

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of February 14, 2012
FACULTY SENATE

<http://www.utoledo.edu/facsenate> Approved @ FS meeting on 03/13/2012

HIGHLIGHTS

Dr. Penny Poplin-Gosetti, Michael Sabbah, Jacob Hessey, William McMillen

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 Lawrence Anderson called the meeting to order, **Lucy Duhon**, Executive Secretary, called the roll.

I. Roll Call: 2011-2012 Senators:

Present: Anderson, Batten, Brickman, Cappelletty, Christ, Caruso, Dowd, Duggan, Duhon, Eisler, Franchetti, Giovannucci, Hammersley, Heberle, Hewitt, Hill, Hornbeck, Hottell, Humphrys, Kistner, Kranz, LeBlanc, Lee, Lipman, Lundquist, Mason, Molitor, Moore, Moore, Nazzal, Ohlinger, Peseckis, Piazza, Plenefisch, Randolph, Regimbal, Rouillard, Skeel, Teclehaimanot, Templin, Thompson, Thompson-Casado, Weck-Schwarz, White, Yonker

Excused absences: Cooper, Cuckovic, Dismukes, Ellis, Hoblet, Powers, Sheldon, Slutsky, Solocha, Wedding, Wilson

Unexcused absences: Hamer, Hey, Lingan, Malhotra, Moynihan, Nandkeolyar, Shriner, Tinkel, Willey,

II. Approval of Minutes: Minutes from the eighth^{meeting} are ready for approval.

President Anderson: I am calling the meeting to order. Happy Valentine's Day and welcome to the ninth Faculty Senate meeting of academic year 2011-2012.

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

You all have received the minutes for our last meeting, on 31 January. I remind all speakers to use the portable microphone, and begin with your name. Are there any corrections from the floor? Do I hear a motion to accept the minutes of 31 January? All in favor? Any opposed? Please let the record show the Minutes from January 31st meeting have been approved. And thank you, Quinetta, for preparing the copy because it is always a great task and you do a great job.

III. Executive Committee Report

Several months ago, Sharon Barnes and Barbara Floyd submitted a Faculty Senate log item requesting that the Senate look into the issue of the Eberly Center and its leadership. Apparently, a change in the center's focus has been instituted, and there is no full-time leader. The Executive Committee has considered this item, and will invite concerned individuals to address the Senate at its next meeting. Dean Pryor of COIL presented information to the Executive Committee about revising the first-year experience of our undergraduates into a much more intentional and interventional program. He will report to Senate at our next meeting. On a related topic, seven UT people including myself visited

Howard University and the University of Maryland, Baltimore Campus to inquire into their practices for increasing the retention and graduation rates of minority, in particular, African American, students. These institutions are well known for their successful graduation and placement of such students. Drs. Rubin Patterson and Willie McKether from the Department of Sociology and Anthropology organized the visit, and will give a report at a future meeting. At our next Executive Committee Meeting, Dean Jamie Barlowe of the College of LLSS will present information on that College's plans for a three-year degree and other innovations.

At the Board Academic and Student Affairs Committee meeting this morning, Chancellor Gold presented a very encouraging record of increase and performance among applicants and graduates of the MD programs. Much of this increase is due to the work of Dr. Jim Kleshinski, Associate Dean of Admissions. Also at that committee meeting, 14 sabbatical leave requests were approved, and the Faculty Senate was deliberately recognized for its effort in revising the University Core Curriculum. Other issues considered by the Executive Committee in concert with President Jacobs and Provost McMillen will be discussed later in the agenda. That concludes my report. Would the other Executive Committee members like to add commentary? Are there any questions about that?

Senator Hewitt: How many sabbaticals were approved and how many were rejected?

President Anderson: Fourteen were approved out of twenty-eight.

Senator Hewitt: How does that compare historically?

President Anderson: It is about the same as last year's, but it is quite different from very long past practices. What was interesting this year was a lot of the awards were made to more senior faculty than last year. Last year the preferential awards were given to first time requesters of sabbaticals. This time it is a more equal mix of both.

Senator Dowd: Is that a reflection of having fewer untenured faculty members?

President Anderson: I don't know the answer to that, there wasn't any explanation given. But, at the Board meeting they did present the activities that all of the awardees were going to be doing, and I must say it was a very stunning list of intentions by these sabbaticals.

Senator Hewitt: What about the distribution between full-year and one semester sabbaticals?

President Anderson: Okay, I can go through here: one, two, three, four, five.

Provost McMillen: There were three full-year and one semester. Overall, there were four full-year, and three of the four full-years were in the group.

President Anderson: Okay, let's move on to the other reports. Senator Nick Piazza has a report from the Ohio Faculty Council.

Senator Piazza: Thank you. There have actually been a couple meetings since the last time I gave a report. We had two meetings; the second was a follow-up meeting, so I thought I'll report on the both of them. The first item that I have has to deal with OhioLINK: The good news is that OhioLINK is now fully funded through 2014. The OBOR is looking for ways to pay for OhioLINK after that time. The plan right now is for OhioLINK to remain a model for the country. So the OBOR wants to see OhioLINK survive and prosper. The problem right now is that OhioLINK gets funded out of the capital budget bill. Last year there was no capital budget bill so no funding. The Kasich administration is looking at moving funding to the operating budget bill. Putting funding in annual budget bill would make funding more secure from year to year. Just for information purposes: The OBOR will relocate to the same building as the Ohio Dept of Education in April. The move is intended to increase collaboration for all levels of education, K thru 20. We are in the process of trying to get additional information about STRS, however: The STRS proposals that we have been hearing about for the past two years are on hold. The legislature has contracted with a consulting group to essentially replicate the study that STRS did 2 to 3 years ago. One side effect of waiting is that STRS may lose liquidity during the study period. This means one of four things will have to happen: (1) the legislature will have to make up the lost liquidity, (2) members will have to accept cuts in benefits, (3) members will have to increase their contributions to maintain current benefit levels, or (4) some combination of the above. We've asked for representatives from STRS to come and speak to us at our next meeting so we can get some idea as to how STRS is appearing in this economy. There are a couple of items on OBOR funding that I want to report: First, the OBOR is considering a policy change that would put more emphasis on degree attainment and certification for distribution of SSI. The goal is to increase the percentage of the population with a degree in higher education from 36% to 43%. Discussions currently center on how much emphasis should be placed on degree completion. Second: The OBOR is debating where they would like to see developmental courses taught: either in universities, community colleges, adult workforce education centers? It would appear that the OBOR would like to get universities out of the remediation business and insure that students coming into university are ready for higher education. The goal is to improve completion rates and degree attainment. No one is quite sure what the implications will be for open enrollment universities like Toledo, since our charters require that we admit any applicant with a high school degree regardless of readiness. We could be compelled to provide remediation without reimbursement or our charter could be changed so that open enrollment universities can be more selective. This is still up in the air and still being discussed at this point. That concludes my report. Are there any questions?

President Anderson: Thank you Senator Piazza. Next, Mr. Michael Sabbah, the President of the Medical Student Council, and Mr. Jacob Hessey, President of the Toledo Chapter of the AMA will give a presentation on student activities and engagement here on the Health Sciences Campus, and they will be joined by Cara Elmer who is a representative on the council.

Michael Sabbah: Good evening everybody. Thanks everybody for inviting us here to tell you a little bit about ourselves and our organizations. The first thing that I wanted to do is tell you what Medical Student Council does. So what we do is: We are student advocates in a nutshell. If a student comes up to us and has a problem and/or a suggestion we do everything we can to make that happen or not happen depending on the circumstance. So not only that, we work with administration very closely; we meet with them regularly to give them feedback on what's going on. We are lucky enough to have a good administration working with us because they really take student input to heart and we definitely appreciate it. Changing

gears a little bit, what I want to talk about is a few ongoing projects that we have. For example, I want to mention a little bit about the LCME process and how students are involved in it. First, the Medical Student Council is basically the head of the LCME student survey. So, as of now we have approximately 85% of the entire medical student body who have responded to that survey and the survey doesn't close until next Sunday at midnight. We are excited to see the results and as of right now we can just briefly look over them, but we don't have any analysis done. I'm sure many of you are anxious to see those results as are we. The other thing that I wanted to mention about the LCME process is student input. There are several subcommittees for the LCME process and students sit on three of those subcommittees. So, for instance the Medical Student subcommittee which deals with all the points of the medical students, three students sit on that. The other thing that I want to talk about is our talent show. This is our biggest event of the year and it is a charity event. We invite students to come in and show off their talent, and of course, students have talent. We give most of the proceeds to charities. So, this year we are really excited about it because it is going to be bigger and better, hopefully at the Doermann Theatre. And we are hoping to provide a little bit of a liquid courage for the audience as well. So, maybe that can draw in a good crowd and we are really looking forward to it. With that said I would like to first introduce Cara Cara, she is going to talk to you about how medical administration and counseling are working together to get a new student help wellness center for us.

Cara Elmer: One of the really big projects that we had this year was trying to work out the student Health Center. Last year the Student and Employee Health Center was closed and we got a lot of feedback from students after it closed. Working with administration: Dr. Gold, Dr. French, Olivia Dacker, Rick Huay, and Dr. Medding we all came to the conclusion that the best solution was to build a new student health center. The center was built and it was opened in the middle of January. It is located in the basement of the Rupert Health Center in room thirteen. In the first two weeks we had about seventy-four students who visited the Health Center. We are trying to continue to put advertising out there so all students will know that it is available for all students at UT. It is not available just for the medical students; it is for all students on the Health Science Campus as well as students from the Main Campus. So we are very excited about that and it is a huge deal for the students and I think they really appreciate that. Some of the feedback that we received from the students so far is the check-in process. Currently students are supposed to check-in upstairs with the main check-in, so there are issues with privacy, but we are working through it, as Mike said, "it is a work in process." We are also working to get a behavioral health therapist for students, which we really tried to have before, but it wasn't related to the students enough; they didn't know when the hours were available or who to call, so we are really trying to get that kind of communication out there to the students once we have a behavioral therapist. So, I think those are the main concerns that students have right now and we are working on it and we are really excited about

Jacob Hessey: Just to give an example what the LMA does, I thought it was a great event, last night we just go back. We had four students go to Washington D. C. for the LMA Sponsor Lobby Day. The event pretty much ran Sunday night to Monday and we pretty much went and talked with the representatives of this area: Marcy Kaptur, Sherrod Brown, and Senator Rob Portman. We hit on three issues: graduate benefit education spots; we tried to get them to increase the amount of spots for residency training. We tried to lobby for them to repeal the sample growth rate payment which is how physicians are paid, and we also talked to them about medical student debt. So, we had about two-hundred medical students in Washington D.C. talking to representatives just trying to get something done and trying to represent some

of the medical students across the nation with the problems that we deal with. Overall, that's just some of the taste of what the LMA is, especially at the medical student level. Here at the local level, this weekend we are going to have the region five regional meeting. The region five includes: West Virginia, Kentucky, Ohio, Michigan, and Indiana, so schools from all those states will be here on the Health Science Campus on Friday and Saturday. Chancellor Gold will be talking on Friday and we will also have some guest speakers from other states and other organizations in good leadership positions in the LMA. One of the events that we are having at the LMA meeting this weekend just to show off Toledo a little bit, we are going to go to the Simulation lab on campus and get a chance to look at the three-dimensional arteriograms and some of the medical imaging that we provide here. We are going to put on some goggles and hopefully we will have a radiology resident or physician show them some of the technology that we use here at Toledo. Also, we are going to have an event where a bunch of specialties are going to sit at a table and students are able to spend five minutes each at each specialty and be able to learn about that specialty. We are hoping to have twenty or twenty-five specialties in groups of three and four. That is just a little bit of what the LMA is at the University of Toledo, a little of what we do at the national level, and a little of what we do at the local level. Thank you.

Michael Sabbah: If anybody has any questions for us please let us know, we will be around.

Senator Dowd: You mentioned a student medical center. Perhaps you would be willing to talk about the expense for students insurance and that for medical students in particular. I believe there are three options available for students, though I am not sure if medical students are required to purchase tier one, two, or three. My understanding is that it is exceedingly expensive, roughly \$5,000 per year.

Cara Elmer: I believe that is for Tier Three

Senator Dowd: Is that a standard for medical students at the University?

Michael Sabbah: To be honest with you, I'm not sure about that.

Cara Elmer: Yeah, I am not sure specifically. But in general, I believe it is the same for the other students at the University, but I am not sure.

Senator Dowd: I'm not sure it is the same for all students. It is my understanding that medical students have to purchase additional coverage because of the work that you do.

Cara Elmer: Right.

Senator Dowd: I hope the University recognizes that this option involves a level of expense that most other graduate student can't afford to choose. Do I have the correct amount? Is it approximately \$5,000 per year?

Michael Sabbah: To be honest again, I don't know, but I can check on it and get back to you and that is the best answer that I can give you.

Cara Elmer: I know that tier two is approximately \$2,400 per year, but I am not sure what the other ones are; I think that is the one that most people get.

President Anderson: Dr. Gold, do you have an answer to that?

Chancellor Gold: I do. I believe that there are at least two tiers and it also depend on whether a student is purchasing single insurance or family insurance. Many of our students have families, so therefore they need different types of coverage. I believe tier two coverage which Cara is referring to is approximately one and a half to two times what it would be for an undergraduate student, and I believe it is in the mid \$2,000s, not far from the number Cara gave.

Senator Dowd: I don't know if that is the family plan. Where I am going with this, Chancellor Gold, is that this is very expensive and I don't know if the University is any way trying to help offset some of the cost of this insurance for medical students.

Chancellor Gold: Essentially, we are the committee of faculty, administration, and students. Each time the contract expires which is approximately every two years in order to keep the cost down and make sure that the benefit packages that are offered are reasonable for what the students would want and need. However, it is extremely expensive, unfortunately as my health insurance and yours, Senator Dowd, is. Is the University trying to help? Absolutely. Investments that we made for the student services on this campus recently was not trivial, the staffing of that is completely absorbed by the University and we do everything we can to limit out-of-pocket cost, but at the same time increase... To answer your question, Senator Dowd if you are asking could we do better, always. We consider that as much as possible the cost of health insurance goes into the calculation. The total cost of attendance which then goes into financial aid packages etc. But, for it to go away and we give it away for nothing, we would have to find a way to do that.

Senator Batten: I have a question for Cara. It was a student in my office in with a great deal of distress and it is a lot of misinformation and a lack of information on this campus. I was told by some parties that Dr. Cox was available and I was told by other parties that only medical students qualify, do you know what the current state is for intervention prior to us paying a behavioral specialist in student health?

Cara Elmer: I'm not speaking from a personal experience, but what I understand by talking to other students, Dr. Cox is mainly available for medications, like getting refills on your medication. But, as far as behavioral therapist goes there is the Harbor Group that students are directed to, so that is a separate group I believe that is located on Central Ave. so they are able to go there. As far as having something on this campus at this time we are still working on hiring somebody.

Michael Sabbah: That process is actually going on now; we are trying to hire a new therapist for the Student Health and Wellness Center.

Senator Batten: It is probably a good opportunity to put information on the student health website about the Harbor Group is for continuing care, so if someone has a crisis they are more likely to go there. I also think that it will be pretty exciting to have someone here.

Cara Elmer: Absolutely. students just don't know where to go, so we are really working on that.

Senator Ohlinger: I believe this question may be for Dr. Gold. Are there differences in the cost for health insurance for all the students on the Health Science Campus or is it really just a reflection for the medical students?

Chancellor Gold: I believe it is multi-tiered and the selection of undergraduate versus graduate level students. I don't think if its medical students versus law students versus graduate students. I can get that information to President Anderson and the Executive Committee and they can share it with Senate. It is probably on the website I would think, As soon as we get that all set in stone we are going to do our best to tell students about it and to make sure information is getting out such as where to go and to know who to call etc. It has been a serious issue in the past and but we will get it out to you.

President Anderson: I think that would be very useful so we can see the comparisons on all levels and across all disciplines in some sense that there is.

Chancellor Gold: I believe there's at least two and possibly more.

President Anderson: Thank you very much. Finally, someone who needs no introduction by now: Dr. Penny Poplin Gosetti will give us a final summary of preparations for the HLC visit at the end of the month.

Dr. Penny Poplin Gosetti: Greetings everybody. I wish I can say that this is a wrap-up, but it is not, they haven't arrived yet, so you can't wrap something up until after they've been here. We are still moving. But it is a chance to update you on the final preparations for the HLC site visit which is the 27th through the 29th. Most of the stuff that we will be involved with will be on the 27th and the 28th. What I would like to do is tell you a little bit about the site team, and if I repeat myself I apologize.

In terms of the Site Team: We are not allowed to reveal the names. We do have ten representatives that are representing ten universities from eight states. The HLC region goes from Michigan, Ohio, Arizona, and Colorado; it is kind of a weird setup. So, we do actually have some people from Colorado, Arizona, and Michigan, so they are really coming from all over. I will say that the institutions that they represent are more like us than different. There is one institution that is a little smaller than us, but in general they are representing an institution such as ourselves and they hold positions ranging from a department chair to a president. Many of them I can tell you because I know some of these people professionally because I've been working with them, even though they are administrators they are actively engaged in their research and scholarship. The purpose of the site team visit is to validate the self study information. They already received this document on December 23rd and they also have access to a research room that has additional tenancies? and documents that are required by the HLC that they had a chance to read. I know they are reading it because we started getting fast and furious requests for additional information that supports the materials in here. So, if you see me typing I am responding to the Site Team and sending them things. Because they read this they come not without information, but they come prepared to ask us questions. So all the groups that we are working with right now they will come in and actually run all the

meetings with questions in hand because we can write anything we want in here, but unless we can validate it when they get here, it doesn't mean anything. So part of that is to validate and part of it is if we missed something in the report and if they want to know more about it they can ask us additional questions. Basically, they are going to have considerable time with our participation. We have a research room that is located in the Carlson Library and the Writing Center is going to be moved to the Learning Enhancement Center for a couple of weeks while they are here. In the meantime, we are actually cleaning carpets and painting and some other things so it will make the Writing Center look better and our occupants pleased with us. In that space they will have access to hard documents, wireless, and meeting rooms if they want to call individual meetings. They will spend quite a bit of time in there and they will spend every evening and every morning meeting with each other connecting about the sessions that they had. So the time we have with them is between 8:00-5:00 p.m., so making best use of that time is really important. They are also obviously going to be meeting with us, and the community members that cover each of the criterion core components, and they will have open forums with faculty, staff, and students. Per PowerPoint slide, these are most of the topics that we are going to be covering. It is not an exhausting list, but gives you a good idea of the meetings that we will be having. Throughout this week, next week, and a little bit of last week we have been doing orientation sessions with each of the groups that are meeting. The purpose of this is not to do any type of scripting, but to let these groups know without reading the whole three hundred plus page document where we have talked about that particular functional area and we also went a little over what to expect when talking to the Site Team. We had a couple of meetings where we've been kind of like a "deer in headlights," like "They are going to ask me what?" It is not a quiz, it is not a dissertation, but it is a conversation, so we are going over those kinds of things. In terms of the general kinds of meetings, there is a welcome reception on Sunday, February 26th for one hour. The purpose of that is a meet and greet for some of the key players and to also say "Here is what we are here for" and "Here is our purpose" and then they are going to change the schedule. Monday, February 27th we have an Economic Development Partners lunch, it is one of our community lunches that we are going to be having. On Tuesday February 28th they are having a breakfast meeting with the Board of Trustees along with the Community Partners. Now, the Community Partners are different from the Economic Development Partners and it is a group of our religious, cultural, political, and civic leaders. So that is an opportunity for us because Mayor Bell and a number of different people will be at that. Then the student leaders will be going to lunch with the Site Team on Tuesday also. I met with the student leaders yesterday, Matt Rubin was there, and we had GSA Student Government, medical students, law students, and CAP?, we've tried to get some of the umbrella organizations too. On Monday we are going to spend a lot of time of the Main Campus because again, this is where the Research Room is located. The day will begin with the president and the Senior Leadership Group and also the Self Study Steering Committee. The entire HLC Site Team will meet with the groups and their entirety. But in general, they will be splitting up. The Site Team is made up of ten people; two will be assigned to each criterion, therefore we will have criterion one, two, three, four, and five. We set up the meetings as they are best placed under each of those criteria and understanding that there's a huge overlap between the criteria and things are talked about in each of those areas. Also, in the morning they will meet with the Provost and the Chancellor under the umbrella of Academic Affairs and they will meet with the Strategic Planning Committee, people who worked on strategic planning. The Self Study Steering and Strategic Planning Committees are responsible for? a lot of understanding the process for which we used to develop both our self study and our strategic plan. One of the groups that they specifically asked was to meet with

Affirmative Action along with strategic planning, so they will be meeting with Affirmative Action in the morning along with Finance and Budget.

Student experience is not necessarily a student life area. The larger picture of student experience that has to do with retention and how we deal with student complaints and issues, so it is people like Kate Kaye Patten Wallace...and Peg Traband and some of the other people that's working on that larger global experience and then graduate and professional studies. So it is a busy morning. They then will go to the Economic Development Partners' lunch and then we skip Monday afternoon. Monday afternoon we are getting a little bit more granular and we are moving to a meeting with the deans where we will talk about enrollment and financial aid, primarily from a strategy stand point. One of the other areas that they asked specifically to talk about is research and we will be meeting with faculty leaders. There were four groups that requested a meeting with HLC and the HLC site leader wanted to do that, however asked that we do it in two meetings. General education is another big area; two of the criterion will be meeting with the General Education Group. Government Relations: College of Innovative Learning will also include distance learning and some of the...innovative types of things that we are doing across campus using technology. The UT Joint Foundation Investment Committee will be talking a little bit about the Dorr Street Gateway project, which is a great example in how we are combining engagement with student learning and a number of other things. So, while we do a lot of things this is a great example, and they will actually be able to see it when they drive by and that demonstrates several criteria that we are showing that we meet. On Monday there will be four forums for faculty and Main Campus students, and we will show you on Tuesday afternoon what the other ones are.

Senator Dowd: One issue raised at Graduate Council was the availability of the forums for faculty members.

Dr. Penny Poplin Gosetti: I'm still waiting to hear back from the Site Team leader regarding department chairs, which was the big question; I have not yet heard back.

Senator Dowd: To clarify for Senators, the issue that came up at Graduate Council was if this is a forum for faculty members, should that forum be open to department chairs and associate deans as well? Or should it be only faculty members without administrative positions? Dr. Poplin Gosetti reported to Graduate Council that she is looking into this issue.

Dr. Penny Poplin Gosetti: Yes, I am looking into it. So as soon as I hear back from them I will let you know.

Senator Dowd: Thank you.

Dr. Penny Poplin Gosetti: Tuesday morning is going to be the Health Science Campus. While being there the Site Team will have a chance to meet with the Health Science Campus administration to focus on some of the health education pieces. Also, you'll see a little later that we have some of the health education faculty. We are going to talk with them about institutional advancement and take them over to the Center for Creative Instruction and have present some of the faculty actually using some of the CCI's work in their classrooms and with their students. We'll have a session about libraries and also transfer in

the University of Toledo Innovation Crisis?. Diversity is another section that they specifically asked for. We'll have a session about information and instructional technology. We had a good group meeting on that yesterday, and one of the things that we are doing is we are doing the group orientation and making sure that we have the right people at the table to answer the questions. I will give you an example, we met with legal this morning and we realized that we didn't have anybody at the table to talk about how we deal with FERPA, HIPAA, and ADA, so one of the reasons we're doing the orientation also is to ensure that we do have people when there's a question that comes up that someone will have expertise in that area and can respond. A good question came out of Athletics yesterday; does anybody in the room know who is our Title IX coordinator? Those are the kinds of things they may ask and so Thea is raising her hand because she knows. Also, we are going to do experimental service learning. We are going to take them over to the...Center and meet. It is not just simulation, when we talk about experimental learning, this is co-ops, this is internships, this is service learning, this is study abroad, and study away, again it is very broad. We are going to have some students there that have been involved in these activities and some of the faculty that are working with them. Federal Compliance, this is the section that everybody must write as part of their report on terms of how do we respond to the Higher Education authorization requirements of the federal government. In addition to things such as how do we know the student taking the DL class is in fact the student who is getting the grade and things like that. So, there are a number of things that we must respond to and they want to meet with us on that and then we will have a little forum for the Health Science staff members in the morning. In the afternoon if we weren't tired enough yet, we will add institutional research. Let me broaden that definition, most of these are the offices of; they are people who are involved with, are users and consumers of, so in this area we are bringing people data from many different departments and who are users of those data. We will also have them meet with Athletics and also the global initiatives work that is being done, campus planning which is all about our facilities and how we are using our spaces. Student life is going to be more of the traditional student life area where we are talking about residence halls and some of the other kinds of functions. Undergraduate research, this is a great group because there are a couple of students in there that are going to take over the whole conversation and nobody will be able to say anything, but that is what this is about is having them see the kinds of things our students are doing and the opportunities that they have. Legal and policy alumni will have a forum for the Health Science Campus students. Actually, that is really misleading because what we are trying to do is have them on each campus so if somebody is tied up at their campus on the day of the forum they can go to the other campus. So, this is a little misleading to say that it is just for the Health Science Campus students.

Senator Dowd: For clarity, does your slide say the forums for faculty members are on Monday?

Dr. Penny Poplin Gosetti: On both campuses at the same time they will be occurring because Faculty Senate is on Tuesday.

Senator Dowd: I was not sure whether your slide said Main Campus or both campuses?

Dr. Penny Poplin Gosetti: It said "both faculty and Main Campus staff."

President Anderson: Is it likely that we might have somebody drop in the Faculty Senate meeting?

Dr. Penny Poplin Gosetti: Could be, but probably not, but is always a possibility. It is going to be on the Main Campus, right?

President Anderson: Right.

Dr. Penny Poplin Gosetti: I call it going “rogue,” they can do whatever they want. So, that is why we are going to have an escort so we know what they are doing. But they do like to get out and talk. We obviously have invited people to these meetings and they want to talk to people who we didn’t invite. So, they may stop in the cafeteria or they may attend a meeting; I really can’t tell you, I can’t promise you one way or the other.

President Anderson: Do they know our schedule?

Dr. Penny Poplin Gosetti: They will know all of these things. They even know things that we don’t know. I will tell you right now, they are doing their homework. This is a time right now where we schedule additional meetings. For instance, one of the things that I dread horribly is on Sunday night they are going to change the schedule. I have heard sometimes there are massive changes because after they read it and even though we sent the schedule to them they may decide that they really want to know more about “this” and more about “that.” So, while we scheduled all of these meetings we are asking people to be incredibly flexible because we may cancel your meeting, we may make it a longer meeting, we may add an additional meeting, we may need data that we didn’t know we needed etc. So we are asking for those two days that everybody be very open, understanding, and flexible because our goal is to make our Site Team happy and give them the information that they need. So like I said, I hope we did the most “stellar” schedule in the world, but I do anticipate some changes. Tuesday afternoon is the day that they can add those additional meetings and we set some time aside for them. Wednesday morning we have two fifteen-minute meetings: one is an exit interview with the president and the other is for presentation/comments. A couple more people may be there, but it is merely a presentation, it is not a conversation, it is not for questions and answers, and it is not a definitive statement on a recommendation. We will not know our final status until August; however I am sure we will have a good idea of how well we did in general. To answer your question, Mike here are the forums to the Main Campus and the Health Science Campus faculty which are both in the afternoon. Again, we apologize for that, however the Faculty Senate is the next day and we knew we couldn’t compete with that. The students have one on each day, the Main Campus from 4:30-5:20 p.m. and the Health Science Campus from 4:00-4:50 p.m. Please note if you have an old flier it may say HEB 103, but we moved it to one of the bigger rooms at the request of one of the faculty members from Grad Council and I thought that was a good suggestion. The Main Campus staff forum is on February 27th in the afternoon and we do encourage you if your staff asks to go that you do allow them to. The Health Science Campus staff forum will be from 11:00-11:30 a.m. because that is the time that we will be on the Main Campus.

Senator Dowd: Are there any forums which chairs and associate deans could attend?

Dr. Penny Poplin Gosetti: We’ve put together what they requested for us to put together and then a little bit more. I wished I would have said this at the Grad Council, but I did not, these are not really open forums in the way we think about them. We think about open forums where we get to go and ask

questions and put things on cards, but that is not how this is going to be. It is really about them coming in and doing validation so that notion of representation, this isn't about representation of a voice, but it is about coming up with groups that they can ask questions of. There will be some people that are not at the table because we can't put everybody at the table at that short period of time, so that is why I want to get the reading from the Site Team leader about what is expected in terms of the notion of faculty and administrators. Now, how we feel about that is a different story. I said in my e-mail to this person is that every campus thinks differently about what faculty administration is. So I was looking for input in regards to what the Site Team might consider that. But, if we were to do forums for every group we will be spending all of our time doing forums, and you can see all the other meetings we put in. I really agonized over this and I think I pushed them a little bit on adding some things; most campuses don't have two forums for each group and some campuses don't do staff forums.

President Anderson: How are you notifying the staff of these forums and the faculty for that matter? I'm sort of asking what the role is for Senate.

Dr. Penny Poplin Gosetti: The Senate can help in any way. When I met with the student leaders yesterday we talked about how the students are going to be notified and getting the fliers out, it really means a whole lot more when it comes from the peer group as opposed to somebody in administration saying "Be there." I know we've done a lot of advertising about HLC and I am really quite amazed about how many people know about it. So you can help a lot with making sure the rest of the faculty know and then getting into your offices and colleges for staff. Yesterday there was supposed to be an article in the paper about the forums so people will know when they are and where they exist. They have been put on on the screen savers and UT's daily news, so we are trying many ways as possible, but I think the most success comes from "grass roots" when people talk about it themselves and they take it back to their college etc. Two other things that I want to tell you: Site Team members will have badges, so if you see someone walking around with a blue badge that is a Site Team member. Anybody with a yellow tag is a HLC logistics person and if you have a question you can ask any of them. We are also going to have student ambassadors as escorts so they will be in their blue blazers and they are also people who can help answer questions for you. We want this to be no secrets and anything we can do to help, let us know. Are there any other questions that I can answer? Alright, if you have any other questions about this please contact me.

President Anderson: Thank you, Penny we will miss you a lot.

Dr. Penny Poplin Gosetti: I'm not going away.

President Anderson: But you are going on a well deserved vacation, correct?

Dr. Penny Poplin Gosetti: Correct.

President Anderson: Senators, I just want everyone to know, that while Penny and her team have been working day and night on the HLC project, hosting some of us at workshops, and reporting to all leadership and student groups, etc, Penny has also kept up with her academic advising of several graduate

thesis students. In Canada and other countries, she would be recognized with the title of a “National Treasure”. Please give a round of applause.

[Applause]

Dr. Penny Poplin Gosetti: Thank you. I really appreciate it. I’ll tell you that this is the greatest learning experience I’ve ever had. This is one way to get to know the campus in ways that nobody really gets the chance to do. I will tell you that there are fabulous people and we are doing incredible things. I think we get caught up in things sometimes that make us forget the great people that we are working with, the great students that we have, and the success that we have, so keep up the good work.

President Anderson: Alright, I will like to move on to an action item: At a previous meeting, University Core Committee Chair Mary Humphrys discussed the impact of the new competency-based general education curriculum on programs. One issue was that under the present system, certain courses can and do fulfill double duty in programs, both as a program requirement and as satisfying a State distributive requirement. In the interest of not adding credit hour requirements to a student’s career, the committee introduces the following resolution:

Whereas:

Requiring students to fulfill their State distributive requirements through competency-approved core courses may add unnecessary credit hours to a program,

Be it resolved that:

Program course requirements that previously served as concurrently fulfilling the State distributive requirements will continue to do so, with approval of the Faculty Senate Core Curriculum Committee.

It may be that Marcia King-Blandford has some input on this resolution. Is Marcia here today? We had some conversation about this, but let me leave it at that. I think in some sense we are safe with this kind of resolution, partly because we already do it and we are phasing the program in with new students and maintaining the old system for old students, so the courses that are presently listed as fulfilling the distributive requirement will still be listed by the state; at least until a cohort of students have moved through and out of that on the campus. So, I think we have a year or two to play here, but I just want to go on the record that programs will not be adversely affected by additional requirements.

Senator Dowd: For the record, could the Curriculum Committee give a specific example of how this is to be interpreted?

President Anderson: The one case that I know of, at least that it has come up many times is the business requirement for mathematics.

Senator Hewitt: In fact, it’s almost all math requirements such as engineering, business, pharmacy, physiology, you name it, and most students will get their state distributive math requirement outside the new University General Ed. core. I will say at least two-thirds of students.

Senator Dowd: I understand the point Senator Hewitt is making, but what will happen if something like this resolution is not in place? I think what we need for the record is a description of the issue that the

Curriculum Committee is dealing with and how we can try to address this issue.

Senator Humphrys: I think that I may have misunderstood the purpose of this proposal. It was sent to me and I looked at it, but I misunderstood and thought it was coming from the Executive Committee. I just want to clarify that it isn't directly coming from our committee. In other words, these are issues that we have concerns about, but I think when I met with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee that this was something that came out of that. But anyways with that being said, the issue we see as a committee as being something that has to be addressed is that if student is required, for an example from the College of Business, to take Math 1260--and Math 1260 is not going to be a course that will be included in the new competency-based core group of classes—we don't want those students to have to take 1180 to satisfy the new core requirement. We want them to be able to have a mapping system that says if you take 1260 you will have satisfied one of the math requirements that is part of the core. That really doesn't answer your question to whether we need to have this as something that is officially done by Faculty Senate. I know that the committee is here and I don't know if they want to add anything to that.

Senator Hewitt: Some of the alternatives were to do things like simply transcript courses like Math 1200 to Math 1280 for students who passed into engineering calculus. This would add to the number of credits that are required to graduate, whether or not students take the class and bump-up against constraints on the other end which are expected to build academic programs on 120 credit hours outside of those that have special accreditation requirements. So, this will eat up three credit hours for no other reason than we have decided to separate out this general education core from the rest of the programs. We have this problem that we've always had and have not faced up to; many students come in and place above the level that other students aspire to meet our general education math requirement. In the old core we had dozens of math courses to meet the core and we can't map that into the current competency-based system so we are at odds with the state student requirements.

President Anderson: I think in part this will end up being resolved when the competency-based core will get extended up through the programmatic process to the capstone experience where students will be assessed for a competency in mathematics or mathematical and scientific reasoning. The conflict is with the distributive state requirements of one math class, which is three credit hours of math and the coincidence of that distributive requirement with the general education portion of our curriculum. At this point one equals the other, the general education and the things that are designated as the general education that's part of the introduction of the core competency are also the courses for satisfying the state requirement.

Senator Dowd: As a friendly amendment, all business of the Core Curriculum Committee has to be brought to the full Senate for approval. The Core Curriculum Committee can make a list of the type of mappings Senator Humphrys spoke of, but given that this is the core I believe it has to be approved by the full Faculty Senate.

President Anderson: But it could be approved by a consent item, right?

Senator Dowd: I believe that none of these issues should ever be put on consent agenda because it is the university core and, hence, needs to be approved by the full Faculty Senate. The committee can make

recommendations but approval must be by the full Senate.

President Anderson: They can make it in a block form.

Senator Dowd: Standard curricular issues can be brought up as a consent agenda item, but not core issues.

Senator Molitor: I am also a member of the Core Curriculum Committee and I would just like to say that I do agree with everything that Senator Humphrys just said, although we have been kicking around similar ideas, I believe this resolution came from the Executive Committee. I also agree with Senator Dowd, I don't think anything that come out of our committee should end up as a consent agenda item and it should come to the full Senate.

Senator Dowd: For transparency, at the last Executive Committee meeting I asked President Anderson to talk with Senator Humphrys about this issue and suggested that the Executive Committee bring something like this resolution to Faculty Senate. I suggested this because we are facing a deadline that will require departments to submit syllabi to the Core Curriculum Committee. I thought that this committee will be "handcuffed" if Senate did not address this issue.

Senator Molitor: To add to this, what I was going to suggest rather than this be a resolution that basically says the Core Curriculum Committee will have the purview of approval, just make it as a recommendation from the Core Curriculum Committee that would be submitted for full approval by the Senate.

Senator Humphrys: Also I think one issue that the Core Curriculum Committee wants to make sure we are clear on is what the Faculty Senate charge is to the Committee. We believe our charge is to look at the courses that are applying to be part of this new competency-based "core," and recommend courses for inclusion into this new General Education core. It is my understanding that there will be another committee that will actually oversee the implementation and transition from the existing core to the new core, is that correct? When I met with the Faculty Senate Executive there were a lot of things that were discussed, so I want to make sure that we understand what our charge is.

President Anderson: Your charge is correct as far as just the approval of the core courses.

Senator Humphrys: Okay.

President Anderson: The implementation I am hoping is going to be fairly straightforward with the moving target or the moving cohort; as people come in one or the other, new students don't have a choice and the old students can have a choice, so it is a boundary between the new and old students moving through the years of their articulation and we certainly don't want to hold any student up, to do no harm to a student career is the basic principle.

Senator Molitor: If I can just follow up with that, I think she's asking if you are charging the Core Curriculum Committee not just to approve courses for the next generation core, but are you also asking us to make recommendations about the entire core curriculum?

President Anderson: No, I think we already voted on not any more courses to the old curriculum.

Senator Molitor: It's not just the matter of adding courses, but it is the matter of which requirements we are going to have: what set of courses do you have to take? Do you have to take two of "this" or three of "that"? There are a lot of issues that need to be resolved.

President Anderson: Right.

Senator Dowd: Regarding Senator Humphrys' point, I see the Core Curriculum Committee continuing to address these issues, but it doesn't have to be this year's Core Curriculum Committee.

Senator Krantz: Beginning Fall 2012, academic advisors will need a set of guidelines in order to accurately advise their students. ... we will have some idea of where the entire Core Curriculum will be going. Right now we are handling the very first foundational step which is the general education component.

Senator Dowd: I understand Senator Krantz's point. The Executive Committee members have discussed many of these points during many meetings over the past few years. I guess all I was trying to say is that the Core Curriculum Committee has to handle many issues, but one issue at a time. And this was a way of addressing just one of those issues. It does not get to the point that you are raising, but we have to have a plan in place by the end of this semester so advisors could start working with students in the summer to schedule their fall courses. Senator Krantz, is that consistent with what you were saying?

Senator Krantz: Yes.

Senator Cappelletty: It is not in the fall that the advisors are needed, but it is Rocket Launch because it starts very early on in the process and those freshmen need to be told what they need to take. So in my own example, in Pharmacy we allow an option of either Psychology 1010 or Sociology 1010 and Sociology 1010 is a course that is applied in the core, but Psychology is not. So are we going to be required to tell our students that they have to take Soc and they can't take Psych because it is not going to fulfill one of those core requirements? We have to have that plan in place ASAP. They are already planning to get the schedule set and getting material printed to put into the hands of the freshmen of what the first two years are going to look like around here.

President Anderson: Alright, I understood that Psych 1010 is possibly going into the core.

Senator Humphrys: We haven't received any paperwork.

President Anderson: Whether it does or not, that issue is still an issue at hand.

Senator Cappelletty: Yes, it is an issue at hand.

Senator Caruso: I have two things: Addressing her question about Psychology, wouldn't this resolution cover that because they currently state "This will fulfill the requirements?"

Senator Cappelletty: I don't know because I don't know if that is a requirement where math is going to retain a requirement, so the math example makes perfect sense, but some of these other things don't.

Senator Caruso: Yeah, but it says "...a course that fulfills the state distributive requirements."

Senator Cappelletty: Is that the intent of this resolution because I'm not very clear on that?

Senator Caruso: I think that covers it

Senator Humphrys: Again, I think this came from the discussions that I had with the Executive Committee; and as Senator Dowd has said, President Anderson asked us to put something together, there are numerous issues with the transition from the old core to the new core. Not to get too involved with it, but basically what we are saying is right now every student who gets a bachelors degree has to have two social sciences and they pick from this list, they have to have two humanities, and two natural sciences and they pick from this list, but those lists are going away and those lists are being replaced with the courses that right now people are asking to be included in the new General Education curriculum. There's not necessarily a one-to-one correspondence between the old and new cores. Now, foreign languages is a really good example because right now in the core curriculum the languages that are accepted to count towards your humanities credit include courses that don't fit the new state definition where we have to use foundational classes.. So the foreign language courses seeking approval for the new core won't match the current selections. The problem is that this could provide a resource issue because there will be different courses required for incoming freshmen, as opposed to current students. So, there are a lot of major issues and that is why I think that there needs to be some sort of a committee to oversee the transition to tackle issues like do we have enough teachers to teach the old and the numerous logistical issues as Senator Krantz was saying. We as a committee are not looking at these because we are looking at the course applications.

President Anderson: I want to limit the discussion and allow the next items to be discussed. Senator Dowd has suggested privately over here that we take this back, which I think I am willing to do and work out some of these issues that you have raised and come back to this at the next meeting and I think it is a good idea. Is that appropriate?

Group of Senators: Yes.

President Anderson: Okay, we will do that. Provost McMillen is here to discuss several issues, some of which have an impact on general education as well. Let's begin with what appears to be coming from OBOR regarding total credit hours, 3-year baccalaureate degrees, and new transfer guidelines for general education courses.

Dr. McMillen: Oh, sure I will wrap that up.

President Anderson: This is what scared me this morning when we talked.

Dr. McMillen: Interestingly enough, at 3:19 p.m. I received an e-mail that was sent around, of rules that have been distributed a few weeks ago in draft form and I assume these are the finals and it impacts on what you were just talking about. It is called *Decisions Rules for Assigning Levels at CIP Codes to Undergraduate Courses in the HEI Course Inventory*, which essentially means how we are going to get paid for teaching courses. I think perhaps the two most important people in this institution are rapidly becoming Marcia King Blandford and Nick Piazza because they interact with the Board of Regents. The Board of Regents is obviously moving forward on a number of areas with the change of administration, and the change of chancellors, and governors. One of the areas and I think this goes across, but subsidy will be awarded in its completion and graduation rates as a means to these subsidies. One of the most controversial items and it is listed up there is the 3 year baccalaureate degrees. As I said before, by October 2012, 10% of our programs at the University of Toledo need to be able to be completed in three years. By October 2014, 60% of our programs will need to be completed in three years. Now, there are a couple of things to be noted here, these are programs, not 60% of our students or 10% of our students this fall. Again, these are 10% of our programs and that is a very important distinction to be made. Also, another form of distinction is that this is not going to be required by students, students are not going to be put into a three-year degree program against their wishes. I asked Jamie Barlow and Dr. Jacobs to develop a three-year curriculum plan for Language's-Literature and Social Sciences degrees partly because I thought they will be the most flexible for adapting to this. There was a long e-mail sent out from the Board of Regents and it included the plan listed by Ohio State. Ohio State jumped in to this and offered a ten-page plan, but if you look at it closely, essentially it is no plan at all. All it is: if a student comes in with a year of college credit that was attained from some other way such as high school, military, or testing out of foreign languages then they are able to complete a three-year program; of course, because they came in with one year. Dr. Barlow tried to address this differently by actually creating a pathway so a student could enter without a huge number of previous credits from high school or by testing out and actually obtain a degree which is really in the spirit of the Board of Regents. Although, if you go to the Board of Regents website their only suggestion for accomplishing this is to take a bunch of credits beforehand. Dr. Barlow's plan essentially had students attending full-time from the summer before their first year taking a load of about 18 credits in modular form, in other words, we module eight week systems, essentially taking 68 credit hours in one year which completes the general education requirements and possibly early courses for that student's major. Then their second and third year will be equivalent to their junior and senior year of their major. In other words, a student will take a Theatre Major and a Film Minor. I know there are a lot of details that are being discussed and worked out, plus being debated, but the idea was to have 100 students cohort interested in this and if the student wants to drop out he/she can and go into a four-year program, which is coincidentally different from Ohio state because Ohio State essentially says if a student drops out they will get kicked out of school. So, that is the three-year baccalaureate degree and again, this is another instance of the Board of Regents responding to the legislative law because this was legislation for the budget amendment, the budget was passed a year ago. Anyway, that is my comment and is there any discussion about that?

Senator Peseckis: As I understand the way you are thinking of this is that a baccalaureate degree is actually an accelerated program that still requires, let's say 102 credit hours.

Provost McMillen: Yes.

Senator Peseckis: I thought initially the legislation was to save money; I thought they were implying if you get a baccalaureate you take “90” credit hours.

Provost McMillen: No.

Senator Peseckis: So, if it is still the same number of hours but it is an accelerated program, would that mean we need to offer more courses in the summer?

Provost McMillen: Even though the Ohio State plan mentions taking courses in the summer, students wouldn’t have as many credits as a full year. On the Board of Regents website it talks about taking courses in the summer as if no student ever does. I might say pharmacy, engineering, and other programs that have pre-professional undergraduates that move into professional programs, this is hardly impossible at all; because in engineering there are three internships and internships are death to this program. Ironically, the Board of Regents is pushing for all majors to have internships. Senator Piazza, did I say anything wrong here?

Senator Piazza: No. Just for sake of clarification, what you are seeing is this effort to put more degrees into the hands of Ohioans faster.

Provost McMillen: Yes, that is the real reason. It is not so much to save money, but a three-year degree means more.

Senator Piazza: Somebody needs to figure out how to do a regression analysis with Excel I think, but what they discovered is if we can increase the proportion to about 36% from about 33% it would mean about a billion dollars for the economy in Ohio. Plus, it will make Ohio much more competitive in trying to lure jobs into the state. The politics and the economics of it make sense from a logical pedagogical, but I am not sure if it makes a lot of sense to do this because as Provost McMillen said, if you have a one-year internship with your degree, how do you do that? I really don’t think anybody actually took a look at the number of credits people have to achieve and divide that by three and tried to figure out if you have a degree or not.

Senator Rouillard: Just a quick question, you said the three-year plan that was proposed by Dr. Barlow would include some session work prior to coming in?

Provost McMillen: It will not exclude a student and that is what I meant.

Senator Rouillard: I think if you can rely a little more heavily on more course offerings and summer sessions as you said “it becomes much more doable.” As President Anderson pointed out on the Ohio State web page what the state seems to be calling for is simply array of options such as more summer sessions, such as A.P. credit, or dual enrollment and those kinds of options which then makes it much more possible to do a degree in three years.

Senator Lipman: I have just one question and one observation: If there weren’t credit creep and all the degrees were 120 credit hours for a baccalaureate degree and I understand a part of this objective as well

was to indeed have 120 hours opposed to 126 or 128 which is what a number of our baccalaureate degrees have moved up to and that is part of this objective as well.

Provost McMillen: The three year baccalaureate degree doesn't drive 120 hours; the 120 hours were driven by all the quarter system universities switching to semesters and establishing 120, therefore everybody else who was on semesters will ever have student out course.

Senator Lipman: Help me out if I misunderstood this: Dr. Barlow's presentation to the LLSS Council indicated that the degrees will be 120 credit hours regardless of whether or not they are a three or four year degree henceforth, is that correct?

Provost McMillen: Yes.

Senator Lipman: I think that impacts a lot of our degree programs in various colleges because we will lose a course or two or maybe more than that. The other thing: wouldn't it be an incentive to the students, and I don't know if the budget model can accommodate this- to offer a semester base tuition for which a student can take as many credits as he/she wants. And let them maximize their own programs and buy a semester worth of education whether it's 12 credits, which is fulltime, or 21, or 24 credit hours, which is also fulltime for the same cost.

Provost McMillen: I think that will have to be looked at because there is a range.

Senator Lipman: Right now it is 16 credit hours, so if you go above 16 credit hours you will start paying per credit.

Provost McMillen: I think that is a very good observation.

Senator Hammersley: I guess part of my question is since everybody has gone to the full semester system instead of quarters have anybody looked at the impact that this requires on faculty to increase the coverage for the summer and if you look at buying each semester are there slots for each course to allow to allow that kind of expansion? I mean there are some brilliant people that may get away with it, but that is really not where students coming in are, to be able to go through at an accelerated pace. The faculty demand to fill summer as their compensation goes to the university the university has to come up with it as well as do we have enough slots.

Provost McMillen: There are a lot of questions that we have to answer and I think those are very good ones. The way this cohort will work and the paradox that will come in two years when we suppose to offer the...programs if everybody doesn't want to be a single major are you going to have classes in the summer for two kids because they are science majors and five for theater because how would that work?

President Anderson: Plus the factor that you have two different cohorts, so the scheduling will have to be included.

Provost McMillen: Yes.

Senator Heberle: I see this as a growing nightmare and obviously it will have to unfold. I think a lot of concern with our college, LLSS through putting out a very concrete plan that looks the way Dr. Barlow's looks we are sort of walking a plank in term of "getting put out there" in terms of this success/failure possibility for this program. I know that is required and I know that it is a cohort level, but it is layering on a complexity in our college in terms of scheduling that is profoundly difficult. Also, in terms of our concern about the lack of flexibility and the compacting the core in one year, instead of allowing it to unfold and allowing the kinds of questions and discussion that we are having here to be raised and maybe put as a pushback at the state level as you were suggesting, we are being made to be "put out there" as a college with this plan and it may not do this college a hack of a lot of favors. So, I just want to put that out there as part of the concerns that we raised because it is a lot to be said for a three year degree program. Whether or not we need to back off from it and I know that OSU doesn't make a lot of sense, but the fact is that any student can come in and do a degree in three years. So, I am a little baffled why we are putting out this special program or this special idea.

Provost McMillen: I can answer that, but it is not going to be a very good answer. The Board of Regents requested that all the universities put forward some ideas. In a way we can fall back on what Ohio State did and simply say, "Fine, every kid that comes in with 30 credits we will give them a three year degree," but the idea from both Ohio University and ... Council was to offer up some plans and there's only one that I've seen so far besides Dr. Barlow's where she tried to avoid a lot of things was the Ohio State plan. It's not exactly what you are asking, but it is a part of what this means.

Senator Piazza: there is one proposal that I think is worth taking a look at and it includes putting a college degree in the hands of thousands of students in a hurry - if a student completes 60 credit hours they are awarded an Associate's Degree. There are a lot of students that maybe drop out after their sophomore year and before they graduate with a baccalaureate degree and that will certainly put college degrees literally in the hands of half the undergraduates. I think we are close to it and probably around the state as well. There are students that will qualify for it right now who are eligible for an Associate's Degree.

Provost McMillen: Literally thousands, all of our juniors and seniors.

Senator Batten: We looked at something similar to this a couple of years ago (College of Nursing) and even though I don't have an answer it could be considered- there are some ramifications for students if they have a degree and are getting another degree and it stands for a baccalaureate degree. We ought to probably examine that because it sounds good, but I don't know the ins and outs.

Provost McMillen: There's also one that is closer to that, if a student transfers from a community college to the University with less than the community college credits for a degree when they reach that number of credits at the University the student can go back to the community college that they attended and that college will give them a degree, Owens Community College.

President Anderson: We should move on to another topic. I just wanted to hear a little about the amelioration and how that was shaping up and whether we have approved proposals at this point.

Provost McMillen: I am not sure if we have approved proposals, but some actions have been taken for it and I think the most noted one that most of you know about is that the president released about \$500,000 to the Graduate College to hire approximately thirty-five additional graduate students from the pool of graduate students came in. She says that it is a good pool and that process is on the way. It is hoped that if we use this money affectively we can probably gain a couple million dollars. It is moving forward and the business plans are being examined right now, Brenda Grant who most of you know is sitting in the audience and a few others are all getting together to work through business plans for the budget and this will also affect the amelioration plans. There are various subcommittees that we created through students' experience and Kate Wallace is handling that one and we do not have a final report. We do have a final report on the community college amelioration. Work Place Efficiencies is another subcommittee and Brenda asked if she can say a couple of words on that committee and that report is done.

Brenda Grant: There are two things that we looked at which were office supplies- how can we combine our contracts with the Health Science Campus and gain some dollar value for our purchases there. In addition to that, we are also looking at shipping, Fed Ex cost- how can we negotiate a better price with them for incoming and outgoing shipments. For staffing efficiencies, some of us have reduced staffing in one area so we looked at the Registrar Office with the College of Law Registrar's Office – how can we work together differently to maximize the staff that we have here and for function wise, just getting a better process in place for the reduced staff that we have. Another area that we are starting to look at is how can we gain dollar value with subscriptions. Various departments around the campus might be getting the Chronicle newspaper and so we want to do a survey to see how many people are buying that within their department and if we combine together maybe we can get about a volume subscription so everyone can still get that subscription and maybe the University can save funds. So, those are the sort of things we've been looking at.

Provost McMillen: Just as a final statement, all together the amelioration process was hoping to have about \$2 million dollars minimum effect on the budget and estimates have gone up there to as high as \$8 million, but that is probably unrealistic. But, we are hoping that it will affect the budget. As you know, it looks like we will be moving to the budget hearings in mid March. We will be addressing a \$15 million dollar deficit and Dr. Jacobs has set that as a limit, but finance says that it might be a little higher and that will not come from strictly academics; that will be across the campus, offices, and other general areas.

Senator Dowd: At the Finance and Strategy meeting, Vice President Dabney spoke of a similar report being generated for non-academic units. Do you know when that report will be available?

Provost McMillen: We are both shaking our heads, no. I am not sure how that is different from the things Brenda just said.

Senator Dowd: Vice President Dabney said that the current proposals from non-academic units have been posted on the web. The discussion was having a report about the non-academic proposals, similar to the academic proposals, being posted on the web that indicates which non-academic proposals were accepted.

President Anderson: I have one other question for Dr. McMillen which is the faculty hiring plan. Do people want to continue for five minutes to talk about faculty hiring?

Group of Senators: Yes

Provost McMillen: I don't want to leave out my colleague, Dr. Gold and what I have is an e-mail that has been widely circulated and it list a number of requirements from the president for new hires and how new hires would have to fit all requirements. But, since then Dr. Gold and myself have met with Dr. Jacobs and Dr. Jacobs has met with the Executive Committee and we decided that this is a guideline it is not meant to be a check list for you. It would be impossible to hire someone if they do not fulfill all the requirements. You all might disagree, but in the world that I live in I am actually pleased to have this because it advise where we are in the hiring process and senses has come out and it has been a number of movement to hire new faculty in a number of different areas. It does present some challenges, but one that is often quoted which is bringing in research money which is not easy for anyone these days. The president is fully aware of different measurements from departments such as Humanities and Arts and he is certainly willing to entertain those and has been. The hiring of minorities is still a high priority and it is an institutional goal. So, essentially I think we can work with these.

Senator Heberle: When you said that there are some hiring practices going on, what do you mean?

Provost McMillen: This does not create a new process.

Senator Heberle: I know.

Brenda Grant: We haven't had a specific call for faculty request for new funding, but if you have a vacant position you can certainly put that request forward and that is utilizing the online system.

Senator Lundquist: What is a vacant position? This letter from Dr. Jacobs very clearly states that a number of things do not count.

Brenda Grant: Within a department it is an opportunity for the college to assess their needs and if you need to replace the academic area where that person was then you should put that request forward.

Senator Dowd: What are the financial discussions involving replacing faculty due to retirement, separation from the University, or death? The administration suggests that replacing faculty members is somehow a budget increase. I do not understand that language. Replacing a faculty member does not involve a budget increase. At best, it is status quo. And replacing a senior faculty member with an Assistant Professor at a lower salary implies a budget reduction. Then we're told that all such requests will be sent to Internal Audit for justification. Provost McMillen, one part I don't understand is why Internal Audit is being asked to audit such decisions. Another part is how Internal Audit going to audit such decisions. While Internal Audit can certainly evaluate tuition revenues, state share of instruction, external grant funding, I don't understand how that office can evaluate the non-monetary aspects of hiring a faculty member, such as curricular needs and development, program accreditation, etc.

President Anderson: As I recall from the letter, there was some comment about the actual salary line itself, whether that was fully salaried by the University or whether the new faculty member has to bring in additional funding that would actually be part of their salary.

Provost McMillen: There has certainly been some discussion with that. Again, as I just said in certain areas that is just not feasible.

President Anderson: But even for scientist to be expected to pay half of their salary by a grant is a little bit extreme, maybe their summer salary.

Provost McMillen: There are areas in the University where that is going on. Senator Dowd, I guess I can answer your question by saying that it is not going to be one on one replacement anymore. I think each of the departments and colleges should look at some of the ideas that have been discussed such as the idea of fitting into schools and the idea of reformatting a department on how it might better react to certain things that have been put forward in our strategic plan etc. I don't think it closes out. Now, chairs and deans are going to be faced with dilemmas in major needs to have course "X" taught for students to graduate and if it doesn't really fit anything then that is going to be up for a big discussion about how that course has to be taught.

Senator Heberle: To me, the main concern is that the letter suggests if a major needs 150 majors taught to graduate we will hire contingent faculty or a lecturer to do it, unless you can show somebody who can bring in research money from outside and that was the message of that letter. We haven't had a one on one replacement on this campus since I've been here, basically. I mean my department has shrunk in the last decade by half so that's not really what worry me as much as it was the tenure track issue and who gets hired in as tenure track.

Senator Ohlinger: I have a comment on that as well; whether it was the intent of the letter or not I think that it was read and perceived by many that way because of those words. So, I think it reads that you need to justify if this be done by a long term lecturer or temporary one. We have the idea that we are going to invest in faculty, but that really doesn't sound like investing. It sounds like, "How can we do this the cheapest possible way?"

President Anderson: Okay, we are running way over time here and I think we should close it at that. Do I have a motion to adjourn?

IV. Meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted by:
Lucy Duhon
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape Summary: Quinetta Hubbard
Faculty Senate Office Administration Secretary