

**THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO**  
**Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of February 16, 2016**  
**FACULTY SENATE**

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

Approved @FS on 3/15/2016

---

**Summary of Senate Business**

Budget Stabilization  
Libraries Reorganization  
Master Plan Report  
Governor's Task force on Affordability and Efficiency

---

**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 Keith:** I call this meeting to order. Welcome to the twelfth Faculty Senate meeting of AY 2015-2016. **Lucy Duhon**, Executive Secretary, called the roll.

**I. Roll Call: 2015-2016 Senators:**

**Present:** Anderson-Huang, Barnes, Black, Burnett, Cappelletty, Denyer, Devabhaktuni, Dowd, Duhon, Elmer, Fitzgerald (substitute for D. Compora), Franchetti, Gruden, Gunning, Harmych, Hasaan-Elnaby, Humphrys, Keith, Kennedy, Kistner, Kovach, Krantz, Lee, Lundquist, McAfee, McLoughlin, Molitor, Monsos, Nathan, Nigem, Oberlander, Ohlinger, Randolph, Regimbal(substitute for M. Edwards), Schneider (substitute for M. Caruso), Sheldon, Skeel, Slantcheva-Durst, Smas, Srinivasan, A. Thompson, Weck-Schwarz, White, Williams, Wittmer

**Excused absences:** Brickman, Duggan, Elmer, Gibbs (substitute for A. Jorgensen), Gray, Hoblet, Schafer, G. Thompson, Thompson-Casado, Wedding

**Unexcused absences:** Farrell, Federman, Giovannucci, Malhotra, Mohammed, Prior, Quinn, Rouillard, Skeel, Willey

**II. Approval of Minutes:** Faculty Senate meeting Minutes of January 19, 2016 are ready for approval.

Academic Year 2015-2016. I ask that Executive Secretary, Lucy Duhon come to the podium to call the roll.

**President Keith:** Your Executive Committee has been busy since the last Senate meeting. Aside from our usual meetings, we met with the President and participated in her advisory council. We also attended the Provost's staff meetings and the BOT's Clinical Affairs and full

Board meetings. The primary topic of discussion at most of these events was the current year's budget shortfall, and the need to stabilize future budgets starting with a cut in next year's budget. The consensus is that President Gaber does not want to do budget cuts. However, if she doesn't start to act now, we will be chipping away at our structural deficit for years, even if enrollment increases.

I mentioned in my last report that the EC was scheduled to talk with Dr. Gaber about the University's budget. Rather than describing that discussion in this report, the FSEC believes it is an important enough topic that it should be a standalone agenda item. We had hoped that part of our presentation on that conversation would include the assumptions that will be part of this year's budget process. However, we cannot include them at the time because the Office of Finance is still in the process of active scenario building. I along with President-Elect Humphrys and Senator Dowd will meet with Dr. Lawrence Kelley, Interim V.P. for Finance, this Thursday, February 18<sup>th</sup>. We will be briefed on this year's budget process and the assumptions that will be used to build the budget. We will share with you those assumptions at our March 1<sup>st</sup> Senate meeting. We will ask for your comments and questions, which we will take back to V.P. Kelley. Someone from the Finance office will attend our March 15<sup>th</sup> meeting to answer those questions and address your concerns.

Consistent with the new emphasis on shared governance, the FSEC has been meeting with each Provost candidate, and we will be meeting with the Title IX Coordinator candidate. Two of the Provost candidates have been to UT and two are scheduled to be here this week. Dr. Donald Siegel, Dean of the School of Business at the University of Albany, will be here on Wednesday, February 17<sup>th</sup>. Dr. Charles Robinson, Vice Chancellor of Diversity and Community at the University of Arkansas will be here on Thursday, February 18<sup>th</sup>. The Provost's website contains information about the candidates' public forums including the archived videos of the two candidates who were here last week in case you were not able to attend in person. There is also a link to a feedback form for each candidate, or if you prefer, you can send me your feedback. Regardless of how you provide it, please do so before Friday, February 19<sup>th</sup>. That morning the Provost Search committee is meeting to prepare a list of strengths and weaknesses of each candidate to present to the President.

At yesterday's BOT meeting, President Gaber announced that as of March 1, 2016, the Title IX coordinator will be housed in the Department of Internal Audit and Compliance, which also houses the Clery Act and the ADA compliance officers. No one has been hired yet as that search is still in progress. Donald D. Kamm, a candidate for the Title IX coordinator position, will be at an open forum Friday, Feb. 19<sup>th</sup>, from 4 to 5 p.m. in Health Education Building Room 105 on Health Science Campus. He is currently the associate director of the Office for Access and Equity and Title IX coordinator at the University of Illinois at Chicago, and today's *UT News* article contains a link to his resume.

Another issue we've been involved in is working with the Center for Teaching and the President's Council on Diversity to create workshops on tenure and promotion. The current plan is to have two workshops – one on each campus – this year for anyone who is currently in a pre-tenure position. These workshops will be in late April and will include a panel and working groups. The panel will consist of individuals representing AAUP, UCAP, the departmental chairs and someone who was recently tenured. We'd like the working groups to be college-specific and include a CCAP member along with sample dossiers. If you would like to volunteer your time, your dossier, or have any thoughts on this, please let me know. It's important that Faculty Senate take a leadership role in this project, which we can only do with your help.

I've been asked to update you on where we are with the University's diversity plan. There have been eight focus groups involving over 300 participants. Since not everyone who wanted to participate in one of the forums could, Dr. McKether is developing a campus-wide survey that is scheduled to be released next week. It will take approximately 15 minutes to complete.

In addition, the University has been asking members of the UT community for their thoughts on ways to ensure everyone is included on campus. There are three 1-minute videos that are being rolled out via Twitter to stimulate an ongoing conversation – February 11<sup>th</sup>, February 16<sup>th</sup> and February 19<sup>th</sup> are the release dates.

Finally, the President is encouraging all of us to think about ways to enhance diversity and inclusion within our programs, departments and colleges. Please share these ideas with your Chair, Dean, Provost, and, of course, the President.

As you can see we have a packed agenda for our meeting today. The first agenda item is an overview of the FSEC's discussion with President Gaber on budget stabilization. Following that, President Elect Humphrys will brief us on Faculty Senate's role in implementing the exceptions to the 126 hour maximum for a Baccalaureate degree that we passed at our last meeting. Following that we have reports from Undergraduate Curriculum, Core Curriculum and Undergraduate Programs.

As for our guests at our meeting today, we've invited Eric Prichard, President of the Graduate Student Association, and Kamruzzaman (Zaman) Kahn, Judge Coordinator to talk with us today about the 7th annual Midwest Graduate Research Symposium, and encourage us to volunteer to be judges. Interim Director of the University Libraries, Barb Floyd, is here to explain the libraries' reorganization process and the recommendations that will be given to President Gaber. After Interim Director Floyd's presentation, we will ask you to vote on a resolution that affirms the process.

The last two presentations are by Senators that the Executive Committee appointed to represent our interests on two University committees. First is a report by Senator Williams who is our

representative on the University's Master Plan Committee.

Next is a report on UT's response to issues raised by the Governor's Task Force on Affordability and Efficiency in Higher Education. Approximately a year ago, Governor Kasich signed an executive order that established the above-mentioned task force. The EO required presidents and members of the boards of trustees of state sponsored institutions of higher education to provide their perspectives, input and advice on a list of areas. Last summer, President Gaber formed a committee to come up with a list of action steps to reduce college costs. Senator Dowd is our representative on that committee and he will give us a report.

Are there any comments or reminders from the Executive Committee? I always promise that I have a short agenda and I still manage to fill up several pages <laughter>. Are there any questions from the senators?

**Senator McLoughlin:** Is there a date set for that tenure and promotion workshop?

**President Keith:** We looked at a calendar and thought we probably couldn't get anything organized before the end of April. We were hoping that perhaps the last week of classes we will reach out and find what time(s) people have available. Do you have an idea or suggestion?

**Senator McLoughlin:** No. I am just curious. I know new faculty in our department would be very interested in something like that.

**President Keith:** Okay. If you can send me their schedules or at least give me a sense of when they're available I can put that information into the process.

**Senator McLoughlin:** Thank you.

**Senator Anderson-Huang:** It might also be useful to specifically invite new chairs to this meeting as participants, as opposed to role models; they are going to need role models.

**President Keith:** As many faculty as we can get to show up I think it is wonderful, and that is a great idea.

**Senator A. Thompson:** This is just another suggestion; maybe you can tape it and have it available so that faculty who can't attend can revisit that.

**President Keith:** Great suggestion. We are taking ownership of this; I am so proud of us <laughter>.

**Senator White:** On a different topic. Diversity, I just wanted to make sure, it is very possible that I am the only person still stuck in the "dark ages" that I don't have Twitter, will those videos be available any other way?

**President Keith:** I was really hoping somebody would not ask me that <laughter>. I actually had to send Twitter my password question so I can actually go to my Twitter account, which I never go to. But I did not see the February 11<sup>th</sup> one on there so I can't answer that, but I will get back to you, I promise.

**Senator White:** Thank you.

**President Keith:** Are there any more questions or comments? Okay, then I would like to turn the floor over to President-Elect Humphrys.

**Senator Humphrys:** As President Keith mentioned, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee met with President Gaber specifically to talk about the budget. So what I am going to do is give a summary of the things that she brought up. Basically, we are starting the conversation for Faculty Senate to have a conversation about these items and share ideas that we might have. The first thing that Dr. Gaber mentioned to us is that in the past we had set budgets with assumptions about enrollment increases; and as it turns out from the people that we talked to who have spent time at other institutions, this is not the norm. So we had our own unique style for better, but probably worse - when you couple that with the five years of declining enrollment that we had, what would happen is, we would put together a budget assuming a 2% increase in enrollment, and then we would get a 2% decrease in enrollment and that would put us 4 percentage points off from what was budgeted. Knowing that tuition is such a large driving factor for our income, that put us in a deficit situation right from the start. Also, the budget for this year did not account for the change in plateau tuition. As we all remember, it used to be that 12-16 credit hours would be the same price, now that's changed to 12-18 credit hours- we used to get income for credit hours 17 and 18, but we don't get income any longer, so that added to the deficit. We used to give or have given some discounts for living on campus, and we all also know what the situation of privatization of one of our dorms did in terms of the decrease in the number of students that we receive dorm income from; that also played a role in the budget deficit. This is probably one that people don't think about that much, but Dr. Gaber reminded us of - in the past, colleges were allowed to say that instead of cutting our budget, we think we can increase our revenue. So what we will do is promise to increase our revenue through growing the program or whatever it may be - then what would happen is, they wouldn't grow the program and the corresponding revenue to the point that made up the difference of what they were asked to cut, so that put us further in the hole. The next item is what I labeled "imprudent scholarship offerings-" until we got involved with this this year I was really pretty much unaware of one of the most important budgetary things which is the scholarship offerings that we offer as an university. I believe we are committed to doing this through next year, is that correct?

**Senator Molitor:** Fall of 2016.

**Senator Humphrys:** Okay, Fall of 2016. We give "direct from high school" students the following scholarships; we call them merit scholarships, which is somewhat interesting when

you take a look at this. You can see: if you have a 16 as an ACT score, you get a merit scholarship. How much is dependent upon your grade point average from high school along with your ACT score. It's especially interesting when you look at the fact that a student who comes in, for example, with a 3.25 high school GPA and a 24 ACT score you will get the same amount of scholarship/merit grant as someone who has a 20 on the ACT. So it is a very interesting table. I am not and I don't think Dr. Gaber is or anyone on the Faculty Senate Executive Committee is suggesting that we shouldn't be giving out merit scholarships. However, it is just very much something that needs to be visited. It just shows that there are tuition discounts that are being given, and it does have an impact on our overall budgetary situation.

So, where are we currently? That is kind of what got us here. Where we are currently is we have a shortfall this fiscal year of about \$14 million. Obviously it causes an immediate budgetary issue. The administrators may not want to use actual numbers until things are finalized, so these aren't etched in stone, but there is going to be some sort of giveback this semester and it probably is going to be more than 1.5%. Dr. Gaber indicated that it would be a giveback from the operating budget, not really affecting personnel, but more of the operating budget. This is yet to be announced. Also, Dr. Gaber indicated that there would be a giveback of what I referenced earlier as the college revenue generating predictions. In other words, if a college said, don't cut our budget because we will be able to create some revenue by growing a particular program or however they had indicated they would do it, and they didn't reach their revenue generating predictions, then that would generate a bigger budgetary gap. They were then supposed to grow the difference and if they didn't, well then it added to the negatives in the budget. So, that brings us to the stabilization issue. Dr. Gaber mentioned several of the things that she has done and will look to do that she feels would at least help stabilize the budget, and not all of them will be pleasant. It is pretty much a given--again the numbers are not set in stone--but there will be a budget cut of 3% or probably more for the fiscal year 2017. Because if we continue to go down the same road and doing the same thing, we will never do away with the budget deficit we have. Apparently, we are kind of used to this, but there are institutions that don't have budget cuts and givebacks every year. President Gaber indicates that we are not going to include any enrollment increase projections in the budget planning for 2017, which means they won't predict some sort of increase and the tuition that comes along with that increase, so we won't experience the same issues that we have had for year after year. As you know, there's been an 8-month position hold and that actually has saved or brought back into the budget quite a bit of money. I think it's like \$1 million or something in that general vicinity.

**Senator Dowd:** I believe it was more than that.

**Senator Humphrys:** Is it more than that?

**Senator Williams:** It was \$1.5 million to \$3 million.

**Senator Humphrys:** I don't know. Provost Barrett, do you have any ideas on that? The other thing Dr. Gaber pointed out that she's doing is exploring alternative funding sources. We had an example of that at our last meeting with Andy Jorgensen, who is the Faculty Senate rep. to the parking committee. Although, the decision was made not to pursue it at this time, at least Dr. Gaber is looking for alternatives, maybe non-traditional funding and bringing in revenue. Also, if you recall, Dr. Gaber had talked about doing away with the stacking of institutional scholarships, so for people who have dependents who are getting tuition waivers, there was talk and President Keith brought that up several times in her Executive Report, that those dependents who were getting the tuition waiver would not be eligible for some of the other institutional scholarships like the one I showed you a minute ago, the merit scholarship. Dr. Gaber decided not to go in that direction. She is indicating that she is willing to look at various policies and unique ways to make up the budgetary deficits that we have and hopefully can avoid having in the future. So that brings to the general overall comments I will ask some of the other members, especially those who are on the Finance and Strategy Committee to add their comments, but in general, that is the overview of what Dr. Gaber had indicated to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. The thing that I think we all have to remember is Dr. Gaber didn't play any role in putting together this budget so she really inherited the budget situation that we're in right now. So we have to keep that in mind when we talk about options and things that are done, have been done, and should be done because she came in faced with this deficit.

The other thing I think I can speak on behalf of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and maybe other Senators here is that Dr. Gaber has really changed things in terms of her transparency and her willingness for faculty input. If you remember the parking situation, we had Andy Jorgensen represent the Faculty Senate on that committee. Also, Dr. Gaber encouraged and got quite a few comments from faculty concerning the dependent waiver scholarship situation, so I think that is definitely a good thing and definitely a difference in what we've experienced over the last many years. As President Keith mentioned, several members of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee will be meeting with the interim senior VP for Finance. I don't how many people are aware of Lawrence Kelly, he is now our Interim Senior Vice President for Finance Administration, and we are going to be meeting with him to discuss the fiscal year 2017 budget assumptions and also the scenarios that he sees in terms of what he will be looking for in coming up with a fiscal year 2017 budget. I guess a question comes down to – and this is the difficult part – is we've been on this cycle where every year we seem to have to give back money and we have budget cuts for the next year. I believe that one of the things Dr. Gaber wanted to get across to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee is that she really would like to stop that cycle because she sees if we continue down the same path, that we are never going to really get ahead and be able to do the good things that come along with actually having a budget that works, a budget that people can feel comfortable with, and a budget that faculty have had input in putting together. I think that is one of the major messages she gave us, hoping she can elicit the faculty's assistance in seeing that we've had seven years of annual budget reductions of at least 3% and can we go on doing that, and how long are we willing to go on doing that? I mean, it's become

like I said, a way of life; it's hard for us to fathom that there are [other] institutions that don't actually meet with this type of challenge every year. I would say that that's a good way to put what she hopes to accomplish. This is from a personal standpoint, I've been on Faculty Senate for a lot of years and frequently we've heard, especially during the last administration's years here, we would hear from Senate's representatives on the Finance and Strategy Committee or people who were in the loop of what was going on, and they would oftentimes be able to pinpoint for us the very things that seem to now be so obvious, but somehow the faculty was never really listened to and our input wasn't really considered. I think the good news is now we have a president who is willing to listen, and not just to listen but to elicit input that would make changes, as opposed to just pretending "this is a box I have to check that we asked for faculty input." I believe Dr. Gaber is really strongly committed to getting faculty input that is actually worthwhile, and that she is going to take into consideration and use. So our current representatives from the Senate who are on the Finance and Strategy Committee are President Keith, Senator Dowd and Senator Rouillard. I would like to ask you if you could inform us of anything I missed or if there's anything you want to supplement, knowing the background that you have on this Committee.

**Senator Dowd:** I would like to raise a couple of issues. First, as President-Elect Humphrys mentioned, in previous years, discussions about budget assumptions at the Finance and Strategy Committee would begin with, say, the forecast on enrollment the Office of Finance would be using when building the budget. For example, year after year individuals in the Office of Finance would budget for a 1%, 2% or 3% increase in enrollment when data from previous years indicated a downward trend in enrollment. Why would they do that?

Over those years your Senate representatives on the Finance and Strategy Committee, along with others on that committee, would ask why the Office of Finance is budgeting for an increase in enrollment when the consensus at Finance and Strategy Committee meetings was to expect enrollment to decline. The representatives from the Office of Finance were surprisingly responsive to that and related questions. Their responses varied from needing to do what they had to do in order to produce a zero-margin, or that they did not want too negative of a story regarding the budget they would be putting to the Board of Trustees. Well, okay, that is fine if you want to "live in denial." Come July 1st, the start of the new fiscal year, UT's budget deficit would increase – because they employed unrealistic enrollment projections when building the budget. And, of course, no one was surprised by the "surprise" increase in the budget deficit. This occurred year in and year out. For example, Dr. Cameron Cruickshank, Vice President for Enrollment Management, might say that enrollment in a particular year was going to increase by 2% and enrollment turned out to decrease by 1%. That 3% spread in enrollment would translate to a several million dollar increase in UT's budget deficit.

Regarding an issue raised by Vice President Humphrys, I believe President Gaber has a very difficult job ahead of her. With regards to such budgetary issues, my opinion is that for years the Jacobs and Naganathan administrations did not face their responsibilities and simply "kicked the



‘fiscal can’ down the road.” Continuing with that metaphor, I believe that UT has “run-out of pavement” – in that both senior administrators have to act like “grown-ups” and address our fiscal issues. The faculty too. That is, we all need to deal with the current budgetary “pain” created by those two previous administrations. In my opinion, and certainly not speaking for your other representatives on the Finance and Strategy Committee, I believe President Gabor should consider starting the process of change by addressing the culture within the Office of Finance. Budgeting is planning. In my opinion, the Office of Finance should be less concerned with optics and instead devote more of its attention towards realistic financial planning.

**President Keith:** I’ve been to two Finance and Strategy meetings this year; they’ve been essentially cancelled since Larry Kelly took over as Interim VP for Finance and the reason for that isn’t that he doesn’t want to meet with us - one of the first things that he did when he stepped on UT’s campus is he met with President-Elect Humphrys and me. I think it is because they are seriously looking at what is the purpose of this committee on Finance and Strategy because it kind of metastasized and it includes a bunch of people and it has become just a way for the Office of Finance to tell us what they are doing, so there isn’t much give and take there, in terms of trying to actually talk about some of these assumptions and whether or not they are good ideas. As I said in my EC report, we meet with him this Thursday and we will come back at our next meeting and we will tell you exactly what we know about this year’s budget. I have asked Larry Kelly to come to our March 15<sup>th</sup> meeting to basically answer your questions and address your concerns. He is willing to do so, but we are just not sure at this point if he can actually fit it into his calendar.

**Senator Anderson-Huang:** Senator Dowd, you might remember years and years ago the battles that we used to have about the Blue Book.

**Senator Dowd:** Oh, yes. Unfortunately, both Past Faculty Senate President Anderson-Huang and I probably recall all or most those battles about the Blue Book – and wish we could forget them.

**Senator Anderson-Huang:** My question is, can you remind me who is on this Finance Committee from the administration side and also, is it likely that we will ever get accounting down to some...level?

**Senator Dowd:** If I remember correctly, the current “Finance and Strategy Committee” was called the “Fiscal Advisory Committee” at the old UT, prior to the merger with MUO. The old Fiscal Advisory Committee was populated by Senate Representatives and individuals from the Office of Finance, if I remember correctly.

**Senator Anderson-Huang:** Yes, you are right I think.

**Senator Dowd:** After the merger, President Jacobs eliminated the Finance and Strategy Committee. Evidently, that was not acceptable to the Board of Trustees. Carroll Ashley, UT

Board Chair, quickly reconstituted that committee, and mandated that the Office of Finance meet with Faculty Senate representatives to discuss relevant issues for building the budget and other financial issues relevant to the university. To Past Faculty Senate President Anderson-Huang's original question, UT President Jacobs did reconstitute that committee but, in my mind, circumvented Mr. Ashley's intent by appointing many, many additional administrators to that committee – with the result of the faculty voice being “drowned-out” during committee deliberations.

**President Keith:** There is a “Blue Book” though. The faculty on Finance and Strategy last year requested that they put together a Blue Book and it should be on your “myUT,” maybe the employee tab, I am not really sure. Quinetta, is there a hard copy in the Senate Office of the Blue Book?

**Administrative Secretary, Quinetta Hubbard:** We have fiscal year 2014-15.

**President Keith:** Then we are going to put a hard copy of the Blue Book in the Senate Office. Somewhere on myUT there's a copy of the Blue Book.

**Senator Dowd:** Given she is in attendance today, we have the opportunity to ask Past Faculty Senate President Barbara Floyd, Interim Director of University Libraries, to comment on the current status of the Blue Book.

**Professor Barbara Floyd:** Yes, we have the current copy. The printed version of the Blue Book is available in the University Archives in the Canaday Center for anyone who wants to see it.

**Senator Dowd:** Interim Director Floyd, for the Senate Minutes, would you be willing to give a brief description of the Blue Book's contents?

**Professor Barbara Floyd:** A brief description: it contains every budget line and a memo allocated for it as well as a position roster with each person's salary and all the salary lines are listed in that position roster.

**Senator Dowd:** If you do not mind, how popular would you say the Blue Book was, or is, relative to other materials requested from the Library?

**Professor Barbara Floyd:** I would say it is one of our most requested items.

**Senator Humphrys:** Are there any more questions or comments? Okay. Thank you.

**President Keith:** Thank you so much, President-Elect Humphrys; you are up again.

**Senator Humphrys:** This relates to something that we voted on at the last meeting. It was corresponding with the state's guidelines that said a baccalaureate degree should be from 120-126 credit hours. After members from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee talked about this a little bit, what we passed--which was fine –dealt specifically with new programs. On the slide I

put in red the part that we are referring to today. “So proposals for new degree programs requiring more than 126 semester credit hours must provide justification for approval.” Then there was the situation where Senator Ohlinger did show us a list I think Senator Molitor had put together of the programs we currently have, that actually require more than 126 hours. So, through a conversation that Kristen and I had with Provost Barrett, we did confirm that these particular existing programs did have justification based on the things the state is looking for, accreditation, licensure, and so on. Like the new programs, these existing programs also need to provide a written justification because the state isn’t just looking for programs that don’t exist at this point, but any program at The University of Toledo that requires more than 126 hours. So keeping that in mind, there isn’t anything that we voted on last time that needs to be changed, but we just want to make sure that we understand that the degree programs that are currently offered that have more than 126 credit hours, must provide justification for this requirement. What we will do as a Faculty Senate Executive Committee, we will notify these programs and make sure we have a justification for those programs as well. It doesn’t really need to be written into the policy because once we have justifications for the current programs, that part will be done. The policy really is geared toward the future. The process that appears to be the best would be for the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to do the initial review of a program that needs to require more than 126 hours. The justification for that would come to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, which will do the initial review and then it would be sent to the Undergraduate Programs Committee for its review. The reason for this two-level review process is it’s an exception to a state guideline, so it is different than just saying instead of Biology 101 we are going to require Biology 102; it is not like a typical program modification since it’s something that is affected by a state guideline. I don’t know if “complicated” is the word, but I think you can see the point. Then just one other statement just to make sure it’s clear, if you have a program right now that requires 120 hours and you want to go somewhere between 120-126, which is the accepted guideline, all you would do is go through the normal program modification process. There are two parts to this and if you stick within the 120-126 guidelines, you wouldn’t be required to provide additional justification.

**Senator Anderson-Huang:** On this justification, how long does it last? Is it going to be a five year review of programs or anything like that? Does it last in perpetuity?

**Senator Humphrys:** I think it lasts until there is a reason that you no longer should be getting that exception. In other words, there could be some chance where a program needs to have 127 hours and then---

**Senator Anderson-Huang:** And if the accreditation body backs off.

**Senator Humphrys:** Yes, backs off or if they change the credit-hour requirement. But I am not aware of any time limit to it.

**Senator Cappelletty:** Who are you notifying within the colleges? Are you going through the deans?

**Senator Humphrys:** We haven't actually. That was something that actually came up since the last time The Faculty Senate Executive Committee met. We started to look at them a little bit and had questions about whether people were *mainly* doing this for posterity purposes. Do you have a suggestion?

**Senator Cappelletty:** Well, in my college it is a little challenging because we have so many different programs that went through what might be still listed on the books as a program director, it would be challenging. And we just had a change in our curriculum committee co-chair due to somebody leaving, so I think from a "trickle down" effect, it might be easier if it goes through deans and pass it back to the appropriate people within the colleges.

**Senator Humphrys:** That sounds like a good idea. Thank you. Are there any other comments or questions on that? Thank you.

**President Keith:** The next agenda item is undergraduate curriculum because it is my understanding that Core Curriculum needs Undergraduate Curriculum to go first.

**Senator Denyer:** Yesterday afternoon, you all received this chart that details 20 course modifications and 10 new courses that the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee has reviewed and would like to bring to you for your approval. I would like to ask if there are any specific questions about the course modifications. Do you have any questions? Hearing none. All those in favor of approving these course modifications, please say "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? ***Motion Passed.*** Thank you. *The following courses were approved.*

Course Modifications Approved by the Faculty Senate Undergraduate Curriculum Committee			
College	Course Impacted	Change	Rationale
Business and Innovation	PSLS 3440 Professional Sales	Removing BUAD as pre-requisite	Only junior standing now needed as pre-req
Engineering	CHEE 4110 Pollution Prevention	Title, description, pre-req, and content changes	To reflect current state of the art in the field
Engineering	CSET 3600 Software Engineering and Human Interfacing	Remove pre-req, add one credit hour	<p>1. Elimination of prerequisite: IT students no longer take CSET 3150 or EET 3150. CSET 3600 is a mandatory part of the IT curriculum. It has been modified to eliminate the need for CSET 3150 or EET 3150 as a prerequisite.</p> <p>2. Change from (3) to (4) credit hours: CSET 3600 (Software Engineering and Human Interfacing) is one of the core courses in CSET (Computer Science and Engineering Technology) program. By taking this course, students should not only learn the important software engineering theories, but also apply the learned</p>

			<p>theories in a semester-long group software project.</p> <p>We propose to increase its credit hours from 3 to 4, so that dedicated lab sessions following the lectures can be added for instructors and TAs to better support the students in working on the challenging final project and hands-on programming assignments.</p>
Engineering	EET 2410 Programmable Controller Fundamentals	Title change	The new name more accurately reflects the content of the course as it evolves from just a programmable controller course to a more thorough discussion of automation. This change is to meet state TAG requirements for algebra based physics
Engineering	EET 4550 Programmable Controller Applications	Title change	The new name more accurately reflects the content of the course as it evolves from just a programmable controller course to a more thorough discussion of automation.
Engineering	ENGT 1050 Computers for Engineering Technology	Alpha Numeric change	Only MET majors take ENGT 1050. Other programs now have their own version hence change to MET 1050.
Engineering	MET 1250 Cadd	Title change, TAG, increase in credit hours from 4 to 3	To meet TAG OETO12 Course description
Engineering	MET 2350 Advanced Cadd	Title change, decrease credit hours from 4 to 3	Reduction in total credits required to accommodate increase in credit hours in PHYS 2020 from (4) to (5) credit hours. Lecture content will be scaled accordingly. Increased lab (computer design lab) content.
Health Sciences	SLP 3150 Speech Science	Title, pre-req, course description and increase of credit hours from 3 to 4	<p>Hearing Science is currently a required two credit course. Similar hearing science content is also represented in the Audiology course as well as the Speech Science course. By its nature, teaching speech science also necessitates discussing hearing science (and vice versa), so many universities combine speech and hearing science into a single course. We propose expanding Speech Science to a four credit course that will include more coverage of hearing science concepts. As a result, the Hearing Science course would no longer be on students' plan of study.</p> <p>The following expanded hearing science content has been added to the course: anatomy and physiology from ear to cortex, acoustics and sound processing, and pathologies of the auditory mechanism. See the course</p>

			calendar in the syllabus for additional detail.
Health Sciences	KINE 3680 Exercise Pharmacology	Increase credit hours from 2 to 3	Have eliminated a course so the increase in 1 credit hour will not increase length of students' program
Health Sciences	KINE 3830 Principles of Strength and Conditioning	Redistribution of 3 lecture credit hours to 2 credit hours of lecture and 1 credit hour of lab	The course was originally set up as a 3 credit hour lecture. Due to the designated strength and conditioning lab, and so that students can master the techniques in the course, a designated lab time is now needed in the course. With 30 + students in a class it is difficult to divide the class into labs and then repeat the lecture for 1/2 a class on two different days. Thus, the request is to divide the 3 credit hour class as 2 credits of lecture and one credit hour of lab per week. Specific time blocks for labs will be offered when students register for the lecture.
Languages, Literature and Social Sciences	LING 3190 Sociolinguistics	Numeric change from 3000 level to 4000 level	We would like to change the course from a 3000-level to a 4000-level course because the course content has become more rigorous due to a shift in our student population in the course. The course is no longer a requirement of our now defunct undergraduate linguistics major, so fewer undergraduates are taking it. It has also become a new requirement of our MA-ESL program, so more graduate students are taking it. Because of this increasing level of rigor, we would like to make sure that enrollees who are undergraduates are upper-level students. Thus, we would like it to be a 400-level class at the undergraduate level.
Natural Sciences and Mathematics	ASTR 4810 Astrophysics I	Change in pre requisites	For the BS in Physics with concentration in Astrophysics and for the BA in Astronomy, we have introduced a new required course, ASTR-3880, for the purpose of preparing students for ASTR-4810. This new course will supply the necessary prerequisite material.
Natural Sciences and Mathematics	ASTR 4880 Astrophysical Measurements	Change in pre requisites	For the BS in Physics with concentration in Astrophysics and for the BA in Astronomy, we have introduced a new required course, ASTR-3880, for the BS in Physics with concentration in Astrophysics and for the BA in Astronomy, we have introduced a new required course, ASTR-3880, for
Natural Sciences and Mathematics	PHYS 3310 Quantum Physics I	Title change	This name change more accurately reflects the content

			of the course. It is also required for our students to qualify for medical physics programs.
Natural Sciences and Mathematics	PHYS 4620	Change in pre-requisites	For all our degree programs we have eliminated the requirement for PHYS3320. The necessary topics will now be covered in PHYS3310, so the current prerequisite of PHYS3320 should be replaced by PHYS3310.
Natural Sciences and Mathematics	PHYS 4780 Atomic and Nuclear Physics Laboratory	Change in pre-requisites	For all our degree programs we have eliminated the requirement for PHYS3320. The necessary topics will now be covered in PHYS3310, so the current prerequisite of PHYS3320 should be replaced by PHYS3310.
Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences	PHPR 3040 Pharmaceutical Ingredients Used in Cosmetics	Title and description changes	The current title does not describe the course content properly. Not just pharmaceutical ingredients are discussed, and many ingredients discussed are not used in pharmaceutical products, only in cosmetics and personal care products. The proposed title will eliminate this problem. The description has also been updated to better reflect the scope of the course.
Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences	PHPR 3080 PPD-2	Remove pre-req	The curriculum committee and course instructors have evaluated all of the PharmD program's current prerequisites and corequisites. It has been determined that the content in PHPR 3070 (PPD1) is not essential for being able to understand the content in PHPR 3080 (PPD2). There is not significant overlap in concepts taught. PPD1 focuses on community pharmacy practice, while PPD2 focuses on pharmaceutical compounding.
Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences	PHPR 3130 PPT-1	Remove pre-req	The curriculum committee and course instructors have evaluated all of the PharmD program's current prerequisites and corequisites. It has been determined that the content in MBC3550 (physiologic chemistry) is not essential for being able to understand the content in PHPR3130 (intro to patient care). There is not significant overlap in concepts taught.

**Senator Denyer cont'd:** Are there any questions about the 10 new course proposals? Hearing none. All those in favor of approving the new course proposals, please say “aye.” Any opposed? Any abstentions? **Motion Passed.** Thank you very much. *The following courses were approved.*

<b>New Course Proposals Approved by Faculty Senate Undergraduate Curriculum Committee</b>		
<b>College</b>	<b>Course</b>	<b>Description</b>
Judith Herb College of Education	PJS 1000 Introduction to Peace and Justice Studies	This survey course provides an overview to fundamental peace knowledge: theories of peace, ethics, violence, conflict and change in the context of historical and 21st century issues and events.
Judith Herb College of Education	PJS 2000 Nonviolence and Conflict Transformation Theory and Practice	This course provides an overview of theories and principles of nonviolence, ethics of conflict, and conflict transformation; it engages students in the application of practical methods and skills of peacebuilding through the lenses of these theories and principles.
Judith Herb College of Education	PJS 2500 Peace Education Facilitating Learning for Change in Schools and Beyond	The purpose of this course is to introduce the basic concepts, theories, and approaches to peace education. The course explores the theories of peace education, including pedagogical approaches to peace-learning for formal, informal, and non-formal learning settings. The course also introduces the substantive areas of peace education.
Engineering	MET 2310 Materials Science	Study of the relationships between structures and properties for common engineering materials, including metals, polymers, ceramics and composites. Mechanical behavior, temperature effects, heat treatment, corrosion and electrical properties are covered
Engineering	MET 2320 Materials Science Laboratory	Laboratory based study of the relationships between structures and properties for common engineering materials, including metals, polymers, ceramics and composites. Mechanical behavior, temperature effects, heat treatment, corrosion and electrical properties are covered.
Languages, Literature and Social Sciences	HIST 4290 US Women from 1865	A survey of women in the United States from 1865. Covers women's political, economic, and social participation in American life. Particular attention is given to the life experiences of women from a diversity of racial, ethnic, sexual, and socio-economic backgrounds.
Languages, Literature and Social Sciences	HIST 3230 Early Caribbean History	This course covers the history of the early Caribbean through emancipation in the mid-nineteenth century. Topics include: The Carib and Taino Indians, European exploration and colonization, the Atlantic slave trade, and the golden age of piracy.
Languages, Literature and Social Sciences	HIST 3240 Modern Caribbean History	This course examines Caribbean history in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Topics include: history of Caribbean culture and music, migration, tourism, and social, political, and economic challenges of the twentieth century.



Languages, Literature and Social Sciences	DST 3090 Disability in American Literature	Disability In American Literature addresses a wide range of contemporary literary productions, including novels, graphic novels, plays, short stories, poetry, memoir, and personal essays, connecting these productions to an American literary genealogy and recognizing the deployment and resistance to ableism in American Literature. At the course’s conclusion, students will be able to understand how literature interacts with cultural stereotypes, ultimately understanding how literature can be utilized for disability justice and social change.
Languages, Literature and Social Sciences	DST 4500 Asylums, Prisons and Total Institutions	This course explores asylums, prisons, and other total institutions in order to consider when and why spaces of containment have arisen. In this context we will explore how disability and madness get defined, by whom and for what purposes; the social responses to criminality and disability in the past and in the present; and frameworks that resist the idea that spaces of segregation, such as prisons and institutions, are necessary.

**President Keith:** Thank you very much, Senator Denyer. Next, we have Senator Monsos.

**Senator Monsos:** Thank you, President Keith. One of the items is a new course, PGS 1000, which you just moments ago approved. The Core Curriculum would like to also put forth this course as fulfilling the humanities category of gen ed. The learning outcomes are up there, are there any questions?

**Senator Lundquist:** Can you say why, humanities and not social sciences?

**Senator Monsos:** That’s a good question. The form itself did not say, but in looking at it and looking at the criterion for humanities and the criterion for social sciences, the committee leaned towards humanities.

**Senator Lundquist:** Just from that description there for the student learning outcomes, it seems to me to lean towards social sciences. Of course, I haven’t seen the whole syllabus, if there is one.

**Senator Monsos:** The syllabus is in the curricular tracking system and that is what we were basing it on. There are limitations, as you well know with the curricular tracking system and people can check gen ed. Sometimes they think to provide additional explanation and sometimes they don’t.

**Senator Anderson-Huang:** Is it ever possible for a course to satisfy either one?

**Senator Monsos:** You know, actually, it sort of is. In my college, communications straddles that divide somewhat - the state considers it a social science. But we have several communications

courses that are humanities courses in our gen ed. because they felt, at the time that they were proposed, people felt those were more humanities. But communications, since then has declared itself more of a social science, but they still feel those courses are humanities. So yes, there are straddlers.

**Senator Molitor:** We can have an interdisciplinary course category, for example, that combines social science and humanities courses. We can say that this course is 1.5 credits of humanities and 1.5 credits of social science, but then we have issues meeting our distributed requirements because a student has to take six hours of humanities and six hours of social science. So we as a committee have to decide, does it belong in humanities or does it belong in social science? We did discuss this course and we looked at the syllabus and we thought the learning outcomes matched humanities better, although there was clearly an overlap. This happens all the time; it happens with multicultural courses and between humanities and social sciences courses. We need a way to get departments to say “we want it in “this” category” and then specify why they think it belongs in “this” category. Hopefully, with the new curriculum tracking system we are going to get some day, we can include that feature in there.

**Senator Lundquist:** So, just so I understand it, it was the committee that decided humanities, not the people who proposed the course?

**Senator Monsos:** The people proposed the course didn’t suggest any category. We can discuss it in more detail.

**Senator Molitor:** In the past we have gone back to departments, although, we didn’t with this one; we will ask which category they want.

**Senator Schneider (substitute for M. Caruso):** Senator Denyer probably knows the answer to this. Are the readings for this class drawn largely from philosophy?

**Senator Denyer:** I don’t know that off the top of my head, but I can let you know.

**Senator Schneider (substitute for M. Caruso):** For some reason I remember looking at a preview of that syllabus and it seemed to me that many of the readings were drawn from philosophical text, which might explain why it got a humanities coding, I just thought Senator Denyer might know.

**Senator Monsos:** We looked at this a month ago and I don’t actually remember, but that sounds likely.

**Senator Humphrys:** Senator Monsos, I think it is interesting to note that that’s one of the peculiarities of our curriculum tracking system; just one of the many I might add. All it asks is if you want to be considered for the core.

**Senator Monsos:** No, it doesn’t say “core,” it says gen ed.

**Senator Humphrys:** Yes, gen ed.; so it is left up to the committee to decide the category. It just asks if you were interested in gen ed consideration, it doesn't ask you which category. That is one of the other issues that maybe in the future we can look at.

**Senator Monsos:** These are things that are on my list to ask.

**Senator Humphrys:** Thank you.

**Senator Monsos:** The way that it is set up, it says, choose one of these buttons - there's gen ed. and various different buttons and then there's, none of the above. But on my computer screen when you look at it, it kinds of runs off the side and then it is stacked on top, but it's kind of hard to see. I have been trying to stay caught up with what is marked as gen ed. and in a couple of cases people have marked something as modification of a course that they say is gen ed., but it is not actually in the gen ed. I think they look at it and say, well, I have to pick one of these buttons, I guess it's a gen ed. course; I think that what's happening. There are a couple of courses that are in there now that I've been working with Marcia to get un-button checked or have the button changed to "none of the above" and there's an email trail attached to those courses now in the system, so we can see that in fact the people who originally put it in say, no, that shouldn't be a gen ed. Some of the sample texts, we do have aren't in here, we got comp, and then we have a whole set of text around issues related to justice, war, and peace. We've got gender, peace and conflict, pieces of history movements and ideas, and we have the work of Betty Rudin in that. So it is kind of a mix, but certainly it is in philosophy. What is your pleasure? Would you like to return it to the department some more?

**Senator Dowd:** If the Senate wishes additional discussion at the committee level, we can vote to table the issue, follow a Motion to Commit or, I suppose, have the committee withdraw their proposal.

**Senator Monsos:** What is Senate's pleasure? Why don't we withdraw this and go back to PJS and discuss it with them and make sure they are comfortable with humanities and can justify that? Okay, we will do that.

The second part is really just a clean-up. These are items that are core courses, either gen ed. or core courses that were passed last Spring, but because Senator Humphrys wasn't receiving notifications, we missed them and Core Curriculum never actually approved them. The modifications did not change their status in the committee's opinion and we would like to at least get it on the record in the Minutes that we approved them, even though they have already been coded.

**Senator Anderson-Huang:** So moved.

**Senator Dowd:** Second.

**Senator Monsos:** All in favor please say "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? *Motion Passed.*

Clean up for minutes - Recommend for approval

SOC 1010	Changed Course Description	FS approved 4.2015 (already through Registrar)
SOC 1020	Changed course number from 1750	FS approved 4.2015 (already through Registrar)
AL 1130	Originally COIL 1130 for 2 credits.	FS approved in 2013 (alpha to AL) and 2015 (credits to 3)

**Senator Monsos cont'd:** We will bring PJS 1000 back with more clarity next time as well as two other courses that are in the system that we will be meeting on tomorrow. Thank you.

**President Keith:** Thank you, Senator Monsos. Next, we have a report from Academic Programs.

**Senator Ohlinger:** This report is going to be much shorter than originally planned. We were kind of waiting for some of the academic program approvals for course modifications, not all of them were able to come through. What you see in front of you here, the new program proposals, those are going to be tabled until later because we are waiting for some course approvals for Peace Studies. The program modification proposals for Engineering also are tabled because we are waiting for Physics' course modifications to be approved. So actually, we are only going to be looking at these from the College of Business and Nursing. I did not send these out because I wasn't sure what we were going to be able to present today, but I can very briefly/simplely explain these: BBA Information Systems, major and minor – based on updating the content that needs to be delivered, they are just swaps. The information system, 3150 and 3380, those are just swaps, elective to required/required to elective as well as some prerequisite changes that have gone through. The same thing with the minor, swapping 3150 and 3250, and 3770 for required versus electives. Professional Sales minor for non-Business major students – this did have some more significant changes, so this is just a program modification. We are no longer requiring Economics as a non-business course. Changing Business Administration 3010 from a required to an elective; overall, this changes the hours required for the minor from 18 to 15 because there's a decrease in six hours of required courses, econ and 3010; and 3010 falls into the elective category which increases electives by 3 credit hours, then there were some prerequisite changes. Why don't I just stop there with Business and there is one more with Nursing. Are there any questions on the Business program modifications? Hearing none. All in favor of the program modifications for the College of Business as presented here, please say "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? ***Motion Passed.*** Thank you.

**Curriculum Changes**

**Information Systems (Current Catalog)**

<p><b><u>MAJOR</u></b>  <b>3 Required Courses: 9 hours</b>  INFS 3380 Web Application Development I  INFS 3770 Data Base Management Systems  INFS 4510 Systems Analysis &amp; Design</p> <p><b>4 Electives:- 12 hours</b>  INFS 3150 INFS 3160 INFS 3240  INFS 3250 INFS 3370 INFS 3780  INFS 3980 INFS 4300 INFS 4320  INFS 4620 INFS 4810 INFS 4940</p>	<p><b><u>MINOR</u></b>  <b>1 Required: 3 hours</b>  INFS 3250 Software Applications in Business  <b>Or</b>  INFS 3770 Database Management Systems</p> <p><b>2 electives: 6 hours</b>  INFS 3150 INFS 3160 INFS 3240 INFS 3250  INFS 3370 INFS 3770 INFS 3980 INFS 4300  INFS 4320 INFS 4620 INFS 4810</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Information Systems (Proposed Changes to Catalog)**

<p><b><u>MAJOR</u></b>  <b>3 Required Courses: 9 hours</b>  <b>INFS 3150 Business Application Development I</b>  INFS 3770 Data Base Management Systems  INFS 4510 Systems Analysis &amp; Design</p> <p><b>4 Electives:- 12 hours</b>  <b>INFS 3380</b> INFS 3160 INFS 3240  INFS 3250 INFS 3370 INFS 3780  INFS 3980 INFS 4300 INFS 4320  INFS 4620 INFS 4810 INFS 4940</p>	<p><b><u>MINOR</u></b>  <b>1 Required: 3 hours</b>  <b>INFS 3150 Business Application Development I</b></p> <p><b>2 electives: 6 hours</b>  INFS 3160 INFS 3240 INFS 3250 INFS 3370 INFS 3770 INFS 3980 INFS 4300  INFS 4320 INFS 4620 INFS 4810</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b><u>Current</u></b>	<b><u>Proposed</u></b>	<b><u>Notes</u></b>
<p><b>INFS 3150: PRINCIPLES OF STRUCTURED COMPUTER PROGRAMMING AND PROBLEM SOLVING:</b> Problem solving, event driven programming, control structures, data types, data structures, objects, properties, events and methods. Subroutines, functions, file processing, menu and application development will also be covered.  Prerequisite: BUAD1020 or CMPT1100 or passing score on the computer proficiency test and junior standing.</p>	<p><b>INFS 3150: BUSINESS APPLICATION DEVELOPMENT I:</b> Introduction to fundamental constructs of computer programming. This course introduces data types, variables, constants, arrays, objects, properties, methods, arguments, events, subroutines, functions, data handling, and program control structures. Additionally the course helps students develop skills and logical reasoning used in solving business problems.</p> <p><b>Prerequisite: BUAD1020 or CMPT1100 or passing score on the computer proficiency test and junior standing.</b></p>	<p><b>REQUIRED for major &amp; minors</b></p>

<p><b>Prerequisites: BUAD 1020 FOR LEVEL UG WITH MIN. GRADE OF D- OR CMPT 1100</b></p>		
<p><b>INFS 3160: BUSINESS APPLICATION DEVELOPMENT:</b> Building on programming skills developed in INFS3150 this course emphasizes database connectivity, data retrieval, and business application development. The course will also survey an object oriented language like C++, Java.</p> <p><b>Prerequisite: INFS3150 and INFS3770</b></p>	<p><b>INFS 3160: BUSINESS APPLICATION DEVELOPMENT II:</b> Building on programming skills developed in INFS3150 this course emphasizes database connectivity, data retrieval, design of user interfaces and business application development. The course will survey an object oriented language like C++, Java.</p> <p><b>Prerequisite: INFS 3150.</b></p>	<p><b>Elective</b></p>
<p><b>INFS 3250: SOFTWARE APPLICATIONS IN BUSINESS:</b> This course is designed to acquaint students with the application of integrated software to business decisions, report writing and presentations. Student will gain hands-on experience with popular business software packages.</p> <p><b>Prerequisite: BUAD1020 or CMPT1100 or passing score on the computer proficiency test and Junior standing.</b></p>	<p><b>INFS 3250: BUSINESS DATA ANALYSIS &amp; REPORTING:</b> This course is designed to acquaint students with the application and use of integrated software. The course will provide students with hands-on experience in data analysis and manipulation, macro recording and editing and other advanced features and functions of popular business software packages. Students will gain skills in computer based report writing and data visualization techniques.</p> <p><b>Prerequisite: BUAD3050, INFS 3150 and Junior standing.</b></p>	<p><b>Elective</b></p>
<p><b>INFS 3770: SMALL BUSINESS DATABASE SYSTEMS:</b> The design and implementation of database management systems are studied. Develop significant skills in form based input, report writing and data modeling. Students will work in teams developing database applications.</p>	<p><b>INFS 3770: INTRODUCTION TO DATABASE SYSTEMS:</b> In this course, the design and implementation of database management systems are studied. Students will develop significant skills in data modeling, database design and SQL. Students will work in teams developing a database application.</p> <p><b>Prerequisite: INFS 3150, BUAD 3050 and Junior standing</b></p>	<p><b>REQUIRED</b></p>

<b>Prerequisite:</b> <b>BUAD1020 or</b> <b>CMPT1100 or a</b> <b>passing score on the</b> <b>computer proficiency</b> <b>test and Junior</b> <b>standing.</b>		
<b>INFS4510 Business</b> <b>Systems Analysis &amp;</b> <b>Design With Erp</b> Analysis, design and implementation of business information systems will be studied using Case tools and ERP systems. Will also emphasize management of organizational change brought about by information technology projects.  <b>Prerequisites: BUAD</b> <b>3050 AND INFS 3250</b>	<b>INFS4510 Business Systems Analysis &amp;</b> <b>Design</b> Analysis, design and implementation of business information systems will be studied using Case tools and ERP systems. Will also emphasize management of organizational change brought about by information technology projects.  <b>Prerequisites: BUAD 3050 AND INFS</b> <b>3150</b>	<b>REQUIRED</b>

**Senator Ohlinger cont'd:** The last one, this is this is even simpler, Nursing. For the Bachelor of Science, RN degree - currently, the program requirement state Health 4700 is required as intro to nutrition for the program, BS in Nursing. There is another course, Health 2800 that is also introduction to nutrition just at a different level obviously. When you look at the tag requirements across nursing degree programs, the 2000-level course is accepted and actually our College of Nursing even accepts transfer students into the College of Nursing from other programs with a 2000-level nutrition course as a requirement for the Nursing program. The Nursing Program would like to change, so Health 2800 is the required intro to nutrition course. Are there any questions about that one?

**Senator McLoughlin:** Has the faculty of Nursing consulted with the faculty from these course offsets?

**Senator Ohlinger:** Yes, Deb Boardley and---

**Senator McLoughlin:** Yes, that was exactly my question, they consulted with them.

**Senator Ohlinger:** Yes, Deb Boardley in Nutrition has said “thumbs-up.”

**Senator McLoughlin:** Thank you.

**Senator Ohlinger:** And 4700 will be continued to be offered as an upper-level course if anybody desires to take it. They are not removing it from the books, they just like the 2000-level course to meet the requirements. Are there any more questions? Hearing none. All in favor of the

program modifications for the College of Business as presented here, please say “aye.” Any opposed? Any abstentions? ***Motion Passed.*** Thank you. We will be back with the other new program proposals and modification proposals.

**The University Of Toledo  
Undergraduate Program Requirement Revision**

Contact Person: Susan Sochacki Phone: 383-5806

**College: NU**

**Program Code: NU-PNRN-BSN**

Email:  
susan.sochacki@utoledo.edu  
Dept/Academic Unit: NUR  
Program Name: BS in  
Nursing, RN

**Present**

**Proposed**

**Supply all information asked for in this column.**( Supply core, research intensive and transfer module info if applicable)

Fill in appropriate blanks only where entry differs from first column.

**Minimum number of credit hours for completion:**

Minimum number of credit hours for completion:

**List all courses which comprise the certificate or degree:**

List all courses which comprise the certificate or degree:

**Identify term offered (summer/fall/spring):**

Identify term offered (summer/fall/spring):

**Identify delivery method (Online/in class/off campus):**

Identify delivery method (Online/in class/off campus):

**Proposed Effective Term: 201540**

**Comments/Memo:**

The College of Nursing currently requires a nutrition course for admission to the major. The course that has been used for several years is HEAL 4700. When looking at transfer credit agreements for nutrition from other institutions, it was noted that the CON accepts 2000 level courses from most other institutions of higher education. Considering equitable treatment of students, and after talking with Dr. Debra Boardley (current nutrition faculty) it was decided that HEAL 2800 (currently offered course) is an acceptable nutrition course for the UT pre-nursing students. HEAL 2800 also meets TAG as an introduction to nutrition course. BGSU has a 2070 course that also meets TAG - this is important since the program is a consortium program between UT and BGSU. We are requesting to replace HEAL 4700 with HEAL 2800 as the required nutrition course for the pre-nursing students.

**Rationale:**

HEAL 4700 and HEAL 2800 will continue to be offered at UT, but HEAL 2800 will be the required undergraduate nutrition course for admission to the nursing major. This change has been approved through the CON governance structure.

**President Keith:** Thank you, Senator Ohlinger. Next on our agenda is the President of the Graduate Student Association, Eric Prichard, and he is here to talk to us about 7<sup>th</sup> Annual Midwest Graduate Research Symposium.



**Student Gov't President, Eric Prichard:** I want to thank you for letting me be here and speak about the Midwest Graduate Research Symposium (MGRS). This is an annual graduate research symposium. We invite universities across the region, most of the Midwest universities. Every year we have about 150-200 students depending upon the year and the turnout, and we are anticipating about that again this year. We always have a keynote speaker. This year the keynote speaker is actually coming from Eastern Michigan University and we actually got a historian to talk about four decades of European travel because we want to kind of change things up and get humanities more involved. We are also seeking more sponsor awards; we want to try to expand the scope of interdisciplinary symposium. But specifically, I am here to kind of talk about the importance of MGRS judges. One thing that really sets MGRS judges apart from maybe the typical graduate conference experience is getting feedback from somebody with a terminal degree in their field. I can tell you that I remember my first conference experience as a graduate student, it was at APS, which is one of the two big meetings for psychology. My first experience I...as a graduate student and somehow I got... which is a miracle, it is the first time a graduate student does study. I was really excited about it. We got accepted and we...physiology posters. I remember I was in Chicago at this...meeting, standing there for about 1 hour and 15 minutes and one guy comes up and asked a of couple questions and then said, "well, that is interesting" and walks away. I had to find some graduate student nearby with their own posters and dragged them to my poster and forced them to listen to me talk about..., so it was a very heartening first experience at a conference. I was very excited to meet and interact with people with PhD's and get feedback and one of the things that faculty participation at MGRS does, it gives graduate students a chance to get critical feedback from people with PhD's. This year we actually have somebody from Indiana University Medical School presenting research.

What makes a medical student from Bloomington, Indiana get up on a Saturday morning and drive four hours to come to The University of Toledo to present research? I really think it is that added component of that feedback, that chance to hear something from somebody in the field. You are not just putting a poster up or have some people walk by, you're getting something more out of it and you guys will make that possible. So while we're proud of what we do as graduate students organizing the event, it is that faculty participation as faculty judges that really make it something above and beyond, it is something that you want to come to; it is something that makes you want to drive four hours from Bloomington. So, we really want to encourage people if they have time on April 9<sup>th</sup> to consider being judges. We offer free food, lunch and dinner. We have both oral sessions where you have people sitting in rooms listen to talks. We have poster sessions. You can be a poster judge or oral judge or both. To show our appreciation we do [again] offer free food, dinner and lunch, and you can sit in at the professor panel. I think that we probably should have some sort of award or motion to thank the faculty in the future which is something else I'd like us to do. But if you are interested in MGRS, you can check out our website, [utoledogsa.com](http://utoledogsa.com) and we actually have a registration tab. The registration tab is for participants, judges, and volunteers. Graduate students can actually get active membership in GSA by volunteering, so you can have graduate students of your own who might want to become

active members of GSA by volunteering, so it is a great way to become an active member. Obviously, we welcome your participation. If you are interested in signing up, you can click here to register as a judge. Our judge coordinator name is Zaman Kahn. Zaman will be in charge of scheduling and will be getting back to you on where we will be going and what types of things and why we judge. The more judges the better, because the more judges, the more likely we are to get somebody who has expertise to really give somebody some critical feedback that would be useful to them. Also, it is just an easier workload for the judges. I recognize some of your faces at MGRS and I've seen some of you do a lot of work at MGRS. If you are interested, please free to ask any questions at [Eric Prichard's email provided]. Feel free to check the website and I encourage you to participate and I encourage you to encourage fellow staff members. Are there any questions?

**Senator Barnes:** What's your average time commitment for a judge on a Saturday?

**Student Gov't President, Eric Prichard:** It depends on what you sign-up for – so oral presentations are from 9:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., so it is actually that 2 ½ hour block – so about 2 ½ hours.

**Senator Dowd:** For context, did the MGRS began approximately seven years ago?

**Student Gov't President, Eric Prichard:** I believe so.

**Senator Dowd:** As background information, I was involved in Graduate Council leadership during the early years of the MGRS. The success of that symposium was not due to the efforts of Graduate Council or Graduate College, other than the generous participation from individual Graduate Faculty members. In my mind, that success has been due entirely to the tremendous leadership and foresight demonstrated by the UT Graduate Student Association. That amazing conference is 100% homegrown by UT graduate students. The MGRS started with the Graduate Student Association – involving only a few graduate students getting together to talk about their research. Since then it has been the efforts of our most excellent graduate students that have seen the growth of the MGRS to include 150- 200 participants a year. The UT GSA has received national recognition and awards for their activities. Good for them. Mr. Prichard, I mentioned the number of recent participants. Do you recall the number of universities involved in the MGRS?

**Student Gov't President, Eric Prichard:** I know that we invite probably about 70 from the region. I would say about 45 -50 will actually send people.

**Senator Dowd:** Your graduate research symposium is a wonderful thing. Students from this region of the country can present their research results to a very broad audience – with all participants knowing throughout their careers that their first opportunity to do that was provided by The University of Toledo. It also represents the best a student organization can provide its

constituents – the opportunity for their students to showcase their knowledge, skills and talents. Again, this is a tremendous opportunity the GSA provides for our students. Thank you.

**Student Gov't President, Eric Prichard:** Thank you for those comments.

[Applause]

**President Keith:** Thank you, Eric. We really appreciate it. Next, we have Barbara Floyd.

**Barbara Floyd:** Thank you, President Keith. I am going to give you a brief report about how we came to this reorganization plan. In April of last year, Vice Provost Peg Traband, at the request of Interim Provost John Barrett, asked the faculty and staff of University Libraries to undertake a peer-directed effort to establish a shared vision for the [University] Libraries built around three core functions: reference services, library instruction, and collection management.

Surveys requesting input on each of these three areas were distributed to the library faculty, and the results of those surveys provided some common ground around which to discuss the issues.

At a series of retreats, the faculty reviewed the survey results and decided which of the outcomes reflected the consensus of the faculty. Once consensus was reached, groups of library faculty—with staff input—developed white papers on how to improve services in the areas of reference, instruction, and collection management. After the white papers and program review report had been prepared and discussed by the faculty, the library leadership team met and analyzed the outcomes. The reorganization plan presented reflects the significant efforts to achieve a shared vision based on the process outlined above. In addition, it:

- Addresses salary and status inequalities between Main Campus and Health Science Campus librarians that have continued since the merger in 2006;
- Establishes improved communication lines, with staff members reporting directly to the supervisors who oversee their work, improving efficiency and accountability;
- Establishes a leadership team that builds on the unique talents of the individuals in those positions;
- Identifies positions that are required to fill several faculty retirements, but does so with revised position descriptions that better reflect the current needs of the library;
- Provides considerable cost savings to the university;
- Positions University Libraries to attract the best qualified leader in 2017.

The proposal establishes a new leadership structure with five departments each headed by a director. These departments are: Library Operations, which brings all business operations including circulation, assessment, facilities, staff human resource oversight, and marketing; Reference and Instruction, which provides daily coordination of information literacy, reference, and subject liaisons and allows for implementation of a new tiered reference model and a coordinated information literacy program that addresses the needs of both lower division and upper division/graduate level students; Collection Services, which will provide oversight for all acquisition and cataloging functions; Special Collections and University Archives, which will remain unchanged from the current organization; and the Health Sciences Library, which will remain the same except for supervision of staff at Mulford Library which will be done through the director of that library. The Chair of the Library Faculty's responsibilities remains unchanged.

This proposal requests funding for filling four positions, including: Collections Management Librarian, which will work with faculty to insure collections meet research needs within tight budgetary constraints; Undergraduate and Information Services Librarian, which will focus on providing reference assistance to entry-level and lower-division students; Cataloging Librarian, a position responsible for overseeing all collection cataloging; and a replacement for the Clinical Medical Librarian position at the Health Science Library. Are there any questions? Thank you.

**President Keith: President Keith:** Well, if there are no questions, then we have a resolution for you to consider. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee met separately with Jolene Miller and several other members of the Library faculty, I was not at that meeting, I was actually out of town. Then we met with Interim Director, Barbara Floyd, and based on those conversations we drafted this resolution, but then it occurred to us that she was going to come and give a presentation of what actually the structure would be; then instead of it coming from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, we thought we would actually have it come from the full Senate. I guess I need to read it into the record:

*“Whereas, Article 7, Section 7.2 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement states that the Administration will seek input from the Faculty Senate on the reorganization of colleges and departments;*

*Whereas, in the spring of 2015, the University Libraries submitted a faculty hiring plan to address impending retirements and with a view to future faculty needs;*

*Whereas, beginning in the spring of 2015, the Library Faculty and staff of both campuses engaged in a series of retreats and workgroups to develop a shared vision for the University Libraries in key service areas (i.e. reference, instruction, collections), and to recommend needed positions;*

*Whereas, during the summer of 2015, Library Faculty administrators proposed a reorganization plan which would streamline services and reporting lines across both campuses as well as provide parity for all Library Faculty regardless of campus location;*

*Whereas, the Library Faculty unanimously endorsed the reorganization plan as presented at their Faculty Council meeting by the University Libraries' interim director in January 2016;*

*Whereas, the library staff have subsequently been apprised of the reorganization plan as well;*

*Whereas, the Faculty Senate has reviewed the proposed reorganization and commends the Library Faculty of both campuses for their commitment and input into the reorganization process;*

*Therefore, be it resolved, while the input provided by Faculty Senate can take many form, in this particular case the Faculty Senate of the University of Toledo on this 16<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2016 endorses the process used to gather input regarding this proposed reorganization."*

**President Keith cont'd.:** Are there any comments? Hearing no comments.

**Senator Williams:** So moved.

**Senator Dowd:** Second.

**President Keith:** All in favor of the resolution please say "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? ***Resolution Passed.***

Next, on the agenda is Senator Fred Williams. He is going to tell us about where we are with the master plan.

**Senator Williams:** Thank you, President Keith. I don't have any audiovisuals or anything like that, but just a small kind of a concise way of putting where we are with Master Plan. The Master Plan Steering Committee has met several times (last time on February 3<sup>rd</sup>) and went through the phase of data collection regarding space utilization last semester and is now in the scenario phase. That is, data analysis being tied to potential changes. They have analyzed a lot of data on buildings, grounds, and classrooms utilization to find what is in need of fixing, what is fine as it is, and what needs to be reimagined or rethought as what could be best done with that space. The data analysis would give the UT community a good idea of where to put their money for the best return on investment. That is what is going to have the biggest impact on getting students, retaining them, safety, graduating them on time etc. This will be where the university can best put any money they do have and see enrollment growth and better returns on state money while giving students the best possible experience while they are here. This will take into account all campuses and some non-campus planning. After all, we are the University of Toledo.

They are currently finishing the analytics that would give data past and current with what space. As said, this is taking all things into account: usage, technology, condition, all of these things, so that good decisions can be made on where to put the money in the future as it is necessary to

bring some areas of certain campuses up to speed and bring non-technological areas into the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Not to be forgotten, some buildings don't function well or are in disrepair and will need to be addressed. The idea of the analytics is to give data to the prioritization process. From a building/facility standpoint, everything that happens on campus: teaching, how technology is utilized, research, student life, and the adequacy, condition, and placement of space is being utilized to get a handle on how to proceed in the future. The committee will be reviewing all these analytics this Spring with the idea that these are scenarios and recommendations that will then need to be prioritized by the campus community and leadership and will eventually be dealt with if we are to make the University as good as it can be and needs to be in the future.

There is no doubt that this will be tied to the budget and the budget is at least in part tied to enrollment. Therefore, many things such as the budget, master plan, and enrollment plan, and the strategic plan seems to be proceeding in parallel with some things having an impact on what other things can realize. That is my report. Sorry if it wasn't more factual. We really haven't gotten to the point where we are saying "wow, that building is in bad shape or these sidewalks should be fixed." There really isn't anything we are looking at in specific. They will be coming up with a myriad of possibilities. Are there any questions?

**Senator Regimbal (substitute for M. Edwards):** Will we be asked for further participation in the plan because I did try to find the plan?

**Senator Williams:** I am the only faculty member on the committee. I will engage you if you engage me. So if you want a little more data, I can see what I can give you. At this point in time, I don't have a whole lot. We have gone through some things where we know, for instance, what buildings are being underutilized and what classrooms are being underutilized. I guess it's a cliché, but it is not rocket science, they are going to find the things that are indeed not being utilized. Why? Because there are ready places to hold a class and they don't have the facilities to do that. There are obvious places where they think they can streamline things or at least suggest those things so they are going to be doing that.

**Senator Regimbal (substitute for M. Edwards):** I do have some things that I want you to bring back to Senate. One would be what are we going to do with Carter East and West? What are they going to do with the athletic facilities on Scott Park Campus? If they talked about moving them to this campus, where do they think they are going to put all of them?

**Senator Williams:** That hasn't been discussed.

**Senator Regimbal (substitute for M. Edwards):** I realize that, I would like for it to be brought back to the Faculty Senate.

**Senator Williams:** Unfortunately, obviously, nobody made any decisions with this.

**Senator Regimbal (substitute for M. Edwards):** And I think faculty ought to be involved. My last concern is when we look at the facility use, we take in very careful consideration the amount of open space that would be available for university students to be used for recreational activities?

**Senator Williams:** Now, I can speak to a little bit of that because, if you put us on a map of space, they did this at our last meeting – If you don't take into account Ohio State, which I think is ridiculous, they have huge amounts of outdoor space that is available for all student usage - If you put us in the MAC we're in like type programs, we are okay as far as indoor space, but our outdoor space is lacking. Again, like I said, this is not new, however, what are we going to do? How are we going to get more space? Are we going to take down buildings? This hasn't been decided yet. Is Carter East and Carter West reutilization on the table? Yes. Has it been decided? No. So I can't really tell you that there's a firm thing there, but there have been discussions on those things.

**Senator Molitor:** I know that we had a chance to provide input. But I assume some sort of plan is going to be developed. Will part of the planning process include a chance to solicit more feedback from faculty, staff, and students?

**Senator Williams:** Well, I think that is going to come down to, the plan is going to be what are the possibilities? Where could we go? What would be the best usage of this space or that space? For instance, there is one in Engineering that really lags behind all the other buildings, I think you all know what I am talking about, but these buildings need to be brought up to speed obviously. Where is the money going to come from? There are big issues there. The idea is this is going to point us in a direction and where are we going to go and then comes prioritization of what is the next step.

**Senator Dowd:** I would like to touch on an issue Senator Williams raised a moment ago. Based on a number of conversations I have had with you, it is my understanding that Master Planning on buildings, grounds, classrooms utilization, and many other related issues has been proceeding according to the projected timeline. However, it is also my understanding that Master Planning needs to “slow-walk” its current activities so that other important activities such as Strategic Enrollment and Strategic Planning can advance their activities to be aligned with those from Master Planning. By that I mean the Master Plan, Strategic Enrollment and Strategic Planning must be aligned so that a true, comprehensive set of planning can take place. It seems to me that such coordination of efforts will, in contrast to previous years, yield an operational plan to move forward all areas of our university. Given your direct involvement in the Master Plan, what are your thoughts on this coordination of activities?

**Senator Williams:** The master plan and others are more or less running side-by-side right now, parallel. While we might get some information back from this committee, that will actually give us some ideas. They will only be potentials unless we actually have a budget and other things

that can be used to eventually do these things. Again, is everything being put into play? As far as I can see, everything has been put into play that you have suggested, but we haven't had any decisions, obviously.

**Senator Krantz:** Is it a safe assumption that there are no proposals for large new construction? This is basically just taking what we have presently and improving it?

**Senator Williams:** I really can't say that there won't be any new construction, but I am not going to tell you that there is. That is a very political way to say that they haven't actually said anything about building any new buildings, yes. But, never say, never.

**President Keith:** Are there any other questions?

**Senator Humphrys:** Is it true, Senator Williams, I heard something along the line that they talked about giving away or selling Scott Park, but then I heard that it is not ours to give away.

**Senator Williams:** That is an interesting thing that somebody introduced somewhere that we should just sell Scott Park. But the problem is, that it's actually the state of Ohio's. It is not ours. If we try to sell it we will probably be "spanked," probably rather badly. It is not something that is actually on the table. Quite honestly, Scott Park has been really a big focus of "what do we do with this?" Again, the baseball fields and the other fields that are there, what do we do with them? What do we do with the thousand or so employees that are there or few hundred employees? I don't know. But it wasn't a very large group of people compared to the rest of the university. Quite honestly, could they bring those people to the Main Campus or the Health Science Campus and find room for them at those places? These are things that they are exploring, obviously. But the issue is how do they get rid of some expenses while still maintaining all the services that they are trying to deliver? Yeah, that was rather interesting when somebody said "well, why don't you sell it?" We don't own it, that's a problem, so it would be like selling the Brooklyn Bridge.

**President Keith:** Are there any more questions or comments? Well, thank you very much, Senator Williams. Okay, next on our agenda is Senator Mike Dowd who is at long last going to share with us a presentation.

**Senator Dowd:** Thank you, President Keith. I was bumped from the previous Senate meeting because we ran out of time. I had planned for roughly a two-minute presentation at that meeting. Hopefully I can stick to that time frame today. This presentation is intended simply as a "heads up" on the governor's Task Force on Affordability and Efficiency. The content of this presentation will be a summary of the material sent to you prior to the previous Senate meeting.

**President Keith:** We sent it out yesterday.

**Senator Dowd:** Nice. Thank you. Last year, Governor Kasich signed an Executive Order establishing the Ohio Task Force on Affordability and Efficiency. The charge to that task force



was to recommend solutions for institutions of higher education based on three key simultaneous needs: to be more efficient both in expense management and revenue generation, while offering an education of equal or higher quality, and decreasing costs to students and their families. Please consult the documents distributed to you to consider all of the recommendations from the Ohio Task Force. For background information, note that last summer President Gabor convened a group to provide initial responses to the issues raised by that Task Force. I was appointed to that group. Last summer and into Fall 2015, each Ohio university responded to initial inquiries from the State and provided initial suggestions as to how meet the charge given to that Task Force. It is my understanding that the Ohio Task Force considered suggestions from each Ohio college and university when forming their October recommendations which, again, were distributed to Senators prior to this meeting. The University of Toledo must address the recommendations of the Ohio Task Force. President Gabor seated many individuals across the university onto a UT Council to form a plan on how to best address those recommendations. That group first met during the first week of January, basically to assign specific tasks to council members. That council has not met since that time, but our initial reports are to be submitted later this week. I will inform Senate as the work of that council moves forward. That said, there are two purposes of my presentation today. First, though President Keith informed Faculty Senate of this task force in early Fall 2015, I wanted to remind Senators of the Ohio Task Force that a UT council has been formed to begin addressing their recommendations. Second, and more important to me, I've asked for a few minutes at Senate to invite comments from Senators on the issues and recommendations included in the material distributed to you. Second, I've asked that the recommendations from Ohio's Task Force be distributed so that I will have the opportunity to receive feedback from Senators on the various recommendations described in that document. If you would, please send your comments to the Faculty Senate office. I am happy to address any questions you have on this work.

**President Keith:** Thank you, Senator Dowd. Are there any items from the floor?

**Senator Barnes:** Two quick things. Senator Dowd, is anybody challenging these cuts that have been going on for at least the last ten years? In addition to cutting costs, what they should be doing is reinvesting in education.

**Senator Dowd:** What a thought! I don't know if I can respond fully due to the few remaining minutes of Senate today. Can I talk to you privately after the meeting?

**Senator Barnes:** I would really like to see someone officially and formally take that message back to these people.

**Senator Dowd:** I would be more than happy to take that message back to that group for consideration. The initial UT group worked in summer 2015 and then was inactive for a period, then met again, and then was inactive for another period. We now have a UT council to consider such issues. That council will be considering general issues and yours is a specific

recommendation. However, this is an issue – we do not have to discuss this issue privately because I can respond with the remaining time today. Your point of reinvesting in education is completely consistent with part of the charge to the Ohio Task Force of decreasing costs to students while offering an education of equal or higher quality.

**Senator Barnes:** Okay. The other issue was something that was raised maybe two or three years ago at Senate. We heard a report from the University Recycling Services and at that time I asked a question about book recycling as a possibility of instead of putting books in dumpsters; put them into a shipping cart container and send them somewhere where people might actually still be needing books because “we don’t need them here.” The guy, I don’t remember his name, said we can organize that, so he was really willing to take it on and then it just seemed to maybe fall through the cracks. I think someone really needs to clean their office out <laughter>. It would really be nice probably at the end of the academic year to cart our books to a central location where the university could provide a place where we can donate books as opposed to leaving them in the hallway and hope somebody picks them up, which is what we do in our building.

**President Keith:** Thank you, Senator Barnes. I think we can talk about that at our next FSEC meeting and come back and tell you what a great idea you had <laughter>. Maybe we can dig into it a little bit more to find out the name of the person.

**Senator Barnes:** It was somebody in Recycling.

**President Keith:** Right. Thank you. Are there any other items from the floor? May I have a motion to adjourn? Meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

IV. Meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Lucy Duhon  
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard  
Faculty Senate Office Administrative Secretary