

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of April 10, 2012
FACULTY SENATE

<http://www.utoledo.edu/facsenate>

Approved @ FS meeting on 4/24/2012

HIGHLIGHTS

Mr. Nathan Reaver, Dr. Pamela J. Boyers

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 Lawrence Anderson called the meeting to order, **Lucy Duhon**, Executive Secretary, called the roll.

I. Roll Call: 2011-2012 Senators:

Present: Anderson, Batten, Cooper, Caruso, Cuckovi, Dowd, Duhon, Eisler, Franchetti, Giovannucci, Hammersley, Hewitt, Hill, Hoblet, Hornbeck, Kistner, Kranz, LeBlanc, Lee, Lundquist, Mason, Molitor, Moore, Moynihan, Nandkeolyar, Ohlinger, Peseckis, Plenefisch, Randolph, Regimbal, Rouillard, Slutsky, Solocha, Teclehaimanot, Templin, Thompson-Casado Weck-Schwarz, Wedding, White,

Excused absences: Brickman, Cappelletty, Duggan, Hottell, Humphrys, Lipman, Moore, Piazza, Powers, Sheldon, Thompson, Wilson, Yonker

Unexcused absences: Crist, Dismukes, Ellis, Hamer, Heberle, Hey, Langan, Malhotra, Nazzal, Shriner, Skeel, Tinkel, Willey

II. Approval of Minutes: Minutes from the March 13th meeting are ready for approval.

President Anderson: I am calling the meeting to order. Welcome all to the thirteenth Faculty Senate meeting of academic year 2011-2012.

To start the meeting, I request Secretary Duhon to call the roll.

You all have received the minutes for our meeting on 13th March. Are there any corrections from the floor? Do I hear a motion to accept these minutes? A second? All in favor? Thank you. And thank you again, Quinetta, for preparing the copy.

Let me start by saying that at the Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees meeting this morning, the Senate was recognized and lauded for its work on the General Education curriculum. I also want to thank here all the faculty who worked to submit competency outcomes based proposals, and the Provost staff who helped in organization and information, particularly Penny Poplin-Gosetti, Heather Huntley, and Marcia King-Blandford. I also thank the Provost for providing funds for participation in HLC sponsored workshops. Finally, I specially thank Mary Humphrys and the Core Curriculum Committee for their hard work reviewing all of the proposals and making the recommendations. They were aided by two representatives of college advisors, Robert Detwiler and Deborah Sobczak.

Other business at the Academic and Student Affairs Committee included the recommendation of two faculty for Distinguished University Professor appointments, and 14 recommendations for tenure.

Now, let's move on to more complex issues. The packet of materials Quinetta sent for this meeting included a draft constitution for the so-called University Council that was presented at the Trusteeship, Governance, and Audit Committee of the Board of Trustees meeting yesterday. The "Best Practices" subcommittee, composed of representatives from various constituencies on the campuses of the university, was introduced to this draft at its meeting on Tuesday of last week. At that meeting, several substantive concerns and suggestions were made, and we were promised a revised version to be commented on before yesterday's Board committee meeting. Some of these concerns included:

- a) the ambiguity of the charge- advisory or ruling;
- b) the population of the executive committee and its powers;
- c) the authority over purely academic issues such as curriculum, but no authority over the budget or hospital;
- d) the reporting route to the board- with or without "minority reports."

We did not receive any revised copy. The draft was presented essentially unchanged yesterday, and approved for presentation at the next full Board meeting. I will also comment that at the subcommittee meeting we were assured we would have another opportunity to meet and make revisions before it goes to the full Board. We will have to see what happens. Dr. Dowd and Dr. Rouillard, do you want to add further comments on this particular issue?

I was not actually at the meeting of the trusteeship governance committee meeting, but Dr. Dowd and Dr. Rouillard were and I wonder if they have any further comments?

Senator Dowd: Well, as President Anderson described, individuals on the "Best Practices" subcommittee came up with a list of issues and proposed revisions that we wanted the Board to consider. Some issues were very serious and some were minor changes. At the Board meeting this past Monday, Trustee McQuade tried to discuss some of the important issues we raised at the "Best Practices subcommittee meeting. But Board members didn't appear to even consider some of the issues Trustee McQuade had raised. There was no meaningful discussion of the implications of establishing a University Senate. It was very disturbing and quite discouraging. The Board suggested a couple of minor changes and Trustee McQuade indicated that he would inform members of the "Best Practices" subcommittee of those changes. We are not going to be given the opportunity to comment or propose other changes before it goes to the full Board in May. Senator Rouillard, do you have anything to add to this?

Senator Rouillard: A couple of things. I know that there was a concern at one point for the way that the secretary of the University Council would be chosen, and that is that the secretary will be chosen by the president. The secretary will not necessarily be a member of the council, and that was not addressed by the Board of Trustees. That to me is a very problematic issue. This is a person who is responsible for officially signing off on the Minutes of that meeting. If that person is not a member of the council I find that very troubling. Yesterday, Judge McQuade made reference to the fact that he heard some concerns from the undergraduate students who believe their numbers merit more representation on the University Council which was completely dismissed by the judge. Furthermore, I heard some additional statements that were rather troubling: one was from a trustee member (it may have been the judge) described the

purpose of the University Council as being the principal university body for shared governance, and I do find that more than a little troubling.

Senator Dowd: If you look at the proposal, the faculty has a slight majority in the membership of the University Council. But, keep in mind that the proposed council will have responsibility over new programs and new courses --- anything new regarding academics --- and the elimination of academic programs. The problem is that approximately 50% of the members of that council have no academic background, experience, or expertise. This was one of the most important points the Best Practices subcommittee emphasized to Judge McQuay and to the Board of Trustees Chair, Carroll Ashley. Carroll Ashley was present at the subcommittee meeting. This is a very troubling. Suppose a program wants to create a new course. With the University Council, we are adding two levels of review: the Executive Committee of the University Council who may or may not decide to push it forward, and if they decide to push it forward it will then go to the University Council. This is all colleges and all programs. If there is good news and if they are course modifications I guess they do not do to University Council. But anything new it has to go all the way to the top. Mr. Rubin, were you at the Board meeting yesterday?

Matthew Rubin: No.

Senator Dowd: But you were at the best practices subcommittee meeting, correct?

Matthew Rubin: Yes.

Senator Dowd: Do you have anything to add to this discussion?

Matthew Rubin: The discussion among the students had to do with the CL allocations with the graduate students, undergraduate students, and professional schools of law and medicine. The recommendation that the group proposed was to see added to the Graduate Student Association since they do represent the majority of all graduate students. So that way professional students can obtain their representation. To me, it was important location wise since we are talking about a number of students across campus who have a student perspective from the Health Science Campus and the College of Law, so that was important to me and we came to consensus for everyone to be represented. I understand the importance of having the faculty majority and how that seems popular among this group. But to me, I thought the purpose of the University Council was to help build consensus among stakeholders and the purpose of the committee will be to vote and have collaboration and more discussion instead of having one group with more power and I was not in favor of any group having more than 50%.

President Anderson: Any further comments on that particular issue?

Senator Eisler: I just have one question. Did they make a decision about the alumni representative?

Senator Dowd: I don't recall. However, they did discuss it. It might be the case that they are going to look into it. Chancellor Gold, do you remember at the Board meeting the issue with the alumni representative was made?

Chancellor Gold: On the piece of paper that they handed out there were two alumni. I believe one was a vice president of Alumni Affairs and the other is from the Alumni Association..., I believe.

Senator Eisler: Because the copy that we got had a footnote that said that they are going to decide what they are going to do with alumni representation.

Chancellor Gold: What was handed out was the April 9th draft document.

Senator Dowd: We should be clear that there may be revisions between now and the time the proposed constitution is presented to the Board in May for full approval by the Trustees. I have no idea what those revisions may be though.

President Anderson: Now, on to the Provost Search. The Provost Search Advisory Committee also met last week, on Monday, for the first time. The members are:

Joel P. Epstein [Waverly Partners], Jacobs, Lloyd; Palmer, Susan; Poplin Gosetti, Penny; West, Kevin D.; Gold, Jeffrey; Barlowe, Jamie; Anderson, Lawrence S.; Rubin, Matthew - Student; Dabney, David; Lee, Brenda S; Masterson, Michelle; Steinbock, Daniel J.; and Komuniecki, Patricia R.

At that meeting we met Mr. Epstein of the Waverly Partners group, the professional search firm hired to facilitate the process. We also reviewed drafts of the advertisement and the position description. Some of the suggestions made were incorporated into the final documents. Dr. Masterson and I argued for some reference to academic experience and the tenure review process, but our arguments were not addressed in the documents. Dr. Jacobs was not able to attend today; he is trying to arrange his calendar for the next meeting. We are all asked to direct possible candidates and/or sources of candidates to the Waverly Partners firm. So, if anyone has persons in mind, please contact me or another committee member. Does anyone have any questions or discussion about the Provost search?

Finally, of concern to all of us are the recent draft revisions of the Board of Trustees Bylaws. The draft accompanied today's agenda and is available on the Board website for materials and agendas of upcoming meetings. Whole new paragraphs relate to the ability of Board members to speak individually with constituents. While the principle of "speaking with one voice" may be valid, the content of the proposed bylaws seems rather draconian and fraught with the possibility of individual interpretation by either the sitting Board Chair or the President. It is my understanding that although these bylaw revisions were on the agenda for yesterday's Trusteeship, Governance, and Audit Committee meeting, they were put off for a later meeting because the committee members had not had time to review them prior to yesterday. Of course the Board has the authority to write its own bylaws, but perhaps the Senate could make a recommendation and send it to the chair of the committee. Please read the draft if you haven't already, and send comments to the Senate office. From your suggestions, the Executive Committee will decide if such a recommendation is warranted. Are there any questions about that? I do encourage you to read them even though they may seem less "scary" than I think they are. Okay, let's move on to the other reports.

Senator Rouillard: We could highlight one of the most problematic sections. I think it is probably on the fourth page. There's a section on compartment with internal constituents and the members of the Board of Trustees: "Conversations with internal constituents should not breach matters deemed confidential by the

Board,” that’s logical. “Discuss pending Board business without the purview of a chair,” that makes sense. “Criticize the president on any matter,” that’s problematic. I think there are a couple of other instances where what we are seeing amounts to a gag order.

Senator Dowd: What is the definition of sedition?

President Anderson: Okay, if you have special comments or advice for the Executive Committee please send that on to the Senate Office and we will deliberate at our next Executive Committee meeting and come up with a recommendation if that’s the right way to go. Alright, let’s now move on to the Committee Reports. Is Senator Peseckis here today? He’s not currently present. How do we want to deal with that? Do we want to move on to the program material, but let’s hope that Senator Peseckis finds his way here. He was going to present the material as a consent agenda, but I believe we have the material.

Senator Ohlinger: Let me see if I can track him down.

President Anderson: Okay.

Senator Dowd: Either that or you can invoke supreme executive authority and present it on behalf of the Committee.

President Anderson: I could do that, but let’s move on to the Programs Committee.

Senator Nandkeolyar: We looked at the program modifications and all of them passed unanimously. We are looking at these proposals and here are the item numbers that I mentioned in the PowerPoint slide. That is the college that it came from, Arts & Sciences does not exist anymore, but when the proposal originated that is where it came from. These are the brief descriptions of the request for changes. So, we are proposing that Items 2, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, and 15 be approved as a consent agenda item.

Senator Lee: On number 10, the minor in women, is that limited to characters or is it a minor in women’s studies? I think everybody is “minoring” in women.

Senator Nandkeolyar: I have a feeling it is women’s studies.

Senator Lundquist: It is women’s studies.

Senator Caruso: It is women’s studies, officially. We passed it through our council, it should have been changed.

President Anderson: Are there any further questions on that matter? The committee has approved it, so we do not need to move it. All in favor for accepting these programs say “aye.” Any opposed? *Motion Passed.*

Senator Nandkeolyar: The next one is a proposal from the College, JHCE & HSHS.

President Anderson: Senator Rouillard, is this the one that you wanted taken off?

Senator Rouillard: We asked at the Faculty Senate Executive Committee meeting to table this for the time being until we get a report on the ending of that physical education program that is precipitating the changes for this program.

President Anderson: Okay, let's move on then.

Senator Nandkeolyar: Thank you.

Senator Templin: I move that we take back up from the table the math education single degree option that was tabled at the last Senate meeting.

Senator Teclehaimanot: Second.

President Anderson: I heard a "second." Is there any discussion on this matter? I'll add: there have been a lot of emails that have been flying back and forth and back and forth, so I am wondering if the present status of that program is defined.

Senator Hewitt: We had numerous discussions with Tod Shockey who came to see me after the last Senate meeting. We discussed the concerns they have and the concerns that we have. It was fairly easy to come up with a list of course requirements that satisfied both of us. He has circulated this to several people in the department, but we have not yet gotten any response from the chair, Leigh Chiarelott, so that is where the revised proposal stands now. I assume by taking this motion off of the table it would preempt any revision. I assume that it means that the proposal that is being discussed now is the one that we continue to have the objection to.

President Anderson: That is what my interpretation would be.

Senator Hewitt: So that is the current status.

President Anderson: Right. If your modifications would have to go through the curriculum review process in some way at the lower level before they come here.

Senator Teclehaimanot: I think there are two issues about the single degree program option. The main issues that we need to consider are do we want a four year single degree program option or do we want continues with the six years dual degree program? The proposed single degree option has 48 hours of mathematics courses that both departments would be able to communicate and finalized what those courses ought to be once the single degree option is approved. Also, we would like the Faculty Senate to approve the single degree program option.

Senator Hewitt: With all due respect, it is a program modification and it is not a course modification issue. The issue that we object to are programmatic. The Senate has the prerogative to decide this either way, but I want to make it clear what we are voting on. The proposed single degree option significantly

reduces the subject area requirements. In particular it increases the 2000 level math requirements by six credit hours and decreases the 4000 level requirements by six. It is not an issue that could be addressed in course modification because it is a program modification issue. It is a significantly weaker program for students many of whom teach AP Calculus and Statistics. I believe there is already a problem of a lack of subject preparation from many of our high school teachers. This goes in the wrong direction. I would advise that it gets resolved first to the satisfaction of both departments. I think that it would have been very easy to come to the department and discuss this issue before you brought this up to Senate. After the last meeting Tod Shockey came and we quickly came to an agreement and it seems to make people happy, for an example the advisors that are in your department. I don't understand why we have to vote on it now and then make major program modifications later. But, if you want an up or down vote I do not have any objections. I object to this particular proposal because I think it is a bad idea to eviscerate the subject area for pre-service high school teachers. I think that is a bad idea to take it off the table now.

Senator Wedding: Can't we table it?

Senator...: We haven't taken it off.

Senator Lundquist: This is an up or down motion.

Senator Wedding: If we have a down motion will we then table it?

Senator Dowd: To clarify, is this not to take it off the table?

President Anderson: No, this is a move to take it off the table. This is a discussion for that motion.

Senator Wedding: So, we could leave it on the table?

President Anderson: Yes, we could leave it on the table. A "nay" vote will leave it on the table.

Senator Wedding: A "nay" vote will leave it on the table?

President Anderson: Right.

Senator Dowd: This motion is to take it off the table.

President Anderson: The motion is to take it off the table. Is there any further discussion?

Senator Templin: Keep in mind that AYA math education dual degree and single degree option is like all of the other AYA content teacher licensing options are nationally accredited programs. The content in the cognate area is tightly specified by the national learning society, and in this case it would be The National Council of Teachers and Mathematics. My understanding was that the current proposal meets NCTM requirements. Also, I would like people to keep in mind that in teacher education in every AYA field every teacher candidate has to pass a Praxis 2 exam that specifically designed to cover the content. So, in other words, if they are deficient in their content they don't go on to teach.

President Anderson: Okay, are we ready to vote on this particular motion? The motion is to take it off the table.

Senator Wedding: As I understand it, there is dialogue ongoing between your college and the chair of the math department. Is that correct?

Senator Hewitt: Yes, that is correct.

Senator Wedding: That there has been dialogue and that there are understandings that have been reached and are in the pipeline?

Senator Hewitt: That is correct. In fact, the chair has been discussing with advisors and other people in their college. The Judith Herb College has met with our undergraduate curriculum, which is correct.

Senator Wedding: Would it be better to allow that poll to come forward and be used to modify?

Senator Teclehaimanot: We have already discussed the single degree program option with our department chairperson and he encouraged us to move forward with the vote to approve the single degree program option.

Senator Wedding: As is?

Senator Teclehaimanot: Yes, as is.

Senator Dowd: Even if it risks voting it down at this stage?

Senator Teclehaimanot: The dialogue about the single degree program option started from five to seven years ago. At the same time, we need to understand that the degree is offered in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction not in the Department of Mathematics. The single degree program was approved by the department, by the college academic affairs committee, and also by the college faculty and signed by the dean on May 4, 2011. As colleagues, we can still work together on the single degree program option. Also, the questions is what do we tell new students who are interested to attend at the University of Toledo in the Adolescent and Young Adult, Mathematics Program. I think the students should to make the decision if they want to continue with the four-year single degree program option or with six years dual degree program options. If we table the program again, for how long do we have to wait to approve the single degree program option?

Senator Rouillard: I just have a quick question. What is the pass rate for the students who currently passed this program that you currently have in place?

Senator Templin: All of the programs are in the 90's; about 90 something percent.

Senator Rouillard: If you have that high of a rate for the classes now when the students are taking higher levels of math, what do you think is going to happen with their pass rate if they don't have that experience of math at the higher levels?

Senator Templin: Well, keep in mind, the Praxis 2 Exam is specified according to the learning society recommendation in that particular content area. So in other words, they are taking a test and the specification matches the program requirements, which in this is case NCTM.

Senator Wedding: May I ask the math chair to elaborate on his discussions because they are indicating they want to go forward, at least the college does. But you have had discussions which led you to believe that there were certain combinations being made.

Senator Hewitt: Yes. The day after the last meeting I got a visit from Tod Shockey and he elaborated his concerns especially the need for the four year degree and we discussed various possibilities on that and we raised our concerns that we do not believe that the 2000 level math classes are appropriate for people who may well be teaching upper level math and stat courses in High School. As I pointed out to Tod Shockey, there are high schools that are teaching math courses for UT credit. There's enormous pressure from the state and others to earn UT credit taught by high school teachers and he felt that our request to keep the quality high was not a barrier as long as we met the requirements by NCTM. I invited him to come to the Curriculum Committee meeting the next day and he did. We had a discussion and we came up with two separate proposals. He took these back to people in his department and he told me today that he discussed this with various people and the only person who has not yet responded is Leigh Chiarelott. One of the reasons that I was worried about this weakening of the math content was that the statistics from the number of majors and the number of graduates and the other programs that introduced a single degree option, Language arts, Social Sciences, and Life Sciences, none of them have shown an increase in the total number in majors of our graduates with possible exception of Social Sciences. The numbers of majors have gone up and the graduation rate has gone down. So, in that effect on this proposal could simply be to take the existing students we have and provide them with a weaker education. I am concern about that. So, we have passed back and forth four drafts of a proposal making sure both sides were okay with all the various parameters. Today, again I met with Todd for the fourth time within two weeks which is four more times than I've met with Leigh Chiarelott about this over the last two years and he said except for Leigh everyone else has signed on it. That's all I have to say.

President Anderson: Alright, I think we should close the discussion at this point.

Senator Wedding: I would like to hear a reply from Senator Templin and/or Senator Teclehaimanot.

President Anderson: Alright, but this will be the last round because I think we've been over this round quite a bit.

Senator Templin: From the email conversation that I've seen going back and forth, I was questioning each other's math, I guess. In AYA Science Education at the undergraduate level, the base line number prior to the development of the single degree option was two students. I taught the methods course in AYA Science over the last three years and we've had six students, the numbers are actually six, seven,

six, so by my calculation that is a tripling of the size of that program. I question the numbers because we are not dealing with the same set of numbers as what it seems like. That maybe because in science education things are extremely complex at the AYA level. There are multiple programs that are coded in multiple ways in the system so we may not be finding every student in the system. So, that may be part of the problem.

Senator Hewitt: I agree.

Senator Lundquist: It sounds to me that the Math Department and the appropriate people in the College of Education are really close in coming to an applicable agreement here, is that right?

Senator Hewitt: Yes.

Senator Lundquist: So, what it sounds like to me are the people in the Math Department and the appropriate people in the College of Education are really close to coming to an applicable agreement, is that right?

Senator Hewitt: Yes.

Senator Lundquist: What is the problem with time here? Seven years you have been working on it, isn't it worth another month to get it right?

President Anderson: In two weeks.

Senator Lundquist: Or in two weeks?

Senator Templin: The issue is that it is going to be a somewhat different Senate.

President Anderson: Not in two weeks.

Senator Rouillard: We have the first half of the meeting.

Senator Teclehaimanot: I don't think we can do it in two weeks. The changes must be approved first by department, by the college academic affairs committee and also by the college council. The approval process is very long.

President Anderson: Okay. I think we have the information that we are going to need to make a decision. Each of us has to make one's own decision and that is what the Senate is for, to resolve this kind of issue one way or another. I would like to call a question for bringing this issue off the table. All in favor of bringing the proposal off the table which means making it an approval or disapproval in another vote please say "aye." Any opposed?

Group of Senators: "Nay."

President Anderson: I think we need a hand vote. All in favor please raise your hand (in favor for untabling it). All in favor for keeping it on the table please raise your hand?

Senator Wedding: How about abstentions?

Senator Dowd: There aren't abstentions on this vote.

President Anderson: So it remains tabled. I encourage that an appropriate compromise be brought before the next Senate meeting if at all possible. **Motion Defeated.** Alright, let's move on. Next, I see that Senator Peseckis is here with us, so let's take care of his item.

Senator Peseckis: Okay, you have the courses that were sent out, one from Engineering and one from LLSS. It is a consent agenda item, are there any questions on there? All in favor for approving these courses please say, "Aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? **Motion Passed.** *The following courses were approved by Senate on April 10, 2012.*

College of Engineering

New Course

CSET 4350 Operating Systems 3 Chr

Enrollment: 25/section, 25 per term

Credit hours: 3

Delivery Mode: Lecture, 3 h

Offered Fall; Every Year.

Grading System: Normal Grading

Pre-requisites: CSET 2230

Co-requisites: None

Catalog Description: "This course teaches the fundamentals of operating systems concepts. It discusses the following topics: process scheduling, memory management, kernel and user mode, system calls, context switches, inter-process communication, I/O and file systems."

Additional clarification: CSET 4350 will be a required senior-level course for Computer Science and Engineering majors. It will replace EET 4250 Microcomputer Architecture as the requirement, which has also been submitted as a program modification. This change was prompted by an accreditation visit in 2009 and subsequent review of the curricula for currency. The target audience is CSET majors only, and it is the fourth course in a prerequisite sequence (CSET 1100, 1200, 3150).

GNEN 1800 Engineering Applications of Mathematics 3 Chr

Enrollment: na/section, na per term

Credit hours: 3

Delivery Mode: Lecture, 2.5 h, Regular Lab 1.5

Offered Fall; Every Year.

Grading System: Normal Grading

Pre-requisites: None

Co-requisites: MATH 1320, MATH 1330, MATH 1340 OR MATH 1980

Catalog Description: "Solution of engineering applications using mathematical concepts ranging from algebra to differential equations. Examples from the first two years of engineering coursework are solved in class and explored in corresponding laboratory experiments. The objective of this course is to provide an engineering context for subsequent courses in mathematics. Intended for students prior to Calculus."

Course Modifications

CSET 1200 GUI Programming 3 Chr

Change title to "Object Oriented Programming and Data Structures"

Change prerequisites from "None" to "CSET 1100"

Update catalog description to "This course teaches object oriented program design, analysis, and verification with an introduction to data structures including but not limited to list, queue, stack and tree. The course emphasizes Programming Methodology and its impact on programs and the use of Data Abstractions and the implementation of Data Abstractions using classes."

Reason: This course will focus on OOP and Data Structures.

CSET 3150 Advanced Programming 4 Chr

Change title to "Introduction to Algorithms"

Change prerequisites from "None" to "CSET 1200, CSET 3010"

Update catalog description to "The course covers topics in basic algorithm design and analysis of traditional algorithms such as sorting algorithms, selection algorithms and graph algorithms, with the focus on building correct and efficient algorithms based on the known algorithms. Besides, advanced data structures such as hash tables, binary search trees are covered in the course."

Reason: To meet ABET CAC Accreditation requirements.

Additional clarification: CSET 3150 will be a required junior-level course for Computer Science and Engineering majors. The target audience is CSET majors only, and it is the third course in a prerequisite sequence (CSET 1100, 1200, 3150). Non-majors are not expected. This change was prompted by an accreditation visit in 2009 and subsequent review of the curricula for currency.

CSET 4850 Network Security Fundamental 4 Chr

Change title to "Computer and Network Security"

Change prerequisites from "None" to "CSET 4750"

Update catalog description to "This course provides an introduction to the concepts of computer security, topics include, but not limited to basic cryptography, security policies, network security, program security and systems security. Hands-on lab projects are provided for important topics.

Reason: This course provides an introduction to the concepts of computer security, in addition to the previous network security only.

College of Languages, Literature and Social Sciences

New Course

LLSS 1000 Orientation 1 Chr

Enrollment: 25/section, 350 per term

Credit hours: 1

Delivery Mode: Lecture, 1 h

Offered Fall; Every Year.

Grading System: Normal Grading

Pre-requisites: None

Co-requisites: None

Catalog Description: "Course will introduce new students to the university and college, provide information on requirements, regulations, campus resources and career exploration and help students develop academic skills."

Fit: orientation course required of freshmen students during first semester or year matriculation.

Similarity: This course is similar to all freshman orientation courses across the university in offering certain topics and resource exploration.

President Anderson: Alright, our first guests this afternoon are Mr. Nathan Reaver and Mr. Anthony Bova, who will present the Student Green Fund Initiative. Please welcome Mr. Reaver and Mr. Bova.

Nathan Reaver: Hello everyone my name is Nathan Reaver and this is Tony Bova. We are here representing the new student Grass Roots that has been taking place over the past two semesters; it is called the Student Green Fund Initiative. There are actually a few of us that are from the BOSEF Program, and the renewable energy minor, and a lot of the new courses that started here on campus. Four

of us went down to BG for the Sustainable U. Conference and we heard about this and we decided to try to bring it back to UT.

Tony Bova: For those of you who haven't heard anything or seen anything about this and don't know exactly what we are trying to do: A Student Green Fund is essentially a fund that would be created by the student body and it is funded 100% by the student body voluntarily through student fees and used to fund grant proposals issued from students, student organizations, classes, senior projects, capstone projects etc. to improve the greenness and sustainability of our campus. This is not a new idea. This is something that's been happening over hundreds of campuses across the country, but ultimately this would be 100% student-centered and 99% student-run fund with the exception of a few faculty and administration.

Nathan Reaver: Among a lot of other things, we are trying to make a case why it is something that we need at UT. So, like Tony said we are on a mission at the University of Toledo. I know UT made a big commitment about sustainability; it was an administrative pack, they did "blue and gold makes green." We already dedicated the campus to renewable energy. We installed renewable energy systems on that campus. We have a lot of research programs at UT specifically for this. President Jacobs recently signed an American College University President's Climate commitment which states that we are going to do a lot of implementation of many programs to reduce the campus and carbon footprint. We are also an Ohio's center of excellence in advanced renewable energy in the environment. We just recently started a school for Green Chemistry and Engineering. So this is part of the University's mission

Tony Bova: We want to get a bunch of recommendations from students and let them know the concept of what's going on. It's on the Scott Park Campus and we have the Lake Erie campus. I believe Dr. Anderson is going to be there to talk about a lot of stuff that is going on at the river; there are going to be huge modifications to improve habitat over the summer.

Nathan Reaver: One of the reasons we came here today is to give this presentation to all of you as to why we think UT Green Fund is beneficial: It fits in very well with UT's preexisting commitment to sustainability. Most of the push to make UT sustainable from those issues you have seen with the new school, ...river, and the Lake Erie Center have come from administration, not from the students. They invite students to participate through programs that many of you have been at entry level and establishing. A lot of the students are still unaware that they can actually help make an impact because currently there is not a whole lot that they can do on their own to help move the issue forward. So, in 2011 the University received our sustainability report card with an overall grade, the student involvement was a "C." We saw this as a major issue and something that the Green Fund can definitely help remedy and improve, not only for the University specifically, but all. So, with this new Green Fund what we are hoping to do here is have a positive attitude of student awareness of the student body at UT commitment. This is to give the students pride and ownership. Lately, we seen a little of that with UT Litter Bug, I believe they have something coming up in the next week or two. We also have people who help pick up cigarette butts on campus to remove smoking away from public areas. This will be an opportunity for student organizations and also students who want to do something to have a more profound and lasting effect on the University.

Tony Bova: So, here is what it will be. I think you all have seen our proposal two weeks ago; it kind of has what we need and what we are actually proposing. We have a voluntary opt-out fee. The student legal

services fee is approximately \$10.00 right now and they can choose if they want to do that. It will be \$5.00 per student per semester. A lot of other universities have done this, they have an opt-out fee of about 70% participation. So, given our estimate they had, and there is about 20,000 students here about \$80,000 at a 70% participation rate per semester. So, the neat thing about this is there is a substantial amount of capital for students to do the projects and it is all funded by students. The way that we are going to have it administered is we would have a green fund committee who would accept proposals by student organizations, students, and students who are sponsored by faculty. We would have four undergraduate students: one is from student government, three undergraduate members at large, one staff member who we suggested to be appointed by the president and one faculty member. This (proposal) is for the chair of faculty Senate so you can have a say on who we put on the committee.

Nathan Reaver: Basically, this is what we would want. There are many campuses available that are also interested in the University's mission of sustainability. We can also include community projects and we have a list of potential projects.

Tony Bova: In the proposal we outlined some details at the end where we definitely welcome any comments or proposals from anybody here. These are just some ideas. This is how we would have this. We worked really closely with Bowling Green with getting our proposal typed up and we have an opportunity to speak with Dr. Nick Hennessey, who is their sustainability coordinator. I believe his position was created interim a couple of years ago and he helped a student group very similar to us get this off the ground. I think it started in 2009 and by 2010 they had their funds in place to start issuing these grants. The PowerPoint here is something that we would have on the website to make this program transparent to all students and for anybody who would like to look at it. So, this is a short list of the universities that currently have similar funds and the majority of these we got from the AASHE website which is the Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education. They have a very lengthy and exhausting list and this is a list of universities that have done voluntary fees like we are proposing. Many of them have implemented mandatory fees. Some of them put the money for purchasing carbon credits or put the money for renewable energy resources to offset the university. So, as I mentioned before, Bowling Green established theirs, moved very quickly in fall 2008 and 2009 and in under a year their proposal was thought up, pushed through, and it is now very successful.

Nathan Reaver: Per PowerPoint: This is one that we want to talk about because we have a lot of students who are interested in this. The students want to have some kind of a bike share on campus where you have these bike stations where you can swipe your Rocket card and go across campus and dock the bike. These are the examples of a lot of different universities that have done this so far.

Tony Bova: I had an opportunity to talk to one of the student reporters from the Independent Collegian a few weeks ago. One of our first goals to overcome is to get the students to understand exactly what the Green Fund would be. We would not be the ones that would actually do these projects. We would be the people who would have the money and grant this money to other organizations who want to do this. This isn't saying if this passes that this particular project will have this; we really hope it will because a lot of students were interested in this even before we started talking about this initiative. But, something like this will have multiple benefits, not only for the students, but for faculty at the University as well. We thought that if there were money available to do this and if a student group could find a group to organize

this and find a contractor we would be able to cut down the amount of traffic on this campus. We are a very high percentage commuter campus. A lot of students park next to a building that they are not supposed to, get a ticket, and then walk to their class upset. Not only will this cut down traffic on this campus, but it will improve efficiency on campus.

Nathan Reaver: This is a big one that I heard a lot of people talking about such as the people in the Honors College. It is an idea to use the Green Fund in a way to reach out to the community as well. For example, using the money to buy an additional lot and turn it into a community garden where it could be given to the community, but it will be run by student organizations/areas of programming.

Tony Bova: This is another thing, Bowling Green actually used this project, they put a green roof similar to one on Stranahan Hall. It was funded by their green fund and is located on their dining hall. Hopefully, a lot of these initiatives can save money along the way. I know that there are several faculty that wanted to get involved. Thank you. Are there any questions?

Senator Dowd: I have a couple of questions. Are you asking for a \$5.00 fee for anyone who registers for at least one credit hour?

Nathan Reaver: Yes.

Senator Dowd: Have you thought about altering that to be based on the number of hours taken? The reason is that a \$5.00 flat fee is a very regressive fee for individuals who take a one or two classes as opposed to someone who takes 15 credit hours.

Nathan Reaver: It is an opt-out fee so if they look on there and say that they do not want to pay it they don't have to.

President Anderson: It doesn't sound like they have to.

Nathan Reaver: Yes, it is an opt-out fee. If the students want to participate in it then they can. Everyone will benefit from this program, but hopefully more people will realize that this is beneficial, but we are not forcing anybody.

Tony Bova: Here are a few examples of other universities that had something that was fee-based on the credit hours. We knew that \$5.00 would "pop," it would be a cap if anything. There are some universities that have fees as much as \$20.00 like \$2.00 or \$3.00 per semester and we even saw that some colleges had proposals that every year fees would go up. We thought with what we wanted to do being in its entirety \$5.00 was a good starting point.

Senator Dowd: But, in its essence it is not a fair fee. It is a regressive fee. It hurts the people who are taking fewer classes. I am not arguing against a fee, I just hope you would consider this alternative. The other part that struck me was that you have a target amount of \$88,000?

Nathan Reaver: That is not necessarily a target; it's an estimate of what other universities have done. We based those off of what Bowling Green has done.

Senator Dowd: For that part I would encourage you to get the numbers of the students registered and then back-engineer. Come up with a target dollar amount that you want to raise and then get the enrollment numbers to figure out what the fee should be. Because you are going to have to do that anyway because the University is going to scoop off 11.5% tax on no matter how much you raise. So, if you want a targeted amount you are going to back-engineer with this.

Senator Cooper: First of all, I think you all should be congratulated because this is a great idea, a lot of initiative support 100%. My second comment is it would be nice to have involvement on the Health Science because I bet you will get a lot of medical students, pharmacy students, nursing students who would also like to see more green initiatives and be engaged on the Health Science Campus. The third thing, also make an option for...

Nathan Reaver: Also, I think we are going to have a meeting on the Health Science Campus, so we are trying to get some of the nurses involved.

President Anderson: Okay, thank you very much gentlemen. They sent to me a proposal for a resolution that supports this activity and it would help them in their presentation to the Board. The Executive Committee will present that proposal to faculty to donate to this initiative because I think you are going to get a lot of support from faculty.

Tony Bova: I think we do have somewhere in there where we do allow outside donations. That section hasn't been fleshed out in its entirety from the initial proposal. But, there are other universities that have things like that where faculty being alumni have helped and even matched what the students raised. for a recommendation and add something from the Executive Committee at the next meeting.

Chancellor Gold: President Anderson, could I do the introduction?

President Anderson: Yes, you may certainly do the introduction.

Chancellor Gold: Thank you. First of all, I want to thank all of you for agreeing to hold your Senate meeting here. Secondly, I would like to take a minute of your time and ask each of you to stand up in your place like I am, close your eyes as tight as you can squeeze them, and reach for the ceiling. I want you to reach for the ceiling, reach really high and take a really deep breath.

[Pause]

Chancellor Gold: Thank you very much. That is great. Now you can sit down and make yourself comfortable; you needed to get the blood circulating a little bit. Again, thank you for taking the time to be here this afternoon. I would like to hope for the next few minutes that you are with us you can suspend disbelief and think about what simulation could possibly mean to the world of education in the future. Think about what this type of technology means to you and more importantly, how you could use this technology to change the world. There is no question that the technology that is available to us, available

to the military, available to those that are in transportation being on the ground or in the air, or available to medicine continues to evolve and is increasing at an unprecedented rate. What you may not know, is that human beings' ability to deal with that technology has now been remarkably equipped for technology itself, and human performance is now the delivering factor. What do you and I and all the great faculty on this campus do for a living? We enhance human performance. We enhance the life of the mind. We enhance knowledge and we enhance skill. So I would like you to think for the next few minutes as Dr. Boyers walks you through some of these ideas and then you get to physically walk through this center, to what it might be like in the future. Could you envision a world with this type of technology? It is useful to you as an individual, faculty member, and it is useful to this University as a way of thinking about the future for higher education. So, with that, it gives me great pleasure to introduce to you Dr. Pamela Boyers. I met Dr. Boyers about five years ago. I will never forget it, we were at dinner and she was introduced to me by a mutual friend and she was talking to me about some of these unusual ideas and simulation and virtual reality and I was thinking, "I could be answering some emails etc."

[Dr. Pamela Boyers, Executive Director of the Inteprofessional Simulation Center presented the vision, purpose and progress being made with Phase I of the Interprofessional Immersive Simulation Center. Following the presentation there were questions. PowerPoint link coming.

Following her questions, members of the Faculty Senate toured the Center, with Dr. Gold and Dr. Boyers.]

Chancellor Gold: Could we take one minute for some questions?

Dr. Boyers: absolutely.

Senator Teclehaimanot: I attended the Society for Information Technology and Teacher Education (SITE) 23rd International Conference that represented above 70 countries from March 5-9, 2012 in Austin, Texas. I was delighted to hear that one of the keynote speakers Mark Milliron from Western Governors University to mention the University of Toledo's Simulation Center as an example one of the emerging technology to utilize a new generation of learning tools in the country.

Dr. Boyers: Really?

Senator Teclehaimanot: Yes.

Dr. Boyers: Wow! Thank you. That is very exciting. I didn't know that.

President Anderson: Alright, before we go on the tour we should formally adjourn. Do I have a motion for adjournment? Meeting adjourned.

IV. Meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:

Lucy Duhon
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard

Faculty Senate Office Administrative Secretary.