have to be passed now (this semester) and cannot be put on hold because of their accreditation body. The courses first have to be passed by us, then their accreditation body evaluates them, and not until after they accept them are they activated in our system. There will also be a large number of courses from the HSHS.

**President Barrett:** The Executive Committee met last Friday and went over all the Log Items received throughout the year trying to make sure everything was in progress or completed. One of the Log Items was the issue of what’s going on with the diversity issues. We sent that to the undergraduate curriculum committee, and there is a compiling going on of all the courses; there is a lot of data and it’s taking a while. I just wanted to let you know we haven’t forgotten. Next is Celia Regimbal for her report from the Academic Programs Committee.

**Senator Regimbal:** This is a consent agenda item. You have received the report with a number of requests from the Academic Programs Committee. Are there any questions?

**Academic Programs Committee Report  
March 30, 2010**

All new programs and program modifications are posted at:

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

The Academic Program Committee met on 3/23 and approved the following:

**EDUCATION**

\* Adolescent and young adult education single degree program B.Ed. science  
Add: CI 4610 Investigations in Science

Rationale

This course fulfills an assessment component required for national program accreditation

**NURSING**

\*The planned sequence for discontinuing courses as a result of closing the Associate of Applied Science in Nursing program  
Courses will need to be removed from the catalogue

Rationale

The College of Nursing and the UT Board of Trustees have approved closing the Associate of Applied Science in Nursing program. The last student cohort will matriculate August 2009 and has a planned graduation date of May 2011. Individual nursing courses will be processed for removal from the UT system semester by semester.

\*Change in admission criteria for DHS and transfer students to:

3.0 GPA

20 ACT with writing score or 950 SAT with writing score

Registered Nurses with active unencumbered license to practice will be admitted as pre-major with 2.5 or greater higher ed (cumulative) GPA.

Rationale

To help assure that only students with adequate academic preparation are admitted as pre-major. Students below threshold will be admitted to UTLC Gateway Programs.

\* Change in Probation Policy from the College of Nursing

*Effective Spring 2010, the Academic Probation policy will read:*

*Any undergraduate student who fails a nursing course or earns a semester GPA below 2.0 is placed on probation.*

Following is the reason for the revision change request:

Current Academic Probation states any student who fails a nursing course with a grade below C or has a cumulative GPA below 2.0 is placed on probation. A student who enters



professional coursework with a high GPA will not reach a 2.0 cumulative GPA until a significant amount of coursework is failed. This does not change the current policy limiting the student to no more than two course failures to remain in the major.

#### Rationale

The policy change will also permit easier tracking by semester, especially for pre-nursing students taking university-required courses

### **BUSINESS**

#### \*Bachelor of Applied Organizational Technology

Change Math Requirement from a Calculus requirement to any UT Math course that fulfills the UT core requirements.

#### Rationale

The MBA and general business minor math requirements have changed; this requested change is necessary to ensure consistent standards within program pre-requisites

#### \* General Business Minor for Non-Business Students

Change Math Requirement from a Calculus requirement to any UT Math course that fulfills the UT core requirements.

#### Rationale

This minor serves for many students to fulfill the pre-requisites to the MBA. The MBA math requirements have changed and this request is to ensure consistent standards within program pre-requisites

### **ARTS & SCIENCES**

#### Art – New Program/Concentration

##### \*Bachelor of Arts in Art History with a concentration in Art Museum Practices

The Art History program is proposing a new concentration in the B.A. in Art History whose focus is on professional standards, practices, and procedures used in contemporary museums of art. In implementing the new curriculum -- Art Museum Practices (AMP).

#### Rationale

The proposed curricular enhancement does not replace the current requirements for the B.A. in Art History, but **supplements** them with a new concentration offering students who qualify and are interested a deeper undergraduate experience in a field in which many will pursue further education and careers

### **ENGINEERING**

#### \* Construction Engineering Technology

Changes required to reflect proposed modifications in Alpha and Numeric code of required courses.

#### Rationale

The current Alpha code of ARCT is a remnant of a program that no longer exists. The Alpha code is being changed to the CET code under which the courses are taught as required courses.

Added to the list of courses allowed as Technical Electives: CET-3010, MET-4600, ENGT-2500 and ENGT-4900.

#### Rationale

These courses have been allowed as substitutes for Professional Development Electives for the past four years. These Professional Development Electives will now be classified as Professional Development/Technical Electives.

**Senator Jorgensen:** In the statement they use the word “failing” to mean something other than what is in the undergraduate catalog. It says grades below C are failing. Grades in the undergraduate catalog are failing when they are below a D - . There is an inconsistency. I can understand that the College of Nursing would have a standard with a grade below C being unacceptable. But to say it is “failing” it’s inconsistent with the undergraduate grade scale.

**Senator Regimbal:** Is there anyone here from the Nursing Program that could address this?

**Senator Carrie Lee:** In the Nursing program it has been a standard for a long time that students must earn a C or better to progress, they also have two course failures in their major program.

**Senator Jorgensen:** What I am saying is if below a C is not acceptable that’s fine, but it’s not failing by definition in our undergraduate catalog. You can call it unacceptable or some other word, but failing is contradicting in what is in the catalog. That’s my concern, because it is not F, it does not go as 0 in the GPA.

**Senator Barnes:** Can we have a friendly amendment to change it to unacceptable instead of failing? Would that work?

**Senator Carrie Lee:** I’m sorry I’m caught us off guard, I don’t know why it’s in it, maybe we can forward background information.

**Senator Regimbal:** Would you like us to pull this issue and come back with it next time? The issue here has to do with the word “failing”.

**Senator Hornbeck:** The current policy reads, grade below C, so I don’t think that would make a good substitute.

**Senator Jorgensen:** I would not want to force it unless you talked to the right person to address it. I raised this with Karen Hoblet last time and I thought that it would be changed.

**Senator Regimbal:** I did ask for comments from Nursing, this reflects the statement they had before the conflict between “fail” and the general catalog definition was raised.

**Senator Carrie Lee:** I think if there is a concern about the continuity with other documents and people communicating, I will be glad to take this back for clarity and bring it back at the next meeting.

**Senator Peseckis:** The word “fail” is not necessarily what is in the catalog.

**President Barrett:** Maybe they are using “fail” in a non-technical sense, different from catalog?

**Senator Jorgensen:** It’s in the proposed policy statement, any undergraduate student fails a Nursing course earns a GPA of less than 2.0.

**Marcia King-Blandford:** What we want to explain to the college is that the wording has to say who earns a grade of C or below, because the State acknowledges that we have to accept transfer credit all the way down to a D-. So the college has the right to establish the grade so that they can stay in the program. The wording that we want is a student who has earned a C or below.

**Senator Regimbal:** So the word “fails” will change to earn a grade below C is unacceptable. I suggest that we take it out and bring it back next time for clarification. Are any of the other items acceptable?

**President Barrett:** Excepting the Nursing policy - striking the Nursing policy. All in favor of the remaining policy, please say “aye.” Opposed? None. *Motion passed.*

**Senator Regimbal:** I would like to offer my apologies, we were asked to consider a minor in Sustainability Studies, we did discuss it and voted on the request. I missed the boat and didn't put it in the report. So that will come forward next time. Please go to the Curriculum Tracking system, the link will take you to a description of the program. I didn't feel it was fair to bring to you today without you having an opportunity to review the proposal. Also the committee has questions about the Curriculum Tracking System. I don't know who is in charge of the system and it seems to be causing problems. I heard that there will be some work done on the curriculum tracking system and would like to ask that person some questions.

**Marcia King-Blandford:** I am in charge of it. The Curriculum tracking system was not designed to support an inventory system tied to SYS. When SYS went away, the curriculum tracking system really did not function as it was designed to function. It did not make sense to continue to tie it to work with SYS since they took SYS away. So what we are working on is a system in SHAREpoint which would support what the faculty is trying to do. So we have this window for the next two or three months, there is no sense in correcting the curriculum tracking system and we are going to have to limp along with it and IT is working with SHAREpoint which will hopefully allow for more sharing of documents and typing information, but we are not quite there yet. For those of you having problems with it, I suggest filling out paper forms and let it go through the system in paper form, so that you are not holding anything up.

**Senator Regimbal:** The Committee will meet on April 6 and that may be our last meeting, so if your college or department that has a program would like to have move forward before the end of this year, please make sure it is in the system and through your deans to make sure it will come to our committee.

**President Barrett:** Next is Tom Kvale and Jeff Bush to talk about some updates on the Research Intensive Courses we approved earlier this year, and clarification of IRB approval.

**Dr. Tom Kvale:** I am the director of undergraduate research, and Jeffrey Bush is the U.T. Research Compliance Officer. In my presentations the various groups a question of IRBs came up on research intensive courses and that is what I will focus on today. It doesn't effect the procedures that were voted upon when Faculty Senate adopted the RI courses so today's presentation is for informational purposes. The timeline, in March a year ago this information was presented to the Faculty Senate and a couple of months ago the RI courses were adopted by Faculty Senate. The key point is that research at U.T. must be conducted safely, ethically, and comply with all applicable laws. So the clarification of IRB and the procedure will also apply to new courses. The department initiates the process, they will fill out the form and submit it to my office, my office will then forward it to the RI designation committee that is comprised of Faculty Senate members, as well as other members, that's step one.

Step 2, we are going to involve the Office of Research to make sure the oversight committee is appropriate for their approval to be involved in the process.

Step 3, the RI Designation committee will forward their positive recommendation to the Faculty Senate for final approval, or return the RI course applications back to the originating departments for modification/clarification in the cases of negative recommendations.

Step 4, If the Faculty Senate approve, I will forward its recommendation to the Registrar for designation on student's official UT transcripts for the RI courses.

Each semester my office will keep record of RI courses being offered. In those cases where research requires approval from the appropriate oversight committee, our office will help facilitate those discussion between the instructor and the oversight boards. This should happen before the semester starts. The Research Intensive Contract Procedure is the same as what Faculty Senate approved. There are questions that the student must fill out such as, does the research involve human subjects, and you will need the IRB approval for that. If it involves animals you will need the IAUC (?) approval, if it involved radiation, it would require the Radiation Safety approval. I thank you for the opportunity to present this to you today. Any questions?

**Senator Anderson:** If the forms are approved when does the IRB need to review individual students? As students register do they sign on individually?

**Dr. Jeffrey Bush:** The primary investigator is always a faculty member, and so the protocol, new students, once you find out who those students are we sign the agreement, the contract is between the committee and the faculty member.

**Senator Anderson:** What is the student's responsibility then?

**Dr. Jeffrey Bush:** The PR's responsibility to insure that the research be conducted in compliance with agreement with the protocol. It is also the faculty's responsibility to make sure that the work gets carried out.

**Dr. Skeel:** Tell us how important it is that every student who participates in the research has completed training before they can have their name on protocol and can participate in research. That has to be done ahead of time. It takes few hours to complete. And the signature for the expedited review then could be done within 24-48 hours to put a student on.

**Senator Olson:** Recently the National Science Foundation mandated that people working on NSF contracts undergo research misconduct training. This is a fairly extensive training, approximately 14 hrs of training, how does this affect the program as envisioned at this time?

**Dr. Kvale:** The University has subscribed to an online training course which the students are required to take. My office would be happy to assist.

**Senator Dowd:** Suppose a faculty member is the principle investigator on a research project supported by NSF and a student is only providing assistance on that project. That is, the student is not named on the grant. Would the student have to go through the NSF training?

**Dr. Jeff Bush:** Yes, they would be supported.

**Senator Dowd:** Senator Olson has raised a very important issue for students enrolled in a research intensive course. Would that 12-14 hours of training be part of the course or would it be in addition to course work?.

**Dr. Jeff Bush:** If the research was supported by NSF, but I would anticipate that most of the projects will not be funded by outside funding agencies. I would say my answer would be no. The faculty member who does have the NSF grant and their position is being funded, the answer is yes, they would be.

**Senator Dowd:** That is, if the student is not receiving financial support then they do not need that training. Is that correct?

**Dr. Kvale:** From NSF, yes.

**Senator Olson:** The NSF regulation is, if it uses any equipment provided by NSF, if they write any papers that come from NSF equipment or anything relating to the NSF funding, they must have this research misconduct training.

**Dr. Kvale:** Okay, thanks Walt. We are trying to make sure they get the appropriate training, no matter if they are funded or not.

**President Barrett:** Thank you. As you know, earlier today Ben Pryor, the assistant Vice Provost for Learning Ventures, sent a report to me on what happened last week to the Blackboard and the DL system. I hope you had a chance to read it. It explains what happened and we have John Gaboury here to help answer any additional questions.

**V. Provost Gaboury:** Ben and I wanted to take this opportunity to share with you how serious we take this issue. I wanted to give you some background in our processes and why the process that over ten years protected us from this kind of failure, so we did a deep self assessment. First we had to construct a history and chronology of what the events were, both human failure and the system software failure, so we can understand where the problems came from and how this happened. Once we did that, then we began to identify each component and what is the fix to insure that this doesn't occur again. How we validate the synchronization between the two sites, how do we receive email notice in the middle of the night when these automatic systems are running, and let us know how the synchronization failed, or if the entire process failed. We thought we had a fail-safe system, we were comfortable with it, it never let us down before. But there was a series of events that that type of failure had not been envisioned. So we wanted to assure you that we have put into place both, human issues that we dealt with as far as validation for synchronization of the sites, but

also more importantly, taking look at the technical side of the issues of the series of events that failed so that doesn't happen again. In addition to that, we looked further to the new release that is coming along, and since we were going to buy additional storage space, was there an opportunity to create an additional fail-safe that we did not have before. Any questions?

**Senator Olson:** What was the failure and what caused the failure?

**V. Provost Gaboury:** The details are in the memo. We have a process that synchronizes the two databases together. This process runs automatically. That process began to have a failure that slowed down in transferring the data, the process would conclude, it was set to run at night. Next morning it would be done. It never gave us a notification when it failed. What it would do is start itself over again, it kept getting into this loop of failing and we kept losing dates. Also part of the human error was that it was a good intention; the problem was made worse by not wanting to disrupt the service and pushing it off several days into the weekend. Had we dealt with it right at that time, it would not even been close to that, we would have known the seriousness of the problem. So our good intention hurt us even more. Then the back up automatically overwrote the primary, and when it did that, it took us back to those days we've lost.

**Senator Jorgensen:** I am not sure I got this email with that memo. When did it go out?

**President Barrett:** It went out this morning. We will resend it again so that everyone will have it.

**Senator Jorgensen:** I dealt with DL since its started and I wrote Ben a note, got a nice reply from him. Just to underscore where we are at with it, his note said there was a short time-out. The courses beginning with the early part of the alphabet were missing nearly seven days of records. I am having a really hard time understanding how that could happen. A series of events such as there was no way to collect anything that was in storage over a week that was overwritten for the University that is supposed to be the DL leader in the State of Ohio. Hundreds and hundreds of classes lost, it is unimaginable.

**V. Provost Gaboury:** You are correct, our self-assessment is questioning this. That was the secondary backup when it overwrote. You are absolutely right, this is totally unacceptable. The guys worked very hard to do self-assessment in the human error, and also the technical error. We had two technical errors occurring at the same time.

**Senator Dismukes:** I want to compliment you on fixing this problem a lot quicker than initially announced. It was supposed to be fixed by Wednesday, and it was fixed I think on Monday. What I did have a problem with is an email was sent out saying if this happens to you, why don't you do this or this. At least in my courses, everything is in Blackboard and the Blackboard goes down. I had to start from scratch to reconstruct what's up there. I don't know of a method that you can store what you have in Blackboard so that something like this happens you can update. That's something I would ask you to explore if that's possible.

**V. Provost Gaboury:** I will take your comments back and also we work on this as partnerships to make sure it never happens again. To counter that, adding this third bank of servers, also you will see in the message that we are putting in a different timeframe for the ZIP files to create, and that also contributed to delay of three days, caused a part of our problem. We are going to spend an additional \$21,000 on expanding the storage space and create a third environment that will allow us to process ZIP files immediately. This will also provide better stability.

**Senator Anderson:** You can download everything and store it as back up but it can't be uploaded easily. You can download all the records if you want to do that, but you can't put it back in the same format. So it doesn't really help. I just wanted to take this opportunity and recognize very good work the DL staff has done over the years. It's very unfortunate situation what happened last week.

**V. Provost Gaboury:** The staff truly cares. We had server failures over the years, we have lost storage devices and the fact it wasn't there this time, it bothers them greatly.

**Senator Humphrys:** Considering the fact that thousands of hours of student and faculty work were just lost, the issue that I have is the time lapse between when the meltdown occurred and the time that faculty and students were notified. It was quite a lapse. I agree the staff has been very responsive, but we needed to be communicated with immediately. Even if the site was going to be

down for two hours, some sort of timely communication to the faculty and to the students was necessary.

**V. Provost Gaboury:** That's one thing that Ben and I talked about in our assessment. Sending out an automatic notice is something we are looking at and improving communicating is also important. The Registrar's Office needs to know. From technical standpoint, if this happens again, to let other organizations know so they can refer them back to us so they are aware of the situation. So improving communication Ben and I talked about this and realize that 's part of the recommendation. You are absolutely right Mary.

**Senator Dismukes:** The U.T. website, somehow over the past three-six months it has degraded like it's run by a bunch of high schoolers. You can't find anything on it, it's terrible. I don't know who is in charge of it, and I would like to ask for the Faculty Senate that somebody come to us and talk to us about it. We had somebody come and talk to us whether U.T. was a first rate University. As far as the website and web pages it's a total disaster. And I think something needs to get done.

**President Barrett:** I will try to bring somebody in at one of our last meetings. I will now turn things over to Bill Logie, Scott Scarborough and Bill McMillen to do their presentation

**V.P. Logie:** Bill and I will do a presentation on PERS and STRS. A lot of the information we are showing you today came from STRS newsletter. Most of you should have received it. A couple things in this newsletter that I thought need to be brought to your attention. First is the disclaimer on purchase of service credit. STRS going to recommend change in the formula. Some of you may have teaching time or military time. They are now changed how that is calculated to actuarial analysis, so potentially it could cost you more money if this is passed. If you are considering purchasing some time, you may consider doing it prior to this legislative change. Also on page 4 of the newsletter is information for members retiring soon who should be aware of the current FAS limits. There are a number of things that are highlighted if you are considering years of service and what is counted and what is not. For example working extra duties to increase your salary, it is important that you are aware of the limits on earnings used to calculate your FAS. Even if that was required, you may want to read this closely. There are significant changes that are going to occur. Secondly, make sure you spend some time regularly checking the webpage and contact STRS for additional updates. We will now show you a few slides in this PowerPoint presentation.

To view this presentation in its entirety, click on this icon.



\\

fss00cv02.utad.utole

**V.P. McMillen:** A couple of general points that Bill and I want to talk about, for any of you who have not thought about the retirement system, remember this is not U.T. or H.R. retirement system. This is your retirement system. You can go to H.R. and ask for brochures, but this retirement system is between you and the people in Columbus. That's who you have to deal with. They have forms, they have requirements such as providing them your birth certificate, your marriage certificate. Not your marriage license, but marriage certificate. I wanted to touch on the politics of STRS. STRS lost more money than PERS. It is not in as good financial shape. Fixes are slightly different and more severe for STRS. They are all in the same political system, the legislative fix is going to be one bill. It will be legislatively co-sponsored as the brochure points that out. A Republican from Cincinnati and Todd Book, Democrat from Portsmouth will co-sponsor the legislation. Once a bill appears, all five retirement systems will be included. The other three are even in worse shape than STRS. The legislative bill will be introduced sometime soon. However, it will not be acted upon until after the election in November. The reason for that is because of the unions. The politicians do not want to take on the number of powerful unions. The elections will be pushed back to the lame duck session that will happen in November. There is one caveat, since it is before the House and before the Senate, it can be modified through amendments. We all know about amendment as we have been hearing in the last couple of weeks with health care reform. The

fact that it will be co-sponsored by Republicans and Democrats means that the leadership will not look too kindly on amendments. Nevertheless, at any given point amendments can be passed. For example, a bill has already been proposed that will limit your final average salary if you would earn more than the governor. Hopefully these kind of amendments will not be voted on. What we are presenting now, at least it will be talked about and is a fairly rational approach, you may not agree with all the ideas, but at least it has been vetted through the various councils that oversee the retirement systems as well as their retirement boards.

**V.P. Logie:** I got a question earlier about when it would become effective, because we are in the employer sponsor plan, it becomes effective 01.01.2011, the change is from 2.26 - 2.27. Also, questions that I am asked frequently is if you have dual time, which system do you retire under. It's the system in which you have the most time in. You still get credit for the other system's time.

The Healthcare Pension Advocates (HPA) for STRS presented an alternative proposal for pension benefits changes to the Retirement Board for consideration. The HPA proposal does not call for any changes to the proposed member and employer contribution. Again the caveat given this is all subject to change. This is as proposed today. In their proposal the change to 35 years from 30 of required service would be phased in, in two-year increment beginning in 2015. Members could also retire early with 30 years of service, but with an actuarial reduction of their benefits.

The HPA is also recommending that there be no tiering of the cost-of-living adjustment (COLA). Current retirees would receive a 2% COLA beginning on July 1, 2011. New retirees after that date would also receive a 2% COLA, but it would be deferred for 36 months or until age 60, whichever comes later. This has a substantial impact.

**V.P. McMillen:** If you are retiring now within the next three or four years, you may be able to miss most of these new restrictions, but you won't miss COLA. It will hit you and hurt you.

**V.P. Logie:** Finally, the HPA proposal would prefer legislation that grants authority to the Retirement Board to adjust the final average salary at three, four or five years, based on the funding of the system at the time. PERS is proposing five year with no phase in. It was noted that any or all of HPA's changes could be included in the pension legislation through amendments to the bill. At last count there were twelve pieces of legislation that have been introduced over the last year.

**Senator Anderson:** How do the furloughs impact this?

**V.P. Logie:** Great question, and the answer would be it is based on your pay, so if you give up a day's pay, it would be a day off of that.

Pension legislation sponsorship would be bipartisan, as we already pointed out. The proposal approved by the State Teachers Retirement Board would reduce the retirement benefit formula for future retirees, but would not undo those benefits for current retirees. They are also considering additional employee and employer contributions that are phased in, in 2013 for PERS and 2015 for STRS.

**Senator Anderson:** I am on the ERIP list. How does this affect someone like myself?

**V.P. Logie:** To the best of my knowledge it will not affect you. In this newsletter it talks about contribution for future people who enroll in STRS. It shouldn't have any effects on your plan.

**V.P. McMillen:** About 4% of the members in STRS use defined contribution instead of defined benefit. There is a movement in the legislature to change everything to define contribution that would be roundly opposed. This newsletter is your best source.

**President Barrett:** I would like to follow up on a question about the ARP. When the ARP was set up, as I understand it, STRS had a funding shortage and so a part of what the ARP people have taken out of the salaries doesn't go to ARP but rather goes to STRS and helps support STRS. The initial theory was that this would phase out over time because STRS people would retire or die off and people in ARP would get that extra funding. I assume given all the shortfalls, we should assume that that contribution will go to STRS for indefinite future and probably forever.

**V.P. Logie:** At this point I am not sure what the ultimate index would be under ARP, we have not looked at that as closely. I assure you we will ask those questions and as soon as we have answers we will send them to you as quickly as possible.

**V.P. McMillen:** I just want to go back to what I said earlier, I am interested in the government process and certainly protecting the institution and its employees as best as we can. The only reason I know about it is being in both systems.

For example if you are within five years of retirement, except something like COLA, you can pretty much get out what you were expecting. If you are in the 24, 25, 26 year, range you are going to have to make a decision at some point. Make sure you bought all your previous years and you might want to add a year and make sure you get out most of your benefits. If you are pre-24 years, into the system, you may want to know this legislation and make sure you are protected. That's just a rough personal guideline about how this is going to go.

**Provost Gold:** You need to make those decision before the legislation passes.

**V.P. McMillen:** You mean decisions whether you want to get out?

**Provost Gold:** Yes. People will probably want to see what the legislation looks like.

**V.P. McMillen:** Much of the legislation is going to be what Bill has already pointed out and there will be certain phased-in programs. You should take this into consideration when you make your decision as to when you want to leave. For example, three year final average salary vs. five year average final salary, and if you are better with a three-year average salary, you might want to get out. That's just an obvious one before that five-year average salary is phased in.

**V.P. Logie:** Currently, STRS Ohio members who are employed on a full-time contract can receive a full year of service credit by working 120 full-time contract days, or completing two full-time quarters. That is actually written in to their recommendation. This is their estimate, not mine. About 6% of retirees each year elect to retire midyear.

The Retirement Board is considering the elimination of the reference to 120 days in the service credit rule, as well as the option for a full year of credit to be granted for two full-time quarters, effective July 1, 2015. This proposed change requires members to work 180 days to receive a full year of credit. The Board will be asked to take action on the proposed rule change at its March 2010 meeting. We do not have the results yet.

Additional possible changes, contributions – employee rate increased from 10% to 12.5 beginning 7/1/2010 phased in by 0.5% per year. COLA – reduced from 3% to 2% for current retirees and to 2.0% for future retirees. Final Average Salary (FAS) – change from 3 highest to 5 highest years beginning 8/1/2015. The new formula would be 2.02% per year for the first 30 years of service, 2.5% per year thereafter, beginning 8/1/2011.

Those who have 30 years of service; who are age 55 with 25 years of service; or who are age 60 with 5 years of service as of July 1, 2015, receive the greater of: The benefit as of July 1, 2015, under the current formula; or the benefit upon retirement under the new formula.

**Unidentified speaker:** On the previous slide the increase that will come in in 2011, where the increase will go up from 10% to 12.5 for those who are in the ARP (Alternative Retirement Plan) will theirs go up also?

**V.P. Logie:** Great question, I don't know the answer to that.

**Unidentified speaker:** In some cases it would save the University money if they encourage people to go with ARPs.

**V.P. Logie:** I think that will be the direction that they are going to push.

**Senator Dismukes:** Upon retirement where does it say whether you can obtain health benefits?

**V.P. Logie:** One of the things the STRS newsletter talks about is the viability of health care for retirees. They have propose some changes in the health care for PERS, I haven't seen anything on STRS yet. Long term not short term. My take on it is that the window will probably maintain as long as health plan financial advisor. Thereafter new people coming in will have entirely new formulas.



**V.P. McMillen:** There is a short section on health care in the newsletter. There will be a lot of changes coming in health care.

**V.P. Logie:** We will try to keep everybody posted. You can sign up for e-mail alerts.

**V.P. Scarborough:** President John Barrett asked me to talk about the budget process and to answer some questions you might have about the University's finances. For the past few weeks I have been meeting with numerous groups talking about the University's financial condition, the challenges we had in the recent weeks, I have been meeting with deans, vice presidents, Faculty Senate Executive Committee, the Arts & Sciences Council, the UT Foundation Board, The President's Commission on Faculty Input, Finance & Strategy Committee, Strategic Planning Committee as the whole, the Strategic Planning Finance Committee, and I feel like I have been on a speaker tour and a few of you have seen my presentation several times. One of the things we talked about at these financial briefings is the potential for FY 2012, that will be a very difficult period of time of the uncertainty of the State funds, other one-time funds the State used for budget for a period of time, will not be available in the future. In talking with public schools, city government conversations all across the country, everyone in public sectors gearing up for 2012 potentially to be a very difficult year, the public entities have been supported with those stimulus money, in the future which is very uncertain.

Our budget process has tried to take that into account, our budget process begin in December issuing budget instructions in January, we began budget pre-hearings in February, we began budget hearings in March, along the way we have been soliciting input from these other groups. Where we are in the process now, the formal hearings have been concluded. The budget office is compiling all the data, we have been working with the two provosts to get that in a format where we can make a recommendation to the President on how to balance the budget with parameters by the Board of Trustees. That process has been ongoing for approximately ten days. Beginning Thursday, we will begin briefing the President with our recommendation to get his input. Once we receive that input and feedback, we will make the necessary adjustments we will then take the responsibility, the recommended version of the budget to the Finance & Strategy group for feedback. That feedback is collected and communicated back to the President, and meetings will be held with vice presidents and deans to get a sense of the direction we will attempt to make with the budget, and the president will hopefully make a decision on what budget to recommend to the Board of Trustees Finance Committee on April 19. This will give you a sense of where we are with our process that began in December.

If I were to characterize what is the proper term what we are attempting to achieve in this budget we are obviously always trying to be fiscally responsible in terms of having a balanced budget zero percent operating margin. We are also trying to make sure do in spite of the challenges we face down the road that we continue to make strategic investments necessary to sustain this institution and move it forward. Again we are also trying to make a decision that pertains to FY-2011 with FY-2012 in mind. Such that we don't want for example, to make a lot of new commitments that have a long timeline associated with it if we think that FY-2012 might be difficult. We might want to make more one time strategic investments, rather than investments that have a long time until we know what the FY-2012 is going to look like. Many of you have heard more detailed presentations on finances on this troubled year. This should give you an idea of where we are in the process. As always, the core values that we attempt to live up to is open and thought of in a productive way to provide as many people with updated issues and solicit their input along the way. In the end try to make the timeline giving the budget to the Board. I will be happy to take any questions.

**Senator Dowd:** Would you be specific as to what strategic investments you will be allocating resources to in this upcoming budget?

**V.P. Scarborough:** I can't because those decisions haven't been made yet. I can tell you that during the budget hearings every single unit was asked to submit proposals for strategic investments. If you were to receive 5% more than what you are currently budgeted for your division as a whole, what type of investments would you make. So we have a long list of those 5% additional requests that have been summarized and will be submitted to the President Thursday

morning. No decision about any strategic investments. The only decision that has been made was the desire to create funds where we can continue to make investments.

**Senator Wedding:** How much money was allocated to the School of Alternative Energy first year of operation, second year and so forth.

**V.P. Scarborough:** Similarly because this fits in to the chapter of the strategic investment the decision has not been made yet, however, I can tell you this, 1 Million was budgeted this year and continues to be what we call the base budget. So unless the decision is made to remove that money, it will continue but the question you are asking me is what is the exact amount going to be, that decision hasn't been made yet. But that is on the list of additional requests that we have summarized and will take to the President.

**Senator Rouillard:** There have been several trips to the Middle East by senior leadership, can you tell me if there are any plans for collaborations abroad and how much money might be at stake in those collaborations?

**V.P. Scarborough:** I cannot tell you that, I have not been advised by the delegation that made that trip. But I can tell you that they are looking for opportunities to partner with either Zayed University or other entities that might help the institution with strategic possibilities in terms of student exchanges, faculty exchanges in terms of collaborations in alternative energy resources. I'm assuming that those are the type of things they are exploring.

**Senator Rouillard:** Has there been any mention of the type of funding dedicated to that?

**V.P. Scarborough:** No, not at this time. Many of you know that the former U.T. President is now the president of Zayed University. We are trying to take advantage of the relationship that is already well down the road that could be something mutually beneficial. So far I haven't seen any specifics. Dr. Gold can you add anything?

**Provost Gold:** Other than to say that if we are going to do this, that we would want to see if they could bring to us more than what we could bring to them.

**Senator Dismukes:** We hear a lot about the School of Alternative Energy and everything it's going to do, but what is the administration going to put on the table as far as putting any permanent faculty for that school?

**V.P. Scarborough:** I know that any permanent faculty for that school is part of the additional request that is on this very long list that will be presented to the President. Dr. Haggett would be the person to ask that question, but she is at Arizona State University today.

**Senator Olson:** On the agenda, the question is for Bill Logie and you are supposed to talk about the furlough program, so far we haven't heard anything on that.

**President Barrett:** The way the agenda was sent out was inaccurate. It was intended to be a panel discussion regarding STRS and the budget, and then to open it up to Q&A on any topic.

**Senator Olson:** There are rumors on the furlough program, can someone respond?

**V.P. Scarborough:** Currently Bill Logie and others have been asked to develop a furlough program if we need to implement one. There has not been a decision to implement a furlough program. It remains a tool in our toolbox. I'm assuming but I do not know, that conversation will occur as we begin the final stages of this budget process. If FY-2012 becomes the difficult year, we would most likely have to at that time implement it. But that is speculation at this point. If we chose to implement, we know a lot more now on how to do it.

**Senator Thompson-Casado:** You are talking about a list of proposals to the President, of items you would like to see funded through strategic investments, what about the faculty?

**V.P. Scarborough:** Part of the early decision we went to the Board to determine the parameters for this budget to see whether we are okay with the parameters. One explicit assumption is that we would honor faculty commitments. We would do a good job identifying all those commitments that had been made and funding those commitments an absolute top priority. So I can tell you that in this process funding of the faculty are already being recommended to the President.

**Senator Thompson-Casado:** I didn't think I was clear, the contractual obligations to the faculty's salaries, not furloughs.

**V.P. Scarborough:** All contractual commitments will be in the budget that is recommended to the President.

**Senator Dowd:** Going back to Senator Olson's question about furloughs, first has there been any discussion of building furloughs into the new budget and, second, roughly how many dollars will be saved by a day of furloughs?

**V.P. Scarborough:** It's approximately a million per day, that's the rule of thumb we have been using for a while.

**Senator Dowd:** Is there a formula or available data used for that calculation? I don't remember seeing it posted or discussed anywhere.

**V.P. Logie:** There was an outline, to add to what Dr. Scarborough said, the implementation and what Dr. Jacobs said to the committee, be ready within 30 days. There is still quite a bit of lifting that has to be done, for example, with Dr. Gold and his group today we met to talk about how we implement campus security which is I'm responsible for. We don't have all those nuances worked out as yet. We will be able to do something. This is not one production line that can be closed, like a Jeep production line. We have students to take care of 24/7, we have medical services, there is a whole host of issues that still need to be resolved.

**Senator Dowd:** This question is for Vice President Scarborough. Has there been any discussion of this worked into the FY-2011 budget?

**V.P. Scarborough:** There have been discussions, it will be one of the issues I am sure we will discuss Thursday morning. We have always said, however, that it would be a tool of last resort. All the proposals that will be taken to him, this will be last on the list, but it will be a part of the conversation.

**Senator Dowd:** This question is for Vice President Logie. There was a change in the vacation policy that was announced recently by letter that affected directors, chairs, associate deans and on up. Then a revised letter went out which I received it today. It changes the accrual rate and the maximum number of hours that can accumulate. It's now about two-thirds of what was before. The decision to do this is of course your decision. My issue is not with the specifics of the change of the policy, but that I understand that when this policy was sent to the Policy Committee it was described to that committee that it would impact only associate deans and higher administrators and that would not apply to department chairs or directors. The Policy Committee was told that it would impact about 14 individuals. However, after the Policy Committee approved someone in some office changed the policy to include department chairs and directors. When the Faculty Senate Executive Committee met with President Jacobs last Thursday we discussed this change and how this is an affront to the idea of shared governance. Could you explain how this policy was changed after the Policy Committee approved it?

**V.P. Logie:** I am not sure I can answer your question; there were three postings in the policy, three different 30-day postings. I am not sure when Mrs. Grant put out this letter. Unfortunately, she attached a wrong policy. I know she sent out a revised letter, I don't know in term of your question, I am just reading from the information that I was given, that it includes deans, associate deans, assistant deans, chairs, directors, and anyone whose full time position is not a faculty member. I can go back to the postings of the policy and find out, but right now I don't have the answer.

**Senator Dowd:** I understand that the policy was posted, but that's not the issue I'm raising. Someone changed it after it went to the Policy Committee.

**V.P. Logie:** All I can tell you is the last policy posting, whatever that policy said is what should become. I don't know if you are getting the interpretation off the policy or something that was sent out via correspondence.

**Senator Dowd:** It's not the policy I have an issue with here. I understand that the administration can change this policy. The issue is one of shared governance. This went to the Committee, it was approved, and after it was approved, someone changed the policy.

**V.P. Logie:** I'm sorry I can't say, all I can tell you is what my responsibility was, and that is to get the postings out, get the policy out, the final policy posting was July to August. If the policy interprets, I'm sorry I don't have it in front of me, but if it says, X, Y, and Z, that is what the policy is, and I can't argue with you because I don't know.

**Senator Dowd:** But aren't you the person responsible for this policy?

**V.P. Logie:** I just said, I posted it July 22, which is the last final posting is what I go by, and that was out for a month. That is the policy that I am going with. I don't make the changes.

**Senator Dowd:** Someone did.

**V.P. Logie:** Where are you finding these changes, is what I'm trying to find out?

**Senator Dowd:** When this policy was sent to the University Policy Committee that committee was told that it would impact associate deans and up. It would not impact chairs and directors. Based on that information, the policy went forward but was later changed.

**V.P. Logie:** Bill is the chair of that committee.

**V.P. McMillen:** I don't recall it.

**President Barrett:** It's about 6:00 o'clock, one or two other questions to wrap it up.

**Senator Wedding:** I received internal correspondence that says the bonuses for the administration are illegal. Have I misinterpreted that the bonuses that were paid that are unlawful under Ohio law? I am trying to put an interpretation on that correspondence.

**President Barrett:** The correspondence is from whom?

**Senator Wedding:** It came from internal administration, Mr. Logie's name is on it and general counsel that the bonuses are unlawful under Ohio law. We can't get information from the general counsel because that is considered as 'privileged.'

**President Barrett:** Why don't you send me a copy of it.

**Senator Wedding:** We will just put it out in the AAUP Newsletter.

**Senator Anderson:** Is the restructuring discussed by Provost Haggett part of the budget discussion?

**V.P. Scarborough:** What she was probably referring to is structural deficits.

**President Barrett:** I think you are referring to the BOT's resolution on sustainable transformational changes and the types of changes it contemplates. Whether we should rearrange colleges; should we restructure ourselves around themes or issues, like the College of Solar & Renewable Energy? Should we have a new degree programs? Those type of things. Innovations in the way the University is structured, more or less.

**Senator Anderson:** Why is it that several people now are visiting Arizona State? It seems like restructuring is further along than just a discussion.

**V.P. Scarborough:** There were no decisions made about what types of strategic investments to fund. The only decision that has been made is to try and create a pool of money to do that. So, the conversation as to what to fund will most likely began with conversation with the President on Thursday. Once the conversation takes place, we will have more information that we can share with the Finance & Strategy Committee.

**Senator Anderson:** Part of the re-structuring is to release funds so you can do that.

**V.P. Scarborough:** The answer is 'no,' those conversations have not taken place.

**Senator Carrie Lee:** I overheard Catherine Hornbeck in terms of communicating information to faculty, Health Science Campus faculty that aren't a part of the AAUP don't have a means for that information, so anything that's circulated pertinent to faculty or Faculty Senate has to come in the way that will come to all faculty, please.

**President Barrett:** I think Faculty Senate distributions, generally speaking, go to all faculty on both campuses, at least that's my hope.

**Senator Lee:** If it does come to the senators, it will be distributed to our peers. I am saying the information that AAUP distributes is not reaching all faculty, and that's not appropriate.

**President Barrett:** Not everyone gets newsletters or AAUP flyers either, because not everybody is in the unions. That's an internal discussion regarding distribution from AAUP.

**V.P. Logie:** Just to clarify a question on was money paid by UTP to the employees of the University, I think that's the reference you are talking about, that's the correspondence you are referring to. They may call it bonus but that's not what it is. It's a payment from another entity to employee of the State.

**President Barrett:** Any old business?  
Any new business?

**VII. Adjournment:** Is there a motion to adjourn? *Motion was made and seconded.*  
Meeting adjourned at 6:07 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Nick Piazza  
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Kathy Grabel  
Faculty Senate Office Administrative  
Secretary