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**President Mary Powers** called the meeting to order, **Karen Hoblet,** Executive Secretary, called the roll.

***I. Roll Call –2010-2011 Senators:***

**Present**: Anderson,Atwood, Barden, Barlowe, Barnes, Barrett, Batten, Baumgartner, Benjamin, Brickman, Caruso, Chiarelott, Cluse-Tolar, Crist, Dismukes, Dowd, Fink, Fournier, Franchetti, Funk, Gardner, Hammersley, Hoblet, Horan, Hornbeck, Jorgensen, Kistner, Laux, LeBlanc, Lee, Lundquist, Molitor, Moore, Moynihan, Nandkeolyar, Ohlinger, Olson, Piazza, Plentifish, Powers, Randolph, Regimbal, Rouillard, Sawicki, Skeel, Stepkowski, Thompson-Casado, Wedding, Weldy, White, Yonker,

**Excused absences:** Carr, Humphrys, Malhotra, Sheldon, Shriner, Solocha, Teclehaimanot,

**Unexcused absences:** Attalah,Eastop, Gibbins, Giovannucci**,** Tinkel, Wilson

***II.******Approval of Minutes****:*  Minutes of 9/28/2010 were not yet ready for approval.

***III. Executive Committee Report:***

**President Mary Powers: S**enators and guests should introduce themselves before speaking so the speakers’ names are recorded accurately in the minutes.

**President Powers:S**enators and guests should introduce themselves before speaking so the speakers’ names are recorded accurately in the minutes.

**President Powers:**I am calling the meeting to order. Welcome all to the fourth Faculty Senate meeting of the academic year 2010-2011.

We welcome the return of our Executive Secretary Karen Hoblet today and to start the meeting, I request Secretary Hoblet to call the roll.

Thanks to President-elect Lawrence Anderson-Huang for additionally filling the Executive Secretary duties for the first three meetings of the year. The minutes from the August 31st meeting and September 14th meeting were sent for your review. May I have a motion for approval of the minutes from the August 31st meeting? Second. All in favor? Any opposed. Please let the record show the minutes from the August 31st meeting have been approved. May I have a motion for approval of the minutes from the September 14th meeting? Second. All in favor? Any opposed? Please let the record show the minutes from the September 14th meeting have been approved.

**Please note, due to scheduling conflicts at the Dana Center, the next meeting of the Faculty Senate on November 2nd will also be held in the Student Union of the main campus. Then, for balance, there will be two meetings in a row on the Health Science campus.**

I would like to start by presenting three log items that the Executive Committee is following up on. The first is an ongoing inquiry into the academic and fiscal responsibility of UT’s involvement in the “Grove City Center for Higher Education” that we mentioned in a previous meeting. The second is a request by Dr. Tom Barden to update Senate on the transformation of the Honors Program into the Honors College. The third is a documentation of policies concerning the allotment of instructional lab fees, particularly unspent fees that remain at the end of a fiscal year.

You should all have received an invitation to attend three open forums to share your views and provide feedback for the self-study report UT is preparing for its 2012 visit from The Higher Learning Commission (HLC) for continuing accreditation. These forums are on Fridays from 9 to 11, on October 22, 29, and November 5. Please make an effort to attend.

Since my first presentation to the Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees in June, I have expressed my intent on working hard to develop communication channels between the Faculty and Administration that are both effective and productive this year. I believe better communication is the most important key to making the institution better and stronger. I believe the role of the Faculty Senate is critical. Dr. Jacobs indicated his hope to start by setting up a facilitated session with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, and I gave my recommendation to support this idea. Toward this, Dr. Jacobs invited Ilene Muething, from Gap International, to visit our campus on Monday August 30th and she will visit again on Tuesday October 26th for purposes of planning the facilitation. Participants for the October 26th meeting were originally described to me as including President Jacobs, Provost McMillen, Chancellor Gold and myself. In an e-mail sent last Friday from Dr. Jacobs, the participant list for the October 26th was expanded to include all Faculty Senate past-presidents since the merger. Following Executive Committee recommendation, I expressed concern that currently elected leadership should be the ones working with the Administration on planning the future. In response to this concern, Dr. Jacobs contacted me and explained his hopes for outcomes of the October 26th meeting, stating he was hoping to see the senate in historical context and to understand its role better. He did reconsider the format and participants for the October 26th meeting and is also including president-elect Lawrence Anderson-Huang in this meeting.

Also, we have been made aware that Ohio State recently made a change to form one College of Arts and Sciences from several smaller colleges and in the past few weeks, I contacted the Faculty Senate at Ohio State in an attempt to gain an understanding of how the Faculty Senate at Ohio State was involved in the process. I learned that for years, OSU has had a five-college entity called the Colleges of Arts and Sciences, and this past year it was decided to consolidate those five colleges into a single College of Arts and Sciences. No consultant recommended it; the decision to make it single college was based on discussions and urgings of various people over the last several years--faculty, their president and provost, and students. Their faculty rules require any such change to be approved by vote of their University Senate and its Faculty Council (the faculty part of the Senate), and last spring both groups voted unanimously for the conversion to a college, which is now in effect.

Most of the focus of the Faculty Senate meetings this year has been about the evolving plans for reorganization and to formulate recommendations from this body that has been elected to represent the University Faculty. Senators were provided with information about the reorganization plans via the UT Strategic Plan website. A Call for Comments on reorganization was made to the Faculty Senators on Tuesday September 7th. The comments that were collected from individual Senators were provided to the Strategic Plan Committee so they could be included with other comments that were collected on the Strategic Planning website. At the September 14th Faculty Senate meeting, the Faculty Senate approved its resolution on reorganization.

The resolution was sent to President Jacobs on Thursday September 16th and also read both days at the Faculty Stakeholder Meetings on September 16th and 17th.

President Jacobs addressed the Senate on September 28th, four days after he announced his recommended Organizational Structure for the University of Toledo. President Jacobs also participated in a question and answer session.

Following the question and answer session with President Jacobs on September 28th, significant concerns remained among the Senators, and the Senators directed me to forward the Faculty Senate Resolution of September 14th to each member of the UT Board of Trustees. This request was fulfilled through President Jacobs, Chairman Fall and Joan Stasa, Assistant to the President for Board Affairs. The Senators also directed the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to set up separate meetings with President Jacobs as well as members of the Board of Trustees, so the meetings would take place prior to the October 11th Special Meeting of the Board of Trustees. President Jacobs met with members of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee on Tuesday October 5th, and Chairman Fall met with members of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee on Thursday October 7th. There were three main points the Executive Committee attempted to make in our meetings with President Jacobs and Chairman Fall. First, we expressed concern about the process of the development of the reorganization proposals, with specific concern about the lack of consultation with the Faculty Senate. We explained the role of the Faculty Senators as the elected representatives of the Faculty, and expressed our concern at how the Administration and Board of Trustees could obtain buy-in from the Faculty for reorganization without including this important body in the initial discussions. These concerns are related to general concerns about the relationship of the Faculty Senate and the Administration. Second, we expressed concerns about the cost of the reorganization during the predicted economically challenging times. Third, we expressed concerns that academic advantages to students were not made clear. We made further comments about the adverse effect on the two colleges HSHS and Arts and Sciences. We left the meetings hopeful that more time would be allowed for better Faculty Senate involvement before action would be taken. Do any members of the Executive Committee who participated in either meeting wish to add comments?

**Senator Dowd:** We were confident that we had effectively made our points to Chairman Fall. I can’t speak for the other members of the EC, but I actually expected the Board to at least discuss the issues we raised before they made a decision.

**President Powers:** Any other comments?

**Senator Rouillard:** There was one thing that Mr. Fall seemed to think that the resolutions that the Board of Trustees passed in February, charging the President to accelerate any changes was apparently their call to faculty to get involved. I have to admit that I missed that call.

**President Powers:** The Board of Trustees Academic and Student Affairs Committee met on Monday October 11th where President Jacobs presented his proposal on reorganization. The trustees were also provided with a five-page summary of the proposal. The discussion during the committee meeting included emphasis that the reorganization was a board directive to President Jacobs with the desired outcome of elevating the stature of the University of Toledo. Discussion followed among Board members that the Board has been having discussions along these lines for the past four years, to provide background that the process of the proposal was not rushed from the perspective of the board members. Following the presentation, I presented a report that included much of the information I reported today and I read the Faculty Senate Resolution on Reorganization. At the end of my presentation, I invited the trustees to ask me any questions. No questions were asked. The end result was the board unanimously approved the reorganization proposal. Last Tuesday, President Jacobs sent an e-mail message along with the PowerPoint presentation that was made to the Board of Trustees. I want to call attention to a few parts of the message from Dr. Jacobs:

“I think we need a pause to reflect and think. I plan not to take any significant implementation steps for the next month. I would like to have some initial personnel actions and other steps ready for the December 6 meeting of the Board’s Academic and Student Affairs Committee. In the interval I invite your input and action. This should not be seen, however, as an opportunity to reopen the debate on whether or not the university should reorganize its academic structure.”

The second session that I want to bring attention to: “Individuals, students, faculty, and staff; ad hoc groups, college counsels, The Senate, Deans, Chairpersons, Vice Presidents; please think about the best way to implement. Send your ideas. But, most of all perhaps, you can say “here’s a way to do this and I or we will get it done.” Let’s try for not only action items, but action itself. Everyone is empowered to “just do it.”

And Dr. Jacobs closed with:

“Finally, I urge the College Councils and the Faculty Senate to become implementors. Where Administrative action is needed please call or visit. I promise I will keep an open mind for the month’s moratorium. Thanks. lj”

There was an attachment to the e-mail that included the following information:

The following Colleges were identified in the attached file:

• College of Business and Innovation

• Judith Herb College of Education, Health Science and Human Service

• College of Engineering

• College of Graduate Studies

• Honors College

• College of Innovative Learning (Comprised of Adult and Lifelong Learning, Learning Ventures, Libraries, and First-Year Experience.)

• College of Languages, Literature, and Social Sciences (Comprised of English, Foreign Languages, and Philosophy, etc.)

• College of Law

• College of Medicine and Life Sciences

• College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics (Comprised of Biological Sciences, Chemistry, Environmental Sciences, Mathematics, and Physics and Astronomy.)

• College of Nursing

• College of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences

• College of Visual and Performing Arts (Comprised of Art, Music, and Theatre and Film.)

A listing of schools was also provided, with a note that the list of schools will be expanded and modified as appropriate.

You all should have received a copy of the re-organization PowerPoint that Dr. Jacobs presented to the Board of Trustees, as well as the letter he sent out to all faculty encouraging participation in the implementation. Later in today’s session we will begin our conversation about how to respond to the re-organization and the invitation to participate.

Now I would like to turn to the other reports we have for today.

The first report today will be given by Provost McMillen. So I ask, Dr. McMillen, can you please come forward?

**Provost McMillen**: Thank you Dr. Powers. First of all I would like to take care of one of the log issues that Lawrence addressed to me earlier in the week. I have a short report about Grove City and South Gate. My colleagues from the Provost office, Dr. Ben Prior who you know is here to also add some information and to answer some questions that I will not be able to; since he’s been more involved than I have, although we talked about this on a number of times. But let me go back to the beginning and summarize this. I would like to add one kenyat that we can talk about in a little bit. It has also been an aspect of our missions for us as well.

Grove City is an Ohio town about forty miles southwest of Columbus. The city as other cities have asked and been interested in promoting education and invited universities who were interested to offer residents of the city university courses. UT responded since this fit in with our new efforts in statewide recruiting; for the last couple of years. About ten universities are participating in providing university classes to Grove City. UT will provide online courses as a key part of this consortium bringing high quality educational opportunities to residents of this part of Ohio. Students taking these classes will pay for them. Understand that the students could take these classes anyway even without this consortium. But I believe it is a valid albeit small addition to our statewide admission and marketing strategy. But I believe that this is a valid school all divisions in State wide omission and market strategy. I’ll ask Ben if he would like to expand on that at all and I can answer questions. Then we will move on to part two.

**Dr. Prior:** Part two, so far at the extent of my knowledge the request was that we make available online catalogs. We have done a lot of program review. We have a pretty good idea of inventory what programs are available exclusively on line and what courses we might offer that would supplement programs that are put together by the Grove’s City Higher Education Admissions. So with their fill in where a student find a hole in a program to offer programs exclusively on line where those programs may not be offered face to face down on site. As with the other issue with South Gate, I and I hope my colleagues are, I’m not willing to foreclose options with respect to a blend of learning that would involve someone going down there in the future. If that is what a department may wish to do. I think there’s a lot of interesting opportunities to pursue there. But for now all we got is those online courses and programs offered that is part of this consortium.

**Provost McMillen**: Ben mentioned another venture that is taking place similar to Grove City, but this is happening in South Gate, Michigan. This again has been initiated by the city itself. And again, online learning will be at the heart of delivering classes to students. However, since Southgate is much closer to UT than Grove City by hundreds of miles, it has been proposed that there also will be on-site classes. This is still being put together. I personally believe that Southgate will have more of a feel of a branch campus, which, of course, UT does not have. This is still in the planning stages. There are no other universities involved in this. Ben, would you like to add anything?

**Senator Dowd:** Regarding those courses, are they being taught by UT faculty members only?

**Provost McMillen:** Yes.

**Senator Dowd:** And regarding the academic programs that you spoke of, are they programs that have already been approved by UT and this Senate? Or are we participating in a program from some other university or college? In other words, are these in any way new academic programs?

**Provost McMillen:** No. I prefer Ben.

**Dr. Prior:** No.None of the academic programs are new. My understanding again on this is that with the online courses doing some…that we’re offering with programs online at Grove City that we are in a position to supplement the students of the program of study. Now transferability requires with respect to transfer agreement guidelines which are already in place in generally that are expanding to include courses that are part of programs to study across the state. With those in place I think, I’m not sure, these are all programs and courses that are transferable that been approved by the State for transfer.

**Senator Dowd:** Thank you.

**Senator Anderson:** I’m going to follow up on that question. So, a student will be enrolled in some institution that is part of this consortium, in some existing program. It might be in UT, it might be in one of the other places. But, they wouldn’t be able to put together a new program, not only choosing various courses, but also design requirements, and get a degree from UT or another institution?

**Provost McMillen:** Did you hear that Ben?

**Dr. Prior:** Yeah I did. I’m not sure where the boundary is between a program that is fairly regiment in which a student may choose to take a course with us or from another institution. Because a student can do that now and or a program such as a Lesrea program in which a student is practicing a program study. Now you and I suppose here will be able to make the decision as to which courses are applied by the Grove City consortium by way of less agree. That is totally speculative nothing has been consent. Do you see the point that I am making? I’m sure that both approaches will enable, especially with the extreme transfer guidelines now in place.

**Senator Barden:** What I heard behind those questions was, can this Grove City Higher Education initiative give a degree? It cannot.

**Provost McMillen:** No.

**Senator Barden:** I think that should be clear. Then the other issue is, may this be with DL courses alone. Also do we charge in State tuition or out of State tuition?

**Dr. Prior:** All the DL courses are offered in State.

**Senator Anderson:** But that is only if their entire semester is conducted in DL. Right?

**Dr. Prior:** I don’t think so.

**Senator Anderson:** Individual courses are?

**Dr. Prior:** We will have to check.

**Senator Regimbal:** The Program Committee has reviewed this issue as a log item request. One of the questions had to do with why the information was posted in the Columbus area, but there wasn’t anything carried in the Toledo area. What the committee interprets from that is that it would be helpful as we engage in these ventures, that at least on campus, we are made aware of new ventures.
I know the Blade is not open to us telling them what the news might be.

 **Provost McMillen:** That’s a valid point. I would assume that. Joel at Savage Hall mentioned this. He said that he read it in a paper and I would imagine that Grove City’s was probably in their paper’s *Orbit.* So, the Blade would not cover it because it is not a news story here.

**Senator Regimbal:** The committee members and I interpret that as being part of the concern that we are engaging in unannounced ventures outside of the Toledo area. It would be nice as faculty to be aware of these ventures in case we were asked about them as we travel through the state, rather than appearing to not be very well informed.

**Provost McMillen:** I certainly will be more conscious of that, either addressing it here or addressing it in *UT Matters*.

**Senator Dowd:** Please clarify whether these students are enrolling in our DL classes and that no separate sections are being created for this enterprise.

**Provost McMillen:** I don’t know how to answer.

**Dr. Prior:** No there are no separate sections being created for this enterprise.

**Provost McMillen:** No. There is not a Grove City sub section.

**Dr. Prior:** Whether or not it should be, I think that there’s another issue that I would love to discuss with a department of program that would like to create a Grove City convention. This could happen in thousands of ways. It could be something peculiar to Geology of the Grove City area. Then it will be an important thing to an online geology course since we are out there digging things up. So I don’t want to rule anything out. We can create separate sections for .. including Honors and who are parts of concentration. So these are possible things, nothing like that has been done.

**Senator Hoblet:** Just for clarification, we have no idea, we don’t know if the response from Grove City will cause us to cap our courses at this point. We don’t have data. Correct?

**Dr. Prior:** That will happen with or without Grove City.

**Senator Hoblet:** We are going to monitor that, as we move forward hopefully?

**Dr. Prior:** I suppose, but when you are talking about online, exclusively on line courses, it will be very difficult for me without a separate section that might… forth to monitor and somehow limit the number of people that… as oppose to visit Grove City and have them sign up.

**Senator Hoblet:** I’m not proposing that we.

**Dr. Prior:** But the issues are complicated.

**Senator Hoblet:** I am just saying that I think that when we put together initiative, I would hope that we will have measurement criteria for the initiative as we move forward. We can implement all we want, but whether there achieving whatever outcome we want, expanding our enrollment, increasing our student numbers, etc. we need to be assessing and measuring the outcome. I would hope that we will be measuring the determined criteria in some form especially if it’s online. Whatever makes the most sense and makes the data easy to access.

 **Provost McMillen:** You know everybody in the room may be aware because I have spoken about this a couple of times to smaller groups, but I don’t know if I spoken to the whole Faculty Senate. The officials of the Board of Regents, I believe have recognized and I have seen some charts. They stood literally at the doors at the Board of Regents that they consider The University of Toledo the leading University in the State as far as online distance learning; including Ohio State, they consider even near us. So, I think some of what we do and some of maybe even the policies to fall in place could become State standards. We are clearly recognized by the Regents in this role. That is an important role for us. I have a couple of other things to mention. I want to mention, but some of you have already heard, no doubt, that a memo has been issued today dealing with UT’s response to the “lapse June 2011 State Share of Instruction payments to Ohio universities.” Does everyone know about this? The State has proponed the June SSI payment which for the University of Toledo, it is $7.9 million dollars. They have proponed it to June to July. But in reaction to that a memo was issued over the signatures of me, Dr. Gold, and Dr. Scarborough and went to Vice Presidents and Deans. The university directs that every “university college and division reduce its FY 2011 general fund budget by 1.5%.” I understand that this is a difficult mid-year budget cut that could affect such important things as hiring. I have already today met with one dean. I am pledged to work with deans on this issue.

Here is the update on the searches: Law, School of Solar and Advanced Renewable Energy, and

Re-organization. Read in the memo that I sent to Deans.

**Senator Dowd**: Many people in the central administration have said many times over several years that across the board budget cuts are abhorrent. So why are we now going with the 1.5% across the board budget cut instead of applying these cuts strategically? Is it because the administration’s strategic investments won’t be touched by this budget cut? Why press the across the board cuts now?

**Provost McMillen:** I’m not an expert. I will invite Jeff to correspond. But I am not a financial expert in this area. There is also recommendation at this point in time in the semester that it will be a better way of doing it. It was also a recommendation because all of my years of hanging around Ohio’s universities, Ohio State funding there is no precedence for this. This is a very strange thing. It comes of course just before the fiscal year and initially there was a statement, initially it said “we will pay you after the first of the year. We will pay you your $7.9 million along with everyone else.” So it’s that promise on the table, but being realistic 2012 budget was already being rejected as $40 billion dollar deficit for Ohio. So the thought that we were going to get payment a few weeks later seems not really realistic. However, it is still out there on the table that we would just get a late payment. It was thought that it might be better to handle a late payment with this kind of a cut. The fact of the matter is, the budget reports that came out in the month of September by the office of Budget in Columbus for hire than anticipated, we somehow for whatever reason, continue to make budget, continue to advance for the State through the Christmas season and so on. It’s possible that we see that. It’s just an up in the air situation. It must be cited by the administration the best way we know how.

**Senator Dowd:** The proposal from the Finance and Strategy Committee included the 1.5% budget cut as well as provision that if the money actually is received from the State the funds that were cut from units would be returned to those units. But at the Board of Trustees meeting yesterday, the board approved a resolution that even if the State money is received, those funds cuts from departments and programs and will not be returned to those units.

**Provost McMillen:** I would hope that is still up for question that was part of the original university budget.

**Senator Dowd**: Thank you.

**Senator Wedding:** Did you say that the 1.5% will apply also to the central administration?

**Provost McMillen:** Yes, from the Human Relations and the President’s office. There was a list that was attached that went to all of the Deans.

**Senator Piazza:** Bill, I think that there was another part of that memo that said something about if there are positions cut, about 50% of the money saved from those positions will be apply to that. Is that correct?

**Provost McMillen:** Yes.

**Senator Piazza:** What’s the rationale behind that?

**Provost McMillen:** I don’t know.

**Senator Piazza:** Okay.

**Provost McMillen:** It was clear from our conversation that this was something that was one of the reasons I immediately went and saw one of the Deans this afternoon when I was called; was that there was room for negotiations. We were in a middle of hiring. A person literally had a candidate on the floor when I was visiting. It’s going to have to take individual negotiations for all of us. I mean quite frankly. Steve.

**Senator LeBlanc:** The memo was unclear, is it a onetime cut? Or is it a permanent cut?

**Provost McMillen:** Well, I think that’s up for debate about the next budget. I think that’s going to be an issue for the next budget.

**Senator Olson:** As I understand it is that the politicians moving in the system are saying this is a deferral from June to July. However, the technicians in the system are saying, no, we are going to have some big cuts in fiscal 2012 and therefore this will not be a deferral: this will be a permanent cut. I think that is the problem with trying to find if this is a permanent or a one time cut.

**Provost McMillen:** Well yeah, accept there is a little different twist to that, in a sense that what will happen to the Governor, whether it is a new Governor or the old Governor this is our budget year for Ohio. For the two year. So, the budget will be in process starting in about.

Well, it depends if it is going to come or not, when they give their talk and when they give they present the budget. Because believe it or not whether old staff and new staff. The timing is that beginning or around March 1, 2011 that the State budget will be debated and put together. So that question is how they handle that. If they handle it by March, April, May, and June; if they handle it as another deficit or if they handle it as revenue increasing as they suggested, as part as the old budget. I mean, like I said that is some precedence, I don’t know as my years around I have never seen anything like this so. I don’t mean to be… about it, but I don’t know how to.

**Senator Dowd:** I have a question about the prudence of a budget cut for the colleges impacted by the reorganization plan. The reorganization is breaking Arts and Sciences into three new colleges and it has the College of Education combining with Health Science Human Services. For those of us in Arts and Sciences are being asked to cut our budgets by 1.5% at a time when we have to create two additional dean offices, two additional offices of student services, hire many more advisors, budget officers, and so on. I don’t see how we can have a budget cut at a time when we are going to need additional resources. That is, we need a budget increase. What’s your thought regarding this inconsistency?

**Provost McMillen:** Again, that is an unprecedented situation. I don’t know. I know that is going to be an issue that certainly going no doubt if Bailey along with the Vice Provost, don’t know what we want. I have one more thing. Very, Very quickly, and again this is an issue to. I thought I should update you as much as I know about the three searches. The College of Law is bringing in a number of candidates for on campus visit at the beginning of November. The School of Solar and Advanced Renewable Energy and the Provost Job are both finished with writing the ads and they are going to be placed in a couple places and so on. And that’s all I know about the searches.

**Senator Anderson:** Are final copies of that ad available?

**Provost McMillen:** Which?

**Senator Anderson:** For the Provost.

**Provost McMillen:** Oh Yeah, they had a seminar.

**President Powers:** Thank you Provost McMillen. I know that Dr. Gold also has some announcements of general interest to us about the availability of flu shots. I ask that Dr. Gold to use this time to inform Senators of the availability of flu shots this year.

**Chancellor Gold:** Thank you. I would like to warmly welcome Dr. Karen Hoblet. We are glad to have you with us.

 I would like to once more announce that the influenza vaccine for this year is available on both campuses, in the Main Campus Medical Center and in the Employee Health Clinic on the Health Science Campus. It’s free of charge to all faculty, all staff, and all students. They are scheduled vaccination clinics “that are listed on the web.” This year, unlike last year, there is one vaccination instead of two, so one less needle stick. We are strongly recommending that you do it. There are no predictions for flu season this year, but we have been vaccinating since August. We have a very good attendance this far with scheduling clinics. Any questions? Thank you.

**President Powers:** Thank you Dr. Gold. Our next report is from Steven Peseckis from the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee.

**Dr. Peseckis:** A letter that you all should have received concerned course recommendation from the Curriculum Committee. They consist of new courses and two course modifications and come from the Colleges of Arts and Science and HSHS. This is consent of an agenda item.

*New Course and Course Modification Proposals include the following:*

*College of Arts and Sciences (ARS)*

*New Courses.*

* **ARBC 3410 Survey of Arabic Civilization I** 3 CHr

Lec 3, 24 students/semester; 24/section; Semester Offered: Fall, Every Year.

Grading: Normal; Prerequisite: ARBC 3020 or Permission of Instructor

Catalog Description: “The course examines the Arabic culture and civilization from Arabic authors’ literature published in English as well as in Arabic and compares that to Western thought and ways of expression.”

* **ARBC 3420 Survey of Arabic Civilization II** 3 CHr

Lec 3, 24 students/semester; 24/section; Semester Offered: Spring, Every Year.

Grading: Normal; Prerequisite: ARBC 3020 or Permission of Instructor

Catalog Description: “This course further the students’ knowledge of the Arabic civilization through examining the ways of thinking and social contexts as expressed in literary works and poetry from different eras. ”

* **ARBC 3430 Survey of Arabic Civilization III** 3 CHr

Lec 3, 24 students/semester; 24/section; Semester Offered: Fall, Every Year.

Grading: Normal; Prerequisite: ARBC 3410 and ARBC 3420, or Permission of Instructor

Catalog Description: “This course further the students’ knowledge of the Arabic civilization through examining the ways of thinking and social contexts as expressed in literary works and poetry from different eras. ”

* **ARBC 3980 Special Topics in Arabic**  1-3 CHr

Recitation 3, 24 students/semester; 24/section; Semester Offered: Fall, Spring, Every Year.

Grading: Normal; Prerequisite: ARBC 3010 and ARBC 3020, or Permission of Instructor

Can be taken more than once, but for no more than 3 CHr total.

Catalog Description: “Study of a selected topic in Arabic language, literature or culture. May be repeated when topic varies. Prerequisite: ARBC 3010 and 3020.”

* **ARBC 4010 Arabic Syntax and Stylistics I** 3 CHr

Recitation 3, 24 students/semester; 24/section; Semester Offered: Fall, Every Year.

Grading: Normal; Prerequisite: ARBC 3020 or Permission of Instructor

Catalog Description: “It provides thorough intensive work with authentic texts that allows further study of syntax, morphology and complex grammatical structure of Arabic and the relationship between aural/oral aspects of the language.”

* **ARBC 4020 Arabic Syntax and Stylistics II** 3 CHr

Recitation 3, 24 students/semester; 24/section; Semester Offered: Spring, Every Year.

Grading: Normal; Prerequisite: ARBC 4010 or Permission of Instructor

Catalog Description: “It provides thorough intensive work with authentic texts that allows further study of syntax, morphology and complex grammatical structure of Arabic and the relationship between aural/oral aspects of the language. “

* **ARBC 4850 Media in the Arab World** 3 CHr

Recitation 3, 24 students/semester; 24/section; Semester Offered: Spring, Every Year.

Grading: Normal; Prerequisite: ARBC 4020 or Permission of Instructor

Catalog Description: “The course provides an in-depth study and analysis of media and news sources in the Arab world and surveys major press and alternative publishing outlets produced in Arabic. “

* **ARBC 4980 Special Topics in Arabic**  1-3 CHr

Recitation 3, 24 students/semester; 24/section; Semester Offered: Fall, Spring, Every Year.

Grading: Normal; Prerequisite: ARBC 3010 and ARBC 3020, or Permission of Instructor

Can be taken more than once, but for no more than 3 CHr total.

Catalog Description: “Study of a selected topic in Arabic language, literature or culture. May be repeated when topic varies. Prerequisite: ARBC 3010 and 3020.“

* **EEES 4490 Remote Sensing of the Environment**  4 CHr

Lec 4, 20 students/semester; 20/section; Semester Offered: Fall, Every Year.

Grading: Normal; Prerequisite: GEPL 3550 and EEES 2100, or Permission of Instructor

Catalog Description: “Introduction to theory, methods and techniques used to gather and analyze remote sensor data. Topics range from low altitude air photo interpretation through satellite image acquisition.”

* **SPAN 1010 Spanish for Health Care Professionals** 3 CHr

Lec 3, 15 students/semester; 15/section; Semester Offered: Fall, Alternate Years.

Grading: Normal; Prerequisite/Co-requisite: None

Catalog Description:” Introductory presentation of the vocabulary, grammar, and customs of the Spanish-speaking world as they relate to the field of health care.”

**Course Modifications**

**GEPL 4490 Remote Sensing of the Environment**  4 CHr

* Cross-list with EEES 4490
* Update catalog descriptions to “Introduction to theory, methods and techniques used to gather and analyze remote sensor data. Topics range from low altitude air photo interpretation through satellite image acquisition. Recommended: EEES2100 or GEPL 3350.”
* **PHIL 3370 Medical Ethics** 3 CHr

Change name to “Biomedical Ethics”

**Health Science and Human Service (HSHS)**

**New Courses**

* **KINE 4460 Advanced Human Anatomy I** 3 CHr

Lec 3, 50 students/semester, 25/section; Semester Offered: Fall, Spring, Summer; Every Year

Grading: Normal Grading (A-F,PS/NC.PR, I); Prerequisite/Co-requisite: None

Catalog Description: “KINE 4460. Advanced Human Anatomy I. [3 hours]. This is a combined, online lecture and laboratory course that presents a systems approach to the human body, covering cells and tissues, integument, skeletal and muscular systems, and central and peripheral nervous systems. Prerequisite: Previous anatomy or anatomy and physiology course; junior/senior standing; permission of instructor.”

**Dr. Peseckis:** All in favor? Any opposed? Any objections? **Motion granted** (Courses have passed.) Thank you.

**President Powers:** Thank you Dr. Peseckis.The third report today is from Past-President John Barrett from the Constitution and Rules Committee. His report includes an action item on formal language to allow electronic voting during Senate meetings. Provost McMillen and Chancellor Gold have authorized funds for the purchase of a clicker system to be owned by the Faculty Senate. Thank you very much, Drs. McMillen and Gold.

**Senator Barrett:** At the end of the last Senate meeting in this building in this room, I walked up to Mary and asked “what are we doing about clicker voting?” and she expressed concern about proceeding with clicker voting since technically the rules to the Faculty Senate Constitution provides only for a hand vote, voice vote, or a secret ballet. We decided to send an item to the Constitution and Rules Committee, which I Chair. The Constitution and Rules Committee discussed the matter and we propose amending the rules to allow for clicker usage. We actually went a step further and suggest that it be the presumed method, which is the second half of the language. The bracket in the first sentence and the entire bracket after that are the proposed changes.  We obviously don’t have to include both if people don't want the presumption, but we thought given the efficiency of it and how it worked last year, creating presumption made since. We also discussed whether there should be someone tasked with running the clickers on an ongoing basis: should it be assign to a committee, should it be assign to an officer. To give it to an officer would inquire amending the entire Constitution, which requires a faculty-wide vote, as well as potentially going to the President and the Board of Trustees for an approval. So we weren't too enthused about that. We also discussed assigning it to a committee permanently, which probably is a more formal mechanism than is needed. We concluded the President can just find a volunteer or volunteer someone each year to be responsible for collecting and handing out the clickers as well as for setting up the software so we could have the questions on screen at each meeting. So we propose only a change to Article II of the rules under the heading "Voting". You see the bracket in language, it allows electronic voting as well as creating a non-binding presumption. If we wish to do this, the resolution must be passed by 2/3rds of a duly convened meeting of Senate with a forum, which we have today. So with that, I open it up for any discussion. Since this is coming from the committee, it does not need to be moved or seconded.

 *Resolved that Article II of the Rules to the Faculty Senate Constitution be amended to read:*

*Article II   Voting*

Voting shall be by show of hands or voice vote [or electronic tabulation] unless a member of the Faculty Senate shall request a secret ballot. **[**The presumption shall be that voting will be conducted by electronic tabulation and that Senate will attempt to have the necessary equipment in place to conduct such tabulation, but notwithstanding such presumption no Senate business shall be delayed or postponed due to the inability to vote by electronic tabulation on any matter.**]**

Said resolution must be passed by 2/3 of those in attendance at a faculty senate meeting with a quorum present according to the Rules (see the very last Article).

**Senator Thompson-Casado:** John, why should the presumptive manner of voting be electronic when it is very simple for many matters for us to just raise our hand?

**Senator Barrett:** Well, our feeling was, my feeling was, if we’re going to have clicker voting we kind of have to arrange for it to exist. We need to have the clickers at the meeting. We need to have things set up for it. So, if you don’t create a presumption you are going to use it, essentially you will never use it. So, why buy the clickers? Why go through the process? If we feel like it’s worth doing, we kind of have to arrange for it to happen, unlike a hand vote. So that was what I think the thinking.

**Senator Anderson:** I would assume not using them for things like approval of the minutes.

**Senator Barrett:** Yeah, we didn’t use it last year for approval of minutes.

**Senator Skeel:** Well this saysthat presumption will be that we will. So therefore, we will have to approve the minutes by clickers. That’s kind of silly.

**Senator Barrett:** Let’s go ahead and test using the clickers for all matters to see how they work at a meeting. That’s a pretty easy thing to do; you are just making approving minutes a standing item that is on your computer.

**Senator Skeel:** It’s also very simple to leave the first bracket the way that it is and not have the *presumption* in there.

**Senator Barrett:** That’s true as well; we can drop that if that’s the Senate’s wish.

**Senator Lundquist:** What is the advantage with having the clickers?

**Senator Barrett:** It allows quick, speedy, accurate tabulation. The other advantage is some senators expressed unease with having to identify themselves on controversial issues and this allows essentially all votes to be a form of secret ballet which our Constitution does allow; because essentially you never have to identify where you are voting on a given issue.

**Senator Barden:** I like to speak in favor of dropping the second one, but keeping the first. Because I think it’s a matter of course, it’s a lot trouble with… around. We generally don’t need it. We often know when we are going to have a lot of important votes that could be set up. It is just an option. It makes sense to me.

**Senator Barrett:** If I can just say that it is as President Powers indicated, the Provost and the Chancellor have agreed to fund the purchase of the clickers. I think that if we are going to use them sporadically that would not be a prudent use of resources. That is not saying that we need to favor clicker voting just so to justify spending the money. But if we are going to use it only sporadically, I think that we can go with what we did last year when we borrowed them when needed, rather going through the expense. So I suggest we at least keep that in mind if you want don't want a presumption; and if you want to go down the road of buying clickers if you feel that way.

**Senator Fink:** On a separate note. I don’t think k that you need a secret ballet since you have already said the electronic tabulation, basically which is a secret ballet. So, if we could just put a period after the bracket and the rest of those words.

**Senator Barrett:** Not if you use a hand vote or a voice vote. I mean since it still allows the two types of votes, I think that language probably should be in there.

**Senator Fink:** Okay.

**Senator Dowd:** I believe that prevision already exists unless someone makes such a request.

**Senator Barrett:** Yes. The only change in the first sentence is the addition of "or electronic tabulation.” Somebody else had their hand up.

**Senator Sawicki:** Since you can borrow enough clickers to use, can we pilot them for the next couple of months and use them for everything?

**Senator Barrett:** That’s what we did last year and I think it worked pretty well; most people seemed to like it except, maybe Karen Hoblet who had to do all the gathering of the clickers.

**Senator Hoblet:** Well, we didn’t use it for approval of minutes.

**Senator Barrett:** That is the one thing we didn’t do it for. But, as I say that can always be at the top of our list of items to vote on. It’s the one thing you know you are going to vote on at every meeting.

**Senator Dowd:** You spoke about not identifying the Executive Committee member responsible for the clickers because that would require changing the Constitution. Is there a way to include such language in the rules or appendices?

**Senator Barrett:** I think thatit will be somewhat awkward.  The President could as a habit hand it to the secretary or hand it to whomever, but all of the descriptions of the duties and responsibilities for the officers on the Executive Committee are in the Constitution. So I think it is pretty disingenuous to add a duty in another part, in the appendix or in the rules, when they all are listed in the body of Constitution itself. I don’t think that would be an appropriate approach.

**Senator Hoblet:** Point of clarification. You mentioned officers, you mentioned officers to describe the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC). You said members of the Executive Committee, which is actually more than just officers. The FSEC has a Main Campus representative and a Health Science Campus representative. So there are two different entities on the FSEC.

**Senator Barrett:** Those particular members of the Executive Committee do not have specific duties listed in the Constitution.

.**Senator Hoblet:** But I just want to be clear on the Constitution that that’s not specified. Thank you.

**Senator Barrett:** But that’s four different people.

**Senator Hoblet:** Correct.

**Senator Barrett:** They are all essentially equal. So to assign it to one permanent would also seem a little strange.

**Senator Hoblet:** But you do have that they.

**Senator Barrett:** Yes. Other questions and comments? Do you want to vote on this? Do you want to vote on it without the second sentence? I mean the motion coming forward from the Committee is this one, so unless you want to drop the language I think we need a motion to drop the second sentence and to vote on that.

**Senator Skeel:** I move that we drop the second sentence.

**Senator Barrett:** Okay. Can we vote on it without that change or do we need to vote on the proposed change?

**Senator Skeel:** We don’t have clickers.

**Senator Dowd: Do you consider this a friendly amendment?**

**Senator Barrett:** Do I consider it a friendly amendment. Yes

**Senator Anderson:** Is that what we want?

**Senator Barrett:** Well let’s vote. All in favor of dropping the second sentence. All opposed. ***Motion granted***. The proposed amendment is that voting shall be by show of hands, or voice vote, or electronic tabulation unless a member from Faculty Senate shall request a secret ballet. This requires a 2/3rd vote. All in favor? All opposed? All against the motion raise your hand please. One. All in favor of it. I think that is well over 2/3rds**. *Motion carries as modified****.*

**President Powers:** At our last meeting, we had the first two reports of the regular Faculty Senate reports to help us prepare the university’s upcoming review by the Higher Learning Commission focusing on The Higher Learning Commission Self Study and Program Reviews. Today Dr. Ron Opp will report on the University Assessment Committee.

So, at this time, I ask Dr. Ron Opp to provide a report from the University Assessment Committee.

**Dr. Opp:** Thank you for having me. I want to bring you up to date with the University Assessments initiatives. I have a slide show that we can kind of run through. I am hoping that this will be a regular occurrence and every six weeks or so either myself or someone from the University Assessment, maybe Steve Leblanc or somebody else might be able to come and give you some information and other aspects about what is happening with the assessment here on campus. I have chaired the University Assessment about eight years and the Committee as it stands right now is twenty members. We have somebody that represents the Faculty Senate, someone from the Student Senate, we have a representative from each of the colleges and we have representative from the Academic support.

***University Assessment Committee (UAC)***

* 20 members, including representatives from:
	+ Three subcommittees:
		- Assessment Plans
		- Assessment Reports
		- Assessment Training and Development

***Faculty Responsibilities***

* Ensure implementation of University Assessment Plan
* Create, implement, and evaluate university assessment policies and practices
* Support development and review of assessment plans every 5 years and assessment reports every year

* Sponsor faculty workshops on assessment
* Ensure clearly stated goals and student learning outcomes for each educational program that make effective assessment possible
* Provide evidence of student learning that demonstrates we are fulfilling our educational mission

***Program/College/Academic Support Unit Assessment Responsibilities***

* Assessment outcomes are reported at 2 levels:
	+ Program/major/certificate
		- B.A. in sociology
		- Ph.D. in curriculum & instruction, major in special education
		- Certificate in Health Information Administration
	+ College/academic support unit
		- College of Business Administration
		- Learning Ventures

***Assessment Reporting through Epsilen***

* Assessment outcomes reported through 2 levels of matrices composed of:
	+ Rows
		- the programs/majors and certificates in a college or
		- the colleges in the University or
		- the programs in an academic support unit
	+ Columns – specific assessment information requested for each college/unit or program/major and certificate

***Spring Faculty Workshops***

* *Spring semester assessment workshops conducted by academic support staff in Learning Ventures*
* *Topics to include creation of:*
	+ *Program assessment matrices and rubrics*
	+ *Program reports on student learning outcomes*
	+ *Feedback loops*

***Next Faculty Senate Presentation***

* Assessment of student learning outcomes in the core curriculum
	+ Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA)
	+ Assessment matrix approach

**Dr. Opp:** I’m hoping that you will invite us back andhoping that those folks will make a recommendation to you. Are there any questions? Thank you for your time.

**President Powers:** Our last presentation of the day is from Dr. Sammy Spann. Dr. Spann will talk about Study Abroad and International programs for students and faculty. Thank you for joining us.

**Dr. Spann:** Good afternoon. My name is Sammy Spann and I’m in the office of Academic here at the university. You haven’t heard much about our area, but you will be hearing more soon. What we are trying to do is not rebuild our Study Abroad program, yet enhance it. In the past we had about 123 students in our Study Abroad programs. Compared to other universities within the State and outside the State, that number is relatively low. We are looking at ways to find funding and other mechanisms to get our numbers up. Right now we are at thirty-two students which is a little above target from last year. Also we are looking at bringing National Student Exchange; that’s a new program we have partnered with to bring domestic opportunities here to UT. National Student Exchange has about two hundred universities throughout the United States where students can come to the University of Toledo and we will be trading students. So in other words, we will be sending students away and taking students on. We have about six students that are getting ready for this first year. We are also trying to create more faculty led programs. We are interested in finding funding to help faculty members do more faculty led programs and also get the funding so we can pay for the airfare and or provide them with stipends. If we are going to be a research institution we need to show that in our global experiences with our faculty and not just our students. So, you will be hearing more from my office about that, as I will be working with administration with finding ways of getting more faculties involved as well as students. Our office also provide passports, we are doing that now. It is about $5.00 for two pictures; to get your passport so you do not have to run up to Walgreens, but you can do it here in the Student Union where you can come to Starbucks and get your coffee. We also provide Rosetta Stone in about four languages to help students or faculty to touch up on their international languages. The challenge that we have right now is credit hours, to make sure we get the State subsidy and so that student don’t have a transcript full of electives. We have frozen all of our partnerships with other companies that provide study abroad until we can get an affiliate agreement and also make sure that we are getting State subsidy for the hours our students are receiving. This is a lot to undertake, but I think if we are doing this all at the same time we can have more of a powerful program to offer to our students as well to our faculty members. Finally, we are looking for incentives for faculty to use our office as a one stop shop, assisting with travel arrangements, finding funding, and assist with communication with overseas partners. That might sound enticing for those of you who want to get away for a little while. I have a few minutes here to answer any questions and answers. I know I have talked relatively quick, it is after 5pm and everybody kind of want to go home so if you have any questions I can answer them.

**Senator Thompson-Casado:** As the numbers increase of students going abroad it also increases the work load on faculty members increases because we are doing all of the advising and coordinating and are in constant contact with them while they are there. We’re also getting their transfer credit when they come back. Are there any plans to do some kind of sort of group study abroad advising for these students going out each semester to take some of the load off the faculty?

**Dr. Spann:** Yes. What I have done since I have taken this position **is visit** nine universities with that exact same reason among others and what we are looking at for someone to identify someone in each department so we can either give a free trip somewhere or find some other compensation. I being facetious there, but finding someone in each department that will be responsible for those students. We haven’t figured out compensation, but we do identify that it is a labor intense responsibility for faculty members that have other responsibilities as well. We are working on that.

**Senator Thompson-Casado:** Instead of advising students one-on-one, if we have twenty students going to Europe, it is very easy to set up a session for twenty students and talk about general concerns for students going to Europe or a geographical region. Instead of having a faculty member one-on-one with these students which is very time consuming.

**Dr. Spann:** Right. We will have that; we also have our… part of orientation where we are going to be… and recreate and set forth as well. So we are looking at that. Any suggestions that you might have, we are at the…stage from making those changes, please feel free to send me an e-mail. I will be coming by to talk about other areas. I will be coming by departments to talk to you. I talked to several faces in here. So it won’t be a one man show or decision, it will be something that we will take forward with consideration.

**Senator Rouillard:** You mentioned a national student exchange. This is a service that refers students to the different universities, for study abroad.

**Dr. Spann:** The President is in Indiana and it is a company that has a total of two hundred universities of the concortium. And what it is, we make an agreement for instance, Toledo, we will have what we call an even-in and an even-out. We will only allow ten students in and ten students go out. That way they will pay tuition here, so that way when the students pay tuition here, we get ten students in we are not exaggerating the labor. We are not asking for more people to do more work. It’s going to be an even swap. Students that come in, my office will give them a tour of the city of Toledo and show them the museum, things like that. So, it shouldn’t be extra work on faculty other than having someone in your course from Indiana, Arizona, and California; …to add a little extra flavor to your course. Yes.

**Senator Barden:** I think the Senators should know that this is a domestic, not foreign, study away plan.

**Dr. Spann:** Yes. This is a Domestic program. National Student Exchange is a Domestic program. The Study Abroad is something separate. A lot of students that I have been running into since I been here, do not want to venture out. For those that want to provide that… as well. So National Student Exchange is a domestic program within the fifty States, including Hawaii among other American territories.

**Provost McMillen:** Sammy, I just want to say that the Senators may remember that in earlier this year and in the summer I mentioned a couple of times about forming committees, a couple committees actually and I asked the Senate for, Mary is on, for considering appointments to these committees which I am in the process in forming. They are going to try to approach a couple of administrative questions that has already been asked in fact, not just study abroad, but national students as well. Not separate as two committees, one dealing with International and one dealing with Study Abroad, but cut them horizontally where to deal with the issue of credit both for international students coming here and going away or other academic issues; faculty participation, faculty work load and so on. The other committee will deal with more of the administrative structure, the cause of how things are organized and so on. Sammy as many of you know is taking the lead with this year’s Study Abroad. In fact you might want to mention your visit this weekend. With hope to talk with, meet with, and…

**Dr. Spann:** This weekend, the nine universities I went to visit throughout the United States, not just Ohio; one of the institutions I visited was N.I.U, Northern Illinois University. When I took this position I did some research, I called Ohio State, Ohio internationally concortium of places and I kept hearing the same thing over and over again, UT’s use to be the model of internationally program. UT was this, UT was that before this era came about and it was disbanded, but we use to always use UT as a model. Now the joke in my office is now everyone is saying UT is a model now because we are disbanded. But the person to bring to town is Deborah Pierce, some of may know her; about seventeen years ago she was here and I met her at a national conference which is a international conference in Kansas and when I asked her about being here at Toledo, she choked up. She got a little teary eyed. Then it was the passion that I saw before anything else and I decided to ask her to come here to Toledo. We will bring her here this Friday, take her to the football game on Saturday, and have her meet some of her friends. Mostly, just to thank her for some of the things she has done, but some of the things we are bringing back; the food that we have fed to others are being fed back to us. So if anyone will like to meet her, she will be on campus all day Friday, around 2:00 pm we will be meeting with the Provost, but between 2:00 pm and 5:00pm, if you shoot me an e-mail I can probably bring her to your office or have her at a central location so you guys can meet with her as well. Yes.

**Senator Batten:** In this day and age we cannot assume students have any particular resources for Study Abroad.  Will your office be handling things that will help to cover medical, and liability and all those things that you need when you go overseas?  We just can’t assume that a student family can pick that up. Where will the office be and how can we coordinate that for the students?

**Dr. Spann:** My office is at the end of this hallway, right by South lounge right next to.

**Senator Batten:** But I mean money.

**Dr. Spann:** As far as money, money will…to students to claim. When I first took this position we had a general fee and it actually increase fees to nine thousand dollars for travel… for students. The insurance policy, it will be three companies and going to four more and I am working with the Health Science Campus, he is over Risk Management, I can’t think of his name right now, but we are looking at other insurance companies that we can use, so we don’t have to buy at this institution for every student to go overseas or a low cost for students to pay individually. So, that is in the equation as we try to rebound this. We are working on bringing and making that an issue. But we do have other scholarships also that we are going to try to bring on board for students to help defray costs. Did I answer your question?

**Senator Batten:** I think it does. The health insurance in particular overseas it’s not the same as it is here.

**Dr. Spann:** Okay.

**Senator Batten:** And the students couldn’t have that burden necessarily.

**Dr. Spann:** We will look at our health insurance here at UT to see what it covers. The students will buy UT’s insurance at the end of the semester if it covers. I haven’t looked at that yet…. But it may cover internationally experience. It is something that we will look into. I prefer to find one package deal that the University could purchase at a low cost or a breakdown for students for the ones who travel. One of many universities that I looked at and I’m not saying that we are doing this, but it is something that we are looking at, they have either reduce or illuminating general fees and the office, my office will be charge a processing fee. That money will come in to help pay for those insurances, if it was a package. So other words,…for additional funding to pay for health insurance and we will also use that money for faculty led programs to pay faculty air fare if it’s a course or something that you are teaching . Thank you very much.

**President Powers:** Thank you Dr. Spann.

Now let’s open the floor for discussion about re-organization.  We can bring up on the screen the re-organization PowerPoint and Dr. Jacob’s letter at any time.  The Executive Committee debated for some time about how to proceed.   Succinctly, we have a broad range of options, all the way from ceasing all Senate activities including participating in the HLC study, to cooperating fully in an attempt to steer the re-organization into the best possible outcome under the circumstances.  There are passionate arguments all along the range of options.  The Executive Committee is not advocating passing any further resolutions at this time. We sense there may be a need for more information about what is expected of us, and about what the ultimate goal of the re-organization is.  So far, the re-organization is about changing letterheads and adding a few administrators. Will we lose programs?  Will we lose departments?  Will we lose or dilute authority over the curriculum?  We don’t know.  Does the Senate have a different perspective?  So, we would like to ask you what questions we should direct to the administration for which we need answers before we can commit the Senate to a course of action.

That concludes the executive business for this meeting. Is there any other business from the floor?

We now have time for general questions and concerns that Senate should address.

**Senator Barden:** One concern that I have had about splitting up the College of Arts and Sciences is what will happen to the foreign language requirement. It is an essential heart of the Liberal Arts. I don’t know if it has been thought through or if it may be an unintended consequence that might occur, or maybe nothing will change. If the College of Arts and Sciences is going to be three colleges, will those three colleges maintain the foreign language requirement to the fourth semester that the current college that Arts and Science has.

**Senator Anderson:** That question is certainly on everybody lips, but it’s not just foreign languages; it is the Sciences, it is Social Sciences, everything in it.

**Senator Barden:** The entire Liberal Arts.

**Senator Cluse-Tolar**: It’s the core.

**Senator Anderson:** It’s not just the core; it’s the distributed requirements that are presently in place for in the College of Arts and Science.

**Senator Barden:** Well let me expand my question; that whole core, will that be retained?

**Senator Anderson:** That’s a good question.

**Senator Dowd:** I think I understand why you are asking that question, Tom. But I think this is an issue that has to be directed first to the Arts and Science Council. Out of respect for that Council, I think we have to let that faculty body discuss that issue before Faculty Senate could even consider getting involved in that issue.

**Senator Barden:** I’m currently a Senator representing the College of Arts and Sciences, that may change at the Honors College, but that’s my job right now. I think that, I just want that out there as we are considering as a body, as a Faculty Senate, one of the implications of this reorganization.

**Senator Chiarelott:** AS A COLLEGE THAT IS NOT BEING TORN APART BUT IS BEING MERGED WITH THE COLLEGE OF HEALTH SCIENCE AND HUMAN SERVICES, WE HAVE ESSENTIALLY BEEN GIVEN OUR MARCHING ORDERS. THE DEANS OF THE TWO EXISTING COLLEGES (JHCOE AND HSHS) SENT OUT AN E-MAIL LISTING THE THINGS THAT ARE GOING TO HAPPEN IN OCTOBER, NOVEMBER, DECEMBER AND NEXT SPRING INCLUDING MEETINGS BETWEEN THE DEANS’ CABINETS, THE COLLEGE COUNCILS AND THE COLLEGE COUNCILS’ EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES. I’M NOT SURE WHAT THERE IS TO DISCUSS. FROM OUR PERSPECTIVE, IT SEEMS LIKE THE DECISION HAS BEEN MADE, AND WE NOW NEED TO IMPLEMENT IT. SO, THE PROCESS IS UNFOLDING IN FRONT OF US, BUT WE WON’T HAVE MUCH CONTROL OVER THAT PROCESS AS FACULTY OR EVEN AS DEPARTMENT CHAIRS. IT JUST SEEMS TO BE HAPPENING AROUND US. I DON’T KNOW IF REPRESENTATIVES FROM HSHS FEEL THE SAME WAY, BUT I THINK A LOT OF FACULTY FROM THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION ARE FEELING LIKE SOMETHING HAPPENED, AND WE ARE NOT QUITE SURE HOW IT HAPPENED OR WHY IT HAPPENED, BUT IT HAS HAPPENED AND NOW WE NEED TO MAKE IT WORK. SO, I’M NOT SURE WHAT DISCUSSION OR DEBATE WE CAN HAVE ABOUT THAT. WE JUST HAVE TO WORK ON THE MECHANICS OF IMPLEMENTING IT.

**President Powers:** Thank you. Dr. Dowd.

**Senator Dowd:** I’m of two minds on this issue. First, given the significance of this reorganization, Faculty Senate should not only participate in the associated activities it should take a leadership role. However, the other side is that perhaps we should take our ball and go home. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee asked over and over and over again to be part of the discussion before the decision was made. We were never brought into that discussion. We were never given the opportunity to express our views and share with the administration our experience with such activities. We were never brought into the discussion and now the administration wants us to help implement their plan. But this is not a plan; instead it is a set of results they want to obtain. There is no plan; there is no direction on how to proceed. We are being asked to do all the hard work on a decision that we were denied an opportunity to even express our opinions on. Like I said I am of two minds on this issue. I don’t know what we should do. The administration and President Jacobs in particular does not respect or even value our opinions. The President simply wants us to be the “worker bee” and do all of the work for him.

**Senator Skeel:** Well, I think that we have been asked to be “worker bees” for a long time and they didn’t ask us, but now that they are asking us we are saying we are going to take our marbles and go home. It seems to me that they are now asking us, giving us an opportunity to be involved on how this thing evolves, to help make recommendations to what we have in which programs and we have to help them to make the right decision for our students.

**President Powers:** Thank you Dr. Skeel. Dr. Olson.

**Senator Olson:** I would like to remind everybody what our Constitution says. I am referring to Article II.

**Responsibilities and Jurisdiction**

The Faculty Senate may consider any subject pertaining to the interests of the University and to act in the name of the University Faculty in making recommendations to the University Administration on these matters.

Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the Faculty Senate shall have the following specific powers and responsibilities:

1. To provide a collegial forum for communication and consultation between the University Faculty and the University Administration.

**Senator Olson:** I don’t think that is happening.

B. To promote a positive working environment for academic, clinical, and professional excellence and growth for the faculty of all Colleges within the University.

C. To protect faculty rights and privileges, equal opportunity, due process, and academic freedom, and to promote an exemplary standard of ethical conduct at the academic, professional and administrative levels.

**Senator Olson:** Can you show me how that was implemented here in this?

D. To review and respond to policy, procedural and programmatic changes, initiated or recommended by the University Administration, that affect the University Faculty or the academic mission of the institution.

**Senator Olson:** Does this reorganization affect not that?

E. Subject to the supervision and control of the Board of Trustees of the University as delegated through the academic administration, to exercise responsibility for the academic affairs of the University, including: the academic rules, regulations, policies and standards regarding undergraduate students; the standards for granting of degrees, honors and awards; and the oversight of student development and progression.

F. To participate in a meaningful manner in any University long range strategic planning or prioritization, including budgetary, policy, fiscal and facility planning.

**Senator Olson:** Have we done that here? I really question whether or not this reorganization hasn’t just totally ignored faculty and now that there is work to be done in order to provide an implantation in this process, now they come to us and say do all the work. They have ignored the Faculty Senate; with regard to the Strategic plan to this University, with regard to the Reorganization of this University. If that is not cause for this Faculty Senate to object, I don’t know what is. It is your Constitution, just as much as it is my Constitution and I am outraged at this. It is your problem to solve. Thank you.

**President Powers:** Thank you Dr. Olson.

**President Powers:** Dr. Anderson.

**Senator Anderson:** Well, we can advocate ceasing and desisting all kinds of interactions with the administration including participating on their committees that involve administrative affairs. I’m not sure if that’s a good idea, but it’s certainly an idea. And we can work to make this reorganization, whatever it is, into something that is valid for our students or does at least care for our students; not necessarily validating the letter heads that are being composed. But, at least our students are cared for in someway through this. My feeling is, another thing that we can discuss since we really didn’t discuss this before all this happened, is what kind of threshold we could set up beyond which Faculty Senate stops participating. It seems that if we draw a line in the sand that neither side is approaching yet, but this is very hard after the fact of course. But somehow express something that says if we participate and our participation is not followed or if we advise that a given structure is not useful for students and it is in fact detrimental to students and that happens anyway. Is there some kind of threshold there that we can set up in advance so everybody knows what it is and then we would have a more proactive than reactive and we would have some kind of guideline to a discussion like this? I’m just putting that out of course; now what that threshold is, I have no idea.

**President Powers:** Dr. Barrett.

**Senator Barrett:** It seems to me that there are three fundamental ways to look at this. The first is we weren’t effectively consulted and we’ve been "dissed" and so we’re not going to participate and we choose to be obstructionist. That’s certainly not an inherently invalid approach. But it doesn’t get us anywhere, it doesn’t get the University anywhere, it’s not going to improve our relationship with the Administration and the Board, so I would reject this approach even if I felt that way, and so I put that one aside. It seems to me that the other two fundamental approaches are you either think deep down that this University is fundamentally right and good and working at a high level, in which case why are we making a major change, or you think there is room for meaningful improvement at UT. If you think everything is swell here and we can’t improve much, we should resist this. If you think there’s room for significant improvement at this University, which the Board seems to think- they have passed a resolution advocating accelerating the enhancement of our programs and reputation, our stature etc.- then the question is how we do it. In that event, it seems to me you can either say: this may not be an ideal plan, but let’s work on it and cooperate in it and make it our own; or let's propose an alternative if we think this is a messed up way to do proceed. We need to give an alternative because just sitting there and complaining about this isn’t going to change the path we are on. So, I think that’s the fundamental decision. I think that even with all the wonderful things UT is, we can be much more then we are. This is not necessarily the plan I would have created, but I think that we should significantly enhance the University either by embracing this and making it our own, or by proposing an alternative if we think this isn’t going to work. But I think that this is the only way for us to move our relationship forward.

**Senator Hoblet:** My opinion is that even though many have voiced displeasure and dissatisfaction with the process, we have an outcome that we have to deal with. I think many of you have said that today. One of the avenues for Faculty voice that I think we are not looking at closely enough; especially with the construction of a new college structure is what the Constitution calls for when we merged the two Universities, a strong college centric governance structure. We need to consider that. I believe that we can maintain an affirmative voice in the shared governance model within the university. I know this is an enormous change and I am not in the College of Arts and Sciences; I know about the discomfort that reorganization causes within a college, just recently experiencing this in the College of Nursing on the Health Science Center. I know that we have experienced disagreement during that process. I also know that the College was not functioning at the level it should be functioning and change, although terribly uncomfortable still needs to be considered. I also know that through the process that faculty from the College of Nursing had a cohesive voice and conviction to affirm the faculty voice in the governance of the College in the determination of the curriculum and in to support advocacy of the students. Thank you.

**President Powers:** Dr. Olson.

**Senator Olson:** First of all let me say that I agree with Karen with respect to the College governance. Now whatever is the outcome of this that should be maintained and I fully support that. But, I think that we as a Faculty Senate must take action to support our Constitution. The only action that I can see at this time to support that Constitution is a mandate from the Senate, a resolution from the Senate, which implicates our displeasure, that our Constitution was violated. Now whether we choose to go forward with this reorganization or not is a separate question. But I think the violation of the Constitution is a question that we must address. If we do not address the violation of the Constitution then we rather go out, roll over, and die and not attend another meeting because we have no Constitution. It is only our voice, our integrated whole that makes this Constitution valid. If we do not believe that that is valid then we should do away with it and we should do away with Faculty Senate as we know it. This Constitution calls for Faculty voice when making strategic decisions at this University. This Faculty Senate Constitution was approved by the Board of Trustees. This Faculty Senate Constitution was approved by the President. Now whether or not this Faculty Senate wants to accept this Constitution going forward rests on how well we support it now. The only way that we can do that at this point is to recognize this violation and take action on this violation. The only action we can take seems to be vote no confidence or vote some matter to reinforce the fact that we do have a Constitution and that we expect this Constitution to be our contract with our Board of Trustees and with upper Administration.

**Senator Dowd:** There is an alternative for such a vote; it would be to take our ball and go home. That is, not help in the reorganization and let the administration do all of the work for implementing its own “plan”.

**Senator Olson:** That’s been done on this campus.

**Senator Dowd:** It has been done on this campus during the years with President Kapoor when the Administration stopped communicating honestly with the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate decided that it would not participate in particular activities. The Faculty Senate continued to address curriculum issues, faculty business and student business. But there was no point having the Faculty Senate Executive Committee meet with the Provost or President. It was an environment where Administration did not deal honestly, transparently with the Faculty Senate and the Senate withdrew its representatives to University committees. For example, we could instruct the members of the Core Curriculum Committee to cease all activities immediately. This would not be a temper tantrum. Instead it would be a measured response to an administration that refuses to even listen to our thoughts about the reorganization. However, Senator Olson, I’m not in favor of passing another resolution at this point. I don’t know what good any resolutions will do, other than to remind the Higher Learning Commission that we have absolutely no effective shared governance at this university. A vote of No Confidence I think would be premature at this stage.

**Senator Olson:** But Michael, did not the, what was done to the Core Cabinet until after a vote of no confidence?

**Senator Dowd:** There was never a vote of No Confidence against President Kapoor

**Senator Regimbal:** There was not a vote.

**Senator Dowd:** There was never a vote of No Confidence against President Kapoor. In our case there’s a lack of respect for Faculty Senate. If President Jacobs did not consult us about reorganization --- something that will fundamentally change this university, why should anyone believe he would bother to consult us about lesser issues? What does this mean about what Faculty Senate is? Is it just a curriculum committee? Is there going to be true shared governance at this university? Or does Faculty Senate exist only to serve the President? The Faculty Senate has to decide for itself what it is and what it is not.

**Senator Hamersley:** I guess being here because I deal with engineering all the time. I would ask that at least information be gotten from the Administration. Look, you put this out; what was your goal behind it? What is your vision for the future? How big is it going to be? That means both in people as well as in budgets, so that you will have some estimation. Yeah, paper and innovation sounds cool. The question is, what’s really behind it? I don’t think those have been effectively communicated, anything that I have seen on either of the campuses. So before we pick up our ball and go home or off with their head and selective sit downs and job alterations, how come we get some information and at least we can look at what we would propose that will be better or alternatives that seems to be more logical basic math then just being p.o. about it and saying. Maybe they got something, at least look at it. If it comes back they are just doing it because it looks good or this is a means of shrinking budgets then I think that we have at least a…to react to it or propose alteration. Maybe you don’t want Education College with Health and Human services. Maybe Health and Human Services should be by itself; then you can do something separate focusing on education that is really K -12 in a different fashion. You want to do things to promote different funds to come back in to the University and innovations or incubator scientific components; if it is the same, I don’t know education focuses let’s say the NSF have. So, with that further information, I don’t think either proposed resolutions are really worth it until we have a chance to get more information.

**President Powers:** Thank you. Dr. Rouillard.

**Senator Rouillard:** We have asked for that information on numerous occasions and the most that we got was that this was designed to increase creativity and collaboration. We asked for information about budgets and we were given nothing. Even as we’re told that the point of this is to bring extra voices to the table and we had no voice. Even as the point was to give more exposure to certain underrepresented programs as we are asked to cut our budget. Today at the Chair’s council meeting for Arts and Sciences, your College and your…may be reorganized, ours was not ours was destroyed. We have three colleges; we now have to staff those colleges with administration that is going to cost money even as we are being asked to cut the budget. How are we going to raise programs to extra visibility when we can’t even afford what we got now?

**President Powers:** Thank you. Dr. Jorgensen.

**Senator Jorgensen:**  Two points, one mundane and one more fundamental. We have a Faculty Senate Constitution that defines membership. For example, the Faculty Senate Committees and various other items; we are now changing from ten colleges to thirteen. One unit in effect is being cancelled, two are being combined, and three are being created. So there will be some fundamental differences in the Faculty Senate, so our particular operation which is our area of concern. For example, there will be more Arts and Science faculty members in the Faculty Senate. Because we are right now there is a cap for the number of senators for a particular college. A & S won’t be at the cap because we will have three separate colleges so it will be a greater number of voices from Arts and Sciences in the Faculty Senate. But there will be other shifts as will; Education and Health and Human Services will be combined from two.. There has been a request that we will make suggestions on how we will put this together; but it is all done, it is all finished this is the plan. It has changed twice in two weeks. It is amazing that a “perfect” plan existed on one day and eight days later there was a different “perfect” plan. But this is what the Board passed and the Board has the legal right to do this. What the Board should not be doing is ignoring our Constitution, a document which they did pass. I think that it is valid for this body to make a statement about the fact that this Constitution was not followed to in the least. There was no communication, no consultation with the Faculty Senate. I personally encourage you the Senate Executive to prepare a statement for us to vote on at the next Faculty Senate meeting making that statement. I’m not saying that we will be walking away from what we are doing, but I think that it will serve our purposes that we make that statement. Our college structure has completely changed at this University without any faculty review. We cannot let that action go by without a statement.

**President Powers:** Dr. Barden was next.

**Senator Barden:** I hear John Barrett list things that we can do to help make this work and Lawrence Anderson asked “where is the point where there is a line in the sand.” It already happened when the President said “I’m not bound to obey” and that’s in the minutes. But in our Faculty Senate Constitution he is and he passed that and the Board passed that. That line in the sand got stepped across. What I am worried about now is that we say okay, that happened once that’s fine and continue try to make this work; what if what we try to make this work doesn’t suite him again? Then it’s I’m sorry I don’t what you come up with because I don’t like it. It is a power play that we’ve lost. That’s what it has amounted to.

**President Powers:** Thank you. Dr. Skeel

**Senator Skeel:** There is nothing in the Constitution that says the President shall obey us. In fact.

**Senator Barden:** Yes there is.

**Senator Skeel:** It does not sayshall obey. The Faculty Senate may consider any subject pertaining to the interests of the University and to act in the name of the University Faculty in making recommendations to the University Administration on these matters Make recommendations.

**Senator Barden:** No, you are reading the wrong part. Walt got it right.

**Senator Skeel:** I am reading the same things as Walt and I have in front of me, saying it is within our power to make recommendations. His statement follows the recommendations section.

**Senator Barden:** Walt could you read it again.

**Senator Olson:** Here is the Constitution, you choose what you wish.

**Senator Skeel:** No I hear what he says. The word obey is not there.

**Senator Barden:** You are right thatthe words obey is not there, but there are a lot of musts and shoulds.

**Senator Olson:** I don’t believe that the President should necessarily be in position where he is obeying Faculty; that is the wrong attitude. However, neither should he be a President that ignore the faculty, refuses to take input from the faculty. That’s the problem that I have a lot of concern about.

**Senator Barden:** That’s what I was trying to say.

**Senator Olson:** Even when he signed the document that says he will take recommendations.

**Senator Barden:** That’s what I was trying to say.

**President Powers:** Dr. Cluse-Tolar.

**Senator Cluse-Tolar:** I am concern about how this decision was made overall not just because there was no faculty input. I had a meeting today with our Dean who says she was never consulted and was shocked about this merger with Education and learned about it the same time everyone else did. There wasn’t even involvement of Management or Administrative folks in this decision, so I seriously have concerns about this administration.

**President Powers:** Dr. Rouillard.

**Senator Rouillard:** I would just like to point out that the Trustees met on the 11th. There was no discussion of financial implications of this restructuring. I was at the audit and Finance Committee meeting and there was no discussion of it. Instead, what the Trustees discussed was the amendment to a 403 B Plan that would allow the institution to deposit on behalf of an individual up to $49,000 tax deferred. In addition to the individual’s contribution to that account~~.~~ There was no discussion of the financial implication of what this restructuring will do to our programs and our students. They were concerned to get off their plate, a service that they offered to employees to borrow the money against their pensions in hardship situations and Bill Logie explained that that it was becoming unimaginable for his office to do that. There was no discussion of the financial implications of this restructuring. But the audit and Finance Committee, and the Board of Trustees had the time to discuss that.

**Senator Olson:** There was also a comment made that there were too many employees that it was too difficult to manage this program.

**Senator Rouillard:** About twenty to thirty requests every year.

**Senator Dowd:** If I may? It was twenty or thirty requests in a busy year.

**Senator Olson:** In a busy year. Okay, that was too much work load.

**Senator Rouillard:** I can add at the Academic Affairs Committee, the proposed restructuring was presented and that Committee had no questions about finances. I wasn’t able to be at the full Board meeting that approved the restructuring plan, but it is my understanding that there were no questions asked to their…

**President Powers:** Dr. Thompson-Casado**.**

**Senator Thompson-Casado:** I’m at a total loss about how long are we going to collaborate with this; when we repeatedly asked what the problems are and what the roles are and we never received a list of either. So, how can one possibly even collaborate? It’s not even a possibility.

**President Powers:** Any other comments or questions that we should have address? Thank you for your participation.

**Senator Dowd:** If I may?

**President Powers:** Yes.

**Senator Dowd:** I would like to follow up on a point made by Senator Jorgensen. Does he want the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to draft a resolution that the Faculty Senate could consider at the next Senate meeting.

**President Powers:** Yes.

**Senator Dowd:** Or, possibly, Senators could suggest revisions at that time.

**President Powers:** Yes.

**Senator Dowd:** Thank you.

**President Powers:** Thank you Dr. Gold. Our next report is from Steven Peseckis from the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee.

**Senator Piazza:** I was at the Ohio Faculty Council meeting and there is really no information to report. However, we were asked to vote on a resolution for House Bill 365 and there’s briefly a summary House Bill 365; it grants the right to part time faculty, adjunct faculty, and graduate assistants to discuss benefits and working conditions and to collectively bargain. We were asked as the Ohio faculty Council to vote in support of a resolution for HB 365. At the time I didn’t feel right to vote without getting some advice from this body first on whether or not the Faculty feel that we should support HB 365 or not. I’m merely asking for a sense from the Senate on this bill before I vote.

**Senator Thompson-Casado**: It’s long over do

**Senator Piazza:** Okay, that’s one sense. Do we have any other comments? I might add that there were representatives from the Ohio AAUP there saying that they will be providing endorsements for the bill as well. So you speak for everyone then.

 **Senator Rouillard:** I think that would be one way that UT would make itself distinctive and that is to recognize that part-time workers have the right to benefits.

**Senator Piazza:** I would point out that what this Bill does is that it grants them the right to discuss working conditions and benefits. Right now under current law, if they discuss pay or benefits that is a ground for termination. All it does is grant them the right to discuss it and also legally if they do decide to collective bargain they have rights from that. As far as I know it is just for higher education.

**Senator Hoblet:** Nick I would like to call for a show of hands to support the Bill.

**Senator Dowd:** Senator Piazza asked for a sense of the Senate as oppose to a formal vote.

**Senator Piazza:** I am not that familiar with parliamentary procedure. All I really want from the faculty senate is guidance on how the senate would like me to vote, that is, in support of a resolution favoring HB 365 or against it.

**President Powers:** Thank youDr. Piazza. That concludes our general questions. Do I have a motion for adjournment?

**IV.** Meeting Adjourned at 6:05p.m

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Hoblet Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard
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