

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of October 8, 2013
FACULTY SENATE

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

Approved @ F.S. on 11/19/2013

Summary of Senate Business

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 Linda Rouillard called the meeting to order, **Lucy Duhon**, Executive Secretary, called the roll.

I. Roll Call: 2013-2014 Senators:

Present: Present: Bailey, Cooper, Crist, Dowd, Duhon, Edinger, Edwards, Ellis, Franz, Gilbert, Gunning, Hamer, Hasaan-Elnaby, Hewitt, Hoblet, Humphrys, Keith, Kennedy, Kistner, Kranz, LeBlanc, Lee, Lingan, Lundquist, Molitor, Monsos, Moore, Moynihan, Ohlinger, Plenefisch, Porter, Randolph, Regimbal, Relue, Rouillard, Springman, Srinivasan, Teclehaimanot, Templin, Van Hoy, Weck-Schwarz, White, White, Williams

Excused absences: Barnes, Brickman, Cappelletty, Cochrane, Elmer, Farrell, Giovannucci, Gohara, Nigem, Sheldon, Thompson, Thompson-Casado

Unexcused absences: Crist, Federman, Quinlan, Quinn, Seligman, Skeel, Wedding, Willey

II. Roll Call: 2013-2014 Senators:

III. Approval of Minutes: Minutes from August 27th are ready for approval.

President Rouillard: I call this meeting to order. Welcome to the fourth Faculty Senate meeting of Academic Year 2013-2014. I ask that Lucy Duhon come to the podium to call the roll.

My Executive Committee report is fairly short. I met with our new VP of Finance, Mr. David Morlock. David has been here for about 3 weeks now and is dedicated to getting to know our UT culture. We talked about a variety of issues: for instance, the need for more transparency in the budget process, and the fact that there are some problems in payroll, problems that he has been addressing since his arrival.

On Friday, Oct. 4, I met with Provost Scarborough. Our conversation addressed issues such as the deans' assessment process; Dr. Jacobs' approval of Research Council representation at the VP of Research candidate interviews; gen ed assessment processes and the possibility of bringing someone from OBOR to FS to speak with us and educate more faculty about gen ed and the Ohio Transfer Module.

Also on Oct. 4, the UC Academic Programs committee met for the first time to discuss the issue of two-year degrees, particularly in light of the new state funding formula. This committee will inventory our currently offered 2-year degrees, along with inactive degree programs that might be re-activated. We will consider the job market for such degrees and consider any new 2-year programs that might be developed in the very near future. I have asked the FS Academic Programs Committee to join the discussion beginning on Oct. 11. And we will begin a discussion of that topic here today. We have some visitors—Dennis Lettman, Kim Pollauf, Mike Caruso, in addition to Senators such as Mary Ellen Edwards, Mary Humphrys, and others with experience from COM-TEC.

FSEC met on Thursday, Oct. 3. One of the issues we discussed was the concept of open access publishing and we will bring a presentation here in the near future. At this same meeting, we discussed John Barrett's request that we weigh in on a proposed name change for the Chemistry department which wishes to be known as the Chemistry and Biochemistry Dept. We contacted the Biology Department, triple EEES and the Biochemistry and Cancer Research depts. to verify that their faculty saw no potential problems or conflicts with this.

Since there were none, we did not feel this issue needed to be discussed by Full Senate, but we still wanted you to be aware that FSEC asked for input of related departments. Had there been any indication of conflicts, this issue would have been brought before you.

On Friday Oct. 4 I attended a ribbon-cutting ceremony for two new centers in HHS: The Human Performance and Fitness Promotion Lab, under the direction of Dr. Barry Scheuermann; and the Center for Health and Successful Living, under the direction of Drs. Timothy Jordan and Amy Thompson. The latter Center is designed specifically for support services for breast cancer survivors. We congratulate our colleagues on realizing these important initiatives.

FSEC has been working on issues related to the gen ed curriculum. We have scheduled some time for discussion here this afternoon.

I have asked the FS Core Curriculum committee has been asked to develop a simple, straightforward assessment rubric for gen ed .

The Undergraduate Programs Committee plans to come to Senate Oct. 22 meeting with courses for your approval.

The entire list of our FS committees will be posted on our website shortly. All Chairs for the FS Committees have been seated, with my thanks to them for agreeing. They are Scott Molitor and Mary Humphrys, co-chairs of Core Curriculum; Steve Peseckis on Undergraduate Curriculum; Sharon Barnes for Faculty Affairs; Fred Williams for Academic Regulations; Lynne Hamer for Student Affairs; Paul Hewitt Constitution and Rules.

I have asked 3 non-senators to chair committees and will ask FS for its approval of these appointments, namely Lawrence Anderson as chair of Academic Programs committee, Steven Peseckis as chair of Undergraduate Curriculum, and Mike Caruso as Chair of Elections.

Is there a motion to approve, Lawrence Anderson-Huang as Chair of Academic Programs, Mike Caruso as Chair of Elections, and Steve Peseckis as Chair of Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. All those in

favor of these three individuals being appointed as chairs to these committees please signify by saying “aye.” All in favor? Any opposed? Any abstentions? Thank you. **Motion Passed.** I would like to now move to an update by Vice President Hoblet on the process of the Faculty Senate evaluation.

Senator Hoblet: Thank you, President Rouillard. I’ve been talking and working with Bobbi Vaughn and the Center for Creative Instruction. We seemed to have ironed out any “pot holes” so to speak. Apparently, there’s a little issue with evaluating Dr. Gold as Chancellor and as Dean. Again, I think we have all of that ironed out and I am waiting to hear from Bobbi. We will request a three week window when the College of Medicine faculty will be eligible to evaluate Dean Gold and as soon as that is done we will bring that back and disburse those findings. Thank you.

President Rouillard: Next, I would like to ask Senator Humphrys to give an update on the BoT Committee meeting yesterday, Finance and Audit.

Senator Humphrys: There were just a couple of interesting things from the Finance and Audit Committee meeting that I attended yesterday. First, there was an external audit that was done by the Plante Moran which is a certified accounting firm and they reported that they did not find any irregularities. There is an internal audit that is being conducted and it is approximately 50% completed. The Finance and Audit Committee also approved \$13.2 million in capital spending to be taken from the UT reserves. The projects covered by these expenditures are:

- Remodeling at Kobacker Center to be used for geriatric psychiatry
- Establishing radiosurgery or ‘surgery without a knife’ capability
- Remodeling Scott and Tucker Halls for Honors College housing
- Demolishing Carter Hall
- Upgrading emergency generators at the hospital, boilers at Savage Arena, the chiller at the Memorial Field House, and the east ramp parking deck

The University’s housing plan was discussed. As of Fall 2013, UT has 3,590 on-campus beds, and is at 81 % capacity. There is a plan for a third-party company called American Campus Communities to build and manage student housing in the area previously occupied by Nash, White, and Dowd halls. This project would not represent any financial risk to the University. It was also announced that UT has created a government shutdown work group that will go into action if the shutdown poses any direct impact on the University. Currently, there has been no particular effect. Are there any questions?

Past-President Dowd: During the \$13.5 million that we are spending for the renovations, did they indicate why they are spending on institutional reserves instead of let’s say, “floating some bonds?”

Senator Humphrys: I don’t recall that in the discussion about that. It was presented as the \$13.5 million will come from the UT reserves.

Senator Molitor: What did they say was the purpose for the internal audit versus the external audit?

Senator Humphrys: Well, it is my understanding that the internal audit is more like a process and procedure type thing. They gave a list when they flashed the screen with a PowerPoint slide of a number of things that were being looked at; I would guess 25 different areas that are going to be looked at as far as an internal audit. The external audit is more of making sure that there’s---

Senator Molitor: On a related question, what is the plan for Carter Hall? What is the plan after they demolish it and what is the current occupancy of Carter Hall?

President Rouillard: The plan was to demolish it and build something for soccer and baseball.

Senator Molitor: And so this new housing complex produced by this third party would essentially go to that space?

Senator Humphrys: I kind of got the feeling that the new housing was also supposed to be kind of Honors College related.

Senator Molitor: Okay. I'm sorry, just one final thing.

Senator Humphrys: Sure.

Senator Molitor: And having this third-party company come and manage our housing, aren't we going to have competition for our own students in terms of companies trying to compete for these students out of our own housing units which could produce a financial burden down the road, even though, obviously, they are going to be provided financing of this new facility?

Senator Humphrys: I think so. Just as a little background, I think this is the same company that runs the Old Town which is off campus.

Senator Molitor: Okay.

Senator Humphrys: I think that was the same company. And it seems to me like the talk was, you know, this will be our responsibility because it is going to be on campus. And, I should mention that it is going to be different than the other facility and the students will go through the actual process that students will go through at Parks Tower, so they would have to be approved by the university.

Senator Molitor: So our housing department would assign them?

Senator Humphrys: Right. So, basically, the day-to-day sort of management would be that company, but they would be doing that in concert with the university in terms of placing students into it. So, from that perspective it is much less of a confusion.

Senator Hamer: This might not be something that you know, but if a private company...something on the university, what's our liability associated with that?

Senator Humphrys: I don't know.

President Rouillard: Well, there was talk. Someone asked about how Dr. Kaye Patten-Wallace's unit interface, and there definitely will be an oversight of students...in terms of actual material liability I would assume that the third party would have to carry that risk.

Past-President Dowd: Well, Provost Scarborough made a point in saying that the main advantage of this is that it reduces the risk and liabilities to the university.

Senator Krantz: That was intended as a financial liability.

Past-President Dowd: Yes, I agree. The point that President Rouillard raised, they were saying that all the rules and regulations that are in place in the dorms on campus would be in place when this third party goes in.

Senator Unknown: Okay, as to the Carter Hall demolishing, are there any plans for the living learning communities?

Senator Humphrys: I am sorry; can you restate your comment?

Senator Unknown: The living learning communities, are there any plans to redistribute them somewhere else because there are living learning communities within Carter Hall, Health Professions in particular?

Senator Humphrys: Right. No, they did not mention anything about that.

Past-President Dowd: It was my understanding and correct me if you got a different impression, the discussion of the razing of Carter is not in the current, that is in the future at some point. It is not as if they are moving forward with that now. This is something that they would like to do sometime in the future. Is that the same impression that you got, Senator Humphrys?

Senator Humphrys: It was interesting because it was part of that \$13.2 million and that was one of the five things. But then when they did talk about it later it was like, well, we need to sign.

Senator Unknown: So it is not in there.

Senator Humphrys: Right.

Senator Hamer: Was there any discussion of why the university would be providing a customer base to a for-profit company in order to provide services that would be a profit to the university?

Senator Humphrys: Senator Hamer, that is good question. The only thing I would have to say is that we were told was something to the effect of, "Oh, it is happening everywhere." I mean that is what I recall at least.

Senator Hamer: Well, we do know that it is true that it is happening everywhere and Reverend Rice's video/movie release would back that up if we weren't sure of that. I am wondering if it would be appropriate for us as a Faculty Senate to pass a resolution (if that would be correct). But clearly a for-profit company would not be interested if there was not good profit to be made and I think that we need to start taking a stand and saying that as a university we are not in the service of providing profit to other companies while we are languished in providing a budget. I think we need to take a stand on some of these things.

Senator Lundquist: Our capacity is only 81% so it seems odd that we are building more dorms, why does Honors need more dorms?

Senator Humphrys: I don't think that was explained and I think that would be a real valid question. Of course at these sorts of events, basically, the members of the committee are the only ones who really participate in any question and asking, so I don't recall that. I think one of the members from the Board of Trustees kind of referenced that.

President Rouillard: They are taking a lot of beds offline and then will be replacing them. But I think the strategy is to get more beds near the Honors College and have that be what Provost Scarborough was talking about yesterday, the Academic Honors Village.

Past-President Dowd: This is just a suggestion; perhaps the Executive Committee could discuss inviting Provost Scarborough to Senate to give a presentation of that material.

President Rouillard: Okay.

Senator Edwards: In this discussion of the capital budget coming from..., was there any discussion about the state appropriation of the capital budget this year?

Senator Humphrys: Not specifically, no.

Senator Edwards: Because every year there is a state capital budget that is given to a public institution.

Past-President Dowd: Every two years.

President Rouillard: I think those monies haven't been released yet or assigned yet but we heard that there will be money. Thank you, Senator Humphrys.

Senator Humphrys: You're welcome.

President Rouillard: Senator Edinger has some notes on the Trustee and Governance Committee meeting that he attended yesterday as well.

Senator Edinger: Thank you, President Rouillard. This committee meeting was very brief so I will try to make sure the report is briefer. There were three issues that were brought up. One was the membership of Board committees because they lost one member, so the question was, will they replace that member and how will they staff their committees? The president reported that he had talked to the governor and they were told they have enough people already. So they are looking at options and one of their options that they discussed was whether or not they have a committee of a whole so that whichever Board members are present for a particular committee would be able to be members of the committee for that day rather than trying to deal with Board issues and not having enough members who are assigned to the committee. Apparently, this is what Miami of Ohio does and it was also something that was mentioned that The University of Toledo did back before the merger. So, Jacobs wants to look into that issue and get back to the Board as a way of addressing that problem. The second issue was the University Council and this was a presentation given by Provost Scarborough. It started meeting on January 18th. He said they met eight times. Primarily the purpose so far has been dialogue and communication. They said they talked about a number of issues including the university's finance budget process, workload, program review, and other topics. He said the committees are being asked to coordinate with existing committees that traditionally deal with some of these issues. They said there will likely be minor changes to constitution and bylaws that will be presented soon for the Board of Trustees, based on the discussion within the approval from the University Council. They said the goal was trying to promote healthy dialogue and they said that goal seems to be working. The final thing they discussed was a communication that some of the Board members have been receiving every year. They file a financial statement with the Ohio Ethics Commission and the response that they get back is to the Board member and none of this is public

information, neither their disclosure, nor their report back. But what they asked about was they haven't gotten communication in the past that says, "with regard to this particular investment you could have a potential financial conflict of interest." So the discussion that they had was what that statement means and what they are supposed to do about it. Dr. Jacobs expressed that a potential conflict is just that, it is not an actual conflict. If that particular issue comes up to the Board then they need to manage that conflict, but just having any financial interests isn't necessarily a problem unless we do business with that financial entity. That is how far that conversation went. Are there any questions? Thank you.

President Rouillard: All right, that brings us to some of these issues listed under governing business. I think I see some of our visitors—Kim Pollauf, Dennis Lettman, Mary Ellen Edwards, Mary Humphrys, and Mike Caruso. Anybody else with experience from the previous Com Tech, if you would you like to come down front and help us lead this discussion on the initiative for two-year degrees. So, the idea is the University Council Academic Programs Committee which is chaired by Ray Marchionni. We met for this initial meeting and among the action items that came out of that were first, a request from Terry Roemer to give us an inventory of current two-year programs; what two-year programs that we still have on books and that's still being offered.

Dr. Lettman: Yes, I do. I may not have an entire list.

President Rouillard: If you can just give us an idea of those programs.

Dr. Lettman: In fact, in preparation for this I tried to search the website for programs and what I found was the majority of getting an associate degree here at UT was in the College of Business and Innovation. In the Applied Organizational Technology Department there were several, six or seven different associate degree programs within that particular department and they are all business focused and business related I.T. I believe that in addition to that we have an associate degree in Paralegal Studies. I could not find any other associate degree programs listed on the website of the university although as I said, I may have missed something.

Senator Humphrys: Those are the only ones I know of.

Dr. Lettman: So, maybe eight or so that we currently have on the books. Now there are some others that are not effective, but they are what I call kind of "in the closet" because we are not offering them anymore, yet we could, in particular the Associate of Arts General Studies Program and the Associate of Science. We offered them a number of years ago and those programs could be brought back if it seems to be appropriate.

President Rouillard: Recently we had a two-year degree program in nursing that was "cancelled."

Senator Hoblet: We had a two-year degree in Applied Science in Nursing.

President Rouillard: Was that made inactive or was that completely eliminated? Did you just stop at getting students?

Senator Hoblet: We stopped getting students to that program. I don't know if it is just on the inactive list or we actually cancelled and discontinued that program.

President Rouillard: Senator Humphrys, do you have any idea how many students are in those two-year programs in Administrative Tech?

Senator Humphrys: I think I have a general idea. One may not know this, but it seems like there was a name change that was previously done; it is actually called, Applied Organizational Technology. The last I saw I think there were about 280 in the associate degree programs in the College of Business. It has varied probably within the last six years. I would say it probably varied from about 280 to about 400, it fluctuated back and forth.

President Rouillard: Do you know if students are actually successful in using these degrees to find employment or do they typically go on to four-year degrees?

Senator Humphrys: It is probably about 50/50. But the students who have gone on to employment especially coming from the areas that are computer science (which quite-a-few are coming from that area) have actually done very well in finding employment. I know by getting information about the differences in starting salaries and actually especially for the areas that we have the starting salaries for the very technical programs like, computer science, computer networking, and computer programming are very similar to people who get four-year degrees in those particular areas. The starting salary now, what they find is five years out from a career aspect though there are differences in terms of salaries. There's a quite-a-bit of literature that's available. A lot of it is based on the particular state so it depends. I just recently saw information about Tennessee and they actually had a very successful turn in terms of starting salaries. This is another point as far as two-year degrees are concerned, the difference is kind of the return on investment. It could be good; it really depends on the area you are in.

Past-President Dowd: Perhaps you can say a few words about the state share of instruction.

President Rouillard: Yes. This rose out of the change in the state share of instruction funding formula which will be awarding a much larger percentage of our funding on the basis of degrees awarded. So this is a way of increasing that number although one wonders. One assumes that we will not be the only ones using this strategy so I don't know how long and what kind of window we have to get that approved for this.

Senator Edinger: So is that our goal to get that to go on, so we can get two-year degrees to get more money?

President Rouillard: Yes, that, and we need to make sure that we at least get half of our money rather than losing all of it.

Senator Hamer: I just would like to commend you for going forward and trying to pursue a two-year degree. There are a lot of people in Toledo who want to come to the university and get a degree, some for work and some just to have the college experience and be able to pass that on to people around them to have the knowledge. It is important to help find jobs, but none of us can guarantee a job and a lot of people are coming for that knowledge. I think it is a great market of people. Some of them are going to be going part-time and a four-year degree just takes a little longer.

President Rouillard: Which also brings us to this other issue that Dr. Pollauf addressed in one of her emails, “Do we have the capacity to develop new programs?” Do we have the expertise to develop new two-year programs and where should we do that? Dr. Pollauf, would you like to address that a little bit?

Assistant Dean Pollauf: Well, the fact of the matter is to bring a program that you previously had... is not that difficult. To create something new between the mandates of Complete College Ohio, House Bill 59, and other things coming from the state, you can't just have it because you want it, you have to demonstrate that there's a need for that in terms of employment after the degree and then there is some potential pool of applicants for that particular program. Speaking more directly to the point that President Rouillard raised, I brought three reports as well as the top 50 high paying in-demand occupations in Ohio. For us to belong to that in some way, I think it requires a very significant investment because they are almost all technical areas. So, we can't just go out and create a program in chemical technology if we don't have any of the equipment or the faculty to teach that. I mention that because to me that is a very important area that we lost with Scott Park. We used to have two degree programs that at one point accounted for everybody nearly that worked in Lucas County, Michigan, Toledo, and two of three major cities in Ohio; and those were our chemical technology and environmental control and protection technology, both of which went away with the Community and Technical College. I don't believe there are very many programs in this area of that nature at community colleges. People are trying to retire all the time from these divisions and can't because there is no one to replace them. So, research would prove whether or not that was in fact a prime area for an associate degree, but then, how do you create it? And realize that it is probably a two to four year path to do that by the time you do the research, propose it, get all levels of approval, have the state give us its blessings, and then roll it out, you are probably somewhat limited in the number of programs that you can realistically see to create at this point.

President Rouillard: That was very helpful. You mentioned in your email about some of these programs: computer hardware, architecture, environmental technicians, specialized health technicians, x-ray technicians, oversight specialists, E.M.T paramedics and those types of jobs, which may be targeted by two-year degrees.

Assistant Dean Pollauf: They did exist at one point as recently as twelve or thirteen years ago.

President Rouillard: Prof. Caruso, was your experience in Com Tech more from a gen ed. perspective?

Prof. Caruso: Yes.

President Rouillard: So, what kinds of gen ed.? And of course, that does require change regularly and we initially would have to look at what kinds of core curriculum requirements these programs have.

Prof. Caruso: As I recall, they state roughly half of what the current requirements are.

Senator Humphrys: Now it is the same strangely; it is 30 credit hrs. for general education.

President Rouillard: In a two-year degree?

Senator Humphrys: Yes. 60 credit hrs., so half of that.

Unknown Senator: How many hours?

Senator Humphrys: I just want to mention for informational purposes, our associates degree programs require exactly the same thing that our bachelor's degree requires. Although, we can be a little bit more flexible. If we have a student and it benefits them to take an additional humanities course in what they are interested in, as opposed to a natural science course etc., the state gives us that, plus a...

Dr. Lettman: I would offer to look at the development of associate degree programs from a strategic point of view and I guess you can say also from a financial point of view since we are concerned about that. We offer three possibilities. Not looking at specific disciplines or areas of associate degrees we are looking at the associate degrees that could benefit the university and benefit our students by serving the pipeline into our baccalaureate and higher degree programs. There are many "2+2" that we can do internally and there are a number of examples that could be provided as to how some of the students that are coming to the university. The other item I would suggest is looking at what kinds of terminal associate degrees that prepare students for the job market that they can enter and the job market that's available for them and fit with the overall mission of the university. I don't know how much head-to-head we will go against Owens, Northwest, and some of the area community colleges, but there certainly might be areas mentioned where there could be some void and where there could be demand and allow the university to have those kinds of associate degree programs. The third one, admittedly something that I think is very important and that is as an open door university; we admit students with all different ability levels. We have hundreds of students enrolling in this university who may or may not be successful for a bachelor's degree who we know struggle, who we know are here exploring trying to improve their skills while trying to decide what they want to do in terms of a major and so forth. So we put them in to these tracks and have them take courses because they need to do general education. That really doesn't lead anyone to any kind of a degree or degree completion. I would...looking at something like the associate of arts or associate of science that incorporate general education and prepare students for further advancement in other particular bachelor's programs because as Dr. Pollauf mentioned, the financial model and subsidy from the state is weighed more towards more degree completion. So whether it is an associate or baccalaureate degree we will get paid from the state for every student that will complete an associate degree from The University of Toledo or bachelor's degree. We have many students right now attending here that could qualify for an associate's degree if we have them and that would provide more revenue for the university and the other thing it would do is it would also give an incentive to students because they would accomplish something, instead of being here floundering and thinking "will I ever get a college degree?" This could be something that could be offered to students. I know other institutions that adopted this and not just in Ohio but in other states that have adopted this kind of a plan and it's been successful because it helps with revenue and it helps with retention.

Senator Gilbert: I was wondering are there any plans to have differential tuition then for the students who have enrolled in a community college track versus students coming for a B.A. I know the state is very concerned with completion, but another part of the state wants affordability which is why we have the system of higher education; so we have different institutions, different cost rates, so I'm just wondering if those issues have been...different strategies...addressed.

President Rouillard: It hasn't come up in any of the discussions that I've been in, but I can certainly bring it up in terms of these two committees, The University Council and Faculty Senate.

Assistant Dean Pollauf: We can go back to the history of elimination of Scott Park, that was the request that was made at the time to allow us to have differential tuition for two-year students and it was denied by the state. I don't think that is ever going to get any traction. Going back to what Dr. Lettman said, if I was thinking about this and was in charge of it, the first thing I would do is go to Institutional Research and have them find the last existing Associate of Arts and all the pre areas, pre-economics, pre-psychology or whatever. How many people who are enrolled currently would meet those requirements? If seven hundred people out of the however many are in those areas that would actually meet those requirements then it is sure as heck worth it for us to re-institute. If it turns out that only ten people in the baccalaureate program could actually earn an associate as it was structured before elimination, you know that is different story. But, the former Arts and Science has a pre-track to virtually everything that existed in their college. So if it was me that would be where I would start.

Senator Gilbert: So, it seems like there's two different strategies. One is a strategy that is an internal strategy so in theory, if you have 16,000 undergraduates that are juniors you can say 8,000 of those students are now awarded associate degrees and give... and that seems like an internal strategy. But an external strategy where we are actively and aggressively recruiting students to come here for an associate's degree I am concerned, particularly for the low-income students who we know have a lot less information about their options and alternatives as college students and are already being exploited by lots of for-profit institutions. If we aggressively recruit low-income students from first-generation colleges to come here for an associate's degree that we know they can do for one-third of the cost of a community college, something about that seems problematic.

Senator Humphrys: There are a couple of things that are related to what Senator Gilbert just said. First of all -- one of the interesting things we found and this was true five years ago -- places like Owens which of course has a less expensive tuition, they were found to have a lot of prerequisites. And so if we sent one of our associates degree students with 60 credit hrs., and if you look at Owens and you saw all the prerequisites which on average was somewhere around 12 credit hrs., we came much closer. But I agree, I think the differential tuition would be better. The other thing is this, from my department standpoint there is one suggestion I would make, maybe the university should look into marketing the existing degrees for a period of time just to see what that does in terms of bringing in more students. It would seem like that would be a beneficial thing to. We have those degree programs with low cost and more resources to offer them, but it would be interesting to see what sort, if any, in the number of students we would have.

Dr. Lettman: I also agree with that. I also remember for a number of years working with Com Tech Community College with associate degree programs. The question we always asked ourselves was, why do students come to UT as opposed to Owens or another school when they can basically cut one third of the price and get a degree? Some of us couldn't even understand it and yet we had steady enrollment coming in, very strongly and very steady for many years. We tried to figure out what benefit, I mean, what reason a student would come to UT versus some other school for an associate's degree? And really, it came down to and it turns out to be people in this room which are the faculty teaching the classes. It was the quality of the faculty, the quality instruction, the university experience, the college experience, the name, and the brand, so there were reasons like that that brought students to the university. Me, personally, I am less concerned with how we would compete with another community college, but more concerned with what we can deliver for our students who are here and want to be here that is in their best interest how we meet their goals. I think there is some opportunity that would benefit and I think we need

to look at that. I think we need to look at the search and look at the market so forth and so on. Something that I pulled off the web today just to give you an example from Ohio Comp. there are currently “13,605 associate degree job openings in the state of Ohio right now.” There’s 30,000 baccalaureate degree jobs (less than half), so there’s a lot more baccalaureate degree openings over associate degree openings. But, when you get the Master’s and Doctorate degrees, it is much lower.

President Rouillard: Senator Hoblet, what was the rationale that was given for the two-year associate degree program ending? Was it because there was no market or did the professional accreditation agencies for hospitals want more B.S.N. staff?

Senator Hoblet: Yes. Basically, it was because the enrollment was dwindling in the two-year associate degree in Applied Science of Nursing and we have the baccalaureate degree program. Plus, the literature and the research began showing that patient outcomes improved with baccalaureate education when nurses were there, this was across the board.

President Rouillard: So, even with the technical fields, two-year degrees might not be as marketable as one might think?

Senator Hoblet: Correct. And, A.A.C.N.’s stance, the American Association of Colleges of Nursing’s stance on entry-level practice being the baccalaureate degree -- that really was the push and many faculty thought that we shouldn’t have it. I personally am originally an associate degree grad, so I believe in differentiated practice, so I can see a place for the associate degree nurses which is much more of a technical focus.

President Rouillard: What puzzled me about that decision, that has been a way for these people to pay as they go to complete a bachelor’s degree. The other thing I find interesting with two-year degrees is that if you graduate with a two-year degree they can find a job and pay as they go to finish a four-year degree and they can stay out of debt, so I never understood the rationale.

Senator Hoblet: It was purely a stance of what our vision was and where we wanted to go as a College of Nursing for The University of Toledo.

President Rouillard: Is there anything else on this topic before we move on? Dr. Marchionni is here. As I mentioned, Dr. Marchionni is the Chair of University Council’s Committee on Academic Programs.

Dr. Marchionni: Right. I came here to hear the discussion today. The one thing I think we need to be reminded of, when I spoke to Vice Provost Barrett he set a deadline for the end of the semester to have something to the council and I said something like, “what?” in terms of doing a field study, like which degrees will be important and have a need etc. And he said the state has to approve these new degrees. I think it was by January, does anybody know? It’s really fast. I went and I explored and I am not certain if we are going to make specific renovations, but we think it is expected. I wrote the Registrar and hopefully by this Friday he will give me a list of deactivated associate degrees. I was thinking in terms of fifteen to twenty years, of course, in time things really change. So many of those might be outdated, but any kind of restructuring of degree programs I will always guess or at least assume that they would need to be approved by the state. Anyway, the administration wants this on a fast-track so whatever we can do. We have a combined committee meeting this Friday, so we can see what we can come up and come up with a strategy so we can report this back to the council by the end of the semester.

President Rouillard: I think new programs are more impracticable than reactivating old programs perhaps. Dr. Anderson-Huang is here. Dr. Anderson-Huang, do you have anything that you want to say about this issue of two-year degrees in anticipation of Friday's meeting?

Dr. Anderson-Huang: Not particularly. Did I not hear anything related to Engineering in this discussion?

President Rouillard: That's right, you haven't. There are a few programs in Engineering, right, that are two-year engineering technology.

Group of Senators: Not anymore.

President Rouillard: Okay. Well, maybe those are things that need to be reactivated. Is there something else?

Student Government President Lauren Jencen: I have a question about the additional classes being up. For example, if you are pursuing a bachelor's degree or a master's degree, you take different classes, would that be the same for an associate's degree as opposed to a bachelor's degree?

President Rouillard: I am sorry, can you repeat the question?

Student Government President Lauren Jencen: Will there be very specific requirements for associate's degree?

Assistant Dean Pollauf: Yes, but they mirror the bachelor's degree with core curriculum courses being the same, for example, Comp I, Comp II, two social sciences, humanities and math. Sometimes it is a little less in an associate, but it is the same format, the same kind of courses. The other point I wanted to make to Dr. Marchionni's comment about us being behind the "eight ball," when you talk about any curriculum changes, leaving aside anything that happens outside of this university, please remember that by January of whatever year, everything has to be in place for the following fall. So that is why January is important. You have to have all changes in place so that admissions, the registrar, and everybody else who has to put the schedule up and the information out can do that. Any changes made after January cannot be effective for the following fall. So nine months you are at the end of your time; you need to be two years out to really effectively do some of these things. And the final thing I just want to plant a seed of is, you look at all this work -- course information -- and Dr. Dowd I will send you the electronic link so you can send it on. The one thing that nobody has talked about here and it's really being spoken about a lot at the state level and higher are certificate programs that are specifically built to industry needs. So, it can't be any old five classes that you "slap" together because you happen to have them, but going out and talking to Owens Corning and asking, what are the gaps in your process and coming up with people that can do those five things and modifying the five courses to provide those skills. That is something that is mentioned in all the literature that doesn't seem to be part of the conversation and maybe it should be, so I thought to throw it out there.

Senator Edwards: Normally, the number system is different from the associate degrees which are 1000- and 2000-level, (freshmen and sophomore courses). It is called the lower division. And for the bachelor's degree you have to have a certain amount of also 3000- and 4000-level courses in majority upper-division

baccalaureate programs. It is just like the master's degree programs at the university which are 5000 and 6000, and the doctoral degree programs are 7000 and 8000, which is how you tell the difference.

Senator Krantz: A couple comments on Dr. Anderson's question and Senator Edwards' response. Many of us who teach general educational courses have juniors and seniors in those courses, so if this becomes an advising issue, a student would have to be identified as an associate's degree applicant early on. Otherwise they would not be able to complete 30 credit hrs. of general education curriculum in two years. In other words, there is a distinction to be made between that course, that track. Really, what is going on with policy here is an insurance policy to avoid losing money from the state and that's really what's going on. There are a couple of other issues maybe going back to the discussion of the nursing associate's degree. If you think about it, in just about all of their bachelors programs, the highest skill concepts are given to the students in 3000- and 4000-level courses. There is a distinction between the curriculum of an incoming student that is going to pursue an associate's degree versus a student that is going to go all the way through to pursue a bachelor's degree.

Senator Gilbert: I think the issue that Senator Krantz said about "insurance policy" and I feel like I understand that and I understand the university and that makes financial sense. But it seems like this body has an obligation to think about the insurance policy for the students and so I would like to make sure that any conceptualization of this effort I think it is commendable and I agree with Dr. Lettman, the faculty here are exceptional and that obviously would be a reason why someone would choose to come here in terms of the quality education provided. But I would like to put forward that there is also another explanation why students sometimes make counter to the choices. There is a lot of research at Stanford University and Gates Foundation that low-income students, sometimes really, really smart low-income students will choose to go to a school that is not at the level they are eligible for and they pay more money. So they are able to get into a place like a top-tier school and they would be able to get scholarships and not have to go in debt, but they don't know that. They don't know that the sticker prices are negotiable and they don't know that stuff is...so there are some other reasons why a student might end up here. A low-income, underprepared student might end up here and end up paying \$7,000 for a semester and then fail and the university collects their insurance policy and the student leaves with a significant amount of debt. If they are not provided with the classes as I understand we are no longer doing and we are aggressively recruiting students that we know will need more help, it just seems that this strategy really needs to be wrapped around some resources invested in some student support services, tutoring, some class sizes so those students can be successful so it isn't just a model where you bring in students and get that SSI money and say "goodbye" and wonder, "well, we don't know why they came here and...", so that is my concern. I think an associate's degree is important and I think...certificates are important, but I just think we need to also make sure that whatever is designed is looking out for the interest of the students.

Senator Hoblet: It is interesting what Senator Gilbert had to say and I would like to sort of reiterate that. We had a meeting, a sub-committee with the University Council today and I sit on the committee for the learning environment. And one of the things that we discussed was this sort of "narrow thinking" about what is best; what is best for me, what is best for my course, and we need to broaden that perspective about what is best for the students, for the environment, for the faculty, for the university as a whole and then the university that penetrates and is integrated into the greater community, and I like that perspective, Senator Gilbert. I have long watched healthcare play the "shove game;" when one avenue of

reimbursement closes, they hustle to the open areas where they garner more reimbursement and I watched the same type of thing be perpetuated in higher education and I think that instead of just hustling to an open area or a strategy where we gain additional funding resources, that we need to be deliberative in our thinking about this and what that means for our student body, what it means for us as a faculty, what it means for our university, and then, what it means for this community and how could we serve all of those best.

President Rouillard: Just one point and response to Senator Gilbert's comment about remedial courses. Something that isn't talked about very much and I am forgetting what I got this from. Actually, I think it was Senator Humphrys' report from a meeting that she had in Columbus where she outlined for us at a previous Senate meeting the different bands of reimbursement for students at risk and there are four groups. In fact, we can get reimbursed for some students in those groups who might take remedial classes and do remedial work, but if they graduate in six years we are compensated for that and I think we need to remember that. That formula starts in 2016 I believe. If there is a delay, there is a delay between the new funding formula and that aspect of it, but that is coming, that will be a feature of our reimbursement criteria. Obviously, this is not the last word on the issue, but for today we might need to move on to this other issue on the agenda and that is gen ed.

Let me open the discussion with the following list of courses. As you can remember in 2011 the Faculty Senate voted for a new core curriculum. We agreed that we would zero out all the old gen ed. courses and we would come with a new competency-based curriculum. We approved as a Faculty Senate body about 95 courses as I recall. That list of courses is right here:

Senator Hewitt: Gen ed. and OTM are really very different.

President Rouillard: They are different, but the OTM should be included in the gen ed.

Senator Hewitt: I know they are. I have looked at various sites at OBR and in the process of trying to get our courses approved for OTM I have asked everyone at OBR that question and they all said there is no link between them, they are different. They have overlapping criteria as to how you get in to those lists, but they don't serve the same purpose and they are not the same. And if we were to have the OTM courses as a subset of our general education core then many of the problems will try to make it a competency-based curriculum would just explode the assessment problems just for mathematics. Just doing that kind of thing, for the number of math courses that would have to be on there for the OTM requirement is just ridiculous.

President Rouillard: The work that was done in developing the core competency curriculum was wonderful work and I know that it was an enormous amount of time and attention paid to all kinds of details and very complex information, but it may very well be that it's beyond what we can manage at this point in terms of assessment. I agree with your point that OTM and gen ed. have different functions. But it is my understanding that the Ohio Transfer Module is to assure that students who take certain courses that end up being labeled as gen ed. will transfer seamlessly to another institution. Is that not correct?

Senator Hewitt: Well, that is true in a certain sense. Again, part of the problem that we discovered with various committees that were handling the general education question, the word "general education" is being overused in various things. So, as part of the core curriculum we should probably stop calling it

“general education” because again, if our core is competency-based, then those courses that are going to be at the right of the rubric and are not just general education courses and we shouldn’t think of them that way. There is a general education requirement and we want to think that it has both a component and OTM and that is fine. But then we should separate what the role of the core curriculum means for that because at least for a competency-based core that would have nothing to do with that. Again, the issue with math in particular is that on a competency scale, many students will finish their general education core...on the skill assessment than other students will place into that. There is no way in a competency-based core to give any kind of meaningful base assessment of that kind of situation, so there are these competency-based cores, there are these skills-based requirements that are mandated by the state and they serve separate roles, and we should probably restrict our use of general education to exactly what it means and not make it part of our core curriculum.

President Rouillard: Are you saying the OTM course, we should make it part of our curriculum as our gen ed. courses?

Senator Hewitt: Now, we will have to do assessments, everything will have to be assessment-based. But, we shouldn’t try to conflate all these things to make one simplified assessment to rule them all, I think that is a disaster.

President Rouillard: Are you advocating a different kind of rubric for different course assessment?

Senator Hewitt: Right. If you have courses like this that have various skill components you will have to assess those based on whatever the guidelines are mandated by the state. The state says very carefully what college algebra is. We don’t have any choice about that. One of the reasons it got updated is because we are arguing right now about whether our college algebra satisfies their college algebra. And the reason it doesn’t so far is because we have a few too many extra topics that they don’t, they are a little uncomfortable. They are very conservative what all those skills mean and assessing them is very particular. As far as competency-based core, it is about what that curriculum was about. One of the fundamental comments with all those is mixing those two up. Define first of all a language that you can refer to all these things and keep these concepts separately and stop maybe using phrases like “general education.”

President Rouillard: I think we are going to have to define our terms much more precisely.

Dr. Anderson-Huang: The problem with the Ohio Transfer Module is that it’s really only there to ensure that material taught in a particular course satisfies a prerequisite for another course somewhere else.

President Rouillard: I don’t think it’s just for prerequisites, I think it is for credit transfer.

Dr. Anderson-Huang: Well, yes. But there is also the aspect of just transferring credit without prerequisite and just saying “okay, you satisfied the science requirement of this institution, you don’t have to satisfy it there,” that’s the general education component. And we really need to keep those very different, but I am sure the state wants a list of courses that transfer the content and another list possibly that simply says, okay it satisfies the...How we deal with that is up to us and how we deal with a much narrower core competency is also up to us.

President Rouillard: So, we certainly don't want our gen ed. curriculum to be the bare minimum that is listed in the OTM, is that what you are saying, we want it to be a little more expansive?

Dr. Anderson-Huang: Well, I do think that every gen. ed. course that we teach that is called gen ed. ought to be recognized by someone in the university as satisfying gen ed. otherwise they would have to keep looking for credit.

Senator Gilbert: Are those documents submitted to assess core curriculum or just general education?

President Rouillard: General education.

Dr. Anderson-Huang: Okay. So, the list is to assess general education courses. So, is this list of general education courses an oversight?

President Rouillard: Alright. This is what we passed in 2011. Then up above this is a list from the transfer module. Then there is another list that is right here which is a slightly different set of courses also on OBOR, the number of courses isn't identical.

Senator Gilbert: So that list on OBOR's site is described as our general education?

President Rouillard: This describes the Ohio Transfer Module. There are two lists on the OBOR site that I found that appear to be Ohio transfer modules for The University of Toledo.

Senator Gilbert: And it is not the same as our general education courses?

President Rouillard: No, it is not the same as our general education which is listed in our course catalog and it is not the same as the set of courses that we passed as core competency courses. So, this is what's on our website.

Senator Gilbert: So, there are core competency courses, core curriculum courses, general education courses, and there's the Ohio Transfer Module?

Group of Senators: Right.

President Rouillard: This is what we have to assess and what we use to assess it, but we want to clarify this as soon as we can so we can get started on it. We want to do it in a way that's operational and in a way that it's not going to add to faculty workload burdens over much. I don't know about your department, but in my department people are just wrung-out from doing the program assessment that was 17 pages long and now we want to do gen ed., so we need to find something that is workable and something that gives us the information that we need.

Senator Edwards: From my point of view of looking at this, the Ohio Transfer Module is clear and our gen ed. in the catalog is clear. What isn't clear is what exactly is the core curriculum and OBOR does not talk about the core curriculum and that is a locally defined thing and we need to clarify what our definition is.

President Rouillard: How would you define gen ed. in core curriculum?

Senator Edwards: I don't know.

Senator LeBlanc: From my understanding, the core is different from general education. General education is prescribed by the state, you take two math classes etc. Part of our core is multicultural classes and the state doesn't say, "You don't have to take any multicultural classes to satisfy the gen ed. curriculum in the state of Ohio."

Senator Edwards: Well, there is gen ed. curriculum in the state of Ohio.

Senator LeBlanc: There are gen ed. requirements.

Senator Edwards: Gen ed. requirement and two gen ed. in each institution says it is general education.

Senator LeBlanc: They specify it as 36 credit hrs.

President Rouillard: There are different disciplines.

Senator LeBlanc: I am talking about general education which is two math classes, two sciences-at least one lab science, two English classes, and humanities and social sciences. We voted in addition to that, we say that students have to take multicultural classes and that is part of our core curriculum. We said they satisfy some gen ed. requirements, plus some other stuff and the other stuff is multicultural classes, that is what we decided on as our core.

Senator Hewitt: I thought the deal with the transfer module is those are the courses we would accept to satisfy the gen ed. requirement.

President Rouillard: The core curriculum?

Senator LeBlanc: No, I am saying gen ed.

President Rouillard: Okay.

Senator LeBlanc: So, if somebody takes biology or whatever at Ohio State and they transfer that here we would accept that as a satisfaction of our gen ed. requirements.

President Rouillard: Okay.

Senator LeBlanc: That is the purpose for the transfer modules so they can move seamlessly and transfer their classes and satisfy gen ed. requirements. Gen ed. may be different here than the State of Ohio. So if they satisfy the gen ed. requirement at Ohio State and then they satisfy the gen ed. requirement at The University of Toledo, but not necessarily the core curriculum.

President Rouillard: Because the core curriculum could have other requirements.

Senator LeBlanc: The core curriculum could have other requirements over and above it, what the state considers general education. I may be wrong, but that is how I understand it.

Senator Edwards: That is what the transfer modules are supposed to say. Transfer modules should be transferrable to all state institutions, but it doesn't say that if you complete the transfer module here you can transfer it to OSU and meet their gen ed. requirements, it does not say that. It says, you will be given credit for those courses.

Group of Senators: What?

Senator Edwards: You can complete the general education core here at The University of Toledo and not meet the gen ed. requirements at Owens Community College.

Senator LeBlanc: Then why take the 36 credit hrs.?

Senator Edwards: Because they have a course in their gen ed. requirement that is not part of the transfer module like the Computer Science class.

Senator LeBlanc: Gen ed. or core curriculum? I mean it is satisfying the state's general education.

Senator Edwards: There is no state general education requirement.

Senator LeBlanc: I disagree with you.

Senator Edwards: Well, go look on the OBOR site.

Senator Keith: Senator Edwards, what are the distributed requirements? How would you define those?

Senator Edwards: There are some. But the distributive requirements are in the transfer module.

Senator Keith: But they are not set by the state?

Senator LeBlanc: They also said you have to take two sciences, two maths etc.

Senator Molitor: That's the Ohio Transfer Module made by the state.

Senator Edwards: That's the confusion.

Senator Molitor: When you look at a student's transcript online before they even graduate you will see Ohio Transfer Module requirements completed, which means they've taken two composition courses, two humanities courses, math course and a natural science course.

Senator LeBlanc: So they don't use the gen ed. terminology?

Senator Molitor: No. Once the Ohio Transfer Module is completed at that point you go to another university and you get credit for Ohio Transfer Module distributed requirements such as the humanities and the social sciences.

Senator LeBlanc: So there is no more gen ed. terminology from the state, it's just transfer modules?

Senator Molitor: That is the one thing I can't find define for you, Senator LeBlanc. I can't define general education. I understand core curriculum and I understand OTM, but I don't understand the term general education. That is the curriculum we want every student to have a common set of courses that we define as our core curriculum.

President Rouillard: So we should be talking about general education and OTM and general education at UT?

Senator Molitor: I can't answer that question.

Senator LeBlanc: Here's an example, if a student comes in and places into Account I, that is not on our transfer, is it?

Senator Hamer: Yeah, it is.

Senator Hewitt: But it is not in the core.

Senator LeBlanc: So you are placing it with a math that is higher than what the gen ed. requirement is?

Senator Hewitt: Correct. So, it probably help a lot of things if we stop using the words "general education". I think it does have meaning at the state because it has to do with the CIP codes. But, there are going to be courses that every university in Ohio offers which will satisfy distributive requirements for math that are not in the transfer module because there are no define outcomes.

President Rouillard: And just before I forget, the other wrinkles in this question is that I believe there are now state mandated student learning outcomes for the English courses and the Math courses which also has implications for assessment. We have those mandatory student learning objectives and it sounds to me that that is what needs to be assessed.

Senator Relue: It seems like we really have some confusion going on. Is there someone at OBOR that we can have come and talk to Faculty Senate to answer all of our questions to get this right this time?

President Rouillard: We have faculty working on that and it looks like there's a group that's going to go to Columbus where there will be a conference call. But, the purpose of having this discussion is to at least start the assessment process and the first process to have some instruments that can be used and start the process. I recommend that we move ourselves to selecting some courses from our catalog, whatever we are calling the catalog, gen ed. or core, or whatever it is and start there. I talked to Peg Traband today about some of these issues and about all of these different lists. Every time I look it seems like I discover a new list. Her proposal is very similar, pick a group of courses, pilot some assessment rubrics this fall (I think we can do that), and see how it works, what kinds of revisions we need before we do a more full blown assessment of what is published on our catalog. We can revisit that and we may need a resolution.

Senator Cooper: I have a comment and it may be naive. I don't teach undergraduates, but I do have a kid that is an undergraduate. It is amazing to me that Faculty Senate is debating whether or not what our students have to do. I think about my daughter trying to pick classes and understand etc. etc., it seems like one of the fundamentals that we need to come back to Faculty Senate with is, what terminology should we be using, what terminology needs to be abandoned, and how do we simplify this on behalf of our students so we have mentors who can guide them through the process.

President Rouillard: And Faculty Senate Exec. can certainly work on maybe drafting a resolution that would help us to decide some of those terms so that we are all talking about the same thing and we might be able to do that at our next meeting.

Senator Molitor: A comment about your "wrinkle;" you have another wrinkle, and that is many of these courses have what is called Transfer Assurance Guidelines and that will also determine course outcomes.

President Rouillard: But, isn't that for higher level courses?

Senator Molitor: No, not necessarily. This is what I am saying as a faculty member that is familiar with assessment, not as the chair of the core curriculum committee. I believe the approach "one size fits all" is going to be a mistake. I think we have to let individual courses and departments tell us these are the learning outcomes for their courses and this is how they want to assess it.

President Rouillard: Absolutely. I think what our job is, is to kind of devise a form, but we are not going to tell people what the student learning is.

Senator Molitor: I want to avoid using the word rubric. Because I think that implies that we are sending some kind of grading mechanism for what they are going to submit. I agree that we need some kind of common template for these courses.

President Rouillard: We are not going to dictate grading outlines, instructors will define that.

Senator Krantz: Since many of us just went through the program assessment; can you please go back and specifically say what is the charge of the provost which is to assess individual courses for this Fall, which we currently do not have anything in place and we are to report by January?

President Rouillard: That is the initial charge, but I think we have illustrated what some of the drawbacks are to that.

Senator Krantz: How are we going to motivate individual departments and instructors to get this done instantly after it was approved?

President Rouillard: That is why I think we need to have several different instruments perhaps or a barebones form piloted with a few courses just to see how the process works. That is part of the rubric. The rubric that was designed for the competency curriculum came from ACE. It is a lovely rubric. We got a lot of information out of that rubric, but with our workloads, we cannot ask instructors to spend that much time when we can still do assessment and get some useful information that we can pull back into our courses to continually improve.

Senator Lundquist: Last year we did a rubric for faculty to fill out when they were looking at student assignments and so forth and they did that in good faith and those forms are sitting on my desk. They haven't been compiled, they haven't been anything, since there is no clear direction about how or who to report to. I am reluctant to go back to the faculty and say, "Do this again." OR "We are doing it differently this time, and by the way, the courses you were asked to assess last year are not even part of the gen ed curriculum, even though we spent considerable time applying for them to be so."

President Rouillard: And people worked very hard. I don't want to diminish that.

Senator Lundquist: But, the thing is I think is, they understood when they put their course together before the semester began that they weren't going to have to do this, or that the rubric would be the same. Are we now being asked to create a new rubric in the middle of teaching a course? .

Senator Unknown: We should be able to use the rubric we have.

Senator Hewitt: For different purposes, I guess that is her point.

Past-President Dowd: Correct me. The notion of doing an assessment this Fall, what I remember was, courses that can do it will do it. It wasn't that it was going to be imposed on any course this term. It is just the matter of what President Rouillard said earlier, it is just the matter of trying to gear up for the Spring semester.

President Rouillard: Right. If your faculty has already done that, then you are good. It doesn't have to be the point that you use a new rubric. The point of rubrics is to find something that is a little bit more simplified that can work for other people and it doesn't have to be "one size fits all."

Senator Lundquist: I get that. But I also know when one gets ready to make an assessment report that the report form too often asks for information that doesn't correspond to the information we asked the faculty to report. I'd like to know what the assessment committee wants to know *before* we collect the data.

President Rouillard: For people who want to assess their courses on a competency format, we can assess that way. The people who want to organize their course based on, "here are the student learning objectives I have for this course," we can assess that way.

Senator Teclhaimanot: I think all courses ought to have specific goals and objective based on standards in order to assess student learning outcomes.

President Rouillard: But given all the work that was put into competency-based curriculum and that's how you feel comfortable organizing your core course now and you want to assess it that way, it's fine or you feel like organizing your course according to other student learning objectives, that's fine.

Senator Humphrys: You know we have two issues, we have assessment and we don't even know at this point what we should be assessing. If the Ohio Transfer Module should be a subset of our core, from what we learned last year, we don't even know if we meet that requirement, isn't that true Senator Molitor?

Senator Molitor: That is correct.

Senator Humphrys: So we know that we don't even meet that particular criterion; and the thing is it goes back to what was mentioned earlier, I really think that we have to get a solid set of guidelines from OBOR. OBOR keeps telling us that we are an institution that doesn't really seem to be meeting the guidelines.. Here is my concern; we have found that you can meet with somebody from the Provost's Office this week and then you can meet with somebody else or maybe the same people next week and get a 180 degree different explanation, wouldn't you say that is a fair statement, Senator Molitor?

Senator Molitor: I would say it did depend on who was in the room.

Senator Humphrys: So the thing that worries me is that what we'll get back from this group will be construed in a way that will meet their agenda.

Senator Molitor: I would say that too; I agree 100%.

President Rouillard: Peg did say to me today that faculty can accompany this group to Columbus and there also may be a way to do a teleconference back here with that group as well. Now, we are fast approaching 6 pm, do you want to make a proposal Past-President Dowd?

Past-President Dowd: I suggest that we turn this back to the Executive Committee and ask the Executive Committee to meet with the co-chairs of the Curriculum Committee and any other members from that committee who would like to meet with us just so we can discuss the discussion that is happening today so we can come back.

Senator Lundquist: How are we the only university who can't figure this out? Can we visit some other university that has figured this out to see how they did it?

President Rouillard: I am concerned about the...on the OBOR site too, I've seen two different lists there too.

Senator Lundquist: I understand that.

Senator Molitor: If I can make the final last word? I think one of the goals is to meet with people like you to see what you have and how to incorporate this information into a summary or something similar. Again, we have to make this easier for all of us.

Senator Krantz: It has to be an efficiency gain in this entire process or faculty will rebel and I am already dealing with it.

President Rouillard: We have an announcement from Senator Regimbal.

Senator Regimbal: We started this meeting with Student Government's invitation to come to a "meet and greet" and this is another invitation related to students. The Student Athletics Committee would like to invite faculty to come a reception prior to this week's game at the Alumni Pavilion, there will be hot dogs and beverages. During the game our student athletes will receive their award -- the MAC Institutional Academic Award that you were told about earlier this year. The award is being brought to UT by Mid-American Conference Commissioner Dr. Jon Steinbrecher and will be presented to the student athletes and athletic department. Please accept the invitation from the Student Athletics Committee they would like to thank you for all the work that you've done.

Senator Hoblet: I just want to give an update- Bobbi Vaughn answered my email. The link is being distributed and it will close for Dean Gold's evaluation on the 29th.

President Rouillard: May I have a motion to adjourn? Meeting adjourned at 6:09 p.m.

IV. Meeting adjourned at 6:09 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted by:

Lucy Duhon
Faculty Senate Executive Committee

Tape Summary: Quinetta Hubbard
Faculty Senate Administrative Secretary

