HIGHLIGHTS

Dr. Lawrence Anderson-Huang- Report from the Faculty Council of Ohio Board of Regents
Dean Ben Pryor and Provost William McMillen- Library Report
Dr. Steve LeBlanc- Faculty Senate Core Curriculum Committee
Provost/ Chancellor Forum

Note: The remarks of the Senators and others are summarized and not verbatim. The taped recording of this meeting is available in the Faculty Senate office or in the University Archives.
President Mary Powers called the meeting to order, **Karen Hoblet,** Executive Secretary, called the roll.

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

Present: Anderson, Atwood, Batten Barlowe, Benjamin, Brickman, Caruso, Chiarelott, Cluse-Tolar, Dowd, Duhon, Eastop, Fink, Fournier, Giovannucci, Hamer, Heberle, Hoblet, Hornbeck, Humphrys, Kennedy, Kistner, LeBlanc, Lee, Malhotra, Molitor, Moore, Moynihan, Nandkeolyar, Ohlinger, Powers, Randolph, Regimbal, Rouillard, Sheldon, Skeel, Stepkowski, Teclehaimanot, , Weldy, Wilson, Yonker

Excused absences: Baumgartner, Eisler, Franchetti, Hammersley, Jorgensen, Olson, Piazza, Sawicki, Shriner, Thompson-Casado, Wedding,
Unexcused absences: Barnes, Crist, Dismukes, Funk, Gardner, Hottell, Laux, Lundquist, Patrick, Rooney, Solocha, Tinkel

II. *Approval of Minutes*: Minutes from the March 15th meeting were ready for approval but inadvertently were not approved.

III. *Executive Committee Report:*

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

To start the meeting, I request Secretary Hoblet to call the roll.

Since the last Faculty Senate meeting, the Executive Committee met twice with President Jacobs. The first meeting was scheduled to follow the announcement of the governor's budget and the second meeting was a regularly scheduled monthly meeting. The main topic of both meetings was faculty workload especially as it relates to the BOT draft resolution on faculty workload. As a result of the meetings, a subset of the Executive Committee, at the request of President Jacobs. will be looking at alternatives to the BOT draft resolution. The group will be looking at how workload is documented. Senators can expect a report for the Senate on the group's proposals.

The next update is about the work of the FY12 Budget Formulation and Reengineering Task Force. The group has met twice since the last Faculty Senate meeting, and one of the two meetings included members of the responsibility group: Chancellor Gold, Provost McMillen, Dr. Scarborough, Mr. Logie, and Mr. Burns, in addition to President Jacobs and members of the task force.

At both meetings, dollar estimates for savings that could be anticipated from a number of suggestions received by the group were considered; however, no final decisions were made. At the meeting yesterday, I learned that the FY12 budget will attempt to address a shortfall between $30-35 million. It is expected that a breakdown of how this amount was determined will be posted on the Budget Reengineering Task Force Website: http://www.utoledo.edu/2012Reengineering

Lastly, the Board of Trustees had a regular meeting on Monday of last week. It was reported that some members of the Executive Committee were not allowed to enter the meeting room because of fire regulations. At the meeting, Provost McMillen presented some data on faculty workloads and there was some discussion about faculty workloads. No action was taken on the proposed resolution at this meeting and additional work on faculty workload is anticipated for the next board meeting.

That concludes the Executive Committee report for this week. Before moving forward, I will be happy to take any questions on the Executive Committee report.

At this time, I would like ask Dr. Lawrence Anderson-Huang to provide a report from the Ohio Faculty Council of the Ohio Board of Regents.

Senator Anderson: Report from the Meeting of the Ohio Faculty Counci.18 March 2011, Ohio Board of Regents Conference Room, Columbus, Ohio.
Present: Representatives from 12 Faculty Senates
The first topic was an announcement that the new Chancellor, James Petro, would not be able to attend as planned due to a changed schedule conflict.
Two resolutions were passed unanimously. The first honored Ohio University Associate Professor Emeritus of Geography Hubertus L. "Hugh" Bloemer, who died on Thursday, March 10, at the age of 71 after a lengthy battle with cancer. Dr. Bloemer was chair for the Ohio University Faculty Senate during 2001-2004, and was very active on the Ohio Faculty Council for many years. The second honored Jamail Johnson, the student at Youngstown State University who died in an attempt to stop a violent confrontation off campus, and further sent condolences to the Johnson family, Youngstown State University, and the surrounding community.
The rest of the meeting centered on discussions of Ohio Senate Bill 5 and the political actions of the Inter-University Council. The Inter-University Council of Ohio (IUC) was established in 1939 as a voluntary educational association of Ohio's public universities. Today the association represents Ohio's 14 public universities, and its members consist of the various presidents of those universities. On 14 January, The Executive Committee of the IUC sent Governor Kasich a letter asking for relief from compliance with current state laws, namely
•Chapter 119   the Administrative Procedures Act
•Chapter 123   the Public Works Law
•Chapter 124   Civil Service
•Chapter 125   Purchasing
•Chapter 126   OBM Regulation
•Chapter 153   Public Improvements
•Chapter 4 I I 7Public Employee Collective Bargaining

Further, on 15 March after the Governor announced his budget, IUC Chair Bruce Johnson issued a statement that included
"Ohio's public four-year universities are pleased to see provisions in the Governor's budget proposal that are designed to provide some measure of relief from unnecessarily burdensome and costly regulatory mandates. Reducing regulatory burdens will give our universities greater operational flexibility at a time

when such flexibility is needed more than ever to ensure that we are using scarce resources as efficiently as possible and with maximum public benefit."

When the original SB5 was amended to restore certain bargaining rights, it included (and still includes) language that redefined faculty as "managerial employees," thus exempting them from collective bargaining rights based on their participation in core shared governance activities such as "admissions, curriculum development, subject matter and methods of research and instruction."

A March 8, 2011 report in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* states that Mr. Bruce Johnson, the President and CEO of the IUC is the primary source of the above language redefining higher education faculty as "managerial employees" and that he believed he was authorized by the member institutions of the IUC to advocate for this language. To the best of our knowledge, the IUC also authorized Mr. Johnson to testify in favor of SB5 before the Ohio Senate. In that testimony, Mr. Johnson claimed that eliminating collective bargaining for all public university employees would result in millions of dollars of savings at just one institution of higher education, The University of Toledo, but he provided no source or documentation for this claim.

In response to SB5 and to this political activity on the part of the university presidents, the OFC debated two resolutions.

The first resolution was similar to the resolutions passed at many Faculty Senates, including ours, that declared opposition to the lessening of collective bargaining across all state employees. That resolution passed unanimously.

The second resolution was more controversial: it was to call for an open records request to determine the sources of the both the 8 million figure quoted by President Jacobs and the language in the revised SB5 that refers to faculty as managers and takes them out of the bargaining unit. Apparently, some university presidents have expressed reservations about their agreeing to the language used by Bruce Johnson. The final decision was to draft formal letters to each university president asking them to declare their individual positions on the IUC memoranda and letters. Individual Faculty Senate Executive Committees would present the letters to their presidents in a format left up to the FSECs. Depending on the responses, a records request may yet be made. At this time, the letter is still undergoing distant editorial review.

As a pro-active step to give direction to our OFC representative, the Executive Committee is introducing a motion to

"Recommend that the OFC pursue a public records request if the individual presidents are not forthcoming."

Is there any discussion? None. All in favor? Any oppose? *Motion Passed by unanimous voice vote.* Thank you.

President Powers: Thank you, Dr. Anderson-Huang. Next, Dr. Ben Pryor, Dean of the College of Innovative Learning and Provost Bill McMillen will provide a report on the University libraries.

Dr. Pryor: I am going to read a little bit from a report that I have used before. I gave it to President Powers to post it on Web and for distribution. I got a preamble; however, I am not going to read the longer report first because it is lengthy. I also want to touch on what I understand is your major concern about the library. I want to give you a sense on some of the approaches that I am taking. I am going to take from you suggestions back to the faculty of the library for deliberation there. Everything that I have been doing in the library, I have been trying to work collaboratively with the faculty to get as much input as I can during this busy time. I know they have been very understanding with me about what we have been doing because we've talked. We have a retreat coming up next week and then a number of meetings that will help us with restructuring.

When I woke up this morning, and despite the fact that I am neither Catholic nor convinced of the utility of prayer, I asked St. Jerome for the strength to visit Faculty Senate to report on the university libraries. St. Jerome, under the auspices of Pope Damasus I and the Council of Rome in 382, was charged with the task of curating the text that is now known as the Bible. The council decided what the official books of

the Bible were going to be, and Jerome catalogued and translated them from the Greek into what became referred to as the Latin Vulgate.

Jerome's certainty and skill translated the will of the bishops at council to a single translation of a unified text. And yet he too rarely gets credit since the authorship and assembly of the text of the bible is sometimes attributed to someone else, or to forces that helped the text assemble and distribute itself.

This is why Jerome is the patron saint of librarians, and this is why I woke up with him on my mind. Academic libraries struggle with many things these days, but perhaps the most serious struggle is with the idea that the internet has become a vast, curated, free, open, and complete library, and that students come to us with the critical and research skills necessary to make sense of it. Because libraries and librarians have been so closely identified with a service that is so similar to what we do when we go on the internet, we therefore too easily assume that we do not need libraries. I hope that my report today goes some way to changing that impression and to starting a discussion that I believe should be had throughout higher education about the degree to which we are willing to commit to support for the library in a time of deep transformation and high anxiety. This struggle is part of the complicated task of organizing knowledge, managing what we know and read, or more appropriately, what we know we can never read (St. Jerome is almost always depicted next to a *memento mori*, a human skull), and that task is essential to a university education and to the professional lives of the faculty.

Today's report is lengthy and I will not read it all. I delivered a copy to you a few days ago. So, what I am going to do is read a brief preamble. What I recently read was a pre preamble. After, I am going to talk about some of the controversial issues.

In December of 2011, the University libraries were places in the newly formed College of Innovative Learning as part as an ongoing attempt to unify the functions, faculty and intellectual pursuits that address and advance the elements of UT's strategic plan that concern what President Jacobs refers to as the "pedagogy of the external mind." In general, if a decisive problem facing the contemporary university is a fundamental shift in the nature of the relationship to information and knowledge, and if our response to this problem is going to reflect our commitment to becoming a transformative force in the world, then we must pursue at least three directions. First, we must transform the undergraduate teaching and learning so that we empower students for success in a world that is not well served by the classical university model and in which mastery of tools and intellectual skills associated with information literacy is taken for granted. Second, we must reach new audiences who wish to learn and who seek opportunities to learn on their own time and at their own pace, and whose needs as learners are maximally diverse. Finally, we must provide institutional support for the development of information literacy for faculty and students, where information literacy adumbrates the digital humanities, visual literacy, cultural literacy, and critical thinking about data.

The University libraries in COIL are physical spaces- Mulford Library, Calson Library, and the McMaster Engineering Library. They house dwindling collections and swelling archives. More importantly, the libraries compose a faculty of professionals dedicated to the collaborative management of information and scholarly resources. Understood in this way, the Universities libraries are at the very center of institutional transformative change.

This report is divided into four sections. Section I will address the libraries as they are today after over six years of transformation under the leadership of Dr. John Gaboury. Section II enumerates ideas about strategy and direction that will certainly impact not only the university libraries, but also the nature and progress of scholarly research at the institution. Section III details some challenges we face and Section IV articulates some approaches and plans in development for feedback and input.

I am going to skip to **Challenges and Threats**.

The challenges facing academic libraries in the United States are serious and must be met creatively and aggressively.

- **Electronic Resources:** The costs of electronic resources are spiraling out of control just as we grow more decisively committed to electronic resources. Publishers and vendors pursue pricing and access models that increase institutionally costs while making information less open. Since COIL is committed is committed to "open access" we will pursue strategies to try to mitigate this, though it is very important for all of us to try realize that "open access" does not necessarily equate to "cost free access." Even as we facilitate making intellectual output publically available, we can sure that someone else will be making it available at a cost, and if we want to maintain a credible research profile we will invest resources to ensure availability and access. The profile consists of electronic resources in the form of digital systems and subscriptions. It involves human resources in the form of expert faculty whose work makes access and availability appear to be seamless, effortless, and natural. As Joanna Drucker argued at the recent presentation to case Western Reserve's library and faculty, "The reliance on digital materials has become enormous, but it is treated as if it is simply water that is going to flow from a tap. It isn't. Resources all take management, which in turns take resources, and this involves very important policy decisions at levels that affect all of us. And that's the wake-up call that the academic community really needs: to understand that information is just not going to be there. The only thing that is going to be there is what we put there, or it's going to be put there for us and we're going to be charged for it… To imagine it's the traditional library's job to do this is just not going to work."
- **Solutions:**
  - **Purchasing Partnerships:** Pursuing purchasing partnerships of the OhioLink. By actively contributing to OhioLink and working to influence strategic direction, which library faculty to do. We can…more effectively to reduce our investment in electronic resources.
  - **Faculty Research Centers:** These are electronic resources that serve as both, archives and interactional centers on the base of faculty base research. These are international, meaning someone can use the electronic research center to bring themselves and to communicate with people all over the world. We have two that are currently in development and they look pretty good. The presence of books and the warehouse.
- **Collection Management:**
  - **Physical:** One of the key challenges for any academic library is the transparent and sensitive management of its physical collections. The presence of books and the warehouse –like structure is a declining priority for nearly all academic libraries. Librarians with faculty rank make decisions about investments based increasingly on a "just in time" model as opposed to "just in case." That means instead of having a book on a shelf at UT, we might put the book in the central repository and record its presence on a virtual shelf in a catalog. The institution must trust in the skill of a trained librarian to make this judgment wisely and with awareness of context. The library removal policy is under review. We will continue to weed (if you think the word "weed" is bad, please go to the library's glossary and you'll see there are worst words) our collection and to use captured space for student-centered purposes such as study space, collaborative work space, digital production, and so on. This entails neither absence of books nor a de-linking of student-centeredness from the availability of the printed word. The COIL will pursue two approaches:

- Renovation will move books away from what essentially entombment in a warehouse and into more constant circulation in a space structured by human interaction, discussion, and collaboration. This will mean shorter shelves, smaller and more focused collections organized by interests, RFID management to enable automatic check-out and collections management tied to mobile devises. Larger collections may be isolated on some floors (which is pretty much what we have now.)
- Consultative Removal**:** many journals and monographs are either available through the Northwest Ohio Book Depository or online in electronic format. Many of these journals and texts are rarely used, out of date, and kept as local resources "just in case." Periodic review of collections by expert library faculty yields suggestions for both acquisition and removal. When the library faculty identify an opportunity for removal, they will follow a procedure that attempts to be transparent, open, and sensitive to the needs of scholars and students. That procedure is in development, but as it now stands, it is:
  - ➢ Library faculty identify volumes that are a rarely used, b) inessential to current research or scholarship, c) readily available via Depository or OhioLink, d) publicly available at no charge through federal, state, or local databases.
  - ➢ Those volumes will be removed from the collection and placed "Holding Pen." Volumes in holding will be listed online and subjected to a period of review during which faculty, students, or any library patron can either a) make the case for non-removal, or b) accept the volume into a personal or departmental collection.
  - ➢ Volumes that are neither essential nor claimed will be professional recycled.
  - ➢ When shelves are cleared, cards with a description of removed volumes and instructions for access online will be placed shelves and marked with a QR (Quick Response) code that will make that information- and maybe the resource itself-pop up on a mobile device.
- **Virtual:** Management of our virtual resources is vital to the future of scholarship and research. The emergence of Google and enhanced access to data gives to some the impression that the management of digital resources is something that is done for us, off campus, but on our behalf and almost magically with our interests in mind. If there are free librarians organizing free libraries of publicly available scholarly research, then it is difficult to see why we are paying millions of dollars for this material. The problem is that it is not the case that the internet provides open access, and it is not the case that students and faculty have the expertise necessary to navigate online data, and in short, the idea that information specialists are rendered obsolete by the internet is a dangerous and misunderstanding of the future of scholarly production, research, and the management of information produced by experts, professionals, students, and scholars. Since it is the faculty who are primarily charged with the task of carrying out our mission to improve the human condition, it is essential that we think deeply about whether the internet alone is sufficient intellectually to fund the scholarship and research that will define our areas of excellence. Again, Drucker's remarks are worth attention. She says: "Academic publishing is in a major crisis [and] the economics of publishing will no longer support the tenure system. Where serious and substantive scholarship in specialized domains is going to live, we need to understand that it is not going to happen in print

form, except perhaps in print-on-demand…Resources reallocation has to happen in the university. For digital work to have authority and status in the university, the funding stream has to come down through the provost to collaborative projects between library professionals and the faculty so that there is equal recognition and status for work on the project… We are going to be forced to rethink… our roles as intellectuals and educators." This means that the library faculty is an institution's shared resource with respect to the management of virtual information and the collaborative development, publication, and review of new knowledge. This is more than incidental, and as far sight more demanding than merely aggregating available material for easy access on a web page. For it is a question of how to make it work, new research, and peer reviewed scholarship available to everyone on the planet. COIL's commitment to open access will structure our choices our choices as we move into the business of digital archives, digital humanities, faculty research centers and learning objects that are made available as widely as possible. This will require sustained investment in our faculty and our digital resources.

- o **Library Resource Fee:** The resource fee amounts to nearly 1.2 million dollars annually. It has been assessed for two years. The fee is managed centrally, as all fees are understood to be, and allocated not simply because the money is available but because allocation advances strategic priorities and satisfies the purpose of the fee. In the case of the "Distance Learning Fee," the money is allocated to the maintenance of our servers and student data, and we receive what we receive what we need in order to provide the best possible service to students and faculty. The library fee currently sustains a very high level of investment in digital resources, investments that we would surely be unable to make without that fee.

  Generally speaking, the fee allows the library to satisfy student priorities and should be allocated on the basis of their needs. The problem is that nobody has engaged the students in direct dialogue about their preferences, needs, and hopes for the library. So, in late February in 2011, I met with our Student Senate in an attempt to begin such a dialogue. I learned that student priorities revolve around adequate study space, space for group work, well-maintained computers, policies to address computer use and etiquette, attractiveness of the physical spaces, and even the importance of having a quiet, comfortable space to curl up and read a book. I learned that my own plans in Carlson were not as student-centered as I thought, and I immediately revised them. I sought and received names of students who would be interested in joining in joining a task-force for the library, and they will be invited to join faculty in the library and other departments in a strategic discussion beginning in April and in anticipation of renovation and the HLS site visit. This is a fundamental part of strategic planning in a student-centered environment, and appropriate allocation of student fees will and should be a consequence of student-centered strategic planning.

There are two additional things that I want to address. One is reorganization of the library. I appointed Dave Remaklus as the Director of Access Services for all University Libraries, and Laura Kinner is now the Director of University Libraries. Jolene Miller will continue as the Director of Mulford Library, and Marlene Porter will help me organize assessment and development. In addition, I just want to give a shout-out to the Canaday Center. The Canaday Center will play an increasingly vital and essential role with the library. It exhibit right now, Wholly Toledo is a great one, if you haven't seen it, please get up and see it. I stand for questions.

Provost McMillen: I would like to make a comment before questions. I just want to say that I have seen the whole report. Dr. Pryor has worked very hard on it, and it is very conclusive. I fully endorse it. In a remark to various groups last week, I mentioned the library a number of times as a personal priority. The two most important ones are: First, the library, the existence of the library, and its support. Secondly, the existence of a viable faculty hiring plan. I just wanted to add my support to Ben and what he has done and accomplished over the past six months as we both attempt to what we inherited some months ago. Dr. Pryor has taken that and worked it to what I think is an advantage for the future. Hopefully, the changes will be endorsed by all of you and work to the advantage of our student population.

Senator Hoblet: Provost McMillen and Dr. Pryor, I want to thank you for coming to give us a report on the library. It has been a great concern of mine and of a number of Senators here. I was devastated by the actual disassembly of the Mulford Library Resources that occurred, particularly nursing texts. I made that well known at the Faculty Senate last Spring. I hear and applaud your feedback sessions with students, but I will encourage you to hold forums to dialogue with faculty on both the Health Science Campus and Main Campus; engaging them in a meaningful conversation regarding how to support their practice around scholarship, teaching, and service. Also, I will encourage you to assess the actual deconstruction of the libraries that occurred. I ask this because when I asked for inventory of texts and journals that were removed, particularly the Mulford Library, I was told that that did not exist. I find this hard to believe and I would encourage an assessment of what has been removed and a review with faculty to determine what we need to rebuild. I would personally appreciate that. Thank you.

Senator Kennedy I have two thoughts. First, if it has not already been done, it will probably be a good idea to revive the Faculty Library Committee. Secondly, how hard will it be to generate an annual report each year to identify how much was taken in regarding student library fees and where that money was spent?

Dr. Pryor: The Faculty Library Committee still meets. Because the first two meetings of my time in office conflicted with the Board of Trustees meetings, I could not attend. They got mad at me, so I went to the first meeting that I could possibly go to. It was interesting. It is a long standing committee and we were unclear of what we were doing. Frankly, it was unclear to me because nobody informed me what my role on that committee was supposed to be. I did not want to intrude, I did not want to steer the conversation one way or the other and when I asked them what they were supposed to be doing, it was advisory to me which is great; now I know who I can call on. My questions are twofold: One, are the people on the committee the ones who want to be on the committee or are they going on just to sort of go on? I mentioned this to Bill that I would like to reconstitute the committee; the people who are on and want to stay on, that is fine. If they want to enlarge the committee, I think that is a good idea. The Library Committee has to serve me in an advisory capacity, so I asked them to advise me. I actually got some good feedback, but all of the feedback that I got was requests for a purchase for some very, very expensive research databases. That is good and that is important, that is a part of collaboration and consultation, but then we will have to talk about it, what is more important and what is less important. I am also going to put together a task force designed to focus on the spaces of the library. I mentioned this in part of the report that I did not read, Carlson is in shambles. If you go up past the first floor in the library, depending on where you go it is not pleasant. We need to correct that and we need to correct it soon and we need to correct it in time for the HLC visit in February 2012. But, I would like to correct it by next week so the students can study there.

Your question about the library fee, again, because the fee is taken centrally and then distributed, the only way that I can account for it is by hypothetically saying that it is part of my budget and then showing what we spend money on, for example electronic resources.

Senator Kennedy: In the Law Library we are able to generate that information- how much the fee generates and how it is used.

Dr. Pryor: Maybe you should tell me how.

Senator Dowd: May I follow up on that point. If a fee is collected from all students and it goes into the general fund, how is imposing that fee different from an increase in tuition? Whether that money actually goes to the library may not be important to you, but how does that fee differ from the concept of tuition? Students were told that "this money is going to go to the library." We have no idea if it went to the library, we don't have a clue. We can hope and pray and do superstitious dancing that the library received the funds. But isn't the Central Administration accountable to students for that fee?

Senator Teclehaimanot: Faculty understands that technology transforms into teaching to learn a new process. However, there are not enough electronic journals available for all of our students, especially for the graduate students that are doing their thesis, so it is pointless to send them to the library. When the students try to access the electronic journals they have to be a member in order to assess the journals. For me, one of the critical points that we need to make is to try to make the University of Toledo fully wireless. So that it may require students to purchase laptops so that the resources that we are spending to update the library computer labs can be used for different resources for faculty and students to access electronic journals.

Dr. Pryor: Absolutely. That is a very good point. One of my priorities which…the library, but it affects the library services and how we work in the library. One of my priorities is to develop a mobile strategy so that some lending devices, i-Pads or i-Pods (but I prefer the i-pad for the book) and with students that already have access to those devices to really create a wireless experience so that students will have easy and seamless access to our electronic resources. However, there is another issue in there and it has to do with the word "seamless;" the difficulty sometimes is going from one task to another. This is one thing that I have always encountered and get frustrated by because you'll find what you need and you know that it is there. This is something that the library faculty works on every single day for students to be able to access the systems. If something is available is because someone has worked really hard to make it that way and not because it is sort of there on the internet. So when you/students find things like that they can tell us about it. Either because we don't have the resources and we should or we have it and we need to make sure that it is appropriate. If any of the people from the library would like to supplement what I just said with actual expert knowledge, please go right ahead.

Senator Duhon: Many of our electronic resources and journals packages do come with wireless access because it is part of a license agreement. So, I would just reiterate what Dr. Pryor says and that is, if you should experience any trouble or would like to request investigating wireless access you can contact the library.

Senator Teclehaimanot: Faculty understands that emerging technologies are transforming the teaching and the learning process. Due to lack of resources, our library journals and textbook holdings are very limited and access to current electronic journals is critical to faculty and students to conduct research. Digital Libraries require membership to access electronic journals that ought to be available for both face-to-face and also for online (Distance-Learning) courses that are offered through Course Management Systems like Blackboard and Moodle. The question is, how can faculty and students do research without access to the most current electronic journals and textbooks without membership?

Dr. Pryor: It's a shift in our emphasis and policy, to go from desk top units to a mobile strategy with interfaces that make sense.

Senator Teclehaimanot: Right.

Dr. Pryor: When you get the interface right, a lot of things happen and it sort of does justice to that work.

Senator Teclehaimanot: We are offering many distance learning courses. Do you expect on-line students to drive to Toledo in order to access journals/textbooks and other resources?

Dr. Pryor: No.

Senator Teclehaimanot: I think it's a good idea to explore further the issues related to electronic resources available for getting materials to students efficiently and effectively worldwide. Also, since we are a wireless campus, the solution might be to require students to purchase their own laptops so that the resource that is used to purchase desktop computers can be utilized to access electronic journals and textbooks.

Dr. Pryor: Absolutely. This is one of the many synergies that I saw emerging from the collaboration of learning ventures and the libraries. If you use Lib-guides, you will have to find the link on the home page and you will have to swell it up to be able to find it. But go to these Lib-guides because they offer expertise that is developed by librarians. They organize resources for students that are interested in these topics or in a department or program. These are ways that the library faculty contributes to the organization of knowledge at this institution and that to my mind should be part of online teaching. There should be a space on every online course that states "library" on it where you can go and have immediate access to your course materials in an accessible way. Also, research materials and free data bases, we have the sources for our students, so let's actively go and give it to them in a way that make sense. Chris Rigda works on our millennium system which is a system that is behind the catalogs that we use. She is aware of some plug-ins that can actually integrate Blackboard with libraries.

Senator Duhon: And most publishers anymore do allow remote access, it is an area that opened up.

Dr. Pryor: Yes, we always have to look out on things like licensing agreements.

Senator Duhon: Some licensing agreements are restricted.

Dr. Pryor: It is complicated.

Senator Regimbal: I was just reading that we need to seriously consider the way in which we take in electronic media; because the opportunity to jump from what you are reading to another resource does not help with retention. So, people that read that way may not retain nearly as much as people that read from a book. I think before we believe that we should go with everything that is electronic we should whether it is going to assist our students with retaining information or just give them access to so much that they won't retain anything.
I don't know if we are ready to go to another area. I have a question about something you mentioned earlier in the report regarding the way in which books are to be taken care of and recycled. I would like for you to address that a little bit further because I think that the past recycling process was to throw books into the dumpster or take them to the shredder. I am just wondering if that is true about how you are recycling?

Dr. Pryor: It is true that they were thrown into the dumpster and shredded.

Senator Regimbal: It seems to me that text books can be shared with other places that don't have access.

Dr. Pryor: That is part of the new policy.

Senator Duhon: We had discarded books to *Better World Books* and for other philanthropic purposes.

Dr. Pryor: We can and should do that. Again, the faculty in the library should be part of the decision about how these books are put together. To put a bunch of books into a box and send them over to somebody who is in our conception "needy" does not seem right to me. But, taking a bunch of books that are focused on an area of need somewhere in a prison or anywhere else, that makes sense to me. Again, that requires thought and we have to think about it.

Senator Duhon: I want to say too, it is not as easy to find a good home for used journals as one might think, because everyone is getting rid of the same titles.

Dr. Pryor: Yes it is hard. The policy that I proposed to the library is designed to hit all of the points that I think we need to hit; discussion and collaboration about what gets thrown out, an opportunity to make a case, or to take the book. If someone says that this is the most valuable text on the planet and have sentimental connection to it, fine. It may not need to be in the library, but you can take it and put it on your department's shelf. Every department can have its own library; it is going to be unregulated and people are going to steal things, but still, why not? I just don't get it why not. Finally, when we do recycle a book we got to know that that book is available somewhere within an easy reach. It may be that we do not get it right away, that is a compromise, but we will get it. We invest in interlibrary loan. Have any of you used Iliad yet? Wow, that is the best. If you use Iliad you would think differently about any library loan. So, there's Iliad, the OhioLink, and Northwest Book Depository where you can get things. I just want to make sure that it is collaborative and that there's a discussion about it so you will know what's going on. People are still going to be mad because throwing away a book brings up images that we do not like and we prefer to save them. A colleague brought me an arm full of books about Guerilla Theatre in San Francisco in the late 70's because they were throwing these books out. If you think the policy safeguards faculty and student's interests, good. If you think that it could be adjusted or you have criteria that you think would be important that we need to pay attention to, I need to know that as well.

Senator Hoblet: I just want to reiterate the exact thing that Senator Regimbal said, we need forums for engaging faculty.

Dr. Pryor: Absolutely.

Senator Hoblet: That has not occurred and that did not occur before. There were hundreds of texts that were removed from the library. I was lucky enough to walk through Carlson one day and I actually picked up seven seminal texts, works by scholars and other key educators.

Senator Dowd: The library need is the heart of every university. Students and faculty members go there to read and do research. I read in your report about the "just in case" v. "just in time" approach. That is, whether a book or a journal is going to be available in the library now or whether we have to request it from some other library. We have a library because we want one. Well, at least we had a library. In your report I don't see a lot of support for faculty research. I don't see any discussion about expanding anything that supports research. There is a lot of discussion that sounds like the mission of the library is the same as the mission of COIL. The library has a separate stand alone mission to serve every student and every faculty member here. I don't see that in your report. But where is the discussion of the library being the heart of the University? There are also the issues about the loss of collections and the notion that some librarians may be pulled from their regular duties to teaching courses; I get the sense that what you want is to no longer allow students to go the reference desk and ask for help. Instead they would

have to pay for a course to get that help. I am not encouraged and I am really worried for the University about your vision for the library. As a last point, you spoke of renovations. Is the funding for that renovation coming from the Central Administration or did you find a box of money in the basement somewhere?

Dr. Pryor: I am looking.

Senator Dowd: What are the renovations for? The core principal for the library is for research. The notion that we will have to ask for something that may be delivered in a week or two is not conducive to research. There were so many times as an undergraduate that I went to the library with only a general idea what I wanted, and I could browse the shelves and ask for help. We are moving to point where students now have to know exactly what they want as oppose to the possibility exploring. We are losing that. We are losing the ability to go the library and look through the collections and to find books that we didn't know we had on particular subjects. Stating that the library could order it from somewhere else is a poor substitute. This university is losing what it means to have a library.

Dr. Pryor: There are a lot of ways to address that. Are you going to talk about the French library?

Senator Rouillard: I would like to follow up on rhetoric about "just in time vs. just in case." I object to the qualification of the library as it stands as being organized in terms of "just in case." This is a false analogy that we are making between manufacturing, knowledge, and research. Manufacturing talks about "just in time." They can do that because they know what they are going to need in two weeks or five months etc. But, I as a researcher and a scholar do not know that, so I depend on the "just in case." The very juxtaposition of things that are on the shelves sometimes suggests a new line of thinking to me due to their very placement. The 19th century text that hasn't been checked out in fifty years is a potential research project to me if I am going to look at medievalism. So the idea that you can in fact take this off of the shelf and it is nobody's loss, I object to that. I object to language that qualifies the library as a warehouse. It is not a warehouse. Now, those may not be your words and those may be words that you are hearing from upper level administrators or from conferences, but please revise that. Even the Classical Library is bigger than a warehouse. That was my first comment and here is my second comment. I understand the kinds of economies that one can make when one centralizes resources. But every time we ask for a book it has to come from the Northwest Book Depository, that is going to get expensive. If there is one copy of all of our books in this State and we are all depending on the Depository to circulate those books around the State it is going to get expensive and it is going to get expensive fast. My third question, has the library had its budget hearing yet?

Dr. Pryor: Only moments before I came here.

Senator Rouillard: I hope that you put in a request and if you didn't, you will put one in shortly that the library be given the fees that were collected in its name. Whether they are treated as part of the central fund, I don't care. They were collected under the name of the library for the students and they should be recouped to rebuild the collection; those fees have been designated for the library, which as you (Dr. Pryor) very clearly articulated, "very expensive electronic resources."

Dr. Pryor: I appreciate that. I do have a lot to say about both remarks. I have a lot to agree with in terms of the passion of which they were made and particularly the support for scholarship and research here at the University. If it was not in my spoken remarks, I tried throughout my report to make sure that I kept aware of that. If it is someway to be even more committed to that I need to know. However, there are broader strategic questions for the library world as a whole. We are not the only academic library that has decisions; these are decisive moments for a lot of academic libraries. I think we really have to start to

think differently about these spaces and these collections etc. I just want to say two quick things. First, I was hoping that you would tell us about library in France. In a European library you will never get what you want. You go in and you will have to fill out a slip and sometime later (I don't know how long the wait time is) someone comes out with that text that you wanted. If you want something else you will have to again ask the now cranky French librarian for what you need. There are different ways you can receive access. You cannot make the decision and you cannot pursue a strategy unless you have your values and commitments in place. My commitment is to open access and that has to be there. If that necessarily means rebuilding a collection and basically going to wall to wall shelving, that may be okay, but I don't think it does. That is a discussion that we would have to have. When I first got wind that I am going to be the caretaker of the library I started to reread my Borges. If you know the story on the infinite library, it is a good one. He posits that for us to have a complete library that we would have to have not only all of the volumes of the world, but every variation of every volume of the world including the ones with typos. The Philosopher Quine looks at this and says "well, the logical consequence of this is that every library in the world literally can be reduced to one volume and that volume has two pages; on page one is a one and on the next page is a zero. All you have to do to generate all of the knowledge in the world is to read them in different order." Then Quine says, "I think computers are doing something like this." It is a huge question and it is one that is interesting with ramifications about how do we think about knowledge and that is why this is an interesting thing. All I do is welcome the discussion.

Senator Duhon: I just wanted to add that the discussion has been going on for decades in the library world about "access vs. ownership" and "just in time vs. just in case." It is not something that has been imposed on us.

Senator Rouillard: I'm sure.

Dr. Pryor: I can say and I don't want to blame anybody who may be in the room, but the "just in time vs. just in case" was given to me by the faculty in the library. However, the "warehouse" is mine. I will take ownership for that. It's just because I see a livelier place in a library that is not arranged with shelves that are close to one another. The reason why you see it in a written report is because that is the material consequence commitment to a form of knowledge and thought in which I do not think that I have.

Senator Rouillard: Well, I think there is something in here in your written report on page 3 that also suggests that the Classical Library is a place where "experts consult authenticated knowledge order to produce answers to questions or increments of mastery that will, in principal, put a stop to the acquisition of additional texts." I would object to that too. That is not my experience of the library. I do not go to the library and dust my hands and say I found the answer and now I am done.

Dr. Pryor: We are going to have a panel and a discussion about this and it's going to be fun. It's an interesting question. See it in terms of how the library is the physical representation of the way we imagine thought. Where we go with that is a matter of further discussion.

Senator Kennedy: Just to focus on the "gold standard" for library collection building. The "gold standard" is always - regardless of the format and regardless of the age of library materials-, to build a rational collection. The collection has to be rational in relation to the research, teaching and learning interests of the people here at the University? That leads me to the collection development policy, has it been updated recently?

Dr. Pryor: Did you state the Collection and Development Policy?

Senator Kennedy: Yes.

Dr. Pryor: Senator Duhon has the Collection and Development Policy updated recently?

Senator Duhon: That has been in process for years and it is probably a question that is better left to my colleague, Alice Crosetto.

Dr. Pryor: Alice Crosetto is our Collection Specialist and one on whom I rely. We have a tradition of area specialists in the library. We collaborate with colleges and faculty with development of specific collections and that continues as far as I am concerned. However, as of today do we have budget consequences and do we know, I am finding out about that.

Senator Kennedy: The Collection and Development Policy will help you determine which books to weed, store, and keep on the open shelves.

Dr. Pryor: That is exactly right. By the way I should also say this, why do we have library faculty and why do they have tenure? Developing a rational collection policy also means that you get into a little bit of a struggle, and sometimes with librarians. That struggle sometimes is about scholarship, research, and the intellectual life of an institution. If a librarian is tenured they are at a different place, with respect to that conversation.

Senator Heberle: What we love to do here is to ask questions based on rumors we've heard. The most recent rumor that I heard was the University Library faculty was being asked to develop curriculum that will fit with the COIL mission. I just wanted you to elaborate on it. For example, what classes would you offer? Because if it is a college it has to have faculty and it has to have classes somehow to fit into the understanding of what a college is.

Dr. Pryor: Not quite.

Senator Heberle: So could you elaborate on it?

Dr. Pryor: Yes. First, I am supposed to thank you for exposing a rumor to the light of day.

Senator Heberle: I am always happy to do that and I have more.

Dr. Pryor: Thank you. It is true that the library has been asked to develop a curriculum and I would refer to my colleague, Thomas Atwood. Thomas Atwood can tell you a little more about his work and he has done a very fine job on giving us some ideas. We have a retreat coming up next week where we are going to talk about what the curriculum for the library means. Whether or not that amounts to cookie cutter curriculum to the College of Innovative Learning, that is not it at all. So, my thinking with respect to curriculum is twofold. One is that librarians are already involved in teaching and learning and we just don't measure it very well. When a librarian goes and gives a lecture to a class or goes to help a student with a research project that is part of the teaching of that class. I want that recognized and I want the College to be able to say we got productive faculty.

Senator Heberle: Well, I am on UCAP and that work is counted in the evaluation of faculty librarians. I hear that is stopped short beyond UCAP evaluations because they want these classes the way they are in other colleges to be in the library.

Dr. Pryor: If it is, nobody made me do anything that I don't want to do. With respect to curriculum, here's another thing that I want to do: depending on the outcome of the discussion maybe in just a few minutes, information literacy will be one of the core competencies that structures everything we do. Not just in undergraduate teaching and learning but administration and faculty at the Medical Campus and so

on. Core Competency means everybody: right? So I'm thinking, well, you have information literacy and you have specialist in information literacy. Every single college and department, program, or unit is going to have to do something to address this competency. How they do it is not up to me but it seems to me that when you want to do that efficiently the best thing to do is to call up your university library and say "hey, let's work on information literacy and visual and cultural and various forms of literacy like financial literacy" Let's see by working together collaboratively across disciplinary lines…. we can actually supplement instruction that would help students gain these competencies. I think it is fundamental and as a faculty member teaching philosophy. I don't know how many of you may be teaching graduate students, but you tell a graduate student sometimes to do the research and come back. They come back and they have nothing, or it is oddly put, or they looked on all the wrong places, or they've done a print out of some Google screen. Then it becomes my job to start teaching them about the fundamentals of research. Well, wait! I do not have the time to do that or it is not my expertise. I would like to be able to call up the library and say "give me one unit of a course that I can put all of my graduate students in and we will count it as part of their thesis hours. I don't care about FTE But that one unit gets the student up to speed with respect to research skills. That is what I envision when I start thinking about a curriculum. There are more things to it. I would like to refer back to the library faculty with respect to what they think curriculum should do. I would like to say that this is another one of those national conversations. Every academic library is facing pressures to become more involved in teaching and learning. I don' think that is a bad thing, but certainly not for all librarians.

Senator Dowd: May I follow up on that? That is what I was referring to before when I was talking about students having to pay for something they currently get for free. If librarians are put into the classrooms to teach these courses that necessarily means a one to one reduction in the amount of time they spend in the library helping our students. They can either be in the classroom or they can be helping students.

Dr. Pryor: They are there anyway.

Senator Dowd: Or they can be in the library.

Dr. Pryor: They are there anyway.

Senator Dowd: No, I am sorry. They cannot be in two places at the same time. Further, if they are teaching a course, they are teaching a course in a fixed amount of time and that amount of time is now reduced from the time they are in the library helping students. If the courses you are describing are like an orientation course, then this is zero sum game. If the students will take that course they will not need an orientation course from their home college. For the university it is a wash because while your college will generate state subsidy from such courses some other college will generate less subsidy due to the corresponding drop in enrollment in their orientation course. However, though it is a wash for the university, the students will suffer there will be fewer librarians available to help students.

Dr. Pryor: I don't think so. But, there are two things. First, let's show support for the library, meaning, that does not happen. So, as far as I am concerned that does not happen. Secondly, it is the question of staffing. For example, right now we have a policy and we had for years where we have at least two reference librarians, faculty who sit at the reference desk and handle student's requests. If that is so, if one reference librarian gets called off to do something up in the stacks or at a computer screen there is another reference librarian to take care of it. The problem is, they did a self study and they found out that 99% of the questions that are addressed were questions like "where is the restroom?" You don't need a trained reference librarian at the desk to tell people where the restrooms are. One, there are ways we can more efficiently allocate faculty time. And two, there are ways we can more effectively measure library faculty participation in courses. The luxury with being in the College of Innovative Learning is that the sole exclusive commitment value which is the value that structures everything we do with student learning. If I

thought for a minute that not having a librarian running around in various colleges and programs was not a beneficial thing for the students I would not do it. I think that it is necessary. I think the students these days must have that kind of contact with someone who knows how to manage and think critically about information. Again, I agree with what you are saying, but I think we are there.

Senator Rouillard: My other question is, exactly what is new about what you are proposing? Because I already used Thomas Atwood's very fine presentation for some orientation classes that he has conducted. I have taken some of my classes over to the library and they had a session given by the library faculty, so I don't quite see what the new plan is.

Dr. Pryor: Maybe nothing. I mean if we are getting everything we need out of those occasional tracks over to the library for the instruction there, it might be no need to go any further. Do I think that you get a better value out of a more sustained integration of Thomas into one of your courses, I think you do; I wish I have done it for a number of courses that I taught when I taught. I use to think "where do I put all of this stuff together?" That is why I refer to the Lib-guide which is a product of the library that can be integrated into your work and also the faculty research centers. I should probably yield. Thank you very much for your questions.

President Powers: Thank you very much. Next, Dr. Steve LeBlanc will provide a report on the work of the Faculty Senate Core Curriculum Committee.

Senator LeBlanc: Thank you again for having me here.

Senator Heberle: Good to see you again Steve.

Senator LeBlanc: Thank you. You've seen most of this previously. I want to start off by saying, faculty owns the curriculum. Student learning is at the forefront of the curriculum. This could be one of the most important things we do as Faculty Senate this year. That includes doing something to restructure and improve student learning on campus. I ask you a couple of things. I will be as quick as I can to go through the material without really rushing. I would ask a couple of things from you. One, suspend your knowledge from the way the general education curriculum is now. Let us see if we can see where it might be. Two, if you hold your questions to the end, if I make it to the end, chances are that some of your questions will be answered.

We would like for students to take these classes to see the relevancy of their programs of study and future aspirations. We would like full-time faculty seek to teach because it is an honor and distinction. Employers will increasingly seek out our students who demonstrate a desired set of competencies and breadth of knowledge. Internal and external stakeholders would be able to see student learning in the competencies because of assessment. And the University is being a part of a national conversation. This move to core competencies is happening all over the country. There are a couple of definitions that I would like to share with you to make sure we are all on the same page: One, Core Competencies are skills or qualities that can be measured against a standard; can be developed over time through general education courses, other credit bearing learning opportunities, and out-of-class experiences. They are a characteristic of a UT graduate. UT provides the resources to achieve a degree of competency appropriate to a well-educated citizen. Two, General Education are a set of courses offered at the 1000 and 2000 level. It is designed to provide students with a breadth of knowledge and it is intentionally designed to address and assess one or more of the core competencies. Three, Proposal for Restructuring the Core Curriculum is the move to competency-based student learning outcomes. Rebuild the core with courses intentionally designed to support development of core competencies. Develop a process for designating and reviewing courses identified for the core and to develop a procedure for the assessment of the core

competencies. That is where a proposal will happen. Redefining the Core means to redefine and focus the core curriculum on competencies will better enable us to ensure and assess student learning outcomes. As faculty, we will concentrate our efforts across all programs to help students achieve our desired outcomes. A positive benefit of this proposal is the core competencies permeate its entire curriculum with programs of study contributing and enhancing competency to development in general education courses. This one is really important; the general education focuses on important core competencies within the context of foundational courses that are applicable and relevant to a broad range of students and all programs of study. It will give us the ability to assess clear learning outcomes and help us adherence to State and HLC guidelines.

Again, these are the five core competencies: Communication, UT students must demonstrate abilities to communicate meaningfully, persuasively, and creatively with different audiences through written oral, numeric graphic and visual modes. Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning and Literacy, UT students must demonstrate the capacity to apply mathematical reasoning and scientific inquiry to diverse problems. Personal and Social Responsibility; this one is undergoing some editing since last time. UT students must demonstrate understanding of and critical engagement in ethical, cultural and political discourse and capacity to work productively as a community member committed to the value of diversity, difference, and the imperatives of justice; meaning all classes that will satisfy this competency will have a component of diversity. Information Literacy, UT students must demonstrate the ability to find, organize, critically assess, and effectively use information in a way to engage in advanced work and challenging field of study. They should demonstrate responsible, legal, creative and ethical use of information. Critical and Integrative thinking, UT students must be able to integrate reasoning, questioning and analysis across traditional boundaries of viewpoint, practice and discipline. There are a lot of students that achieves these core competencies. They are developed as they progress through multiple experiences within their programs. While general education courses have a special, intentional relationship to the core competencies, the courses in the students' major program of study will also contribute in a substantial way to their development. General Education Courses will include course content and assignments appropriate to a non-specialist and meet the following guidelines: The courses must: First, they focus on at least one core competency for which students will receive competency credit. Secondly, they demonstrate a strong relationship to an additional core competency. Thirdly, include clearly stated and measurable learning outcomes. Fourth, include activities purposefully designed to assess attainment of the two core competencies. Fifth, incorporate standardized rubrics for assessment of student progress toward the two core competencies. Sixth, mention a central location for easily accessing published standardized rubrics. Seventh, include activities to be uploaded into student electronic -portfolio so that way students will be able to provide evidence of progress on competencies acquisition. Eighth, meet State definitions for the transfer module. Ninth, indicate the above on the course syllabus so all of the students will know and clearly understand what is expected of the course.

What is the approval process? Initially we would like to reconsider general education courses in their entirety (start with a clean slate.) The course will be selected based on the previously-stated criteria while maintaining a breadth of diversity of selections to address the core competencies. I will talk a little bit more in detail about the process of that in a second. Then we will consider additional courses and request for courses to become general education courses in the future after the core curriculum general education courses will be populated. So, here's the approval process that we are suggesting: We are going to start with the departments; departments and faculty. Departments will decide on what courses they would like to put forward as a general education course. The department and the Program Curriculum Committee will review these submissions and forward those to a College Curriculum Committee. The College Curriculum Committee will then reviews and approve those. It will then be forwarded to the Faculty Senate Core Curriculum Committee. The Faculty Senate Core Curriculum Committee reviews submissions and selects general education courses and make a recommendation to Faculty Senate. The Senate votes on approval and sends approved general education courses as a recommendation to the

Provost's Office. Finally, the Provost's office reviews recommendation and, if approved, forwards it to the Registrar.

Senator Dowd: Senator LeBlanc, are you saying that the Provost has approval authority after the Senate?

Senator LeBlanc: It is my understanding that Faculty Senate gives recommendations. Isn't that in the Faculty Senate Constitution?

Senator Dowd: But that goes back to your opening statement, that the "faculty owns the curriculum." It has to go to the Provost Office and then to the Registrar's Office, but I don't remember the Senate making recommendations only.

Dr. Poplin Gosetti: Please note, it states "the Provost Office" currently every piece of curriculum must go through the Provost Office and it must be a sign-off prior to it going to the Registrar Office. So that is what that references.

Senator Dowd: But the word "approved."

Dr. Poplin Gosetti: Yes, because if it is not corrected it will get sent back to the committees for continued work. As you see at the bottom of the PowerPoint there are opportunities to revise and resubmit. It is signed off by the Provost Office though.

Senator LeBlanc: From my understanding, Marcia signs off on them all the time. And if the proposal does not meet the guidelines it sometimes goes back.

Dr. Poplin Gosetti: Yes, she does signs off on them and if it does not meet the guidelines it will go back.

Senator LeBlanc: It is then revised again. After that, it will go back through the process.

Senator Anderson: Isn't the content that is getting approved? I think it is mostly the technical particulars.

Senator Dowd: Am I the only Senator here that feels that this is not correct?

Senator Heberle: I understand your question and you are actually right. Isn't that the Provost Office reviews it in terms of making sure that wording is correct, but does not change the content? I mean, if I use a similar text book the provost would know if it has similar content.

Senator LeBlanc: I don't think that is the indication at all.

Senator Heberle: Can we just put a different word in there? It is not a review and it is not an approval; the Faculty Senate approves the curriculum: right?

Senator LeBlanc: Yes.

Senator Batten: And the Provost Office processes it.

Senator Heberle: Processes it, right.

Senator LeBlanc: I thought that is what the Faculty Senate Constitution states.

Senator Regimbal: I suggest that we red-mark number seven, finish with the presentation and then come back to that after we check the guidelines?

Senator LeBlanc: One of the other parts of the process is to develop Assessment Process of Student learning in the Core Competencies. The University Level will be focusing on fewer outcomes, in a tighter, more coherent curriculum, allows us to be more effective in teaching appropriate content to help students attain core competencies. An assessment of achievement of core competencies is every faculty member's responsibility in general education courses. There will be opportunities further along in the student's study to add things to their portfolio and demonstrate and achieve core competencies. The "core competency" courses will be assessed by the instructor. Instructors will use a common rubric to asses the attainment of the core competency using evidence and exhibits collected during the course. Course assessments will be reviewed by departmental faculty (in the department offering the course) and course modifications made as necessary. The students will have the responsibility to collect and maintain an electronic portfolio in order to demonstrate attainment of core competencies. Courses in programs of study also provide opportunities to demonstrate core competencies for inclusion in electronic portfolios. Electronic portfolios and capstone projects reviewed using standard rubrics in a process to determine. Training and Faculty Development includes Faculty Senate-sponsored workshop series, in conjunction with College of Innovative Learning. This will include: working with the competencies, developing a general education course syllabus, and how to incorporate a robust assessment of competencies into the courses. What about existing students? We will use a philosophy similar to the semester conversion process so we "Do not harm current student progress." What we propose is a student who is admitted Fall 2012 or after will follow the new system. Students admitted prior to Fall 2012 may choose, with approval of their advisor, whether they would like to complete the new core competency system or the previous general education curriculum (they would have to pick one or the other.) Proposed General Education Course Requirements includes a minimum of 30 semester hours required as part of the demonstration of attainment of the core competencies. Students will have additional opportunities to build competencies as they progress through their major program of study. Each course taken may be used to satisfy the course requirement for only one competency (i.e. no "double-dipping") A Process will be developed to give credit for prior and alternative learning (e.g., service learning), using the standardized rubric for a particular competency. Communications, we are recommending a minimum of 6 semester hours in communication. Six semester hours in composition will fulfill the State requirements. What we trying to do is blend this, so we can satisfy the State guidelines as well as the University guidelines. The state requires 6 credit hours for English. Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning and Literacy include a minimum of 9 semester hours. In order to satisfy the State requirement a student will need a minimum of three semester hours in mathematics and minimum of six semester hours in the natural sciences (including one laboratory experience.) Information Literacy includes no specific semester hour requirement for demonstration of attainment. It is expected that this competency will be attained through courses and experiences throughout the UT curriculum. Students will have many opportunities to document attainment of this competency while progressing through the curriculum. Personal and Social Responsibility and Critical and Integrative thinking include a minimum of 6 to 9 semester hours in each of those areas. What we are seeing that there's a total of 15 credit hours that is required in Core competencies. So, if a student takes 6 credit hours in one, then you will take 9 credit hours in another. The State requires that a student must take 6 credit hours in Arts and Humanities. In addition, 6 credit hours in Social Sciences. Of these, we will recommend that 6 of those credit hours would apply to Personal and Social Responsibility and 6 credit hours towards Innovative and Critical Thinking; this will get you through the range of experiences across the disciplines that we have now.

Senator Dowd: Could one course satisfy one or more areas?

Senator LeBlanc: Right now we say that a course must have one major focus for the core competency and address the second. But, I am sure that it could work out that way, however it may be a little bit of a problem with the book keeping.

Senator Dowd: What came to my mind is that you have 6 credit hours in one and 9 credit hours in another.

Senator LeBlanc: You can just say 15 credit hours total and a minimum of 6 credit hours in that area.

Senator Dowd: In other words, a student can take one particular course and it could potentially satisfy both; the hours can actually be used in one area or the other.

Senator LeBlanc: I am sure you can do that. Again, Personal and Social Responsibility, we reworded it since last time with a suggestion from Senator Heberle; thank you Senator Heberle for sending it.

Senator Heberle: You're welcome.

Senator LeBlanc: The idea is that any course that meets the Personal and Social Responsibility Core Competencies will have a diversity component. Proposed Time Line: The idea behind it is that we will be ready for Fall 2012 launch which may sound like a long time away because it is a year from now, but it is really not. You have to have some of the courses set to go by the end of Fall so they can get into the catalog on time. I think we make the submission in February for the Fall courses. Spring Semester – Faculty Senate would act on General Education proposal by early Fall 2011 – Department/Programs prepare proposals for inclusion in the General Education core course inventory by September – Department/Programs forward submissions to College Curriculum Committees for review; approved submissions forwarded to the Faculty Senate Core Curriculum Committee by October – Faculty Senate Core Curriculum Committee selects a reduced number of general education courses for recommendation to the Faculty Senate by end of November – Faculty Senate votes on approval and sends approved general education courses as a recommendation to Provost's Office; Provost's Office reviews recommendation and, if approved, forwards to Registrar by February 2012 – Provost's Office submits courses for transfer module to OBOR to be effective Fall 2012. Spring Semester 2012 – Faculty development programs for assessment of Core Competencies will take place.

This is my last slide; I am just going to summarize it. I think that it is an important one. General Education courses are focused on important core competencies. There foundational courses are applicable and relevant to a broad range of students and all programs of study. That's all, are there any questions and or concerns?

PowerPoint Presentation

Core Curriculum Report
Faculty Senate Meeting
March 29, 2011
Potential for General Education at UT
• Students want to take because they see the relevancy to their programs of study and future aspirations
• Full-time faculty seek to teach because it is an honor and distinction
• Employers increasingly seek out our students who demonstrate a desired set of competencies and breadth of knowledge
• Internal and external stakeholders can see student learning in the competencies because of assessment
• University is part of a national conversation
Definitions
Core Competencies: Skills or qualities that can be measured against a standard; can be developed over time through general education courses, other credit bearing learning opportunities, and out-of-class experiences; are characteristic of a UT graduate. UT provides the resources to achieve a degree of competency appropriate to a well-educated citizen.
General Education: A set of courses

• offered at the 1000 and 2000 level;
• designed to provide students with a breadth of knowledge;
• intentionally designed to address and assess one or more of the core competencies

Proposal for Restructuring the Core Curriculum
• Move to competency-based student learning outcomes
• Rebuild core with courses intentionally designed to support development of core competencies
• Develop a process for designating and reviewing courses identified for the core
• Develop a procedure for the assessment of the core competencies

Redefining the Core
• Redefining g and focusing the core curriculum on competencies will better enable us to ensure and assess student learning outcomes.
• As faculty, we will concentrate our efforts across all programs at UT to help students achieve the desired outcomes.

Positive Benefits of the Proposal
• Core competencies permeate entire curriculum with programs of study contributing and enhancing to competency development in upper-division coursework
• General education focused on important core competencies within the context of foundational courses that are applicable and relevant to a broad range of students and programs of study
• Ability to assess clear learning outcomes
• Adherence to State and HLC guidelines

Proposed UT Core Competencies

Communication
• UT students must demonstrate abilities to communicate meaningfully, persuasively, and creatively with different audiences through written oral numeric graphic and visual modes.

Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning and Literacy
• UT students must demonstrate the capacity to apply mathematical reasoning and scientific inquiry to diverse problems.

Personal and Social Responsibility P Quantitative Reasoni
• UT students must demonstrate understanding of and critical engagement in ethical, cultural and political discourse and capacity to work productively as a community member committed to the value of diversity, difference, and the imperatives of justice.

Information Literacy
• UT students must demonstrate the ability to find, organize, critically assess, and effectively use information to engage in advanced work in a challenging field of study. Students should demonstrate responsible, legal, creative and ethical use of information.

Critical and Integrative Thinking
• UT students must be able to integrate reasoning questioning and reasoning, analysis across traditional boundaries of viewpoint, practice and discipline.

How Do Students Achieve the Core Competencies?
• Competencies are developed as students progress through multiple courses and experiences in their academic programs
• While general education courses will have a special, intentional relationship to the core competencies, the courses in the students' major program of study will also contribute in a substantial way to their development.

General Education Courses
Approved general education courses will include course content and assignments appropriate to a non-specialist and meet the following guidelines.
The courses must:
• focus on one core competency for which students will receive competency credit.
• demonstrate a strong relationship to an additional core competency.
• include clearly stated and measurable learning outcomes.
• include activities purposefully designed to assess attainment of the two core competencies.
• incorporate standardized rubrics for assessment of student progress toward the two core competencies.
• mention a central location for easily accessing published standardized rubrics.
• include activities to be uploaded into students' e-portfolio that provide evidence of progress on competencies acquisition.
• meet State definitions for the transfer module.
• indicate the above on the course syllabus.

General Education Course Approval
1. Initially reconsider general education courses in their entirety (start with a clean slate)
Course selection based on the previously-stated criteria while maintaining a breadth and diversity of selections that address the core competencies.
Departments submit courses for approval to be included in the UT
General Education Course inventory
2. Consider subsequent requests for courses to become
general education courses.
Selection process will focus on maintaining diversity across the disciplines, balancing competencies across the courses, encouraging innovative approaches to competency attainment, and ensuring a focused, coherent course offering.

Proposed Process for General Education Course Approval
1. Department/Program selects course(s) and makes revisions to catalog description,
syllabus, and content as necessary.

2. Department/Program Curriculum Committee and faculty review submissions and forward approved submissions to the College Curriculum Committee

3. College Curriculum Committee reviews submission and forward approved submissions to the Faculty Senate Core Curriculum Committee

4. Faculty Senate Core Curriculum Committee reviews submissions and selects general education courses.

5. Faculty Senate Core Curriculum Committee forwards recommended courses to Senate.

6. Faculty Senate votes on approval and sends approved general education courses as a recommendation to the Provost's Office.

7. Provost's Office reviews recommendation and, if approved, forwards it to the Registrar.

Opportunities to "revise and resubmit" submissions will occur at each level.

Inclusion of student input in the decision-making process will occur.

Assessment of Student Learning in the Core Competencies

University Level

• Focusing on fewer outcomes, in a tighter, more coherent curriculum, allows us to be more effective in teaching appropriate content to help students attain core competencies

• Assessment of achievement of core competencies is every faculty member's responsibility

Course Level

• "Core Competency" courses assessed by the instructor

• Instructors use common rubrics to assess attainment of the core competency using evidence and exhibits collected during the course

• Course assessments reviewed by departmental faculty (in the department offering the course) and course modifications made as necessary

Student Level

• All students will maintain an electronic portfolio to demonstrate attainment of core competencies

• Courses in programs of study also provide opportunities to demonstrate core competencies for inclusion in electronic portfolios

• Electronic portfolios and capstone projects reviewed using standard rubrics in a process to Determined

Training and Faculty Development

Faculty Senate-sponsored y p workshop series, in conjunction with College of Innovative Learning, will include:

• Working with the competencies

• Developing a general education course syllabus

• Incorporating robust assessment of competencies into the course.

What about existing students?

Philosophy similar to the semester conversion process

"Do not harm current student progress."

• Students admitted Fall 2012 or after will follow new system

• Students admitted prior to Fall 2012 may choose, with approval of their advisor, whether they would like to complete the new core competency system or the previous general education curriculum. Students must choose one of these two options. A blending of the two options is not permissible.

Proposed General Education Course Requirements

• Course requirements designed to provide experiences necessary for attainment of the core competencies.

• Minimum of **30 semester hours** required as part of the demonstration of attainment of the core competencies.

• Students will have additional opportunities to build competencies as they progress through their major program of study.

• Each course taken may be used to satisfy the course requirement for only one competency (i.e. no "double-dipping")

• Process will be developed to give credit for prior and alternative learning e.g., service learning), using the standardized rubric for a particular competency.

Proposed General Education Course Requirements

Communication (min. 6 semester hours)

Six semester hours in composition

Fulfills state requirements for 6 credit hours of English.

Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning and Literacy (min. 9 semester hours)

A minimum of three semester hours in mathematics and minimum of six semester hours in the natural sciences (including one laboratory experience)

Fulfills state requirements for 3 credit hours of math, and 6 hours of natural sciences including one lab experience.

Information Literacy

No specific semester hour requirement for demonstration of attainment. It is expected that this competency will be attained through courses and experiences throughout the UT curriculum. Students will have many opportunities to document attainment of this competency while progressing through the curriculum.

General education courses selected in the following competency areas will fulfill state requirements
for 6 credit hours of arts/humanities and 6 hours of social science. Of these state-required 12 hrs, 6
hrs will contribute towards competencies in Personal and Social Responsibility and 6 hrs will be taken
in Critical and Integrative Thinking. A total of 15 semester hours are required in these two core competencies.

Personal and Social Responsibility (min. 6 to 9 semester hours)

A minimum of six or nine semester hours are required, including a minimum of one course with a focus on diversity. [Clarifying Note: all courses addressing this core competency must have a diversity component.]

Critical and Integrative thinking (min. 6 to 9 semester hours)

A minimum of six or nine semester hours are required

Proposed Timeline

Spring Semester – Faculty Senate acts on General Education proposal **by early Fall 2011** -Department/Programs prepare proposals for inclusion in the General Education core course inventory **by September** – Department/Programs forward submissions to College Curriculum Committees for review; approved submissions forwarded to the Faculty Senate Core Curriculum Committee **by October** – Faculty Senate Core Curriculum Committee selects a reduced number of general education courses for recommendation to the Faculty Senate **by end of November** – Faculty Senate votes on approval and sends approved general education courses as a recommendation to Provost's Office; Provost's Office reviews recommendation and, if approved, forwards to Registrar **by February 2012** – Provost's Office submits courses for transfer module to OBOR to be effective Fall 2012

Spring Semester 2012 – Faculty development programs for assessment of Core Competencies will take place.

Positive Benefits of the Proposal

• Core competencies permeate entire curriculum with programs of study contributing and enhancing to competency development in upper-division coursework
• General education focused on important core competencies within the context of foundational courses that are applicable and relevant to a broad
range of students and programs of study
• Ability to assess clear learning outcomes.
• Adherence to State and HLC guidelines.

Motion for Faculty Senate
General Education "Core Curriculum"
Faculty Senate Core Curriculum Committee

Whereas the General Education Core Curriculum should be viewed by students as relevant to their programs of study and future aspirations; as relevant to faculty, administrators, and employers; comprised of courses
that students want to take; seen as an honor to teach and not a burden; taught primarily by full-time faculty; and assessed effectively to know whether students are developing the desired competencies.

The General Education Core Curriculum Committee moves that the Faculty Senate recommend to the Provost that the University of Toledo adopt the
following proposal in order to move to competency based student learning outcomes; rebuild general education ("core") curriculum with courses intentionally designed to support the development of core competencies; develop a process for designating and reviewing courses identified for the general education curriculum; develop a procedure for
the assessment of the core competencies; and that the Provost in consultation with the faculty implement the necessary changes to the University policies in order to implement this proposal.

Proposal
Approved by email poll of Faculty Senate Core Curriculum Committee 3/29/11, 9-0 (2 no responses)
A. Goals of the General Education Core Requirements

Upon graduation, every UT student will be able to demonstrate competency in:
• Communication
• Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning and Literacy
• Personal and Social Responsibility
• Information Literacy
• Critical and Integrative Thinking

B. General Education Course Requirements

The following course requirements are designed to provide experiences necessary for attainment of the core competencies. A minimum of 30 semester hours are required as part of the demonstration of attainment of the core competencies. Students will have additional opportunities competencies to build these as they progress through their major program of study. Each course taken may be used to satisfy the course requirement for only one competency (i.e. no "double-dipping")

1. Communication (minimum 6 semester hours)

Six semester hours in composition are required for the Communication competency.

Fulfills state requirements for 6 credit hours of English.

2. Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning and Literacy (minimum 9 semester hours)

Nine semester hours are required for this competency: a minimum of three semester hours in mathematics and minimum of six semester hours in the natural sciences (including one laboratory experience).

Fulfills state requirements for 3 credit hours of math, and 6 credit hours of natural sciences
including one lab experience.

3. Information Literacy

This competency has no specific course hour requirement for demonstration of attainment. It is expected that this competency will be attained through courses and experiences throughout the UT curriculum. The student will have many opportunities to document attainment of this competency while progressing through the curriculum.

B. General Education Course Requirements (cont'd)

General education courses selected in the following competency areas will fulfill state requirements for 6 credit hours of arts/humanities and 6 credit hours of social science. Of these state-required 12 hrs, 6 hrs will contribute towards competencies in Personal and Social Responsibility and 6 hrs will be taken in Critical and Integrative Thinking. A total of 15 semester hours are required in these two core competencies.

4. Personal and Social Responsibility (minimum 6 to 9 semester hours)

A minimum of six or nine hours are required for this competency, including a minimum of one course with a focus on diversity. [Clarifying Note: all courses addressing this core competency must have a diversity component.]

5. Critical and Integrative Thinking (minimum 6 to 9 semester hours) A minimum of six or nine semester hours are required for this competency.

1. Reconsider general education courses in their entirety. Departments must submit courses for approval to be included in the New UT Core Course inventory.

C. Process for General Education Course Approval

approval to be included in the new UT Core Course inventory.

2. Department/Program selects course(s) and makes revisions to catalog description, syllabus, and content as necessary. Consultation should occur with faculty from programs that require the course in their plans of study.

3. Department/Program Curriculum Committee and faculty review submissions and forward approved submissions to the College Curriculum Committee

4. College Curriculum Committee reviews submission and forwards approved submissions to the Faculty Senate Core Curriculum Committee

5. Faculty Senate Core Curriculum Committee reviews submissions and selects general education courses.

6. Faculty Senate Core Curriculum Committee forwards recommended courses to Senate.

7. Faculty Senate votes on approval and sends approved general education courses as a recommendation to the Provost's Office.

8. Provost's Office reviews recommendation and, if approved, forwards it to the Registrar.

9. Opportunities to "revise and resubmit" submissions will occur at each level.

10. Courses admitted to the Core Course must be intentionally designed to focus on one of the core competencies and demonstrate a strong relationship to an additional core competency.

11. Core competencies must be addressed in the syllabus and through course assignments that can be assessed and included in the students' electronic portfolio.

12. Course selection based on the previously-stated criteria while maintaining a breadth and diversity of selections that address the core competencies.

13. Selection process will focus on maintaining diversity across the disciplines, balancing competencies across the courses, encouraging innovative approaches to competency attainment, and ensuring a focused, coherent course offering.

D. General Education Courses

The General Education Courses must:

1. Focus on one core competency for which students will receive competency credit.

2 demonstrate a 2.Strong relationship to an additional core competency.

3. Include clearly stated and measurable learning outcomes.

4. Include activities purposefully designed to assess attainment of the two core competencies.

5. Incorporate standardized rubrics for assessment of student progress toward the two core competencies.

6. Mention a central location for easily accessing published standardized rubrics.

7. Include activities to be uploaded into students' e-portfolio that provide evidence of progress on competencies acquisition.

8. Meets State definitions for the transfer module.

9. Indicate the above on the course syllabus.

E. Assessment of Student Learning in the Core Competencies

At the University Level:

• Focusing on fewer outcomes, in a tighter, more coherent curriculum, allows us to be more effective in teaching appropriate content to help students attain core competencies.

• Assessment of achievement of core competencies is every faculty member's responsibility.

At the Course Level:

• "Core Competency" courses assessed by the instructor

• Instructors use common rubrics to assess attainment of the core competency using evidence and exhibits collected during the course

• Course assessments reviewed by departmental faculty (in the department offering the course) and course modifications made as necessary

At the Student Level:

• All students will maintain an electronic portfolio to demonstrate attainment of core competencies

• Courses in programs of study also provide opportunities to demonstrate core competencies for inclusion in electronic portfolios

• Electronic portfolios and capstone projects reviewed using standard rubrics in a process to determined

F. Effective Date

• Students admitted Fall 2012 or after will follow new system.

• Students admitted prior to Fall 2012 may choose, with approval of their advisor, whether they would like to complete the new core competency system or the previous general education curriculum. Students must choose one of these two options. A blending of the two options is not permissible.

G. Tentative Timeline for Implementation

• **Early Fall 2011** – Department/Programs prepare proposals for inclusion in the

General Education core course inventory
• **September** – Department/Programs forward submissions to College Curriculum
Committees for review; approved submissions forwarded to the Faculty Senate
Core Curriculum Committee
• **October** – Faculty Senate Core Curriculum Committee selects a reduced number of general education courses for recommendation to the
Faculty Senate
• **End of November** – Faculty Senate votes on approval and sends approved general education courses as a recommendation to Provost's
Office; Provost's Office reviews recommendation and, if approved, forwards to Registrar
• **February 2012** – Provost's Office submits courses for transfer module to OBOR to be effective Fall 2012
• **Spring Semester 2012** – Faculty development programs for assessment of Core Competencies will take place.

Senator Skeel: I recently done a search of the Constitution and the Constitution per say does not mention core curriculum. The appendix of the Constitution mentions the Senate Committee on core curriculum and outlines the functions of the Core Committee, but it does not say what happens after it goes to the Senate for an approval.

Senator Dowd: Thank you.

Senator Heberle: I don't know if it is strategically wiser to have the timeline of the entire slide be that. But it seems profoundly unrealistic if we are going to have a good initial stab at this and have it done in two months just in time for the provost processing. It doesn't seem right to have that "smooshed" up in time line for it. I know we want to get this on its way for a lot of different reasons. Maybe it's good to have that on paper. I just don't want to sacrifice the quality of it.

Senator Dowd: I would like to see some examples. I would like to see an example provided so that Senators could examine the structure and to see how the process works before acting on this proposal.

Senator Heberle: But one of the things that we usually do about courses is that we pilot them. We pilot them to see what they actually going to do before we put it on paper: right? Then we assess it then we put it into a permanent catalog. In a way we are being asked to approve something. We can pilot for example a year. Then we can say "assessment happened" and then move forward. Is that a possibility?

Senator Dowd: That's a good idea.

Senator Heberle: Actually it is your idea.

Senator Dowd: If it works out well then it is your idea and if it instead goes down in flames then it'll be my idea.

Senator Ohlinger: Maybe a little more specific. When you have courses that you have to have completed is pretty easy to monitor for a transcript because either they completed it or they didn't. Who will be determining these competencies and how will they be determined if they are being met?

Senator LeBlanc: There will be though. As the course comes forward we will have to specify what core competency it is related to. For example, Humanities and Social Science, there will be a list of classes that would satisfy Personal and Social Responsibility and Critical and Integrated Thinking.

Senator Ohlinger: So, for Information Literacy where there is no set semester hours. Is there a course that says it meets this particular core competency? If a student takes that class, does that count as that?

Senator LeBlanc: One of the core competencies is going to be actually met in a single class. That will certainly contribute towards it: yes.

Senator Ohlinger: So that is what I am trying to figure out. Who is going to determine if they don't meet it with that one class then will they need two courses? Is the Registrar Office going to be determining that?

Senator LeBlanc: I don't think so. As long as those courses are taken and those minimum hours are met in general education, but I think that we are kind of mixing apples and oranges here. Programs will be reviewing students that obtain core competency at the end of their sophomore year and at the end of their senior year. We will be looking at their portfolios to see how well the students are doing in those areas.

Senator Ohlinger: So, it will be the programs responsibility.

Senator LeBlanc: Yes.

Senator Heberle: Are we getting back into the confusion between assessments being assessing ourselves to see if we are actually doing what we say we do or rating students to see if they can graduate. We had that confusion before and I hope we are not getting into that again.

Senator LeBlanc: We are looking to obtain the student competency to see how well we are doing in the offered courses. If we have students getting to their senior year and they are not obtaining the core competencies then we may have to tweak something back into the system.

Senator Heberle: Okay.

Senator Heberle: We don't fail students because they don't satisfy all of the core competencies.

Senator LeBlanc: No.

Senator Ohlinger: I got it. Thank you.

Senator Lee: I might have missed this at an earlier meeting. But, will the reduced number in available courses result in more sections and larger classes or classes that are in person and having to become distance learning?

Senator LeBlanc: Do it have to become distance learning? No, but if you have the same number of students that we deliver courses to and there are a fewer numbers of courses, I think it is necessary that we would have to open up more sections of those.

Senator Anderson: But it may be distributed differently, in the sense that the big classes that already have a lot of sections could have the same number of sections and the other classes that are offered in the core that normally have a smaller number could take up the slack. Added students in those medium-sized classes would receive new students who otherwise would have taken a class with very small enrollment.

Senator Lee: I was just thinking about in terms of available resources and areas of expertise of faculty.

Senator LeBlanc: I think we need to decide on how we proceed from here because I don't want to just end here and walk away. I need some gaudiness. Would you like to vote on a proposal?

Senator Dowd: No.

Senator LeBlanc: What would you like to do?

Senator LeBlanc: If a committee makes a proposal does it has to be seconded?

Senator Dowd: If there is a formal vote at the committee level, it does not need to be seconded at Senate.

Senator LeBlanc: I actually have nine out of eleven votes that approve the motion based on this. So, can we bring that forward for a vote?

Senator Dowd: If it is a motion from the committee it can go forward here.

Senator LeBlanc: I sent the motion out today and I got nine affirmative responses back. It is pretty much exactly what is on the slides.

President Powers: Would the Senate like to think about this?

Senator LeBlanc: I have hard copies too.

President Powers: Would the Senate like to think about this for two weeks?

Senator Heberle: The only major intervention that happened today is the idea of holding off on final approval of this until it is somehow piloted. However, I am not for certain how that would work.

Senator LeBlanc: Sometimes you just have to "jump into the water."

Senator Dowd: In my opinion this is far too important to just "jump into the water." Issues like this have been brought up before Senate in the past and they did not work well when we rushed to make a decision. I personally would like to see examples. I would like to see how this process would actually work.

Senator LeBlanc: No.

President Powers: I think because it is a complex and important issue that might be a good idea to distribute the information and we can decide at our next meeting.

Senator Anderson: I do think we can go back and talk more about this option of a "pilot program."

Senator Dowd: That's a good idea.

Senator Barlowe: But a motion has been made: right?

Senator Hoblet: That's right.

Senator Barlowe: So, we have to take action on that motion and not just say we will do it in two weeks.

Senator Dowd: But you can table it.

Senator Heberle: Yes, you can motion to table it.

President Powers: I need guidance from the Senate.

Senator Anderson: Motion to table.

Senator Dowd: Second.

President Powers: Is there any further discussion? Can I have a vote on the motion to table? All in favor? Any opposed? ***Motion passed.***

Senator Heberle: Steve, we just want to see you back up there again.

Senator LeBlanc: Thank you for listening again.

Senator Cluse-Tolar: Senator LeBlanc, I want to ask you a question. It's to my understanding that students graduate sometimes without science lab classes because we do not have enough of them. Will the reorganization of the core requirements make up for this? Will we have enough science lab classes available so that all students can meet this requirement?

President Powers: I know that it is getting close to the hour of 6:00 p.m., but I am wondering if Chancellor Gold or Provost McMillen would like to answer a few questions from the Senate.

Provost McMillen: Greetings.

Senator Batten: I have a question and I guess I will ask Dr. Gold. In the presentation about the library, you talked about the staffing. At least on the Health Science Campus the libraries are funded through the colleges. What is the model on the Main Campus? I am really confused because it didn't sound like that was centralized through COIL which is different on the two campuses. Is it going to be a different alignment?

Chancellor Gold: I do not know the answer to that question. I do know that the models for the two campuses are indeed different. I also know that there are specific accreditation standards from the CCNE, LCME, and ACPE etc. which talk about information resources for students. I also know that our students are very sensitive about library hours and access to specific data bases etc. I commit to you that as our colleges continue to work through these discussions; I will remain extremely involved with looking at these resources and obtaining (at minimum) the accreditation standards and hopefully provide as much resources as possible. Maybe Dr. Pryor can address your concern.

Dr. Pryor: Not without talking to faculty.

Senator Dowd: On a related issue, can you provide any insight about the library fees? Are those funds ever going to be delivered to the library? It goes to the general fund; it is by all count an increase in tuition. It is not a fee. I think what we have here is a matter of truth in advertising. Students are being billed and they are paying a fee for the library. There is no evidence that shows that the money is being sent to the library. Could you please comment on that?

Chancellor Gold: I can only tell you what I know. The library budget is a multi- million dollar budget. I am not aware of the sources of those funds and what percentage of them that comes from fees, what percentage of them comes that from tuition, what percentages of them that come from state funds or other sources of funds. I can't tell you an exact answer, I don't know Senator Dowd.

Senator Dowd: Okay, that is fair.

Senator Rouillard: I have a question about the budget short fall which has been identified today as $30-35 million dollars. It is my understanding that we lose approximately $ 18.6 million dollars to the stimulus funds that are no longer available. There has been an estimate that there will be an increase of $

28

14 million dollars due to an increase of utility cost, health care cost, and union negotiations which brings us to about $ 32 million dollars. Then I heard that there have been $ 7 million identified in offsets IN budget hearings. There is the increasing likelihood of the Twelfth SSI payment which is $7.9 million dollars. So, we could have about $14 million in offsets. So, could you talk a little bit more about this figure and also if we do get the SSI payment, is that going to go back to all of the units that made those cuts to make that possible?

Provost McMillen: Probably. Let me respond to that. First, we have no official word.

Senator Rouillard: I know, I'm just saying likely. If it's likely then what would happen?

Provost McMillen: Basically it hasn't been discussed because it is just not there yet. The $30-35 million figure has been a consistent one, up to $40 million dollar at some point in time.

Senator Rouillard: Where does that come from?

Provost McMillen: Well, it is an estimate basically from finance and it has not been modified. It appears that it will continue through the budget hearings which still have about two weeks to go. The budget hearings will continue with that "20% cut" that all of the units have been presented with. We had a budget hearing today and a couple yesterday and they continue to April 10th before the last one. We have gone through about half of the academic budget hearings and about 2/3^{rds} of the administrative ones. There are still a quite a few to go.

Senator Rouillard: And Administration is being asked to a 20% cut as well.

Provost McMillen: I think government relations.

Senator Dowd: Do you mind if I ask you about a related issue? It's one that I am sure that you are well aware of; the three college computing directors that were fired and the justification for their termination was the 1.5% budget cut due to the projective loss of the state share instruction. If we receive that payment, will those individuals be rehired?

Provost McMillen: As you know that was not an academic decision.

Senator Dowd: I know.

Provost McMillen: I'm just stating it for everybody to know.

Senator Dowd: I apologize if I gave the impression that it was your decision to terminate those college computing directors. I know it was not.

Provost McMillen: I would certainly hope that that will be a consideration.

Senator Dowd: Because next Monday is the last day at UT for one of the individuals involved.

Provost McMillen: Yes, it is Monday.

Senator Dowd: If there's anything we can do to not disrupt their lives, it will be through leadership. I am not "lecturing." So if they are going to be rehired we should rehire them as quickly as we can.

Chancellor Gold: If I can just add that the estimations that are being currently made regarding the budget gap that has to be closed are based upon the total state envelope projections, based upon assuming that the distribution formulas within the state among and between universities, among and between graduate and undergraduate programs, among and between graduate and professional programs etc. are held constant. We don't know that, so we are estimating based upon the total amount of State reduction and based upon our projections of a gap that we would have to close if the State held us totally harmless. But until we get the product from the State in terms of understanding how much of this is going to be related to metrics such as degree completion and other metrics of students success how much is going to be based upon head counts. Again, the other lines within the taxonomy structure are preserved and intact, it is going to be very difficult. Hopefully it will balance out. For example, where there are additions in some there may be subtractions in others and the additions may be minor changes. But, it is really not known now, so I think that it will be a bit premature to put too many decimals points beyond the estimate that you brought forward.

Senator Heberle: How are visiting assistant professors positions being handled for this coming year?

Provost McMillen: The visiting rate right now is assumptions of 50%. Our duration is the 50% of the visitors is allocated so that department chairs can nail down certain visitors that they want for specific reasons.

Senator Heberle: So it means 50% of the previous year from each department. What if a dept has only one?

Provost McMillen: We will round up. Yes.

President Powers: Thank you very much Provost McMillen and Chancellor Gold. That concludes the executive business, is there any other business from the floor?

Senator Skeel: I wanted to make a clarification of the statement that I made before about whether the recommendation of the Senate goes to the Provosts and in the introduction to each of the Faculty Senate Committees in the Constitution Appendix state "…carrying out these duties they are duties that the committees will make recommendations to the Senate. Upon approval the Senate will move forward. The Committee then will make a recommendation to the Provosts." So it is clearly stated what that process is.

President Powers: Are there any other general questions?

Senator Regimbal: I am sure that all of you know that the University of Toledo women basketball team is playing Charlotte in the Final Four of the WNIT tournament at Savage arena tomorrow. I would hope that we all go out and support our school and students.

President Powers: May I have a motion of adjournment?

IV. The meeting is adjourned at 6:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Hoblet   Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary   Faculty Senate Office Administrative
                                                               Secretary