

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of December 3, 2013
FACULTY SENATE

<http://www.utoledo.edu/facsenate> Approved @ FS meeting on 2-11-2014

Summary of Senate Business

Senator Mary Humphrys and Senator Scott Molitor
Senator Amy Thompson
Mr. Dave Morlock
Dr. Steven Peseckis

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 Rouillard: I call this meeting to order. Welcome to the eight Faculty Senate meeting of **Lucy Duhon**, Executive Secretary, called the roll.

I. *Roll Call: 2013-2014 Senators:*

Present: Present: Bailey, Barnes, Cappelletty, Chiarelott, Cooper, Denyer, Dowd, Duhon, Edinger, Federman, Gilbert, Giovannucci, Gunning, Hamer, Hewitt, Humphrys, Keith, Kennedy, Kistner, Kranz, LeBlanc, Lundquist, Molitor, Monsos, Moore, Nigem, Ohlinger, Plenefisch, Quinlan, Randolph, Regimbal, Relue, Rouillard, Sheldon, Teclehaimanot Templin, Thompson, Thompson-Casado Van Hoy, Weck-Schwarz, Wedding, White, White, Williams

Excused absences: Anderson, Brickman, Caruso, Cochrane, Crist, Duggan, Ellis, Elmer, Farrell, Gohara, Hasaan-Elnaby, Hoblet, Moynihan, Porter, Springman, Srinivasan

Unexcused absences: Frantz, Skeel, Willey

II. *Approval of Minutes:* Minutes are not ready for approval.

Academic Year 2013-2014. I ask that Executive Secretary, Lucy Duhon come to the podium to call the roll.

III. President Rouillard: The Executive Committee report: On Oct. 24, Senators Mary Humphrys, Steve Peseckis and I, along with Dr. Lawrence Anderson-Huang met with VP Peg Traband and Marcia King Blandford. Here are some items from that discussion:

---The college credit plus program will include on-line, blended and face-to-face classes which will have to coordinate with high school class times. The first group of courses to be offered in this initiative will be UT courses that are part of the OTM.

---Since programs with more than 50% modifications must go through the state approval process, perhaps UT could use the state form internally to collect the needed information at the beginning of our own in-house process. Perhaps this could be used as an attachment in the curriculum tracking system.

---It was mentioned that some courses in professional programs seem to go directly to the Chancellor for approval and not to FS. Who has the authority to enter the courses into Banner for HSC.

---ways to avoid the end of the year rush in new courses and modifications submitted to FS and to facilitate open enrollment for students. Institute a final date of mid-Feb. for course submissions.

---curriculum tracking system's historical archive function in contrast with Banner which is merely a course inventory.

---items that should be included in syllabus, such as SLO with verbs from Bloom's taxonomy

---request that we develop a philosophy of gen ed and an overarching statement of gen ed. I've requested the Core Curr. Committee work on a definition that clarifies the role of gen ed in our programs of study.

On Oct. 28, FSEC met with Dr. Cam Cruickshank and Dr. Barbara Copp Miller, new director of Learning Ventures. Dr. Cruickshank spoke on design principles for the support and administration of online degree programs in preparation for his presentation here today.

On Oct. 31, FSEC met with Provost Scarborough and Chancellor Gold.

Chancellor Gold informed us that a consultant is scheduled to meet with the different constituents in the college of Nursing in January.

Provost Scarborough discussed the new main campus initiatives directed by Bill McCreary, that is, the development of educational simulation games in potential partnership with such entities as MS, IBM or OI; and the lab school for which he is writing grants. Ottawa Hills will likely be a part of this program.

Additionally we discussed the issue of chairs being left out the process of determining which courses are developed as flipped classrooms, or as DL courses, causing scheduling and staffing problems; the potential for DL course initiatives to compete with face-to-face enrollment; how payment for development of DL course materials affects ownership of copyright.

Finally, I have asked the Core Curriculum committee to develop an overarching statement about gen ed (its definition and purpose in programs of study); the Constitution and Rules Committee to consider any changes to the constitution regarding representation in the light of our 3 news colleges; and members of the Elections Committee, along with Quinetta Hubbard and Lisa Barteck to update the lists of faculty eligible to vote in next spring's elections. Are there any questions? Okay. Next, Senator Thompson's discussion on smoking ban.

Senator Thompson: Thanks, President Rouillard. As we talked last time at Senate, we know that there is a policy on the Health Science Campus that basically restricts tobacco use and this is an item that we've talked about before and Student Senate has brought it up as an important issue they had. They had surveys on this issue. Faculty can vote on this issue. So part of our Executive Committee meetings we did kind of put together an outline of a potential resolution that I would like to discuss and introduce today. I would like to make a point that this is something that other institutions have already done, other campuses have done this, and our students are certainly in support of this; a recent survey states 60% of students want some sort of tobacco restriction. There are two different policies that we are seeing regarding this issue. One is being tobacco-free and the other is being smoke-free. Obviously, the tobacco policy is a little more

restricted in terms of things like using Chew or smokeless tobacco in the classrooms. In a classroom there was actually an incident where I saw a person using an E-cigarette indoors. So this is something that I think is very important from a public health perspective to discuss within our Senate to decide whether or not we want to endorse some type of resolution. This a few years ago was also introduced at the Board of Trustee level in which we decided to have designated areas. As we discussed last time at Senate, it is a problem in terms of enforcement. In terms of adding additional restrictions which are in line with what the Health Science Campus already has, I thought this would make it easier to enforce on our campus as well. I would like to open this up if you like, to have either a motion to have some discussion on this, or how would you like to handle this?

President Rouillard: I don't think we need a motion because it is being presented by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee so we can just move into discussion and comments.

Senator Thompson: Sure. Are there any comments or questions?

Senator Molitor: I just have a question, are electronic cigarettes prohibited on the Health Science Campus as well?

Senator Thompson: I do not believe so; no, they are not.

Senator Molitor: Are they considered tobacco products?

Senator Thompson: They are not considered tobacco products. So again, as you think about this policy, do you want to add that in or do we not?

Senator Hewitt: How would it be easier to enforce this?

Senator Thompson: Most of the research suggests that when you have something that is a total ban it is something that becomes a social norm. So if you see someone walking across campus when there is a policy that is not in place and something that should be happening. And we already see that happening on the Health Science Campus and feel free to join in, those folks that work there -- that when there's something across-the-board -- it is pretty clear-cut to have those designated areas. On our Main Campus we see people smoking in doorways and other areas that they shouldn't, and a lot of times those areas are not clearly marked; you'll see a designated area but they are not sure where that perimeter is. Another thing, the rules sometimes changes during football game days etc. in terms of where those smoking areas are. So if you have something that is across-the-board it is easier to enforce.

Senator Relue: If we became a tobacco-free campus, will we also be tobacco-free on game days?

Senator Thompson: That is a good question and I think that's what we need to decide in terms of our resolution. The way that it is currently phrased, yes, that would happen. That also has to be a Board of Trustee issue because they are obviously going to pass the policy. What we are doing here today is basically showing that we are supporting some type of movement towards a policy. The Board of Trustees really has the final say in terms of what that policy looks like, good question.

Senator Barnes: I am just wondering if you can talk a little about who is smoking. This is a problem; being an interdisciplinary scholar I hear a little bit about a lot of things, and it seems to me that I've been reading that smoking rates are much higher among working-class people. I just worry about the message

that we are sending when we say, “not only are we discouraging you in other ways, but now we are restricting you to certain areas, and now we don’t want you at all.” How much are we gaining in terms of the benefits to the health to the rest of us compared to what we might be losing if people say, “they don’t want you there?”

Senator Thompson: Great question. To be honest with you, I’ve read some research in terms of the smoking ban being a deterrent. I don’t know if having that policy in place on the Health Science Campus has been a deterrent to students being enrolled, admitted, or compliant to the school. I think as we think about this it progresses wide. The mission of our university is to improve the human condition; that includes the condition of our students. The trend that we are seeing is more and more employment settings going tobacco/smoke-free. They are testing their workers to actually see what’s happening in a lot of hospital settings, do they have nicotine in their systems and they are being fired as a result of that because of the healthcare cost. When you look at the fact that an average smoker costs an employer anywhere between \$1,500 to \$3,000 minimum extra per year, people can’t afford that. So the fact is if you can look at it from a public health standpoint, if you can deter smoking, then rates goes down and if you can stop students from smoking by the age of 18-20 they tend not to be smokers. So, when you look at this in a bigger picture, I don’t know, are we doing them more of a favor by trying to put restrictions in place to actually make those rates go down?

Senator Williams: The only comment that I have, based on your assumption, the Health Science Campus and Main Campus are running the same kind of campuses. Really, the idea here is the Health Science Campus is primarily a professional campus and they have set numbers of students that they are going to accept. Does the deterrent there really hurt enrollment? I don’t know if that’s actually correct. Where on the Main Campus those people that are working-class might be able to go anywhere to get their associate and bachelor’s degrees. Now, is that true? I don’t know. But, it is something that we have to start thinking about because really, I don’t think we can say the two campuses are really the same.

Senator Thompson: I have not seen a study out there that talks about that as a deterrent. If you look at the data, about 18-20% of our students smoke, so it is not like it’s a huge population. And how many of those students will say they won’t go to UT because I don’t know if we can ever determine that. What I can tell you right now is that there are 14 institutions within the state of Ohio that already have those policies. We are seeing more and more institutions every day that support those policies as well as work places.

Senator Williams: I will just add to that since you brought up the 18% that actually smoke on campus, they smoke everywhere, period.

Senator Thompson: Yes, they are smokers.

Senator Williams: But, the fact is if you look at the city of Toledo (that area) we are looking at about 20% of the city of Toledo that smoke.

Senator Thompson: Sure.

Senator Williams: So they are just emulating their parents.

Senator Thompson: Sure.

Senator Williams: That is a clear fact.

Senator Thompson: Sure.

Senator Williams: We have to carry that in mind as well.

Senator Thompson: Sure. Although we do see a trend with the completion of college, when education goes up, smoking rates go down. So usually they will quit after they have a college degree, those rates actually go down interestingly enough.

Senator Lee: Thanks for your one comment. I think our focus should be on health, not within certain populations. Some of the populations that smoke also have some other healthy eaters that are concerned as well. Some international student populations have higher smoking rates and so forth, so I totally endorse this as a shift of societal norm. I remember when Toledo Hospital healthcare workers had a place to go, called *Butt-Hut*, out in the garage and they would find their way out over there until that wasn't available anymore. So, I think it's just setting that standard.

Senator Templin: I am unclear about whether or not this is a tobacco-free resolution or a smoke-free resolution because as you said, those are two very different things. It seems to me banning smoking or being smoke-free is a matter of public concern because secondary smoke is negative. I am not so sure that you would use the same argument for chew and tobacco etc. because it seems like it is more of a private health matter. I understand that there's an increase in insurance policies, but economic issues are still private. So, I am not understanding why a tobacco-free system (as your title says)...

Senator Thompson: Sure. I think to answer your question I think that should be something that's a decision of Senate. I think that is part of the discussion, do we want to include other products like snus, like chew, and like e-cigarettes.

Senator Templin: Well, why not coffee?

Group of Senators: No <laughter>.

Senator Thompson: Is that an amendment <laughter>?

Senator Templin: Yeah <laughter>. We can be coffee-free and we can be peanut butter-free.

Senator Thompson: That's a slippery slope <laughter>.

Senator Cooper: The one thing that should be clear to all members of Faculty Senate is these types of smoking bans can improve health, period. They lead to lower rates of heart attacks. They lead to lower rates of sudden death. They lead to lower rates of throat cancer, tongue cancer, lung cancer and pharyngeal cancer with respect to tobacco-free, snuff, chew etc. It went to Bowling Green a few years ago after their smoking ban which is now through the state of Ohio by the time we saw it, I think it was a 40% rate reduction of sudden death within a year. So, we can debate about civil liberty issues about smoking and its effects etc. but as it relates to health status this is absolutely clear-cut.

Senator Barnes: Can I ask a follow-up on that? Is tobacco remarkably different than coffee and alcohol etc.? Is it easier to single out tobacco in this way?

Senator Cooper: It is remarkably different than coffee. There's data back and forth about coffee and some effects and some populations make it better and some make it worse.

Senator Barnes: Is it worse than any other drug, for example alcohol?

Senator Edinger: It is. Alcohol has its own side effects and as you know we have a policy that there's zero tolerance for instance to alcohol in the workplace, at least on the Health Science Campus. But, there's absolutely no safe way for tobacco use as it relates to public health. It is not safe, period.

Senator Thompson: Just as a follow-up to that. It is one of the most preventable world-wide means of death. An average smoker loses about 12-15 years off their life compared to about an average coffee drinker; I don't think it is close.

Senator Barnes: I am just trying to figure out is it really worthwhile to single out tobacco?

Senator Thompson: It is. It costs our university a lot of money in terms of health care. And one of the things you'll notice that our Executive Committee made a very strong point with is making sure that we also offer a cessation program. I mean, you can't just have a policy without then offering ways for people to quit. Currently on our campus and correct me if I am wrong, we need to do a better job in offering cessation programs like at the Counseling Center etc. That is something that we thought would be important if this resolution goes forward. Are there any other comments? Is there any language that you would like to see change or amended?

Senator Denis White: I have a comment. It bothers me a little bit that we seem to be making an end-run around the Student Senate. The Student Senate is not to have a smoking ban and here we are as a Faculty Senate going around them in some sense.

Senator Thompson: Do you want me to respond to that?

Senator Denis White: Yes.

Senator Thompson: I think if you look at the article at least (I was not at that meeting) but the student survey that came out, which had been done several times now, has shown plenty of our students do want some kind of tobacco restriction. My understanding of the vote, 11 to 12 was very close and so what happened was the leadership of Student Senate then pushed forward and said, "Look, we really need to rethink this because the majority of our students are in support of having such a ban." And actually, those folks also approached us saying, "This is something -- why not just do this in tandem, because it's important."

Senator Denis White: Is it in tandem?

Senator Thompson: They have been in discussion with us about this and in fact, they were here last time (I don't know if you were at the meeting) and also presented their stance.

President Rouillard: I think the Student Senate is planning to re-visit this as well.

Senator Denis White: The Student Senate?

Senator Thompson: Yes.

Senator Giovannucci: What is the percentage of students that smokes?

Senator Thompson: About 18-20%.

Senator Keith: At the last meeting somebody noted that just because you have a smoking ban doesn't necessarily mean that they won't smoke, they just won't smoke on campus and so there is some question about where will they go. Will they go to the sidewalk on Bancroft Street? Will they go across the street? What sort of evidence do you have that the smoking ban actually reduces smoking other than it just drives them away from where they can currently smoke? The other question I have was, at the last meeting when we talked about this; there was some status that if we have a ban, we have to figure out a way to enforce it and I don't personally want students to be able to give fines, ask people for their i.d.'s if they catch people smoking. We are not going to empower our students to be anti-smoking cops, are we? So, before we will pass such a thing I would like answers to some of these questions, where will they go because not all of them are going to quit smoking because the smoking ban doesn't necessarily mean that you stop smoking right away? For the people that chew tobacco and use snuff they are not going to spit in the garbage cans if there's a smoking ban; they are going to figure out some other way to do it covertly.

Senator Thompson: Excellent question. Thank you. First of all, I have not seen glitches on specific college campuses. But, what I can tell you is this, there are a number of studies that talk about the fact that when workplaces and other institutions have some type of ban, the smoking rates actually decrease significantly.

Senator Keith: How many campuses are going to different policies because students are not employees?

Senator Thompson: Again, I can't cite where it should be because...work on that. But if you can generalize other studies and make them show reduction for those people who smoke, think about it, you are spending most of your time at school or work, right? That restricts your smoking usage and it is actually easier for people to quit smoking because they are cutting down on the usage. The second question I think you asked is very important, and to be honest with you I don't have an answer to that. I shouldn't decide that. I think that should be something that a task force should decide. As you look at the resolution that's in front of you, if the Board of Trustees does choose to implement a policy, I think that it needs to include a number of individuals that make that decision in terms of how it would be enforced. I'm not actually personally in favor of also having students going there and being anti-smoking cops, but I do think that we need other ways of enforcing that, whether it's campus police etc. Being a social norm is something that we talked about; when people just can ask them, "Hey, you can't smoke here." When that actually builds year after year, it becomes a cultural norm and people won't do it anymore and you won't need to have somebody "tackling" someone and telling them not to smoke. I think those are the two important things because it takes time.

Senator Barnes: I am just curious to know how you're going to weigh the health benefits for everyone against what I'll consider invasive major of sort of saying, "Well, you can get drug-tested before you get hired and you can get tobacco-tested before you get hired," which I feel like in some ways by using that as an argument we're...to that to think that's okay. I really don't think it's okay, but I'm also hearing that this is a really important health policy. I am wondering if people have thoughts about where that line is and how we weigh on it as faculty members of the university.

Senator Thompson: I think we need to focus on something for a minute. What we are talking about is second-hand smoke exposure. Specifically as we look at policies restricting that it is affecting other people's health not just your health. For example, I am severely asthmatic and when I walk through a door-way and someone is smoking it sticks with me for the next couple hours; it triggers for me to have an asthma attack, so, it's not just about that person and their personal choices. What we are talking about is our public health strategies and policies that affect a lot of other people with second-hand smoke.

Senator Barnes: Let's say nothing is enforced perfectly. But I thought the designated smoking areas were the compromise position to say we're not going to eliminate smokers and smoking from campus, but we are going to minimize their damage to other people. So, what you are saying is they don't work?

Senator Thompson: Can I just ask by a show of hands, how many of you have seen within the last couple months people smoking on Main Campus when you're walking around? It is a difference. It is a difference because people are not sure and they say, "Well, here's the *Butt Hut* and my friends are over here and I am going to walk over and start talking to them" and then they move from place to place and people are not certain. So, when you have an across-the-board policy it is way easier to enforce, to answer your question.

Senator Barnes: Okay. Thank you.

Senator Molitor: I just want to address something that Senator Barnes said. There are lots of things that our employers of our students may or may not condone, but it is still our responsibility to prepare them for careers with these employers. I agree we don't necessarily have to condone or say we do think that we should help our students and things like that, but we do have to make them aware that this is a system that they have and a world they need to be prepared for.

Senator Sheldon: I am going along with Senator Barnes. This is very much a working-class campus and we know the working-class does indulge in certain practices that maybe the middle or upper middle-class does not. I am a lifelong asthmatic as well and second-hand smoke does bother me; however, doesn't vegetarianism and veganism also contribute to better health so why are we not putting those with tobacco-free and smoke-free?

Senator Templin: As written, doesn't this ban research into tobacco? It's saying we're banning it, including all facilities, so if it's not allowed in the building, then it would not be allowed for research purposes.

Senator Thompson: Do we have a smoking lab anywhere?

Senator Templin: Nicotine is used in biology research for example as a pure substance and you don't even have to be studying nicotine.

Senator Cooper: Nicotine is not tobacco.

Senator Templin: But it is a tobacco product.

Senator Thompson: Anybody else have any thoughts, amendments, and /or changes?

Senator Edinger: I know that the comment is about smoking and second-hand smoke. Having lived with people who chewed tobacco, I'd just like to say that it is not a health hazard, but, spilling one of those spit-cups certainly falls within the category of things I don't want in my classroom, or in my dorm room, or anywhere else. There are health risks and other health issues added to that as well, not just for the person. It's not smoke necessarily; it's just a filthy habit.

Senator Thompson: Again, I think there could be further discussion on this. I think the thing to remember today is this is not a policy. We are not passing the policy today, but what we're doing today is perhaps endorsing a resolution that is basically charging administration to revisit this issue. And if the Board of Trustee level considers it and develops a policy and if they decide to pass it, they can perhaps have a task force that can help implement and come up with some of those answers that you are asking because I don't know.

President Rouillard: Additionally, I would add that it's giving support to student initiatives too regarding the kind of campus that they want.

Senator Thompson: Anybody else?

President Rouillard: Are we ready to vote on this resolution?

Senator Barnes: Thanks for the work.

Senator Thompson: Thank you for the questions and I apologize that I couldn't answer them all. Do you want to go for a vote for this? All those in favor for passing the resolution that's been presented for you today please say "aye."

Group of Senators: Aye.

Senator Thompson: Anyone opposed say, "nay."

Few Senators: Nay.

Senator Thompson: Any abstentions?

Unknown Senator: Yes.

Senator Thompson: Thank you. *Resolution Passed.*

"Resolution to Declare The University of Toledo a Tobacco-Free System and to Establish a Task Force for this Purpose."

WHEREAS: *The health hazards of using tobacco products are widely known. According to the Centers for Disease Control (see http://www.cdc.gov/tobacco/data_statistics/fact_sheets/fast_facts/) tobacco use is the leading preventable cause of death*

WHEREAS: *approximately 758 college and university campuses in the United States are now 100% tobacco-free and 369 are smoke free. In Ohio, as of Nov. 20, 2013 there are 14 Institutions of Higher Education that are 100% Smoke-Free, 11 of those are 100% tobacco-free.*

WHEREAS: *the University of Toledo Health Science Campus is already 100% tobacco free.*

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED: That the Faculty Senate of the University of Toledo request that the administration take the necessary steps to modify University of Toledo policy to create a tobacco-free university system (tobacco, smokeless tobacco, snus & electronic cigarettes), including all facilities; and be it further

RESOLVED: Smoke-free means that smoking tobacco products will be prohibited in all indoor and outdoor spaces; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Faculty Senate of the University of Toledo asks that the administration also take the necessary steps to ensure that the sale and marketing of tobacco products on University of Toledo property be prohibited; and be it further

RESOLVED: That there be tobacco cessation programming readily available to staff, faculty and students; and be it further

RESOLVED: That there be a formal system created to ensure that this policy is followed by faculty, students, staff and visitors.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: that the Faculty Senate at the University of Toledo calls upon the university administration to establish a task force to make the University of Toledo a tobacco-free system by the beginning of the 2014/2015 academic year.

President Rouillard: Thank you, Senator Thompson. I see that Dr. Penny Poplin Gosetti has come in and so I would like to invite her to come up and update us on what's happening in her new college.

Dean Poplin Gosetti: I promised Dr. Rouillard that I would keep this very brief. I do not have a PowerPoint presentation so I am going to briefly fill you in on what's been happening. I have a number of faculty members from the college here, Senator Edwards, Senator Templin, Senator Denyer, Senator Thompson, and Senator Regimbal who can correct me if I am incorrect or embellish what they feel should be embellished. We actually had a very busy year since I became interim dean last January and it's been almost a year. At that time the announcement was made that the JHCE & HSHS had become three colleges once again, the Judith Herb College of Education was the Judith Herb College of Education. Instead of saying, how do we go back to what we were, there was a decision made and guided by the dean that we would really look forward to what we can be and there was an opportunity here to maybe think differently about some of the things we've been doing and take a look at some of the things that's been going on nationally, within our region and state, in teacher education, and how we want to approach those. In the spring we focused a lot on the nitty-gritty pieces that had to be done by becoming a separate college again such as the mission statement, bylaws, and constitution etc. Again, I think there was a very productive conversation in each of those about how we move those documents forward. There was a conversation about whether we should return to what was, versus what we wanted to move forward. I would say in all instances we chose to move forward on some things and many things, thanks to Senator Templin which I think who was a great help in the constitution and bylaws, and looking at pieces to think about and informing us to think about how that lines up with other pieces within the Faculty Senate etc. Thank you, Senator Templin for your help on that.

The conversations that we had during the spring was a lot of sort of thinking about who we are, where we were headed, and visioning where we could be and then April came and it really wasn't enough time to finish it and I admit that I probably was pushing a little hard to try to get us through because we had lots of decisions to make about structure and if we wanted to stay with three departments, whether we wanted to change and if we change then how do we hire people. Then the council did a very good job saying, "Let's put this on hold. Here's our recommendation that we come back in the fall ready and able to start

this up immediately which I would say we did within the first week and have decisions made on structure and strategic planning by the end of fall term.” I would say that commitment was held. I accepted the recommendation. I thought it was a very good thoughtful response and we picked up the day classes started. I must thank the college council greatly for the work that they did with picking-up and taking that structure conversation and finishing it by September 30th. They met weekly and this included co-meetings with cabinet and this included college forums in addition to our college deans where that discussion occurred about who we wanted to be as a structure. Do we want to stay with three departments? Do we want to think about something...that had to do with cross-disciplinary, clusters, and functional disciplinary? What we decided as a college to do was to stay with the three department’s structure to create what we call planning clusters. The notion was to cross disciplines and to create what we call “planning clusters.” The notion of the planning clusters was to cross disciplines -- to cross departments -- to allow those cross conversations to occur and to encourage those to occur and also they would be at places where innovation can take place; to not get stuck in how we think about our disciplines, but to think more broadly about it and have a place to do that. That decision was made by the 30th and that was accepted as a recommendation to go forward and broadly accepted. Strategic planning actually began with a SWOT analysis that basically was going in six months of conversation because we talked a lot about strengths and weaknesses. We came down to a very concrete conversation about it as soon as the structure was developed. We immediately moved into operationalizing and starting to have conversation about what are the issues and what we want to do about those. There were two college meetings and several college forums, five drafts, college council meetings, and cabinet meetings. We came up with a strategic plan; it is not a narrative, it is four pages with bullet points. It is down and dirty. We did not do a lot of tweaking of language that often comes with narrative. We came up with six issues that we wanted to address that was pretty standard throughout the whole time...themselves were reworded several different times and came up with a plan that would move forward by the 22nd. We are now meeting with the provost on which areas that he’s going to support for researching. We are going to be doing some marketing which will be the focus of the Provost Corner in December. The areas -- just to let you know -- we will be focusing on increasing enrollment, because I think that is an issue across the university. We are looking at addressing the public perception of the College of Education in general specifically. Right now as you all know nationally it is not very good to be a teacher. There are a lot of external pressures for accountability. There’s not a lot of high-pay that goes associated with that. College education is being perceived as mediocre at best and so we are one of those that is being hit by that as are most of the colleges across the nation. We also want to address concerns related to teacher preparation. I’ve been to conferences and I’ve been reading and the message is clear, students need to know how to use data based decisions. Again, it’s all accountability things that we are hearing about. The second thing they need to know is how to do classroom management. Kids today have issues that they bring to the table. They continue to grow and expand and our students need to be better prepared. They also not only need to know how to be taught new technology but they need to bring that to their classrooms. Many K-12 schools are ahead of us by using flipped-classroom and competency-based learning and our students are not prepared in the way they need to be to go out and do that. So that is a major focus of our strategic plan. We also are going to look more strategically at developing partnerships. Finally, I presented this to the deans today; we know that 2015 is going to be bringing us a lot of retirements and we feel very strong about that and we have a very strong leadership that is going to be leading us. We will have grant writers and we are going to work on our...plan, how are we going to mentor faculty to take over those roles and think about if and when we have new hires; are those pieces we are going to be looking for in new hires.

So the focus of the plan you will see at the Provost Corner and I encourage you to take a look at it. There are other colleges that will also be going through this process, maybe not as intensely as ours because we had to create a new strategic plan. This is what we've been doing for the last 12 months. I have to thank the college and the people in it because they really have stepped up to the task and evolved. We video-tape our meetings so if you can't come you can watch, because we really want to involve faculty in that process. I feel good about the plan and for the most part, I think people can see themselves in the plan.

President Rouillard: Does anyone have any questions or comments? Thank you very much Dean Poplin Gosetti. One more short piece of business, Dr. Peseckis has an undergraduate curriculum report. The materials were distributed to you by Quinetta the other day.

Senator Peseckis: You have received the course recommendations for your considerations for approval. Are there any questions? All in favor for approving them say, "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions?

Motion Passed. *The following are a list of new course modifications that were approved by Senate on December 3rd.*

College of Adult and Lifelong Learning

Course Modification

AL 4000 Professional Studies Capstone 4 CHr

Change course number to "AL 4950"

Change title to "Senior Capstone"

Update course description to "This course is designed to provide a capstone experience to students enrolled in CALL undergraduate degree programs. Students will have the option of designing a Senior Thesis based upon research related to the area of concentration, or developing an Educational Portfolio that encompasses total learning and its application to a specific problem."

Reason for change: "To provide a universal Senior capstone class to students enrolled in CALL undergraduate degree programs."

College of Health Sciences

RCRT 4820 Clinic: Mental Retardation/Developmental Disability 3 CHr

Change title to "Clinical: Intellectual Deficit/Developmental Disability"

Change course description from "Provides the student with a structured environment to practice assessment, documentation and habilitation interventions in a mental retardation/ developmental disability facility." to "Provides the student with a structured environment to practice assessment, documentation and rehabilitation interventions in a ID/DD facility."

Reason for change: "New title reflects current terminology."

President Rouillard: Thank you. We also have a report from the Core Curriculum Committee. I would like to welcome Senator Humphrys and Senator Molitor who are going to give you an update on curricular issues. Quinetta distributed those materials to you the other day as well, in preparation for this.

Senator Molitor: The Core Curriculum Committee has gotten together and discussed some of the issues we've been having regarding the general education component of our curriculum. As you may remember, the courses that we approved in Spring 2012 were from a revision of our curriculum that was from the competency-based core in Spring 2011. The following year in Spring 2012 after a lengthy application process we approved a list of courses that would then qualify for this competency-based core curriculum.

About a semester after that we realized there were some problems. First and foremost, the courses that we approved in Spring 2012 were not coded on the course registration system as being part of our general education curriculum. So advisors that were telling students what courses to sign up for couldn't even tell them to sign up for many of these courses unless they were from the previous iteration of the general education curriculum. Also, another problem related to this was that the list of courses approved Spring 2012 did not completely encompass a set of courses known as Ohio Transfer Module courses. As it turns out, one of the OBOR requirements for general education is that any course in what's called the Ohio Transfer Module must be part of your general education curriculum, so that was something we needed to correct. Also, with regard to the competency-based core that was approved in Spring 2011, many courses that need to be in general education for various reasons, primarily because they are in our Ohio Transfer Module or because they meet degree program requirements for specific programs that rely on these courses to satisfy general education as well as degree program requirements. There are specific learning outcomes for those courses based on the degree program requirements. Other general education courses are restricted by Transfer Assurance Guides, so these are courses that have specific requirements to transfer as an equivalent course that follows these learning outcomes. So we are finding a number of courses that we expect to be in our general education curriculum were not applying for this competency-based core curriculum for the reason that their student learning outcomes that were already predefined and prescribed by other restrictions. Finally, there is a lot of confusion as to what terms such as Ohio Transfer Module, core curriculum, and General Education mean. This confusion translates into a problem when somebody has a course that they believe belongs to general education or the core curriculum; it is not clear whether a course qualifies, without an accepted definition for something like general education.

To address these issues, the Core Curriculum Committee got together and we have distributed an outline of a proposal with the Faculty Senate meeting materials. This is a draft proposal and we are not going to vote on it today. We want to give Faculty Senate time to read this so we can digest it and provide feedback.

The first thing in that draft is definitions. Our core curriculum is a set of courses that consists of two components. We have the general education component and multicultural course component. Putting together these two components comprises what we call our core curriculum. We have not changed anything with the multicultural courses and we plan on keeping it that way. There is nothing in the proposal that would suggest a change to it, but we just wanted to elaborate and reiterate the definition of a multicultural course. These are courses that foster an understanding and respect for people in two different cultures. There are two parts to this multicultural course component: Diversity of U.S. Culture and non-Western culture and that would remain as it is. These are courses that can be taught at any level - 1000-4000 level -- and that's important because as you'll see in general education there is a limit to the levels at which those courses can be taught. And courses that are in the multicultural component can also satisfy general education requirements; so you can see a course that is categorized as both multicultural and general education and that's still the same, nothing has changed there.

So, what is our general education component of our core curriculum? These are introductory courses and I want to emphasize an "introductory" course that is a broad interest to students and to various degree programs. So these are courses that we are expecting our students to build upon as they enter a wide range of degree programs. They fall in a list of categories that is specified by the Ohio Transfer Module: composition, fine arts and humanities are actually put together in one category, mathematics, natural

sciences and social sciences. General education courses should be taught at the introductory level, and we are proposing that we limit courses in the general education component to the 1000-2000 level. We did that in the Spring 2012 course list; we only approved courses that were at the 1000-2000 level. The previous iteration of our general education curriculum had courses that were 3000-4000 level so we wanted to make sure this restriction was clear. We wish to keep these general education courses at the 1000-2000 level with a rationale of “truth in advertising”. If you are saying that a general education course is an introductory course that students can take in their first year, then somebody that sees a 4000-level course on a transcript may be expecting a more advanced course that has a few prerequisites. Keeping these courses at the 1000-2000 level more accurately reflects the content that should be presented in these courses

The list of general education courses must include any course in our Ohio Transfer Module or OTM. I forgot to mention this, but the Ohio Transfer Module is a set of courses that can be transferred as a full set. Once a student completes the 36-credit hour Ohio Transfer Module sequence at their university, then they automatically get credit for the same number of general education credit hours at the university they transferred to even if those courses do not have a direct equivalent with an Ohio Transfer Module course here at The University of Toledo. Once you complete this whole module of courses, you are guaranteed to get the same number of general education hours at the university you are transferred to. So this is something set up by the Ohio Board of Regents to facilitate transfer of students between universities in Ohio.

Senator Barnes: What does it mean to complete a set?

Senator Molitor: There are a certain number of hours you take and I believe it’s 36 credit hrs.

Senator Barnes: So they don’t transfer if they don’t complete the set?

Senator Molitor: I believe you have to actually complete the whole set. Senator Edwards, do you have the answer to that?

Senator Barnes: So, it’s sort of like you have to stay until you complete the set?

Senator Edwards: No, they will transfer equivalent. Let’s say a humanities course, it will transfer as a humanities transfer.

Dr. Peseckis: My understanding is that you have to complete all of them in order for them to be a unit. Sometimes if they don’t do well in certain courses they won’t be accepted at certain universities, but if they complete the module and they don’t do well then perhaps they will be accepted.

Senator Molitor: My understanding is that they are completed as a module. If you look at a student’s transcript here at the university it will say at some point on it that the Ohio Transfer Module has been completed. I think that’s the “flag” that then tells another university that they have completed this whole module of courses and the whole set transfers. That is my understanding, but I am not positive on it.

Senator Humphrys: Just one other thing related to that. That’s not to say if you take one humanities course and two social sciences courses at UT and then you go to Kent, they won’t accept those particular courses, but if you want to receive credit for the transfer module, you had to have completed the whole

transfer module. That helps you to satisfy all their requirements for general education. But if you have only taken a course here and there it doesn't mean that those courses won't be accepted to transfer; it's just that you won't come in having completed them all.

Senator Barnes: They might and they might not?

Senator Humphrys: Yes.

Senator Barnes: Thank you.

Senator Lundquist: My question is about OTM, do we have a module of courses?

Senator Molitor: That is correct. We have a list of courses approved by the state to be included in our Ohio Transfer Module. It is not the same as Bowling Green's.

Senator Lundquist: It is not?

Senator Molitor: No, but there's a lot of overlap.

Senator Lundquist: It is not dictated by the state?

Senator Molitor: We submit courses to the state and then the state tells us "That can be in your OTM" or "That cannot be in your OTM."

Senator Lundquist: They are not saying, "You must have a course like this?"

Senator Humphrys: No.

Senator Lundquist: So we are the ones who decide?

Senator Molitor: Right.

Senator Unknown: [*indecipherable*]

Senator Molitor: Our general education has to include every course that is in our Ohio Transfer Module but we can have additional courses on top of it. It doesn't mean that every course in the general education component has to be an OTM course. It just means that the collective group of OTM courses has to be included in your general education component and you can have additional courses on top of that. There has been some debate as to whether you can have a course that is required for a degree program in general education. If it's something of broad interest, shouldn't it apply to every degree program? But we are saying that our general education component can have courses that serve as degree program requirements or as Transfer Assurance Guide courses that actually have specific requirements. TAGs are courses that are an exact copy. So, if you take them at The University of Toledo you have them at The University of Akron or Bowling Green or any other university in the state of Ohio.

In terms of our proposal, we were looking at all these problems we had and made the observation that our previous general education curriculum did not have any problems. And what I mean by "previous" is our general education curriculum that was in place before Spring 2011. What we decided to do as a committee at least as the first draft is to retain our previous general education curriculum. We retained

the pre-2011 purpose and goals as outlined in the first section of the proposal. And then we decided what to do in terms of the full list of general education courses. To meet these requirements, particularly to make sure we encompass that full set of Ohio Transfer Module courses; we wanted to combine any course that was in our pre-Spring 2011 general education curriculum and it would automatically be grandfathered into this current version that you are seeing in front of you now. We also propose to retain any additional course that was submitted for approval during Spring 2012. When we put those two sets of courses together, we encompass almost every course that is in our Ohio Transfer Module. I think there's only a total of three courses that did not fall into either one of those groups so we will also include them as well.

There are a number of courses, I think about ten or eleven, that are at the 3000 or 4000 level. And rather than removing them from the general education what we'll do is to go back to the departments and ask you to re-number these courses to 1000-2000 level if these are truly general education courses. We will allow you to make this decision as to whether it is appropriate or not to your particular courses. We will also ask the Provost to make sure that every course that is in our approved set of general education courses appears on the course registration system as a general education course. This is very important because our advisors will not enroll students in general education courses unless they are marked on the system as being general education courses. So if the Faculty Senate approves this proposal, we are going to provide the Provost an updated list of approved courses and say these are the courses that need to be encoded on our system as general education.

We will still have to assess student learning outcomes in these general education courses. But what we are now saying is that the set of core competencies that were approved during Spring 2011 are not required. There are courses out there that have started assessment processes using these core competencies, and we want you to continue doing it if you feel it's appropriate. However, there are a number of courses that need to have specific student learning outcomes that may not necessarily coincide or align with those core competencies and we want to give departments the freedom to make sure that they have the appropriate student learning outcomes for their courses. And then it should be up to the Faculty Senate to decide if those student learning outcomes are appropriate for a general education course. We should not be restrictive to make every course follow a set of student learning outcomes from a one-size-fits-all set of pre-defined core competencies. We should make sure the departments have the freedom to specify those student learning outcomes and again, Faculty Senate can decide if these are appropriate or not for the general education.

Finally, on this proposal that you have there is a list of proposed courses for the general education curriculum. We already identified a few discrepancies on there and we are going to keep updating and modifying it to insure that you have the correct list of courses prior to final approval. If you review this list and find out that course doesn't exist anymore or if there's a course that should be on there, please let myself or Senator Humphrys know. We are going to take your comments and feedback, and what we are hoping to do is to come back at one of the first meetings during Spring 2014 and gather some of your additional feedback on this proposal and hopefully vote to approve it not long after that. I think that is it.

Senator Edwards: What happens with the multicultural courses that are pre-existing now as gen ed. courses?

Senator Molitor: All of those courses that have been marked as gen ed. will remain gen ed. except for the ones that are 3000 and 4000 which will remain gen ed., but we will ask departments to number them at a lower course level.

Senator Edwards: What if there are other program requirements that don't involve...?

Senator Molitor: Then I think we will have to consider that on a case-by-case basis. Again, the Core Curriculum Committee does not want to exclude any course without knowing why.

Senator Gilbert: *[Indecipherable]*

Senator Humphrys: That is true for 2012.

Senator Gilbert: That list included some multicultural courses?

Senator Molitor: Yes.

Senator Gilbert: That was a gen ed. list?

Senator Molitor: Yes. We are basically taking two gen ed. lists and combining them into one. We are not excluding anything at this point.

Senator Gilbert: *[Indecipherable]*

Senator Molitor: I do not have the answer to that question; that information is in the Provost's Office.

Senator Humphrys: Just kind of as a summary because I think it is a little easier for us to understand because we've been involved in this for some time. What this boils down to is that there is no change in General Education requirements; you'll still need two humanities, two social sciences etc., so none of that changes. Also, nothing changes as far as the courses you can take for the multicultural classes. So, those are all the same if you had a multicultural class two years ago, it's still in the group. Senator Edwards, from your question, any course that you can double-dip, for example, you can still double-dip. We went from something that was very complicated a year ago that just didn't seem to pan-out to something that will definitely benefit the students and will basically go back to the system that we had in place. That has actually never changed because the Spring 2012 courses were never coded.

Group of Senators: Thank you so much!

[Applause]

President Rouillard: I am very appreciative of you making it and very appreciative of your committee work. I would also like to add that I am appreciative of Senator Edwards who also contributed to these conversations and was a tremendous resource. Were there any other comments? Thank you both.

I assume if people have comments that they would like to forward to you by email that you would welcome those.

Senator Molitor: Sure or they can send it to Quinetta and she can forward them to us.

President Rouillard: Thank you very much. Also, now I would like to introduce you to Mr. Dave Morlock who is our new Senior VP for Finance and has a financial picture too. Welcome.

Mr. Morlock: Hello everybody. A couple of things before I get started, the broad point of this discussion is to give an overall view of the financial picture of The University of Toledo and then start to tie it to fiscal year 2015 budget planning process. I do know there are a couple of slides in here that are going to basically work like an eye chart. I apologize; I will get this slide-deck sent to whoever I need to send it to. I apologize for not getting it to you in advance. I try to be conversational so if you have a question please raise your hand and ask and we can deal with it, alright? My style is not to just read slides to everybody so this is just a few bullet points talking about the broad environment of higher ed. I don't think there's any news in this slide. There's a lot of external pressure about price. This is a picture of the percentage of the academic revenue of the university that comes from state share of instruction (SSI). During the last few years it's gone down from one-third to roughly one-quarter of our revenue. If you drew this picture back to the early to mid-90's you would see that only about half of our revenue came from the state. I don't think "screaming in the dark" is going to turn this picture around. This is a reality that we have to deal with collectively. A view on how we are doing financially: There is an organization called Moody's, that is a bond-rating organization. There are a couple of other ones with the same story. What they do is rate the financial risk of organizations that sell bonds in the bond department. Universities sell bonds, hospitals, for-profit corporations etc. These bond-raters rate all of those types of organizations. On the one side of the graph is triple A and that is the best kind of rating. On the other side are worse bond ratings. This picture is all 212 public universities in this country that are rated by Moody's. It is not quite the normal distribution, but it's not "bad." The University of Toledo is in the A1 category and that is the tallest bar. My take of that is not great, but not a financial disaster either.

Senator Gilbert: Has UT been A1 consistently?

Mr. Morlock: The last couple of years we have been A1. Higher education is under a little bit of a fire right now as you know so the industry is riskier than it used to be so Moody's not only rates individual credits within the industry but they make commentary on the entire industry. So higher education is on the negative outlook right now because we are at the beginning stages of diffraction. We are in the higher education business and also health care, and health care is also risky, but they are further down the disruption curve and they hit it a few years ago.

(Disk change) Literally means we do not collect another nickel of tuition, patient care revenue, grant money, or state money etc., how long can we go paying our payroll and paying our bills before we run out of money? It's that simple. We are at about 109 days. This is actual data: '11, '12, and '13. I didn't use any budget stuff; I just used what actually happened for the last three fiscal years. The three comparison categories are the median of the A1 category that we are rated. Regional does not mean Ohio, it means regional universities like The University of Toledo. So "Eastern New Mexico," if there is an Eastern New Mexico, I do not know, but if there was, they would be in the regional, and then national has all 212. To me, the broad takeaway is we might be a little light on cash, but we are not bad. So, we are not rich, but we are not broke. This is a look at the debt. Debt, we call that financial leverage. Debt is a percentage of our capital structure so let me try to relate it to a mortgage at home. The capital structure is the amount of long-term debt that we have, the size of our mortgage over the mortgage, plus the equity that we have in the "house" (the equity in the university). Another way of looking at it: it is everything we own minus

everything we owe is the net assets. We are in the mid-20's and as you can see in the picture, that looks like the right amount of debt relative to the university. So, we are not in "hot" up to our eyeballs, but we also do not have enough of un-tapped borrowing capacity. Down at the bottom, lower numbers are general better, but you can get too low when you are not taking advantage of using other people's money which is what financial leverage is. This is a view of a couple of the drivers of our financial revenue. The top picture is a live graph over the last four years of the net tuition and fee revenue per FTE student. So it's been going up almost 5% per year. That's an all-in-one look: grad students, undergrad, tuition, and fees etc. The bottom is a picture of enrollment and it has been going down to about 2.25 over the last four years.

Senator Relue: Can I ask a question about the panel?

Mr. Morlock: Yes.

Senator Relue: I was under the impression that we've been advertising that we are not changing our tuition, so how are we up?

Group of Senators: It's the fees.

Mr. Morlock: Yes, it's the fees.

Senator Relue: What about scholarships?

Mr. Morlock: Well, we've been scholarshiping quite a bit as well. But it's primarily fees and grants. So the no-tuition increase is an undergrad view and not a grad school view. We were raising graduate tuition and that's in there and fees are in there and these are all net of scholarshiping and those types of things. In that four-year period I don't believe we froze undergrad tuition rates flat for four years.

Past-President Dowd: Mr. Morlock, is that adjusted for inflation?

Mr. Morlock: No, that's not adjusted for inflation. To me the broad story here is the state money has been going down as I showed you a few pages ago and enrollment is dropping; part of the way we've been carrying this is on the backs of the students that we've got. This is a view of financial operating performances: Another way to think about this is what the annual budget is involved in and forming. So the left-hand picture is the operating margin which is the bottom margin of the university as a percentage of the revenue. The first three bars are actual data and we made about 3% and 3.25% in 2011. It dropped to about 1% and 3.25% in 2012. We actually lost money the way an accountant would calculate it in fiscal year 2013. The right-hand side is operating cash flow margin. So this is where we get into that additional finance "yahoo" stuff. The difference between the operating margin and the operating cash flow is an expense item called depreciation. What depreciation serves to do is, take when we buy an asset we spread the cost of that asset out over the life of the asset. So this is not The University of Toledo's "black-magic voodoo accounting," this is just standard generally accepted accounting principle that we apply. An example that I can give you is if we buy a computer system that we expect to use for ten years. We'll spend \$1 million on this computer system, then each year for ten years we expense \$100,000 of that. The cash goes out the door the first year, but the expenses in the calculation of the operation margin goes out \$100,000 per year till it reaches ten years. We call that a non-cash expense, that \$100,000. So, in the operating cash flow margin we take the picture on the left and then we add back the non-cash expense

to say, what's the cash-flow that we actually generated for the year? So in fiscal 2013 it is actually a positive number. We lost money the way an accountant would look at it for fiscal 2013, but we generated a positive cash flow. In my view, that is still not enough cash-flow for the future because you have to eventually reinvest in IT, buildings, and equipment etc. You have to do more than just break even on the cash-flow. I am fairly new here, but I've been told that this whole depreciation concept that we complicated the discussion more than necessary over the last couple of years, so I hope this helps. So, the next view is reinvesting in our infrastructure. This is capital spending as a percentage of depreciation. In my example before, capital spending is when you write that \$1 million check for that computer system, that is capital spending or you build a new building. So this shows us over the last couple of years about 150% depreciation and you will see that falls in line with the compares categories.

Senator Molitor: I'm sorry, just a quick question. If you are talking about building new buildings let's say, aren't you then creating more assets that will then increase the cost of depreciation?

Mr. Morlock: Yes, depreciation will go up. As old assets are fully depreciated they will fall off the books as well so it doesn't just go on forever. But generally speaking, if you spend capital at a pace greater than 100% of depreciation then your depreciation expense will continue to go up over time. Somebody asked me the question about all of those universities and the positive of the rating scale. Remember, I talked about the big endowment and the big drop? The other big distinction of those organizations from people in the middle path is the spending which is the reinvesting in yourselves. Before I came to The University of Toledo part of my career was to stop in Ann Arbor so I was with them for about 20 years. This picture with U of M will be closer to 200% and debt 150%.

Past-President Dowd: Can you make the analogy then that while The University of Toledo is reinvesting in itself through building new buildings it should also be reinvesting in itself through the hiring of new tenure track faculty? I am not being flippant with that question. Isn't the reinvestment in faculty just as necessary?

Mr. Morlock: All of those tenure-track faculty are still here and they are what creates the university. I agree.

Past-President Dowd: That is part of the issue. It is rather easy to talk about this in financial terms – when talking about building and new computers – but the notion of hiring faculty as an investment I believe should be part of the dialogue.

Mr. Morlock: I totally agree with you and when I get to slide 24 I actually have that as part of my presentation.

Senator Unknown: I guess along the same lines I would say, doesn't it depend on what you are investing in the capital that you are purchasing? I mean if you are building a bunch of dorms and you expect undergraduate enrollment to go down, then that is not necessarily a good investment.

Mr. Morlock: Absolutely. That is an excellent point that you are helping me make here and that is that these are all just calculations, right? First, there is a qualitative story that goes behind every one of these quantitative calculations and stories. Secondly, no one of these metrics can be homed-in on to say "we are doing great" or "oh my gosh, we are doing terrible" and that is the gestalt across all of the metrics as well

as the qualitative story behind the metrics that really speaks to the financial condition of the university. That's a great point. Thank you for raising it.

There are four sources of money for us to engage in this capital spending. One of those is producing cash-flow which is the previous page. Second is dipping into money in the bank. So you make that gauge "cash on hand" go down. Third is you just borrow more money so that debt as a percentage of capital structure goes up. Interestingly enough, if you spend all your money down or you borrow too much money people stop loaning you money, so eventually that doesn't work. And then the fourth is making a ..., I mean, go get some donors who will provide money for a cap.

Senator Giovannucci: What about one-time capital investments from the state? I thought our new buildings were from those sorts of things. What comes from the state and capital spends, will that be treated differently in terms of depreciation?

Mr. Morlock: Well, it is not treated differently in terms of depreciation. The capital spending of the state money is built into this picture. There's an increase between 2011-2012 and it went nearly flat in 2013. Even though I showed profitability, picture it going down from 2011, 2012, and 2013. The drivers of the capital spend is a percentage of depreciation. In 2012 and 2013 it is actually some bond debt related to the hospital and some spending in the hospital. So back to your specific question, we are anticipating that the next capital allocation from the state till the fiscal years 2015 and 2016 will be \$22 million. So, I am 10% off either way. So \$20 million to \$24 million and the money from the state is only academic enterprise so that can't go to the hospital and the depreciation in the academic enterprise is annually about \$40 billion? (or million? please check). Alright, so you cut that \$20 million in half and you get \$10 million per year over...so about 25% of that depreciation is state...That state capital appropriation is also doing this over time. Like I said, I came from the state of Michigan and there is no state capital appropriation for the state's schools in Michigan so I was surprised when I got down here when I saw this.

Alright, the next few slides speak to some trends in FTE's, the hospital, and athletics. Since I've been here I've been going around trying to meet deans, faculty, students etc. One of the stories that I've heard people say is the reason we have a budget strain is due to too many empty suits like you, Mr. Morlock, running around, that's the problem, administrators. There's the fact that we have a hospital that is losing money all over the place or we are in D1 athletics and if we just stop doing that then the budget will be fine. So the next few slides I tried to provide to data around those discussion points. This is a summary page for the next two pages that are the eye chart. It has the detail...so this is a look at administrators over the last three years and faculty over the last three years. So you can see it is down over the last three years as a percentage...faculty is down in a little higher percentage than administrators. This is the administrator detail. This 78% FTE is the 78% of the 80% from the previous slide. So this breaks it down into categories like the President's Office, Government Relations, and facilities. We have Provost Scarborough's office, Chancellor Gold's office, deans, chairs, associate deans, and associate chairs etc. Now, we have reorganized a bit over the last few years. We organized and we reorganized again etc. and we tried to make an apples-to-apples look across here. So, if you raise your hand right now and say, Mr. Morlock, who are the 37 people in Research and Sponsored Programs? I will not be able to tell you off the top of my head.

Senator Unknown: So the deans and the chairs are not part of the provost's area? So the 238 are not from the deans, chairs, and associate deans column?

Mr. Morlock: Right.

President Rouillard: I was struck by the fact that we have more administrator types than faculty types.

Mr. Morlock: The faculty slide is a new slide since you last saw it.

Past-President Dowd: Does your classification of “administrators” include just the individual administrators or does it include both administrators and their staff?

Mr. Morlock: It’s got secretaries and stuff in there as well. To the extent that it has grad students working for administrators I don’t think it includes grad students.

Senator Krantz: Where is faculty in there, like the department chairs?

Mr. Morlock: They are administrators in this picture. This is the faculty page, so the negative 87 is faculty and then you see the breakdown of instructors, lecturers, visiting faculty, and tenure and tenure-track.

Past-President Dowd: What is the explanation for the large decline in the number of AAUP faculty relative to the non-AAUP faculty?

Mr. Morlock: I am not sure what the answer to that is. My view is you may be over-reading into that. So the non-AAUP faculty in this case I think it includes Law School and Med School. There are just a couple colleges where the faculty aren’t in the union.

President Rouillard: It is so interesting that you have about 600 faculty in everything, but two colleges. And in the two colleges you have 383 faculty.

Mr. Morlock: Vice Provost Barrett, do you know if it’s just Law School or Medical Colleges that are not in AAUP?

Vice Provost Barrett: Your data is probably old because Nursing isn’t in there. I am not sure how you are getting the 383.

Mr. Morlock: I’ll just get the details for you, how is that?

Senator Molitor: Clinicians at the hospital count as faculty and not AAUP because they normally have faculty appointments.

Mr. Morlock: You guys, I will just get the data for you.

Senator Lundquist: Do we have faculty that can be in the non-AAUP category?

Mr. Morlock: No.

Senator Templin: What does FTE mean? In the sense that we have the president, we gained a person which is the vice president and that vice president can make several hundred thousand dollars a year, but we lost eight people in facilities, but those might be people going to grad school, right? Do those FTEs mean like an amount of cash or is it 40-hr. work weeks?

Mr. Morlock: That literally means full-time employees in...account and not in dollar amount. When we presented this at University Council a couple of weeks ago the same question came up and we are gathering the data to share...the pictures, the dollars goes down as well. We are gathering the data and distributing. The total goes down, but I don't have the breakdown of the data. So, President Rouillard will get it at University Council in a couple of weeks and she can bring it here. Can I keep going because I will never get to that investment in tenure-track faculty if you don't let me get to slide 24?

Group of Senators: Yes.

Mr. Morlock: This is the income statement of the hospital for the last three years. So, in round numbers they average about \$3 million, bottom-line income and about \$10 million is transferred to the School of Medicine and it relates to support for graduate medical education revenue that physicians drive as well as income support, the kind as to building their practices.

Senator Federman: Does that represent the GME payment or does that represent other things such as salary?

Mr. Morlock: The GME, Graduate Medical Payment and that is actually in the revenue here so the cost of driving that revenue...is actually going by the school, so a portion of that payment supports that expense.

President Rouillard: Mr. Morlock, in the line that says "salaries and benefits," does that line include salaries for physicians?

Mr. Morlock: It will include salaries for physicians if those physicians are filling specific employment roles for the hospital. For example, Dr. Sirio is a faculty member and he is also the Chief Medical Information Officer of the hospital and I think a slice of his salary is in "salaries and benefits" for the hospital and he's got some on the books for Med School.

President Rouillard: But, you are single faculty and you are faculty plan and your salary is being paid out of the academic enterprise.

Mr. Morlock: It's also being paid out of the revenue it generated from the practice plan. This is not the practice plan, this is the hospitals. So that revenue that's generating physician fees is not reflected here or the salaries are not reflected here either.

President Rouillard: But the salaries are being paid by the academic enterprise?

Mr. Morlock: The salaries are being paid by the mix of the academic enterprise like the Medical School and the physician practice itself.

President Rouillard: But all of that is on the other side of the house.

Mr. Morlock: Right, that is not in that picture.

President Rouillard: That is a significant distinction which we have not heard before, so I appreciate you making that distinction.

Senator Federman: Part of that switch had to do with the development of the self-insurance plan then linked the practice-plan to the university.

President Rouillard: That UT capital has been in existence quite a few years. What change required the UT physicians to be brought over to the whole UT institution?

Mr. Morlock: I don't know the answer, but maybe I can follow up.

President Rouillard: Okay.

Mr. Morlock: The next slide is athletics. So it is an all-in-one view of athletics; all-in-one view meaning there is a general fee that the students pay and then a big chunk of that goes to athletics and it is voted on by students to go to athletics and so I got that up in revenue. It loses in round numbers about \$1 million a year reasonably consistently. If we were Division II instead of Division I we would still be probably losing some money in athletics. We could spend the rest of our time arguing the value of athletics, but I'd rather not spend that time, I just wanted to share the data with you. To me inclusion of this is that the fundamental cause of our financial strain is driven by the enrollment picture going up and the state money going like this, so it is in the core business of delivering higher ed. It is not all driven by peripheral things like athletics and that type of thing, so we've got to deal with this over the next few years or I try to politely say, it can be "poor stewardship on our part," but it will probably be even worse.

The budget process: The first place that we are starting in the fiscal 2015 budget process with the budget discussion in this month in December is all the administrators. So if you flip back to the detail when you get the email that laid out the cuts in administrator areas, it is not evenly distributed across all the administrator areas and so we are going to dive deeply into that before we start looking at what's going on in the colleges. I want to make sure we bring the administrator areas to the extent we can before we start the discussion around the colleges. This is a set of assumptions that are in the budget column, alright? So I've got another 2% decrease in enrollment built in. 2.5% increase in undergrad and tuition fees, grad and tuition fees are flat. We are pretty expensive in the grad area. Then I've got 2% of average salary increase built-in for all employees, right? So tenure faculty all the way down to graduate students -- that's in that 2%. I've got suggested graph in the title of the slide that's two... I said it is not a promise and it is not a negotiated... but I have to have a negotiated assumption so I can do the model for fiscal year 2015. Please take that for what it is. I can tell you that my friends in University Hall had "heartburn" when I said I was going to put this in the slide and they were like, "what" but you have to have a budget line. People have asked me, what is a 1% of change in salary worth or what is a 1% change in enrollment worth? This is just a set of those data that you "chew" on at night when you can't sleep and it can help you frame some of these issues. The projected budget shortfall for 2015- I am showing the revenue minus the cash operating expenses being about \$8 million short in fiscal 2015 right now. On top of that we've got \$40 million in depreciation, so I think we need to try to cover and get ourselves to a spot where we are funding all that depreciation. Eventually, the plan I want to put in place is a four-year... so I am suggesting that we cover the \$8 million cash shortfall and then \$10 million of that \$40 million in depreciation so we will have an improvement target of \$18 million for fiscal year 2015. Like I said, the first place we are going to dive into is the administrator areas and then the discussion with the chancellor and provost. This slide in an impact on enrollment, so whenever I show in my modeling a 2% in enrollment and then I show the \$18 million target, if we have a 1% in enrollment rather than a 2% reduction in enrollment, then the target gets better and you can see the picture all the way down to zero.

So, the point that I am trying to make here is that when I talk about enrollment, this is not just brand new students coming in direct from high school or adult ed. or something like that, it's retention too. I think that you all can have some impact around retention to the extent that faculty can help with retention. There's a direct link to...and that is really the message that I am trying to tell.

Remember a couple of slides ago I pointed out my caveats, so let me point out my caveats here. In the title, Draft...have four...but I apologize that we are running out of time, but I wanted to generate discussion around this. I am suggesting a notion like this, if we, faculty, engage in the production and creation of online classes and the teaching of online classes etc. I am suggesting that half of the net tuition (tuition minus the scholarshiping of that class) flow back to the colleges/departments. This is a way to incentivize folks to participate in these endeavors that we think can ultimately increase and drive enrollment up. Let's go back to the picture, how do we make enrollment go up because people are not moving from Phoenix and Las Vegas to Toledo, right? They are moving from Toledo to Phoenix and Las Vegas so we are not going to rely on that, so we are suffering and Bowling Green is suffering, all the schools of Northwest Ohio are, to the extent we can drive some of these other ways of increasing enrollment, and I'm trying to figure out incentives to give money back to the colleges and departments. Increasing of direct cost and recovery: I know this is real tight which is primarily three colleges, but to the extent that we can increase federal money for research that comes in. They include dollars to cover indirect costs, etc. There's a formula now that the central administration contains...and some goes to the colleges. I am proposing generating more to the colleges for incremental research dollars.

Past-President Dowd: I think this is a great idea. Has there been a conversation with the provost or chancellor about this suggestion?

Mr. Morlock: Yes. What you think, I just came up with this?

Past-President Dowd: Well, you never know around here. That said, I suppose a certain percent goes back to administration?

Mr. Morlock: Right.

Past-President Dowd: What were their thoughts about this suggestion?

Mr. Morlock: My proposal for external funding is to flip it upside down so 30% goes centrally and 70% goes to the college.

Past-President Dowd: Wow.

Mr. Morlock: I rolled this out to President Jacobs, Chancellor Gold, and Provost Scarborough last Wednesday in sort of a half-day budget summit and President Jacobs was super enthusiastic and Chancellor Gold and Provost Scarborough were enthusiastic around the notion of we've got to do something to turn around the enrollment picture. When I say the structure issue of state money doing "that" and enrollment money doing "that" is a BIG problem, that's a BIG problem. We've got to turn enrollment around. They are okay with it and they know I am presenting this today.

The value around tech transfer royalties and intellectual property, that is something that we think ought to be retained by...colleges, the faculty. Dr. Dowd, the caveat that I would hang onto: this is if we can create jobs that stay in Northwest Ohio.

So, the next one is, what are the other incentives? The last one is the issue of carry-forwards that we struck from the budget a couple years ago. I've never been..., but it seems to make a lot of sense to me why the deans wanted some of this carry-forward stuff, so we will put it back in for at least some of these designated funds, it just make a lot of sense.

Senator Molitor: Does the designated funds include any direct costs?

Mr. Morlock: I am sorry; I didn't understand your question.

Senator Molitor: Indirect cost returns, we can save them for future use and not have to spend them completely during the current fiscal year?

Mr. Morlock: Yes. Anything else? So, I don't know the Collective Bargaining Agreement, but there are ideas like, you always taught 30 people in this section and we will give you more money to just teach 40 people in this section. I don't know, but somebody floated that by me and I said I don't know if that's a bargaining thing.

President Rouillard: It hasn't been traditionally bargained for, it's simply been mandated.

Mr. Morlock: Okay.

Past-President Dowd: This would provide the incentive to department chairs to perhaps modify the department's schedule that not only satisfies what you are looking for, but also taking care from the interest of their own department. It will provide flexibility and benefits on to better scheduling.

Mr. Morlock: Like I said, I am in the system and if you have ideas please send me emails and call me.

The last page is the budget calendar:

December 2013	Set Overall Financial Target Budget Instructions and Training Sessions Administrative Budget Discussions Graduate School Budget Discussions
Jan/Feb 2014	General Fee Committee Discussions
Jan 27-Feb7, 2014	Preliminary Budget Discussions
Feb 10-28, 2014	Final Budget Discussions
Mar 3-7, 2014	Budget Deliberations
Mar 10-21, 2014	Budget Compilation
Mar 14, 2014	University Council Finance & Strategy Subcommittee Review

Mr. Morlock: Is that all?

Senator Regimbal: Are you familiar with the Blue Book?

Mr. Morlock: The things I know about the Blue Book are the things I've heard.

Senator Regimbal: It is a very large document and in it you can see what salaries are general for the department I may be interviewing for (if I'm interviewing). It is a helpful document I think and it's gone away. We are told that the budget is open for anyone to review, but you just have to know all the code numbers to find those things.

Mr. Morlock: That is one of the things I want to tackle. You are not the first person I've heard mention it. I've heard of the Blue Book which is the general issue of "where do I go to get data around the management of my college, department, etc."

Past-President Dowd: My compliments to Senator Regimbal on this issue. I may not get the year right, but the most requested book in the library since 1958 was the Blue Book up until three years ago when they just stopped producing it. It was a document that the people from the Toledo community, not just faculty, could come and ask for from our library. Because this information has disappeared there are people in the community that have wondered what's going on here in regard to our financials.

Mr. Morlock: Okay. Thank you.

President Rouillard: Thank you very much. May I have a motion to adjourn?
Meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

IV. Meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted by:
Lucy Duhon
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape Summary: Quinetta Hubbard
Faculty Senate Administrative Secretary

