

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of March 31, 2015
FACULTY SENATE

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

Approved @ F.S. meeting on 4/28/2015

Summary of Senate Business
Interim Provost Barrett, Provost Update

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 Hoblet: I call this meeting to order. Welcome to the twelfth Faculty Senate meeting of AY 2014-2015. **Lucy Duhon**, Executive Secretary, called the roll.

I. Roll Call: 2014-2015 Senators:

Present: Present: Bailey, Barnes, Black, Boardley, Brakel, Burnett, Cappelletty, Caruso, Denyer, Dowd, Duggan, Duhon, Edinger, Edwards, Elmer, Franchetti, Giovannucci, Gohara, Gray, Gunning, Harmych, Hasaan-Elnaby, Hoblet, Humphrys, Kistner, Krantz, Lee, Lundquist, Malhotra, Molitor, Monsos, Nathan, Nigem, Ohlinger, Porter, Quinlan, Rouillard, Sheldon, Springman, Srinivasan, Teclehaimanot A. Thompson, G. Thompson, Thompson-Casado Van Hoy, Weck-Schwarz, Den White, Don White, Williams, Wedding

Excused absences: Brickman, Keith, Kennedy, Mc Affee, Slantcheva-Durst

Unexcused absences: Compora, Crist, Devabhaktuni, Farrell, Federman, Hammersley, Plenefisch, Prior, Quinn, Relue, Schafer, Skeel

III. Approval of Minutes: Minutes from the Faculty Senate meeting held on February 17th are ready for approval.

President Hoblet: I call the March 31, 2015 Faculty Senate Meeting to order. I would like to welcome all Senators and guests.

The draft Minutes from the Faculty Senate meeting held on February 17th are ready for approval. Are there any corrections? Is there any discussion? Hearing none. May I have a motion to approve the Minutes? All in favor please say "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? Please let the record show, the Faculty Senate Minutes of February 17, 2015 are approved. *Minutes approved.*

Executive Committee Report: FS committees have been very busy trying to address program, curriculum, and regulatory needs while FSEC is trying to address new and ongoing issues and concerns. One issue addressed this past week was lost FBI background check records in the College of Nursing. To address this, the FSEC has determined that an independent investigation be conducted by a task force. Kristen Keith, President Elect FS, will lead this charge. The task force members are Drs. Mary Ellen Edwards, Walt Edinger, Amy Thompson, and Patricia Hogue. FSEC is grateful that they have accepted the charge. The task force will conduct a root-cause analysis of the incident and will provide a report to FS. Dr. Tim Gaspar has also agreed to come to Senate to address any questions or concerns regarding these lost records.

Another item of concern is the Title IX consultation report which included recommendations to strengthen compliance and improve our community so infractions are rare. We will continue to ask that someone come and update Senate on the Title IX Consultant visit and hopefully will hear from someone prior to the end of Senate meetings for this academic year.

The deans' evaluations have gone out to the appropriate colleges. Unfortunately we learned that the Center for Creative Instruction closed the portal prematurely, and the portal then had to be reopened. We are hoping that most individuals were able to complete the evaluation regarding their college dean, but have learned that due to the closure, some faculty did not complete the evaluation process. The results have been compiled by Mike Dowd who did an exceptional reporting of the results. The results have been disseminated to the deans and Interim Provost Barrett. The dissemination of the results to faculty in the colleges where the deans were assessed will occur soon.

The nomination ballots have been sent to colleges and are being confirmed by the Committee on Elections. Quinetta has been working to organize each of the college's ballots. The process of validation of nominees will be completed shortly with final ballots going out soon. My sincere thanks go out to Quinetta Hubbard in the FS Office for keeping up with this year's workload with all that has occurred.

Other committees have been working hard this year with three of them on the agenda to provide updates and gain approvals. Thanks to all chairpersons for your work and dedication and committee members for your time and expertise.

Please revise your agenda to reflect that Sharon Barnes will not be reporting at this meeting, but will be included on the April 14, 2015 meeting.

For your information, I am currently serving on the review committee of eight firms that responded to the "multiple campus master plan RFQ" sent by Facilities and Construction. This process is ongoing and Interviews of the final three firms will take place on April 16, 2015. All of the organizations that answered the RFQ appear to have significant experience and presented proposals that included examples of works previously completed at other universities. Once the finalist is selected their name and some background information will be provided to Senate.

It has been a productive year with so much left to complete. As always we continue to ask for your support and energy in keeping us informed about issues that impact our university community. With that, I would like to introduce our Interim Provost, John Barrett who will be giving us a pretty extensive update on all the things going on in the Provost Office and in the University. Thank you.

Interim Provost Barrett: Thank you all for inviting me here today. I will not deliver on what President Hoblet promised; I will not tell you everything that's going on in the Provost Office because you don't want to know and we don't have that much time <laughter>. First of all, I do want to make a few comments on hiring. Remember we created a hiring plan back in the Fall? This is a moving target. To be honest, we are getting new retirements popping out of the woodwork that didn't give us notice back in November and some people unfortunately are taking offers elsewhere. So far, we have hired 14 people for next year and we have an additional 61 searches in process. So we are trying to fill about 75 new hires for next year, and as I said, I think a few more will pop up as the Spring continues; odds are, we will not fill them all; we've got three years, so we don't want to be hiring the people that we aren't super excited-that is roughly twice what we did this last year. For those of you who expressed some concerns over whether

we are hiring tenure-track or all lecturers- it's about 70-75% tenure and tenure-track. So it is a good year for UT and we are getting some great candidates. I am hearing a lot of exciting things from various departments, so hopefully we are building a great future for the school by finding some great candidates. As I said, it is a robust year for us in this regard, so I thought you would want to hear that. Second, as President Hoblet mentioned, I received the deans' evaluations from Senator Dowd on Friday at 11:54 p.m., so he was working late. He then sent them off to the rest of the deans a little after midnight. To be honest, I have not read them yet, I only read Senator Dowd's summary. I am going to be looking at them over the next few days. I scheduled meetings with the deans at the end of the month. I want to have time to look them over and discuss them potentially with my new boss. At the end of that process, so at the end of April or the beginning of May I anticipate renewing or taking whatever other action that's appropriate at that point, so I want to give you a sense of the timeline that is going on. I also want to say that tomorrow night you are going to get your deans' evaluation. I would strongly urge you, I can't mandate, but I will strongly urge you not to send this out to prominent alumni to put pressure on me to renew or not renew people, things like that. We don't want to be airing---

Senator Dowd: You are just giving us ideas, Interim Provost Barrett <laughter>.

Interim Provost Barrett: Like you didn't have that idea <laughter>. It is not going to influence my thought process and what it does is potentially rouse people up that care a lot about the university without knowing all the details. It is there for you to absorb, and for you to think about, and for you to have a sense where your colleagues are at.

President Hoblet: Are you going to ask the deans to do the same?

Interim Provost Barrett: Yes.

President Hoblet: Thank you. I just thought I would ask for the record.

Interim Provost Barrett: So that is kind of where we are with the deans' evaluations.

As you may know this year, we had Chris Roseman as an assessment representative. We gave him some release time to go around and kind of help people pre-appear on the assessment process to build better assessment. We got very positive feedback on that. He has agreed to continue doing this next year. We're also going to do a similar thing, we are going to add another person and I am not sure if we identified the person yet, so I won't share a name. We are going to add somebody to help people take advantage of our new syllabus tool and the whole kind of course suggestion/new course proposal process- have somebody that's a faculty member, that's a peer who understands why things are on a syllabus whether it's for HLC or the state or just because it is good practice – and what you need to have in your materials, if you want to submit them to a curriculum committee or submit them to OBOR etc. They will make the process a smoother, easier one and so we are hoping that it is some use to you as well; we will see how it goes and then you will give me feedback next year. Tied to that, I have recommended to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee that we create an executive curriculum committee, or you can call it whatever you want. It is kind of a committee of committees that has the chair of the Core Curriculum and Undergrad Curriculum and the other curriculum committees; also, we'll have someone from my office that understands the state's process. We can get a group together that helps foster better communication across the groups and make sure each group is talking to each other so they know what you need. I don't think there's anything that's more frustrating than getting everything all the way through the UT process and

then it gets down in Columbus and it gets rejected because it was missing an element. We just want to make it smoother and more efficient and make sure everyone knows what needs to be in there and have it in there from the get-go. I proposed that, and I think it was genuinely favorably received, although there was no vote taken at the meeting when I introduced it. I also want to thank the Senate Exec for – this year we were pretty slow seating a lot of our committees and some of them really didn't get going till January, and that doesn't allow us to get done what needs to get done in a year; obviously, we had a lot of transitions with presidents and provosts and other things, so it wasn't necessarily at the top of my list either. So, as I understand it, we are going to move to seating the committees at the end of Spring so they are available in the Summer and can hit the ground running in the Fall. I think that is a big improvement for helping making the university work better and I want to thank you all for that, particularly the Exec.

I also suggested to the Exec that we have been criticized by the state for not having a theory of general education that kind of embraces everything it state that we are trying to accomplish. There has been pushback when I repeated that criticism, “yes, we do; here is our statement.” Whether we do or not, the state doesn't see it as giving us extra wiggle room here. If you have a general theory of your gen ed. it gives you some “wiggle” room in the OTM in terms of things you can place in there that you couldn't have otherwise – to accomplish the state admission standards. So I have suggested that the Core Curriculum Committee look at the concept of let's frame everything around literacies: scientific literacy, information literacy, literacy-literacy, and visual literacy. By doing this I think it creates a framework that allows most everything that we're trying to accomplish to fit in, including, we may very well be able to get foreign languages into the gen ed. which they don't fit otherwise. If it is part of this comprehensive thing, it appears that it will allow us to do some things we couldn't do before. I know that's been a struggle for us for revising our gen ed. and moving forward. This is not a mandate for me; this is something I think we should explore and if it provides a good opportunity for us, then let's take advantage of it, and if it doesn't, then we can think about other alternatives.

It has come to my attention and many of you may know, if you use textbooks – a lot of textbooks have a test answer bank out there that you can log into and get test questions that you use for exams and quizzes and things like that. In the modern age there are also companies that get that data and then package it to people that want to buy access that shouldn't have it, such as students. And so I am mentioning this in my report so that it goes out to all the faculty out there. I am going to mention it tomorrow to the chairs and deans at the ALT meeting because if you are using these questions, you should think long and hard about the context in which you're using them and whether they are presenting inappropriate opportunities for academic misconduct. I would ask you as individual faculty members and you as departments to get together and discuss when it is appropriate to use these types of pre-done questions and when is it inappropriate. For example, a timed quiz with no computer access with a test bank with thousands of questions- if somebody went through all thousands of them to learn the questions then it's probably not a bad thing, go ahead and use it. But on the other hand, for a take-home exam, it is probably not a good idea because of the ability to circumvent what you are trying to assess and test through your exam. So as I said, I just want people to be aware of this kind of security issue access that students have. It is part of the modern world that we live in and just think long and hard about how you use those types of materials if you use them.

This is going to take a while- this next item to accomplish. I am in the process of “blowing” up YouCollege and the Honors College Portal. The Jesup Scott Honors College will continue; it is doing great things, it is growing, and it is exciting. But, the Portal seems to confuse people particularly in the

Honors area. I don't know if it serves a lot of purposes, it created additional administrative costs. It is going to take a while to transition. We've already admitted students for the Fall class into the colleges and we don't want to necessarily yank them right back out because then the students are like. "what's going on at this crazy place?" So we are building a transition plan to move away from it. This plan will have students that have a declared interest aligned to the college that they're interested in if they have the admission requirements. For those that don't have them or that are terminally undecided between discipline areas, we need to find a way to transition them in a way that it doesn't penalize them depending on the path they ultimately choose to take. The advisors and coaches I am hoping are going to work better. We've been assigning students to coaches just randomly within the unit; YouCollege is assigned randomly and Honors is assigned randomly. We are going to assign more according to the interests of the students; so everybody that wants to be a mechanical engineer will get the same coach and that way, hopefully the coach starts to work more with the advisor, and get to know the advisor, and gets to know the likely majors that those types of students might switch to so they can be better coaches and better advisors to tie this thing together. When we did the budget process this year, we added several new advisors and several new coaches, so we are trying to make this a little more robust. So far we've had good results in terms of retention and students' success and we want to increase that.

You may have heard that D'Naie Jacobs is on administrative leave and Julie Fischer-Kinney is the acting Dean for YouCollege for the time being. There are a few other things that are going on. You've probably heard, or – if you read the *Collegian* – have seen an editorial criticizing it. I instituted a survey to the students to see how they felt about having a requirement for having tablets or laptops. The survey closes this Friday; I have no idea how it is going to come out. The reason I surveyed them is because I want to find out if the students want to do this or not. If they are not interested, I am not going to force the issue. The reason for looking into this was first and foremost to save the students money. If you get a tablet, you can pay for the cost of the tablet with textbook savings in sometimes a semester but almost always a year, because e-textbooks are about 40-50% of the cost of paper textbooks. If we move to open source materials, then the textbook cost goes to zero – you don't even have a course pack, it can all be electronic, so that was my main motivation. But if students don't want it, then it's fine. I think it creates other opportunities that will allow for some creative teaching techniques for those who wish to engage in it if we have it; it puts a cool device in the student's hand and makes it eligible for financial aid. So there are a number of reasons to think about this, but it really needs to be a student-driven decision, and I am going to defer very heavily to what the students want on this issue. Tied to this, you just heard me mention I want to see us move towards open-source materials as much as we can. There are fields that won't work and courses that won't work. The state is pushing us to find ways to reduce the cost of a degree for students; getting rid of pretty much all textbook costs will go a long way toward making that 5% mandate that's coming out of Columbus this year; if you think about what students spend every term – I think it's over 5% of their total cost right there. So we are developing a pilot that will be rolling out over the Summer and into the Fall to help people move towards it. I am not sure of the exact details, we are still kind of kicking it around a little bit, but we are kind of leaning towards trying to find a way for a department to create an "open source library" within itself, and then various faculty can easily tap into [it] rather than trying to teach a faculty member to do his/her own thing.

You've probably heard, but I'll mention it just in case you haven't. Full-time graduate student status is being reduced from 12 hours down to nine starting in the Fall. This will have a number of impacts. Hopefully, it will make our programs more competitive where we've been having students take too many

credits and that's driven some applicants away. It will affect how many courses people register for in non-cohort programs. The plateau pricing will remain the same – 12-15 credit hrs – so we are not dropping it down. Did you have a comment?

Senator Dowd: I was just about to ask about the “free zone,” where students pay the same amount of tuition if they are within a range of credit hours. Has there been any discussion about dropping the “free-zone” plateau to be between 9-12 credit hours or between 9-15 credit hours?

Interim Provost Barrett: There is discussion of that – the potential budget impact of taking full-time status of graduate students from 12 credit hrs. to 9 credit hrs. is nightmarishly hard to predict because it affects about seven or eight different variables and you're not sure exactly how each one is going to sort out. So we decided to move this one thing this year, and then once we see how it sorts out, it makes more sense to do the other. If we add the change of plateau pricing we are further muddying the waters on what is driving which types of behavior. It will be a robust discussion next year I suspect. We did discuss it this year as well, but that is why we went the way we did.

I had a meeting this morning which is a follow-up on some things we've been reaching out on. I have asked the honors advisors in the academic colleges to work with the Honors College to make our honors courses more robust and more special, not just paper add-ons to courses that we otherwise take. I am really looking to the kind of small discussion-oriented, interactive courses that you get in Kenyon, Oberlin, or Grinnell, something like that. And so, they are going to take the lead on this, but hopefully we will have a handful of courses to roll out in the Fall to pilot this with and see how the students react to it. We are promising something special when it comes to our Honors College and that may be the experiences and it may be the beautiful lectures that we are going to have next year, but I think it's also the in-classroom experience and I think we can improve it. I'm hoping to put some of our best classroom teachers in that are excited to be in a smaller environment that is a little more interactive. People are going to have to step up; and by that I mean, I don't expect to see any multiple choice quizzes in these classes; it should be more paper-oriented and presentation-oriented, things of that sort. I think the people we are meeting are pretty favorably disposed towards this idea and we will see how it develops. I will also comment – sometime in the Honors College we are going to have a great line-up for next year on our speakers. We are bringing Steve Wozniak, the co-founder of Apple in. We are bringing Nathan Myhrvold, who is the first Chief Technology Officer of Microsoft- one of the reasons he is on my radar is because he wrote the definitive 21st Century cookbook called, *Modernist Cuisine* which weighs about 95 pounds and it's five volumes long. We are bringing Ann Bancroft, not the actress, but a global explorer; she is going to go to those poles and cross Greenland. And we are bringing Robin Chase who is the founder of Zipcar. We also invited Neil deGrasse Tyson. So we are trying to expand from just having political people, and I mention this because I think we are bringing in some really cool people. If you went to any of the speakers this year they really did a great job. But, what we're not doing is we are not filling Doermann [Theatre] and so we really need to get the word out to our students, faculty, and community members because I think these are really great opportunities to hear some exciting stuff.

President Hoblet: In planning the dates, I would hope that the Faculty Senate calendar is considered. Two of the speakers were on the same night as Faculty Senate meetings and---

Interim Provost Barrett: Perfect, you are already here at 6 p.m. and lectures start at 7 p.m. <laughter>. That doesn't solve anything?

President Hoblet: No. It automatically eliminated a number of people that would've attended when we are not on that campus

Interim Provost Barrett: One of the challenges with this is when you are trying to get high-profile speakers you have to be somewhat flexible according to their calendar, when they want to come visit, but I will try to be more cognizant of that when we have a choice.

President Hoblet: Or if we know in advance we can look at our calendar and bring it to the floor of Senate to see if there are any adjustments that Senate would like to make.

Interim Provost Barrett: Okay. As I said, the talks have been excellent this year. The people that have gone have really been impressed and it is a pity that we are not filling the house. The College of LLSS and NSM came to me a few weeks ago and suggested a Summer bridge program to help minority students have a better chance of completing. I pushed back on some of their structural issues and budget issues and they came back to me with a refined proposal and we're venturing forward to create a Summer bridge starting this Summer, it's going into the Fall. The statistics that I have are a little old here, but the last statistics that I saw: the completion rate for an African-American male starting at UT (this is from 2007-2008, so it is stale) was about 15%. Unfortunately, I don't think that it's gotten a ton better, so we are hopeful this will grow. It should actually be economically self-sustaining; the actual number of students that will continue actually will fund the cost of doing it and if that does pan out, it will allow us to expand it and cover more programs because I think we owe it to the students. If they are going to come here and put their hard-earned money down or their parents' hard-earned money down, then we need to give them every chance to succeed.

I asked the chairs at the Academic Leadership meeting to meet with their departments and engage in a discussion about the current renewal, promotion, and tenure standards. I am not mandating a change, but I think some of these standards have been around for decades and I think it is an appropriate time to ask ourselves as we are trying to clean house and improve things, do we have the right standards for the 21st Century? I don't know the answer to this for any given discipline, but, should blogging count? In some disciplines, should writing a grant and a follow-up report count as a publication since it is not technically published? That's been an impediment in one department that I am aware of. We had somebody go up for a promotion recently who after getting tenure became a chair and only recently went back to the faculty, and any of you who are chairs know, that is a major workload to take on and it cuts into your scholarly productivity, but the elaborations gave no credit for it which then gives me very little flexibility, I supposed to apply the rules. I am not telling you how to manage your standards, but I would like you to take a hard look at them and ask, are they right and are they giving credit for the right things? We have community engagement scholarship in a way it didn't exist 20 years ago; I don't know where a community garden fits into things, but if you are in the area where that fits, consider how it ought to be- if you don't factor it in, then you discourage the behavior, so that ought to be a guiding element in thinking about this.

A couple of last things; I am beginning to be a little "preachy" here so I apologize. If you are going to buy an Apple product: computer, phone, tablet etc. please go to our technology store in the Student Union. Apple has uniform pricing, you do not save money going elsewhere and if you buy here, we get a kickback; we get a cut of it, so it helps UT. We are on the edge of being the first Apple-licensed seller to lose their license because of lack of volume.

Senator Edinger: Along those lines – I am not sure how it works campus-wide, but on this campus (Health Science Campus) there is very little support for Apple computers. My lab is about half Apple and half Windows space, but we are pretty much left on our own for any Apple support. I don't know how that works across the board.

Interim Provost Barrett: Well, we have better Apple support on Main Campus, there is a fair amount of it. Some of it lives right below my office which makes it pretty easy for me to find. As you may have heard, if you read the Akron president's post, our head of IT may very well be leaving soon to be the head of their IT, but that is not official, he has not turned in a resignation yet. I suspect that we are going to be looking at restructuring some of the services and how they are delivered. So as that happens, I think that is a great point, making sure we are getting adequate support on both campuses because people obviously use these products all around the university.

Tied to the money side of the equation- we are going to spend approximately \$2.6 million on OhioLINK next year. OhioLINK just keeps getting bigger. The more expensive part of it is that they're upping their fees and part of it is that we're using it. I have been told that most people do not know that every time you download an article, it costs the university \$9.00. So, I am not saying don't download something, but if you are going to download it, don't have everybody in your class download the same thing- download one copy and put it somewhere where other people can share it and access it such as Blackboard or whatever. We are putting together a memo that outlines OhioLINK's costs and other major database costs and I am going to send that to all faculty and all chairs just so you are aware of what these costs are. We want you to engage in robust research. We are not trying to discourage this in any way, shape, or form, but if the same articles are developed in two places and one is free and one is not, then pick the free one. The single most expensive use of OhioLINK is bringing a book to campus. Once again, we need the books, our library is not as robust as it ought to be. This to me is low-hanging-fruit- we are just using it mindlessly and not thinking about the cost to ourselves, so be aware of that.

Senator Edwards: I don't think we are using it mindlessly, Interim Provost Barrett.

Interim Provost Barrett: The amount you download, I think some people don't think about it because I've talked to professors and they are like, "I just download everything whenever I feel like it."

Senator Edwards: But to make a general statement like that at a research institution is---

Interim Provost Barrett: I apologize. I didn't mean to imply people weren't thoughtful in their research. I meant to imply, we don't think about the cost at all, so we don't worry about how much we use it. The reason healthcare plans require a co-pay, even if you pay a couple of dollars, is it fundamentally affects you. It is not your dollars, but we just ought to think about it and use the university's resources wisely. If you need something, by all means, use it. I am not trying to say "don't," but be smart about it.

Unknown Speaker: Do you know how much it costs to bring... [Indecipherable]

Interim Provost Barrett: Some people do, I do not.

President Hoblet: \$2.6 million is a lot of money.

Interim Provost Barrett: I know.

President Hoblet: Have we done a cost benefit analysis of looking at the journals that we have been downloading and bringing back journals and hardcopies instead of using OhioLINK?

Interim Provost Barrett: Given the breadth of disciplines and things that we do, I think everybody is pretty convinced as far as I can tell that OhioLINK is an overall bargain. We do subscribe to a number of electronic databases, as well as a limited number of journals and [other] formats, as well as electronic journals that are not part of databases. And that is one of the things we continue to look at, is where do we get the most value? I don't personally do that, but that is something we try to be smart about.

Senator Relue: Let me ask another question about OhioLINK. So, being part of that network, do we have a flat fee that we pay just to be part of it, and then we pay on top of that for anything we actually use?

Interim Provost Barrett: I am not an expert on this, but my understanding is we pay a flat fee that is based on our three-year rolling average of usage. So even if we drop next year's usage in half, then the year after, it will only have one third of that drop in effect because it would take three years for it to fully take effect. So it is not like we pay per use this day; we pay a fee based on how we've used it for the last three years.

Senator Relue: I don't know if that's ever been communicated to us.

Interim Provost Barrett: I don't think it has been, which is why I am doing it now. I don't think anybody knows. The meeting I was sitting in with chairs and VPs and stuff, everybody was like, "wow; I've never heard that before." And so we are trying to get the word out. As I say, it's not to discourage you in any way, but just so people know. It is not negative at all in terms of what you're doing- if there's an opportunity to share a resource, you download it once rather than downloading it multiple times. Let's say another database has it free, take advantage of that.

This one is probably a little more rare and off the reservation and it may be something that I shouldn't even comment on, but I am going to do it anyway. If you are traveling on university business and you are renting a car – and there may be other programs that do the same thing – but I have become a religious devotee of a website called, *AutoSlash*. You can take a reservation you make anywhere you want and put it in *AutoSlash* and it automatically tracks if the price ever gets lower, and if it does, it sends you an email and you click it and it will book for you. Once you book with them it will keep rebooking every time the price gets lower. Once again, you can do it in your own life too, but I am mentioning it from a university point of view because as a group we rent a fair number of cars and that helps us save money that we are just throwing away otherwise. I rented a car for August of this Summer for a vacation that I am going on- the initial quote I got was \$950, but within forty minutes I had a reduced price down to \$540. I rented a car last year for .17 cents for the day, now, there were taxes and fees on top of that so it was about \$12 total, but it really does work. Brian, am I right?

Brian: Yes.

President Hoblet: Just to clarify, your vacation was out of your own pocket, correct <laughter>? For the Minutes- I am assuming that to be so, but I don't want anybody to read our Faculty Senate Minutes and say, "Oh, Interim Provost Barrett"<laughter> is taking vacation on the university's dime.

Interim Provost Barrett: No, my vacations are on my dime.

President Hoblet: Thank you, Interim Provost Barrett.

Interim Provost Barrett: And hopefully, everybody's are <laughter>. So, that is really all I had outlined, obviously there are a zillion more things. I think the reinvigoration of the Kohler Grants and the Faculty Development Grants have been a big success this year; people seem to be very thankful of that. I think the high sabbatical approval rate-we approved literally everybody that was eligible and it's been a major step forward. I feel like it's been a good year. It's been my pleasure to serve you and if there are things that I can do better going forward please don't hesitate to tell me.

Senator Wedding: Interim Provost Barrett, I just want to make one comment- going back to when you talked about Dr. D'Naie Jacobs being removed as Dean of University College.

Interim Provost Barrett: Actually I said she was on administrative leave.

Senator Wedding: Okay, she's on administrative leave, but she was also walked off campus and that was reported in the press. I have a real problem with this university policy or whatever it is. Now, I know you didn't create it and I know you didn't do it, but somebody in this hierarchy, when they terminate somebody or suspend them they are walking them off campus. Now, I can understand this if there's a person that is involved in something that is dangerous or violent etc. etc., but in this case, Dr. Jacobs did nothing and it ended up in the papers. The implication is she did something pretty bad and I think that is really very bad taste on the part of the university to do this. Then one hour later, it was a "hostile environment" in the University College; well, heck, we can walk off a couple dozen deans on this campus. I think this is just poor taste to do that; to suspend her is fine, but to walk her off campus and then to report it to the papers was just wrong. It infuriated me to read that.

Interim Provost Barrett: I can't really comment on the university policies generally. As you said, I didn't create it nor did I enforce it. What gets reported in the *Blade* is largely beyond our control. I don't think it is something that the university sought out---

Senator Wedding: They wouldn't be able to leak it if she hadn't been walked off campus. If they just would've suspended her that is one thing, but to walk her off campus is the point I am talking about. I don't think we should be walking people off campus just because they've been suspended or terminated, unless they are some sort of imminent risk.

Interim Provost Barrett: All right.

Senator Wedding: That is an opinion.

Interim Provost Barrett: Is there anything else?

Past-President Rouillard: Thanks for some of the ways that you are initiating some of these projects. Thank you for surveying the students to see if they want the tablet before "cramming it down their throats." And thank you for reconsidering this new Honors College/Portal business, that was never brought to faculty in the first place, so we appreciate it.

Interim Provost Barrett: Well, I remain committed to shared governance and trying to make sure we have a sound input from lots of groups before we make decisions as much as possible.

Senator Molitor: And as a follow up to that. Thank you for working with us on the gen ed. and the core curriculum. I don't think anybody in this room thinks there anything wrong with our gen ed. and our core curriculum. I think we're responding to perceived changes that supposedly the state wants us to make. It

would be great if we can find a way to work with the state and have them accept what we feel is very successful gen ed. and core curriculum. Again, I appreciate your efforts and what you are doing.

Interim Provost Barrett: Obviously, I am trying to make sure we are in compliance with state rules, and HLC rules, and other bodies because that's part of my responsibilities. And I think you are right, the motivation is not from here, it is an alignment issue. As some of you know, I actually said to the state generally, why isn't foreign languages able to be part of the gen ed.? To me, speaking at least two languages is part of an educated person. So far I haven't won on that one, so I am going to keep pitching it, but if we find another way to accomplish what we are trying to accomplish, then I think that's good. I have to say after seeing Brian Kennedy's presentation on visual literacy, I would love to see that in our gen ed. as well. I think when you look at engineers who are going to be speaking to your universe-designing products, it is not just the product, it is how it looks. I mean, Apple is a testament to that, and having some sense of the elements, I think it would serve some of our students really well.

Senator Barnes: Is the hiring plan done? I know you said it is a moving target, but have all the colleges' reports gone back to the college deans?

Interim Provost Barrett: I believe they all have. I reviewed them all between the week of Christmas and New Year's. I met with my vice provosts and went over them and then they were supposed to communicate everything back to the colleges. I think all colleges have heard back by now- some are a little faster and some are a little slower. I am going to put a footnote up there, however there's one exception- we brought in a brand new dean over the Christmas/Holiday break to the Health Science College and he asked me if he could kind of put their plan on hold so he can give it some thought and make sure it was in line with what he thought. He's been having discussions with my vice provost about what he wants to do. I don't know (exactly) if he has a full plan or if it's been a little "piecemeal," but that one is the only one that wasn't handled in the same way.

Senator Edwards: Thank you also for getting the committees lined up again. But one of the things you said in your discussion here is that committees will be available in the Summer. Most all of the undergraduate colleges and faculty senators are nine-month faculty, so could you elaborate on what you mean by committees being available in the Summer?

Interim Provost Barrett: Well, I am going to say a couple of things and these may not align completely with Faculty Senate Exec thoughts, so there may be future discussions to iron out the details. I am going to say two things: first, there are times when things happen in the Summer that they need to happen and they can't wait till the Fall, and if we're going to engage in robust, shared governance, then faculty need to be available at that point. It doesn't have to be all faculty; it can be 12-month contract faculty that serve on committees. It can be people that choose to interact via email versus being on campus. But some decisions just can't wait, and so you have a choice from my perspective, either you engage when necessary in the Summer, or actions get taken, and I prefer not to take the actions when I have to without consulting. Now, the second piece to that equation is, you don't try to push work in the Summer nor are you looking to push work in the Summer, but sometimes things happen that you need to deal with. And as an integrated campus we have a number of colleges that are 12-month colleges that have operations going all-year-round in a very robust way. And even in the non-12 month colleges, every college has faculty on contract for a good hunk of the Summer because of Summer teaching. So, it is not like people aren't around or it's not like business isn't occurring, and if we are going to be a responsive university I think

we have to be thinking more robustly about how we can have that shared governance input even during the Summer. I am amenable to different ways to do it. I prefer not to make the decisions without the input, but as I say, sometimes you have to, and I think increasingly we need to be thinking that way just as a general model.

Senator Edwards: Increasingly thinking that way that additional business will be conducted over the Summer?

Interim Provost Barrett: A certain amount of business is almost certainly going to happen over the Summer, it always has.

Senator Edwards: Does that mean then that nine-month faculty cannot participate? My understanding is Summer teaching contracts are for teaching only.

Interim Provost Barrett: Well, Senator Wedding is the grievance officer for the AAUP so he can tell me if I'm "stepping" on his interpretation of the contract. I don't think there's anything in your employment relationship with the university that precludes you from some low-level Summer activity if you choose to.

Senator Edwards: Well, official business is not "low-level activity."

Interim Provost Barrett: That is what it is. If you've got one or two decisions to make then---

Senator Dowd: I would like to follow-up on Senator Edwards point. Discussions at Faculty Senate usually focus on academic issues. For Faculty Senate to consider a curricular issue in the summer we first would have to receive a proposal from a college council. This implies that college council would have to be in session during the summer months.

Interim Provost Barrett: I don't think that is true. I don't think most people are going to be proposing curriculum in the middle of the Summer. But, I can imagine the Pharmacy College doing it and I can imagine the College of Medicine doing it. If they want to get something out by the Fall, do we want to hold them up? How do you want to process it? The more common situation is me coming up with another "goofy" idea for open source materials and we would like to run a pilot in the Fall but I would like to get some feedback first. So that wouldn't go through the College Council, it is coming out of the Provost Office and is there a mechanism by which we can vet it? What if we get some opportunity to enter a contractual relationship that needs to happen right away for some reason, wouldn't it be nice that I can turn to a group and get some input versus just making a decision?

Senator Dowd: I am not objecting to that. If a faculty member is willing to work on an *ad hoc* committee during the summer months, then that is his or her decision to make. But that does not extend to curricular or program issues during the summer months. This university experienced a serious problem at the Graduate Council when an apparent abuse of authority pushed through curricular and programmatic changes during summer 2014.

Interim Provost Barrett: I know it did.

Senator Dowd: That is one of the issues to be careful about with respect to summer activities. A small group or committee cannot in the summer assume the authority of the full body just because the full body is not in session during the summer months.

Interim Provost Barrett: Nothing should be bypassing normal or appropriate channels. But the notion is, there are units that are doing things around the calendar and I think we need to be in a position if we want to have shared governance where there's some mechanism to allow communication in the Summer.

Senator Caruso: Both regarding UCAP- I just want to say that I endorse your idea of having departments look at the tenure and promotion standards and how they express them because not only will it help your position, but it will help UCAP tremendously. It always comes up where it is sometimes difficult to know exactly what different departments require and that some dossiers have very clear letters and expectations and some don't and so forth. So, I think that it is a worthwhile project. Secondly, I was thinking about Senator Edwards' question and I think it had something to do with UCAP; something came up this past Summer and it seems to me with those kinds of personnel decisions that I would think it's better to address them over the Summer

Interim Provost Barrett: My general view will be let's try not to do anything more than we absolutely have to do over the Summer. You've got a lot fewer people here which is a lot less ability to get quality input from a diverse perspective, but the reality is, things are going to happen over the Summer. So I think having a mechanism helps us all do better. But this is not designed in a way to create a mechanism to run things through the Summer in a non-robust way. It is just trying to address a reality.

Senator Molitor: Maybe I could be wrong about this, but I thought the role of Faculty Senate Exec is to represent the Senate during the Summer if these decisions need to be made until they can be approved by the full Senate.

Interim Provost Barrett: That is one way we can handle it. And if that's how Senate wishes to handle it then that's fine, but if we have seated committees then there's at least the possibility that you may want to delegate some authority to let them handle certain things if they have people on it that are willing to serve in the Summer if an issue arises. I would respect whatever approach you wish to take on that.

Senator Dowd: As Senator Molitor knows, in many different ways the Executive Committee represents Faculty Senate throughout the year, including the Summer months. However, with apologies to Senator Molitor, at no time does the Executive Committee have explicit or implied authority to make decisions that are reserved for the full Faculty Senate. The Executive Committee cannot do that during the academic year and it certainly cannot do so during Summer months when the Faculty Senate is not in session. That said, with respect to Provost Barrett's point, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee would be happy to seat *ad hoc* summer committees – with willing faculty members – to address issues that might arise.

President Hoblet: However, we can determine if we need to create a mechanism to deal with that.

Senator Dowd: I agree that the Senate can develop a mechanism for creating and staffing *ad hoc* summer committees. However, unless the Senate's constitution is changed, at no time can the Executive Committee presume to have the authority reserved for the full Faculty Senate.

President Hoblet: But it still will have to be brought back to Senate and Senate will have to approve that mechanism.

Interim Provost Barrett: I mentioned this back in December, I still intend to bring to Senate a proposal to change the minimum credit hours for a degree in compliance with the Ohio Handbook. But they still

haven't ratified it despite their proclamations that "it's going to happen any day," so I don't want to do it and then have it changed and have to come back to you. But once that does happen I will bring it to you. If it passes in the Summer I will bring it at the first meeting in the Fall.

Senator Edwards: I would just say on behalf of particularly the newer and younger faculty who devote a large part of their Summer to their professional activities and research and writing, that this is the time they need and set aside for that, and then that we not expect them to not participate in any shared governance because they might have to be available for Summer service.

Interim Provost Barrett: Is there anything else. All right, if you'll excuse me, I have a 5:00 p.m. conference call to go to.

President Hoblet: As I was reminded by the other Faculty Senate Committee members of the Faculty Senate Exec, I was remiss and did not ask for approval for the February 17, 2015 meeting Minutes of The University of Toledo Faculty Senate. Do I have any additions or corrections to those Minutes? And if not, do I hear a motion to approve the February 17, 2015 Faculty Senate Minutes?

Senator Dowd: So moved.

Senator Lundquist: Second.

President Hoblet: All in favor please signify by saying "aye." Any abstentions? Thank you. **Motion Passed.** Next, at this time I am asking Senator Ohlinger, Chairperson of Academic Programs to come to the podium and provide the committee's report.

Senator Ohlinger: Hello. It is a consent agenda item. This is something that has come to the Faculty Senate Academic Program Committee. It was actually sent out yesterday. This is just the middle part of the text from our books and that is we had four different proposals/program modifications that has come through and I just bolded what each one is:

- **The College of Communication & the Arts proposal:**
 - (A) Program revision proposal: BA in Art History/Art Museum Practices.
 - a. Presented and discussion led by Burnett
 - b. Key proposed revision: ARTH 4950-AMP Seminar (1 credit hour) is no longer required. This material is covered elsewhere in the program.
 - c. *Approved.*
- **The College of Engineering proposal:** This College has three separate proposals, but all came through together. They are just looking at modifying the current standards that already exists and have placement; request for modifying that.
 - (A) Program revision proposals: EN-BIOE-BIO, EN-UND/BU-ITCB-BS
 - a. Presented and discussion led by Relue
 - b. Proposal to revise the current standards for math placement for student seeking admission to these programs
 - c. *Approved*
- **The College of Business program revision proposal:**
 - (A) BBA, in Supply Chain Management, basically is changing the name to Operations and Supply Change Management and moving some required course work to elective course work to our flexibility.
 - a. Presented and discussion led by Ohlinger
 - b. Key proposal: 1) Program re-names ("Supply Chain Management" to "operations and Supply Chain Management"); 2) All course identifiers changed from "OPMT" to "OSCM"; 3) Course description updated (also sent separately through course modification process); 4) 12 credit hours or required course work will not be 12 credit hours of elective to provide flexibility
 - c. *Approved*
- **BA in Adult and Liberal Studies program revision proposal:**
 - (A) This is basically kind of a head start program bridging to the Masters in Liberal Studies. This is the undergraduate basically allowing up to 9 credit hrs. of material of the graduate level.
 - a. Presented by Ohlinger

- b. Proposed revision: Students currently enrolled in the BA in Liberal Studies program of the College of Adult and Lifelong Learning are given an opportunity to enroll in up to nine semester- hours of graduate course work in the Master of Liberal Studies (MLS) program of the Colleges of Languages, Literature, and Social Sciences. Students may then apply those courses and credit hours to both their BA and MLS degree requirements for graduation from The University of Toledo.
- c. *Approved*

Senator Ohlinger: Since this is a consent agenda item I am asking for approval. Is there any discussion?

Senator Molitor: Just a comment on the admission standards. One of the programs is in Business and that is because we run a joint program between Engineering and Business and so we wanted to make sure we had the same standards.

Senator Ohlinger: That is right here- Engineering with a joint program with Business.

President Hoblet and Senator Ohlinger: Thank you, Senator Molitor.

Senator Ohlinger: All in favor say “aye.”

Senator Den White: Hang-on a minute.

President Hoblet: Do you have another question?

Senator Den White: In the second item it says “...*proposal to revise the current standard for math placement for students.*”

Senator Molitor: No. We are modifying our admission standards so our students don’t end up being placed in a math course that is too far behind the math courses required by our degree programs. So we are setting admission standards based on your math placement standards; we are not changing your math placement standards.

Senator Den White: Okay.

Senator Barnes: On the last one, I heard you saying that this is already being done. I was just at a meeting where we were talking about seventh graders being able to take college credit courses funded by the public schools. I am not trying to stand in the way of the work of the committee and what everyone thinks is in the best interest for the students, but I really wonder about where this process is going, and what are the larger implications of doing this, and what does it say about the value of our various degrees when we say we can double-dip across a couple of different degrees at the same time. I wonder if we could ask the Senate or maybe a larger body to have a more critical conversation about what this is actually doing to the value of our degrees.

Senator Ohlinger: Thank you. Is there any further discussion? All in favor please say “aye.” Any opposed? Any abstentions? Let the record show the above modifications have been approved. ***Motion Approved.*** Thank you. At the next meeting there would be more proposals/program modifications coming. Thanks.

President Hoblet: Thank you, Senator Ohlinger. I didn’t see Dr. Celia Regimbal come in, so we are going to table the academic regulations. Is there anyone else from Academic Regulations here that can give a report? Okay. I would like a motion to table the academic regulations report until the next Faculty Senate meeting.

Group of Senators: So moved.

President Hoblet: Second it. All in favor please say “aye.” Any abstentions? Thank you. *Motion to Table Passed.* Moving on, as I said earlier, Senator Barnes will not be giving her undergrad curriculum report today; she will be doing that at our next Faculty Senate meeting. Under Old Business, I would like to have Senator Humphrys, Chairperson of Core Curriculum Committee give us a brief update on the proposal for core curriculum/gen education.

Senator Humphrys: This is just a brief update as it is related to what Provost Barrett was talking about. We, the Core Curriculum Committee brought to you (about a month ago) a proposal that we said that was subsequently sent out to you via email that we said we would like you to vote on. Due to the new information that Interim Provost Barrett supplied us with concerning the benefits of us coming up with a more definitive general education statement/an overview of the general education statement and that would enhance our ability to get courses added to our transfer module. We are going to hold-off asking for your vote on that proposal until we get an opportunity to incorporate those into our proposals so we don't have to keep coming back to you on bits and pieces. On behalf of the committee, I really would like to thank the Senate-you've been extremely patient with us as we try to sort out the general education issues which seem to have changed quite frequently over the last many years. So that is why we really want to have something that is definitive that we can bring to you and have you vote on it. Now, there is the chance and actually it won't put us behind in terms of the timeline because we were saying that the proposal wasn't going into effect until Fall of 2016 so probably we won't be bringing something forward this academic year. In the meantime, if you have questions about your college or department trying to get something approved to be in the core, please contact me. We are kind of holding back on some of those things because we were thinking we would have this proposal voted on and use it as our guideline, but I don't definitely want to hold things up; we as a committee will come-up with ideas how to proceed with the proposals or core curriculum related activity that you or your department or college are interested in.

Senator Edwards: Can you clarify just for the record the process? For example, you were going to develop a new course and you wanted it to be in the core curriculum now, would it come to your committee first and then go to the overall Curriculum Committee?

Senator Humphrys: I don't remember how the tracking system---

Senator Molitor: If it a new course that never existed before, it needs to be approved by Undergraduate Programs first.

Group of Senators: The Curriculum Committee.

Senator Molitor: Yes, I apologize, the Curriculum Committee.

Senator Edwards: Then it comes to the Core?

Senator Molitor: Yes, then it would go to the Core Curriculum Committee.

Senator Edwards: Is there any way to track that on the system?

Senator Humphrys: Yes. There is actually a form for both the modification and new courses and there is a place where you can indicate whether you want it to be included.

Senator Edwards: Then we don't know how to get it signed off.

Senator Humphrys: It does come to me, I will get an email. So then our committee reviews it and then we will sign off on it and then it will come to the Senate for final approval.

Senator Edwards: So you bring things to the Senate for final approval?

Senator Humphrys: Yes.

Senator Edwards: So if that happened last year- it was approved finally and a particular course never got approved in the general education core curriculum.

Senator Humphrys: Right. And actually, the issue really has always been the vacillation on exactly, does it have to be an OTM course? So I am really interested in proposing to our committee and then we go forward because we really just can't have this long "jam" any longer. We have to go forward because it is to benefit our students. We need to be able to go ahead and approve these things. The proposal that we distributed, we may have to say it is possibly dependent long term on whether or not this needs to be part of the OTM, but, in the short term I think it can be. Yes, we are part of the curriculum tracking system and I do get emails on anything that's been asked. Senator Molitor, the emails came to you last year, did we get a few emails?

Senator Molitor: At the end of last year what we approved were multicultural course modifications. We did not approve any gen ed. courses.

Senator Humphrys: Right. Now, did we have any requests for gen ed.?

Senator Molitor: Nothing was submitted through the curriculum tracking system, but we did have people contact us.

Senator Humphrys: Right.

Senator Edwards: The box was checked off last year and it went all the way through and it's now on the Registrars page, so I don't know.

Senator Molitor: Then that would not be the box checked for gen ed. It would only be added as a regular course if we haven't signed off on it.

Senator Edwards: Then it should've been sent back to the proposer rather than gone back to curriculum and the other.

Senator Molitor: Right. I do not know why it did not go through the proper process.

Senator Edwards: I mean, it was signed by Senate and it exists on the books, so I am trying to figure out what happened and how do we fix it.

Senator Humphrys: Maybe we can talk about that to see because you are on the Core Curriculum Committee so we probably need to look at those things.

Senator Molitor: Can I suggest that you contact Marcia King-Blandford?

Senator Edwards: I've already done that.

Senator Molitor: Has she responded?

Senator Edwards: She referred me to... [Inaudible]

Senator Molitor: Senator Edwards, please send me the details.

Senator Humphrys: Right, we will look over it.

Senator Edwards: I just wanted to add, on the information regarding *literacy thinking*, Owens Community College which is our neighbor feeder institution for transfer students has *information literacy* as part of their gen ed. requirements (they have stuff that is not on the OTM), so are we supposed to accept those or not?

Senator Humphrys: That's a good question. I would say from the conversation with Paula Compton, and I don't know how many people remember she worked here at The University of Toledo, but I would have to say that there's a lot of "theory" and possibly not a lot of practice in terms of knowledge going on at the same level.

Past-President Rouillard: I have a quick question. Once a course is approved for the OTM, does it have to be updated every few years?

Senator Humphrys: It is reviewed; it is supposed to be reviewed every few years by the State's committee.

Past-President Rouillard: So, one wonders just how operational this system is.

Senator Humphrys: Right. Especially, I will tell you the other thing that was... upon me when we had all these representatives from other institutions- we've always gotten the impression that we were the group that didn't have a clue what was going on and I will tell you, it made me feel like we're ahead of this because the rest of the institutions were like, "when did this all come into existence?" So all along we've been fearful like we haven't been following the rules and we've been told by past administration that we were the only institution that wasn't following the rules.

President Hoblet: I just want to stress that all of you that have been working on this committee have had to take two steps forward and four steps backwards in prior years.

Unknown Speaker: Repeatedly.

President Hoblet: Absolutely. And this is an ongoing sort of dance with the state. We have made it known at the Ohio Faculty Council; we have asked Interim Provost Barrett to take it when the provosts met and said that basically the state counting our hands and having us individualize or point out anything that's significantly different from college to university to university. It is like it's a "cookie cutter" approach to gen ed. and it is not servicing our students well at all. So, they have heard that and I think it was a very conscious decision to operate what the committee worked on and for approval today so that they could really take into consideration this overarching theoretic framework that guides our educational model here. So if that's sort of like the "box" that we have to put our courses in when we ask to have gen ed. accepted for OTM, then the committee has said "let's do that" and take our "four steps back again" and see if we align this and put it into a container that the Ohio Board of Regents is willing to accept, so we can differentiate ourselves once again and can address some of the issues and concerns that faculty have.

Assistant Dean Pollauf: The other problem is it galls me that this is a 70% match in the OTM and we transfer these--so if you have a 70% match and a 60% proficiency of that 70% match and we are all "killing" ourselves for mediocracy.

Senator Molitor: Again, I would like to reiterate, I really give credit to Interim Provost Barrett for advocating to the state for us. However, and nothing against Interim Provost Barrett, I don't think his idea is going to work. I don't think the state is going to buy it, but I am completely willing to give it a try.

Senator Humphrys: We will give it a try. Thank you.

Senator Molitor: Once again, I really think we have a gen ed. that works. So anything that we can do to make the state see that is a useful exercise and I'm willing to put in the effort to do so.

Senator Molitor: We still have a problem though, and that that problem is we need the provost to understand if the committee is going to approve something for gen ed. that it needs to be coded on the system as gen ed. Otherwise, no advisors are going to have the students register for that gen ed. course.

Senator Humphrys: Exactly.

Senator Molitor: So that is something I think we still need to press forward and navigate in the interim until we get this all sorted out and we get something in place. Finally, in terms of the approval process, I did bring the idea to Senate at the end of last year of the idea that we could present a new course at the same time the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee brings a course for approval to the Senate. It would be nice if we can work the processes so then the Core Curriculum Committee could also bring that course for approval to Senate at the same time. Then we don't have to wait for the Undergrad Curriculum to go through and approve something; it would be nice if we can do the approval parallel. If the Undergrad Curriculum says "no" then the Core Curriculum can't approve it. However, if the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee says "yes," the Core Curriculum Committee can say, "no, that is not a gen ed. course." But the ability to do it at the same time will help us facilitate the process.

Senator Humphrys: We have to have software that's more updated than Lotus. You know I am old when I'm stating Lotus <laughter>. Are there any other questions? Thank you.

Group of Senators: Thank you, Senator Humphrys.

President Hoblet: Senator Humphrys, we really appreciate all the work your committee did. Next, I know we have two items from the floor, Past-President Rouillard.

Past-President Rouillard: The Faculty Senate Exec was given a request by email today asking if we could bring a resolution to the floor. If you have changes that you want to suggest to this resolution we can certainly make those changes, but like I said, this was requested from a faculty member by email today. Related to the passage of the Indiana Senate Bill, Religious Freedom Restoration Act. I did notice today in the news that Governor Pence has been under such attack that he has promised to make some sort of clarifying statement so I have tried to incorporate that into this resolution, which it reads in its draft form:

Whereas the University mission statement includes among its core values: compassion, professionalism, and respect along with diversity and integrity;

Whereas Governor Pence signed into law Indiana Senate Bill 101, known as the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, which would protect businesses that decline their services or products to customers whose acts are in opposition to the religious beliefs of that business;

Whereas Governor Pence has called for clarifying language in Bill 101 to specify that no discrimination will be allowed under this bill;

Therefore, be it resolved that The University of Toledo's Faculty Senate calls for a ban on all non-essential travel to the State of Indiana, and a ban on the purchase of all non-essential goods and services from Indiana until Bill 101 is repealed or amended.

Again, this was presented for consideration.

President Hoblet: Is there any discussion?

Senator Wedding: I think this involves bringing the Senate to political issues that might be not within our scope.

Past-President Rouillard: I think we may not have authority to make decisions on travel to a destination like Indiana, but I think that we can voice our opinion, that if our core mission is to demonstrate compassion, professionalism, diversity, and integrity that we can ask our administration to consider such bans as a statement consistent with our mission.

Senator Dowd: I do not want to speak on the “*therefore*” part of the resolution but, instead, the first “*whereas*” clause. As I understand the Indiana Act, it does not permit businesses to discriminate by declining services to individuals but, instead, only provides businesses the right to go to court to challenge the accusation of discrimination.

Past-President Rouillard: It protects them.

Senator Dowd: The protection is not that businesses can decline services. The protection is only the opportunity to go to court. It is still the case that businesses cannot put a sign in a window saying “no cigars smokers allowed.”

Senator Barnes: Let's be clear; it's really no LGTB people.

Senator Dowd: I know, and you are correct. But the broader point is not that businesses can now discriminate, because that Act does not permit that. Instead, the issue is whether a business accused of discrimination can challenge that accusation in court. Are any lawyers in attendance today that know what the Indiana Act states, as opposed to my interpretation?

Senator Edwards: I am not a lawyer, but I support this and I think we can approve it. I don't want to be in a position where I am in a professional meeting in Indiana and have to subject [myself to] supporting this kinds of nonsense.

Senator Wedding: I am going to the NCAA tournaments this weekend.

Past-President Rouillard: Is there a way to re-word this? I looked at the law and I looked at discussions of the law. If there's a way to make this more precise I would be certainly happy to reword it.

Senator Nathan: I am a lawyer and I know no more about this than anybody else, and I think that's part of the problem, is that probably many of us only know what we read in the paper. One thing that I read is there are 19 states that have such laws. I don't like Bill 101, but I think I do agree with the very first comment that was made that there are a lot of states that have a lot of laws that I don't like, I don't think

this is a fight for us as a body to get into. Maybe it is a fight for some individuals to get into. I have mixed feelings about it because I've seen the Bill.

Past-President Rouillard: Right. But apparently it is modeled on a federal bill that is in fact genuinely dedicated to religious freedom and what some states have done apparently is to kind of message it so that it has options to be used in different ways.

Senator Wedding: According to the Wall Street Journal, which is all I know, the 1993 Act that was up in the federal level was upheld by the Supreme Court as it applied to federal laws and regulations, not just the states'. Then the states have begun to pass similar legislation. I read that Illinois passed such a law and was actually voted in favor of by...when he was in the legislature. I don't know enough about this. I was something that we received the demonstrations but on the other hand, as you have said Sir, I only know what I read in the newspaper at this point.

Past-President Rouillard: There's a comment in the back.

Senator Gunning: I have never spoken at a Senate meeting and I've been a senator for five years now. I'll agree with Senator Wedding, I think this is very political and it does not behoove us as a university faculty senate to get involved with this. I think it has the possibility of tarnishing us nationally, and that is all I have to say about it.

Senator Ohlinger: Similar to that, I think the comments that have been made here kind of demonstrate that we are not well-informed on this. I am sure every person in this room is opposed to discrimination, but being asked to consider something that we are not well-educated or well-informed about---

Past-President Rouillard: I would point out that the president of Indiana University has made a statement against Bill 101. But again, this is being brought to you to consider.

President Hoblet: I just want to speak in opposition to Bill 101, whether we support the resolution or not. The sentiment that we discriminate in any legal form is not acceptable to me. To legalize exclusion of any members of our society is not good policy or practice. I will not support any bill that does that. I think that our core values and mission, whether it sounds "hokey" or not, is *to improve the human condition.* To legally disallow the rights of anyone legally goes against the grain of what we're trying to achieve in educating our citizens. I feel badly that any of our members, or our faculty, students, or citizens would feel that they would not deserve the same rights under law as anybody else in this room.

Senator Barnes: I am fairly certain that there are student groups on this campus who actively do not allow LGBT members for religious purposes, so it may be that we are willing to criticize someone else, but not willing to look at our own backyard.

Past-President Rouillard: Is that something we need to work on?

Senator Barnes: I think there are a couple. This is information that came up a couple of years ago.

Past-President Rouillard: I wasn't aware of that on our campus.

Senator Barnes: There's a couple. This is information that came up a couple of years ago.

Past-President Rouillard: That is something that we can definitely perhaps work on. Is there a motion to vote on the resolution or to table the resolution or to bring it back at a later date?

Senator Edinger: One option, given the questions about the law itself, is to modify the resolution simply to say the first phrase of the second paragraph which says, "...governor signed into law about this freedom restoration act, whereas he called for special language about that bill." Therefore, instead of it being about Indiana, let it be about faculty's support for nondiscrimination for all groups and to make a statement to that effect rather than tying our resolution to the Indiana legislature.

Past-President Rouillard: Okay, I can certainly word it that way. We will keep the opening statement, the first part of the second statement, "...whereas Governor Pence signed into law Bill 101, religious freedom restoration. Whereas, he called for clarifying language. Therefore, be it resolved that The University of Toledo Faculty Senate opposes discrimination."

Senator Barnes: Or reasserts our commitment.

Past-President Rouillard: Okay, "reasserts."

Senator Barnes: Diversity and all forms of discrimination.

Senator Edinger: Does that satisfy the people who don't want it to be too political?

Senator Wedding: What about the last paragraph, does that stay in there?

Past-President Rouillard: Well, that would be revised; then it will be, "...therefore, be it resolved that The University of Toledo's Faculty Senate reasserts our commitment to diversity and all its forms and to non-discrimination."

Senator Wedding: Could we table this and figure it out at our next meeting?

Past-President Rouillard: We certainly can.

Senator Dowd: That being the case, could we speak with the person who originated the resolution to determine if our proposed revisions are consistent with the original intent?

Past-President Rouillard: Sure. And it might some legislative act that happened in Indiana some other time.

Senator Barnes: Can those who object to the political, can you say why this doesn't satisfy you so we can think about what might attempt to address that when we say it again?

Senator Gunning: It is my opinion, nothing more. I just don't think to get into a political arena is wise for a university faculty senate, leave it to the politicians. I think that everybody here that has a strong opinion has every right to do as their own personal...but as a university body I think it will look bad on us. Again, that is my opinion.

Senator Barnes: The...about discrimination is political?

Senator Gunning: We are doing a resolution about this particular bill.

President Hoblet: In reaction to the bill.

Senator Gunning: Yes, absolutely. It is reactionary. You don't know what's going on. You don't know what the outcome is going to be. It's a personal opinion and everybody's got a right to their personal opinion. I am looking out from a standpoint of, what is this university is going to look like in the

newspapers if in fact we take a stand. That is totally a personal opinion and totally motivated; I just don't think this is a place for it. And again, I said, "this is my opinion," so you can disagree with me. It has nothing to do with what the law is; I am totally anti-discrimination, but the fact of the matter is you're getting into a political arena in another state. If it was the State of Ohio then maybe I would change my mind, but this has nothing to do with The University of Toledo which is a State of Ohio supported institution so we will be in another state's business politically.

President Hoblet: Senator Wedding brought up a motion; are you putting that into motion form?

Senator Wedding: I move we table.

President Hoblet: Can I have a second?

Senator Lundquist: I second.

Past-President Rouillard: Okay, all those in favor to table this, say "aye." Any opposed. Thank you very much. Let the record show that the above resolution has been tabled.

President Hoblet: We will bring it back to the April 14th Faculty Senate meeting. Last, but not least, I think we have a student here with Senator White. They are proposing another resolution.

Student Senator Ronald Tallon: On the student half of this, the biggest thing we are bringing up is the 2015-2016 academic year, so we are trying to do this now to get it implemented for the Summer so it will be effective for the school year in the Fall. The biggest issue that we face right now generally speaking, especially in the Math Department is our example- "professors tends to test on a one-third basis." You will go through about five weeks' worth of materials, then you will test on it. You will go through another five weeks of materials, then test on it. Then you will go through your last five weeks of material and then test on it, which gives you a 16 week stay.

Senator Dowd: Student Senator Tallon, have you surveyed faculty across the university to establish the validity of that statement?

Student Senator Ronald Tallon: This is based on the Math Department.

Senator Dowd: I recognize that, but you are proposing a change to a university policy.

Student Senator Ronald Tallon: The biggest thing that we are trying to do here is give students more opportunity to evaluate their---

Senator Dowd: Pardon me. With respect, you did not respond to my question. Have you talked about this issue with a diverse range of faculty members outside the Math Department?

Student Senator Ronald Tallon: I focused more on the student side; I did not focus much on the faculty side.

Senator Denis White: There are some people who divide the semester into quarter work; so they do three mid-term tests and then they do a final exam. Many of the people in the Math Department I would have a percentage...so the second midterm is after the... and that was the concern that...me on this.

Student Senator Ronald Tallon: I would like to clarify, I am not speaking for faculty on this. I am not telling you what you should do, please don't think that. But, my biggest thing on this is we are trying to

extend the students' ability to evaluate their grades and evaluate their ability on this. This is what they are...setup for- it will allow students to withdraw before they kill their GPA and before...so basically Spring break generally falls right around this week and a lot of what's happening – and I think a lot of you will agree because I've done this myself – you will end up getting calls and emails on that Thursday or Friday of that test week saying, “what is my grade?” and a lot of times you are not caught up with grading or there are not a lot of grades evaluated, and you will have more grades over the next two weeks because that is the semester, ten weeks kind of...semester where you are getting mid-terms. You have a lot of professors at least in my experience hold after the Spring break and give the students an opportunity at Spring break to study for their mid-terms. A lot of times for semesters that would...before Spring break which then means that you don't get a chance if the professor will do that. All this is allowing is that it gives the faculty...GPA in that way.

Senator Wedding: I support giving students to the 13th week. However, I think your argument is “weak.” When you start talking about “protecting the GPA” and all that, you probably have lost some votes out here. I support it because I think there are valid reasons why a student may want to drop a course in the 13th week. I've had several students come to me, two for example that came to talk to me about having a terminal disease. Now, they didn't make it up (the terminal disease). I have also had students that had personal issues as well as academic, that they had to drop. So the “GPA” stuff is a “no-no.” I think that we do just as a general practice need to give students more time to drop the course, so I would favor that 13th week; I would also favor the 14th week. On the other hand, I think the faculty should have the right to drop our students as well late into the semester, particularly, when I open up my grade book and I don't see anything there for the student. Right after this is over I would like to have a separate motion for faculty being allowed to drop students as well, which we at one time had, until we – it was changed I think around the year 2000.

Senator Dowd: Yes, the old drop date was somewhere around there.

Senator Wedding: So I support you.

Student Senator Ronald Tallon: Thank you.

Senator Barnes: I am just curious if anyone knows, maybe Dean Pollauf, you do – are there financial aid reasons?

Assistant Dean Pollauf: That is exactly why my hand was up. First of all, you are not doing this in isolation and there are three things that you have to realize. I get what you are trying to handle, but I think you are going about it the wrong way. Withdraw is going from the 8th week to the 10th week to the 13th week. The real problem is whatever the withdraw date is, there is no way to get out of the class after that so unless you make it week 15, you are through, so there has to be a cutoff point. More importantly, what a lot of students don't realize is, “W” is not a grade, but “F” is. You can recalculate an “F.” For purposes and finances, if you take a “Withdraw,” you are paying them back for that class, but if you fail that class, you are not, because you have completed it, even though it is with a crappy grade. “W” is not a completion; if you do not complete two-thirds of the work that you attempt as a student, then your aid is gone. Plus, a lot of colleges limit the number of withdraws a student can take, so a point in fact, if you go over 6 then it is an “F” anyway. So to me, the better way to handle this is to realize that whatever we set as the deadline, there is a period of time where you have no ability to get out of class, except through administrative review, so that policy needs to be revisited because through weeks 11-16, for lack of a

nicer way to say it, you are screwed. That is not right, but moving the withdraw date further doesn't solve that problem in my mind. And the second issue is, if you are in a class and 70% of your evaluation is coming after the mid-point of the semester, then we've got a different problem than what the withdraw deadline is. So that would be my take on that; you are solving a short-term problem, but you are creating a long-term problem particularly in the context of completion and continuance of Financial Aid. Then maybe it is worse than the "F" that you are actually receiving, because the "F" you can at least delete up to 12 hours and that is not the case for the "W's".

Senator Molitor: And I was going to follow up on that. I think any of these policies we would have to review at an institutional level to investigate implications on financial aid, to be in compliance with federal and state rules.

Assistant Dean Pollauf: The state subsidy is another issue; if we take it off the 14th week then we don't get paid.

President Hoblet: That is right.

Senator Wedding: I've had students come to me when I give them an "Incomplete" and beg for an "F" so they wouldn't have their financial aid cut-off; now, I have a big problem with that.

Assistant Dean Pollauf: They are in opposition, what is academically appropriate for you to do as a student? It is diametrically opposed to what you do for your financial aid, and most people at this institution don't seem to realize that. So that is a big problem. It is a big problem to me when you are in college and you are better off taking an "F" than an "Incomplete," "Progress," or a "W," but that is not solved by this date when you withdraw, at least to my way of thinking.

Senator Dowd: I remember there were reasons why we changed the rules so that faculty could not drop students at any date, but I don't remember them. I also remember there were reasons for moving the withdrawal date, but I don't remember them either. There were reasons. Perhaps it is premature to consider this resolution without reviewing the documentation on why Senate originally changed those policies to determine if the original reasons are still valid today.

Senator Denis White: We did go back, well, I did look back. Remember the change for the withdrawal date was done when we still had the power to do it and I don't agree what came out from it.

Senator Dowd: Right.

Senator Denis White: So that is when it was approved and I think the 10th week was done when we switched to two semesters.

Assistant Dean Pollauf: The year 2006 is when it happened, the dropping of the "IW" and the changing--

Unknown Speaker: Dropping the "IW" was---

Senator Denis White: But establishing the 10th week for withdrawal I think was done much earlier.

Senator Dowd: The point I believe everyone has grasped is that we are considering a resolution that will have a massive change to the grading structure within this university. And we are considering this proposed resolution with only seven minutes remaining to schedule of this Faculty Senate meeting. I make the *Motion to Commit* this proposal to the Senate Committee on Academic Regulations.

Group of Senators: I agree.

Senator Dowd: Student Senator Tallon, I encourage you to present your case to the Senate Committee on Academic Regulations.

President Hoblet: This is the committee that I referred it to when I got your original request. Dr. Celia Regimbal is the Chair of the Academic Regulation Committee and they know about this. Now, they are not going to be able to act on it this year; this is coming so late this year that it is difficult to ask these committees to hustle in the month of April to get this work done.

Senator Denis White: I submitted this in February.

Senator Edwards: Has the Student Government voted on this?

Student Senator Ronald Tallon: I waited because I wanted to get input from faculty first before I take it to SG. If you guys were to approve this it is scheduled for tonight and I will motion the floor. Either way, this is touching Student Government's floor this week or next week. I was waiting because I would like to have faculty with it before I took it straight to students because I know that is the first question students are going to ask, "did faculty like this or did they give you an ear full of "crap?," so I was bringing it here first to see what happened. I would like to point out, as a student senator I had no idea of faculty regulations of Faculty Senate and I am still learning as I am sitting here now, so bringing this here to the committee was "sorry" I didn't know the policy here. I am asking this to be the spark of the conversation and the spark of the debate and you are bringing up points that are more issues than just the withdrawal date- bringing up financial aid dates and allowing professors to drop you any point during the semester. We are working on those dates so it is one big package and this is starting the debate because I am not an advocate for professors dropping everybody throughout the semester, but I am not a semester, that is not something that I would advocate for students. It is just not something that I am for, but for this it is- this sparks the debate and starts the package so I am asking you to pass this today, so I can take this to Student Senate and start that bigger debate because it is one joint resolution and then it starts the other debates.

Senator Edwards: As a person that chairs the Academic Regulations in the 2006, I also serve as the Faculty Senate liaison to the Student Senate and there was a Student Senate liaison to the Faculty Senate, I would suggest that we reinstate that policy for next year.

Student Senator Ronald Tallon: I agree.

Senator Edwards: So we will know what each other are doing. Also, in the 2006 case, that did go to the Student Senate before it came to the Faculty Senate. I personally support the students, but I would suggest that we send it back to Academic Regulations. We did benchmark other schools and that kind of stuff and looked at what the other policies were.

Senator Edinger: What you are hearing is support for the idea for trying to address a policy in a way that...to students, but that might be bigger than just the "W" date but rather financial aid. I think we are in support of the conversation that you are having, so if you want to take that back to the Student Senate, but it is too complicated to simply vote on this today.

President Hoblet: Regarding approving the resolution.

Senator Dowd: Is there a second to the *Motion to Commit*?

Senator Wedding: I second.

President Hoblet: Could somebody read back that motion to Senate again?

Senator Dowd: A *Motion to Commit* sends this proposal to the Senate Committee on Academic Regulations for investigation and the possibility of a future recommendation to the Faculty Senate.

Senator Denis White: Bowling Green has the 12-week withdraw policy.

Senator Wedding: I would like to encourage you to take this to the committee so they can consider drops by the student or the professor at any time for health, medical, and personal reasons. If a student comes to me and says, "I would like to drop this course because I have an illness etc. etc." I should be able to accommodate that student or the student should be able to drop the course if they have a health reason.

Senator Dowd: Yes, the Senate Committee on Academic Regulations could consider that issue as well.

Senator Wedding: That would be part of this, I hope.

Senator Edwards: There is a medical withdraw policy.

Senator Weck-Schwarz: Yes, but the Medical Withdraw Policy forces a student to drop all their classes, not just one. I had a student with a serious illness at one point and she was taking a lot of online classes that she said she could manage from home and she didn't want to drop all her classes, she just wanted to drop one.

Senator Wedding: And we should be able to accommodate that.

Senator Barnes: I agree; we should look at that policy too. Dr. Regimbal is not here, so let's give her a little more work <laughter>.

President Hoblet: She had this on her plate anyways, but she let me know that they will not be able to act on this this academic year.

Senator Krantz: To ask exclusively was it included in the discussion, can we ask the committee to review and give us an overview of the reasoning behind the change in the timing of Withdrawal and the reasoning to get rid of the "IW, Instructor Withdrawal?" I was going to ask the question that Senator Dowd proposed, do any of us remember why this happened?

Senator Edwards: Because some faculty members were withdrawing students and not contacting the students first.

Senator Wedding: It was considered not to be "student friendly," when in fact, it is often very "student friendly."

Senator Edwards and Senator Barnes: It can be.

President Hoblet: Okay. Is there any other discussion since time is of the essence? We are going to vote on the motion that is on the floor- To have Academic Regulations examine the withdraw from course policy allowing more time for student withdrawal fulfilling the intent of the resolution. Academic Regulations should report back to the Faculty Senate proposed revision of the policy. I believe this is the intent or as close as I can get to it <laughter>.

Senator Barnes: Can you add medical withdraw in there?

President Hoblet: And medical withdrawals; I will put that in as well.

Senator Krantz: That is a separate policy, right?

Senator Barnes: It is a separate policy, but I do think we should review it.

Senator Krantz: I would like for them to review it too.

President Hoblet: As long as we are asking them to review the withdrawal from course policy we may as well ask for the whole enchilada <laughter>. All in favor please signify by saying “aye.” Any opposed? Any abstentions? *Motion Passed.* May I have a motion to adjourn? Meeting adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

V. Meeting adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Lucy Duhon
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard
Faculty Senate Office Administrative Secretary