

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of November 6, 2012
FACULTY SENATE

<http://www.utoledo.edu/facsenate> Approved @ FS meeting on 1/15/2013

HIGHLIGHTS

A Discussion of the Staff Absence Policy
The Core Curriculum – Unfinished Business and Plans for AY2012-2013

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 Michael Dowd called the meeting to order, **Lucy Duhon**, Executive Secretary, called the roll.

I. Roll Call: 2012-2013 Senators:

Present: Present: Anderson, Bailey, Barnes, Cappelletty, Cochrane, Crist, Denyer, Dowd, Duhon, Edinger, Ellis, Giovannucci, Gohara, Hamer, Hewitt, Hey, Jorgensen, Keith, Kranz, Lee, Langan, Lundquist, Molitor, Ohlinger, Plenefisch, Quinlan, Relue, Rouillard, Sheldon, Springman, Teclehaimanot, Templin, Thompson, Thompson-Casado Van Hoy, Weck-Schwarz, White, Williams

Excused absences: Ariss, Brickman, Cuckovic, Duggan, Eisler, Franchetti, Gilbert, Hoblet, Hornbeck, Humphrys, Moore, Moynihan, Nigem, Piazza, Randolph, Wedding, Wilson

Unexcused absences: Cooper, Hammersley, Hill, Hottell, Nazzal, Rooney, Tinkel, Willey

II. Approval of Minutes: Minutes from October 9th meeting are ready for approval.

I call the meeting to order. Welcome to the sixth Faculty Senate meeting of academic year 2012-2013. I ask that Secretary Duhan come to the podium to call the roll.

The minutes of the October 9th meeting of Faculty Senate have been distributed to Senators. May I have a motion to approve those minutes? Is there a Second? Any discussion? All of those in favor of approving the Minutes of October 9 please say, "aye." Any opposed? The Minutes to the October 9th Faculty Senate meeting have been approved. Thank you.

I have been asked by Quinetta to remind you that if you speak at the meeting today, please indicate your name, so she can make record who spoke and when. This is quite important for when she constructs the Minutes of our meeting.

Next, I will turn to your Executive Committee report. Last week your Executive Committee met with Vice Provost Penny Poplin-Gosetti to discuss a number of issues focusing on assessment and possible future steps and actions. In broad terms, there are three assessment issues. The first is overall assessment via the university's Assessment Committee, the second is assessment of general education courses, and the third is a discussion of possible expansion of competency areas. I notice that Vice Provost Poplin-

Gosetti is in attendance tonight. Penny, could you give a thirty second description of the conversation? And, did I adequately summarize assessment activities in that very brief description?

Vice Provost Poplin Gosetti: That was a nice condensed version. I thought it was a good conversation; one of the things that we talked about was sort of teasing out some of these things because my fear is assessment has now become a “dumping pot” for a lot of things and we would like to tease out some of the issues so people are clear on what assessment is and what it is not, so we will continue to work with that. I am very pleased about the conversation that is moving forward.

President Dowd: Are there any questions for Vice Provost Poplin-Gosetti? Your Executive Committee also raised these issues with Drs. Mary Humphrys and Scott Molitor, who are the co-chairs of our Core Curriculum Committee. Senator Molitor has agreed to address Senate today to discuss these and other related issues.

Next, I would like to update Senators on meetings that were scheduled for the proposed University Council. If you recall, at the October 9th meeting of Faculty Senate, the President Jacobs made some remarks about the discussion of the University Council that occurred at the October 8th Board of Trustees' Trusteeship and Governance Committee meeting. That BOT Committee decided to reconsider current implementation plans for the University Council and asked President Jacobs to recommend revisions to such those plans. That committee will discuss those recommendations at its December meeting and will be present to the full Board in January 2013.

Also recall that both the President and Vice President of your Faculty Senate are ex officio members of the University Council. So the update on the University Council is that its scheduled meetings in November and December have been cancelled.

As the last point on this issue, President Jacobs has not contacted Faculty Senate for its input on any proposed changes to the University Council that he will be recommending to the Board of Trustees. This, perhaps, is not surprising. Other than a conversation about Provost candidates, President Jacobs has never invited your Executive Committee to meet or speak with him --- about any issue. On that point, President Jacobs has not met with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee since Spring 2012. In contrast, I have invited President Jacobs to every meeting of your Executive Committee and he has never accepted such invitations.

The last item of this report is not from the Executive Committee. It is from me. I apologize to the Executive Committee in advance for expressing my view on an issue without first checking with them. Given some of the discussions I've had over the past week or so I want to express my thoughts to the Senators.

At issue is the \$36,000,000 budget cut proposed by Chancellor Gold, Provost Scarborough, and Chief Financial Officer Dabney. Your Executive Committee briefly discussed this issue early last week. Since that Executive Committee meeting I've met with quite a number of individuals to discuss this proposed \$36 Million budget cut. For example, yesterday Senate Vice President Rouillard and I met with Provost Scarborough to discuss his proposed budget cut. I would have done the same with Chancellor Gold but

my meeting schedule over the past week was booked solid. Our secretaries are trying to arrange such a meeting.

I have no faith in whether the \$36 Million number is a true or accurate number. No faith. I understand how part of that number may be justified but for other parts, in some respect, it simply appears to be contrived. This \$36 Million number is not a budget deficit. Instead it is merely a budget “short-fall.” By that I mean the administration simply wants to spend \$36 Million more than what UT has available. It appears faculty members are not generating enough in tuition revenue to satisfy their spending appetite. Therefore, to spend that additional \$36 Million, Chancellor Gold and Provost Scarborough must cut \$36 Million from budgets of existing programs.

Reasonable people inside and outside of UT may not object to the proposed budget cuts to existing programs if Chancellor Gold and Provost Scarborough simply explain which specific programs will be cut and, more importantly, where they plan to spend that \$36 Million. It would be nice if they would share that information with us. But they have not. In my mind, the most important question that we have to keep returning to is “where are Drs. Scarborough and Gold planning to spend UT's money in FY2014?”

The second issue is that \$15 Million of that \$36 Million is due to an accounting “maneuver” or “decision” applied in the FY2013 budget. I’m not an accountant, so please forgive me if I do not use terms accountants would use. Last spring semester, over the objections of members of the Finance and Strategy Committee, Chief Financial Officer Dabney listed State capital monies as budgeted (renewable) monies in FY2013. By placing that \$15 Million “above the line” in FY2013, our financial statements were indicating that UT would again receive from the State that amount in FY2014. This was done even though CFO Dabney, the provost, chancellor, president, and Board of Trustees knew such monies were “one-time” funds for that fiscal year only and they would not be available in FY2014. The problem is that the Office of Finance is now claiming that because the \$15 Million in “one-time” capital monies granted to UT last year are not renewed this coming year, we have a \$15 Million “shortfall.” OK, but why would they place the \$15 Million “above the line” in FY2013 when they knew it would cause a \$15 Million “shortfall” in FY2014? Was it to “cover” approximately \$15 Million or so in spending on a particular project? And spending this amount out of cash reserves? Cash reserves? Hmm ... I wonder what the administration spent that \$15 Million on?

It appears that this year Academic Affairs will pay for the sin of spending at least \$15 Million too much in FY2013. But I guess that is “water under the bridge.” For FY2014, where are Drs. Scarborough and Gold planning to spend that \$36 Million?

If you are not familiar with the way that funds come from the State, note there are funds we receive in the form of State's share of instruction, which most of us are familiar with. There are also funds known as “capital” monies, which are separate and designated for capital projects like renovations to our buildings. These are “one-time” monies because we may receive an amount once every two years, but it is not guaranteed and certainly not “renewable.” The President's Recommended Budget, subsequently approved by the Board, listed the \$15,000,000 capital budget “above the line” as if this is amount would be renewed each year by the State of Ohio. But, as I said previously, they knew that money would not be renewed in FY2014.

Vice President Rouillard, as a check on my memory, this was done because the administration had to cover approximately \$15 Million worth of spending last year out of cash reserves. Is that what Provost Scarborough told us?

Vice President Rouillard: Yes.

President Dowd: I know I'm repeating myself, but please keep in mind that the administration took these capital monies and listed them as renewable funds. When a new fiscal year comes along and that money does not come again from the state, Academic Affairs will, again, be likely responsible for covering that \$15 Million "shortfall" in FY2014.

The next issue causing me to wonder about the meaning of a \$36 Million "shortfall" is that of "salary recapture." When a faculty or staff member leaves the university and that position is not replaced, their salary is "recaptured" by the central administration. To cover millions of dollars of planned spending this year, the administration budgeted \$10 Million in salary recapture for FY2013. However, as was mentioned at an all-day Senior Leadership Meeting prior to the start of FY2013, and confirmed in subsequent meetings, the administration recognized that they would realize only \$2 Million in salary recapture in FY2013, not \$10 Million. Abra-cadabra, we had \$8 Million to add into the eventual \$36 Million "shortfall." If the administration knew salary recapture would only amount to \$2 Million, they should have adjusted the projection prior to FY2013 and that \$36 Million would have been reduced by \$8 Million. But they didn't do that. I wonder why. Was it the case that the administration is spending UT's money on large projects that in order to balance the budget they needed \$8 Million so badly that they inflated estimate of salary recapture to \$10 Million? Over and over again I keep returning to the same question: where is President Jacobs, Chancellor Gold, and Provost Scarborough spending UT's money? In this case, it certainly is not towards replacing faculty members.

Provost Scarborough and Chancellor Gold stated the recent 4.9% decrease in enrollment has caused a \$13 Million decrease in revenue. If memory serves, data presented to the Board of Trustees reported that a 5% drop in enrollment translates to a drop in tuition revenue of approximately \$6.5 Million, not \$13 Million. I have to verify such data. Provost Scarborough indicated that this \$13 Million figure is the projected losses for next Summer. Since when has there been any actual loss to any course taught in summer? Minimum enrollment targets in summer teaching always guarantees that each class is profitable. Instead, perhaps the administration has simply done a very poor job of forecasting enrollment in each term. That is, even though each summer class is profitable, it's not "profitable enough" to pay for the administration's spending.

But when talking about summer, there are a couple of other issues to consider. First, keep in mind that we're talking about summer 2013 – which, of course, hasn't occurred yet. So current discussions of budget "shortfalls" based on lower summer enrollment is a function of how poor they know their own projection of summer enrollment will be. This point smacks of the issue described above regarding "salary recapture." At the "all day leadership" meeting last spring they remarked about how "optimistic" those projections were. If that was the case, why did they build a budget around them? As I said before, I'm not an accountant and so I don't have an answer to that question. But I have to wonder what project is

such a high priority for the administration to cause it to make such “optimistic” assumptions for balancing the budget? However, I don't have the answer because this administration does not share with faculty any information on the financial conditions of the university. Nor do they answer our questions about such issues.

But we know a couple of things. First, the administration generated forecasts of summer 2013 enrollment and built a budget around “optimistic” forecasts. Why would they do that? Second, before such enrollment actually manifests, the administration has suddenly – suddenly – realized that forecasted summer enrollment will not be realized. This has nothing to do with any action by Academic Affairs. Instead, it is a reflection on the ability of the Office of Finance to build a sound and reliable FY2013 budget that does not cause a fiscal calamity in FY2014. However, if the past predicts the future, it will be Academic Affairs that will be held responsible for the forecasting errors of the Office of Finance. That is, faculty, departments, and colleges will face budget cuts to cover this \$13 Million portion of the budget “shortfall.” But it will our students who will “pay the price” for the budget built around such “optimistic” forecasts.

A related issue is one of auxiliaries, such as student housing. Again, though I'm not an accountant, I believe some of the arguments I made earlier apply here as well. Costs of student housing are almost all fixed costs, not marginal costs. So the only real movement in such costs in summer would be based on actual v. forecasted enrollments. Again, keep in mind that we're talking about enrollment in summer 2013 – which hasn't occurred yet. If there is now a projected “shortfall” in such accounts, it is due entirely to the difference between actual enrollment falling short of the “optimistic” projections the administration needed to make in order to balance the budget. If so, the Office of Finance is, again, responsible for burdening our university with whatever portion this contributed to the \$36 Million budget “shortfall.” But why would this administration build the AY2013 budget apparently knowing that their budget assumptions and forecasts would necessitate draconian budget cuts in AY2014? Which project or projects are so important to the administration that they would do this? This prompts the same question: where exactly is Provost Scarborough and Chancellor Gold spending UT's money? It certainly isn't on Academic Affairs or improving the quality of education at UT.

Provost Scarborough described the data to Vice President Rouillard and myself and I appreciate the time he spent on this issue and the help he provided us towards understanding some of that data. But UT has approximately \$1 Billion in assets. And, of course, we have expenses and debts too. But we also generate hundreds of millions of dollars in tuition revenue. You would expect that at some point the administration would understand that the massive annual budget cuts Academic Affairs has faced over the past several years are doing irreparable damage to UT as a comprehensive university. I think we need to keep perspective on this issue. For the past five or so years what have been the budget cuts we've endured each year? \$8,000,000, \$12,000,000, \$20,000,000, \$22,000,000? Now we are asked to simply swallow, without question, a proposed \$36,000,000 budget cut? I'm not sure of the exact number, but what has been the total amount of money cut or transferred from Academic Affairs since the merger? \$50,000,000? \$60,000,000? \$100,000,000?

This comment is not so much a comment but is more of a reflection. President Jacobs has said many, many times that people at UT need to be more “business like.” But being more “business like” should not

apply to just colleges and academic departments. I wonder how fast someone in the private sector would be fired from his or her job if year-in and year-out that individual consistently missed their budget targets by \$8,000,000, \$12,000,000, \$20,000,000, \$22,000,000, or \$36,000,000. Or consistently failed to forecast accurately something as important to their business as enrollment is to UT? There is more than a little hypocrisy in the words and actions of President Jacobs with respect to this issue.

The University of Toledo exists to educate young women and men. If Academic Affairs is not the central focus of this administration, then what is? UT's budget has been cut due to reductions in State Share of Instruction, but that amount is a relatively small portion of UT's budget. We know that State Share of Instruction has been reduced. We also know that enrollment and, hence, tuition revenue has declined. But the spending of President Jacob, Chancellor Gold, and Provost Scarborough has continued. And they are not spending UT's money on Academic Affairs, faculty hiring, improving education, etc. So what are they spending UT's on? And why are these projects or areas so important to President Jacobs, Chancellor Gold, and Provost Scarborough that given the decrease in State Share of Instruction and tuition revenue they have been compelled to spend many millions of dollars out of the university's cash reserves? What are these special projects or areas? I know I'm repeating myself, but because this spending continues in the face of shrinking State Share of Instruction and tuition revenues, why are these projects or areas so critically important to Drs. Jacobs, Gold, and Scarborough? And why are they spending such significant amounts out of cash reserves? Is the university at its debt limit? Has it exceed its debt limit? Is it the case that UT cannot borrow any more money? I do not know if this is the ultimate reason for the draconian \$36,000,000 budget cut announced by Chancellor Gold and Provost Scarborough. I do not have answers to these questions because President Jacobs eliminated the only forum Faculty Senate had to ask such questions when he eliminated the Finance and Strategy Committee. I have been asked why I don't raise such questions at Board meetings. In case you do not know, the Board of Trustees does not permit such questions from individuals in the "audience" when such issues are discussed during their meetings. And that, certainly, is their prerogative. Perhaps Board members are unaware that faculty do not have any other forum to ask such questions.

I want to return to an issue I talked about earlier. If securing Academic Affairs isn't the central focus of this administration then what is? By all appearances, instruction and research activities are no longer UT's top priorities. In their place we have two new priorities. The first is to cut positions and budgets to the point of damaging operations, and then backing away from such cuts during the next budget cycle – by pennies – so operations can “limp-along.” The second is to simply generate money, any money, any revenue. They only common element across these new priorities is that the short-run is this semester and the long-run is the end of this fiscal year. No true planning takes place at UT anymore. I understand that higher education is expensive. But the administration has “taken its eye off the ball.” Our true goals should be, must be, instruction and research activities. That's why our students come here. University leadership used to reflect these goals but at UT the goal now is apparently to accumulate millions and millions of dollars to spend on the president's, chancellor's, and provost's special projects. It used to be that the highest priority was to provide the resources needed to educate our students and to promote faculty and student research. Not anymore. What are those special projects? Why do they deserve such a significant amount of the university's financial resources?

One of the problems is that the administration has eliminated the Finance and Strategy committee. Although that committee was not a perfect source of information about UT finances, it provided an opportunity for Faculty Senate representatives to ask the questions I've been forced to raise on the floor of Senate today. Apparently, this administration does not believe that there is a benefit to informing the faculty on such issues or hearing feedback from faculty on such issues. When I expressed this point to Provost Scarborough yesterday, he suggested that we invite Chief Financial Officer David Dabney to an Executive Committee meeting to better explain the proposed \$36 Million budget cuts. Your Executive Committee will do that. Following that meeting, we will also invite Dave Dabney to address the same issues before the Faculty Senate.

If you are not aware of the Finance and Strategy Committee, it had representatives from different groups from around the campus, some from central administration, some deans, a couple representatives from Faculty Senate, students, PSA, etc. Vice President Rouillard and Past-President Anderson, do you remember any other groups represented on the Finance and Strategy Committee that I did not mention?

Vice President Rouillard: It was a student rep. as well.

Past-President Anderson: I believe you named all the groups.

President Dowd: The Finance and Strategy Committee was not the perfect committee in terms of getting all the information that everyone needed, but it was the only committee available for the administration to share financial information with the above mentioned groups. We routinely wanted more detailed information, though we seldom received it. But President Jacobs eliminated that committee. So now we have nothing. Part of my "hair being on fire" over this proposed \$36,000,000 budget cut is that I have no idea if that number is an accurate or even a meaningful number. The administration apparently does not believe that there is any benefit to informing the faculty on whether this \$36 Million has any basis in fact.

That concludes my portion of the Executive Committee report.

Do other members of the Executive Committee want to add anything at this time?

Are there any questions from Senators?

Senator Thompson-Casado: I am not a member of the Executive Committee, but I would like to thank you for your remarks and your reflections.

[Applause]

President Dowd: Please, do not applaud. I expressed my views and frustration without first checking with my Executive Committee. I should not have done that. An important lesson I learned a number of years ago from a former faculty member and distinguished Senator, Professor Walt Olson, is that I should have asked permission from the Executive Committee before I expressed my own personal views on a subject. So I extend a most sincere apology to the Executive Committee for my behavior today. I am just

heartsick over what I've heard over the past few days and what it means for our students. My head would have exploded if I didn't get off my chest the views I just expressed.

[Applause]

Again, please don't applaud. I am heartsick over what a \$36 Million budget cut will mean to our students. That \$36,000,000 is the most recent and largest number the administration has used in recent years as a justification to cut an already decimated Academic Affairs. In all of these discussions, the administration has ignored the impact such cuts would have on our students. So please don't applaud my remarks because I could cry over what this administration is doing to our students.

I was going to ask, are there any questions or comments from Senators? Perhaps that is an excellent way to move from my personal comments and start this meeting. Are there any comments or questions from Senators or Executive Committee members? If there is specific information any Senator wants us to ask about, please let an Executive Committee member know of your issue.

Senator Barnes: Can you ask about the report that's in the union newsletter about the rising cost of dollars for administrative fees as opposed to instructional fees? Basically, from every report, for every one dollar spent, I'm referring to the rates.

President Dowd: Senator Barnes, I am going to give you a "bad" answer.

Senator Barnes: Okay.

President Dowd: I am not trying to be sarcastic or funny here, but Faculty Senate has to walk a fine line with such issues. We cannot step on the toes of the union and administration on particular issues. We can ask for data, but if I get that data I will provide it without comment, alright? Senate has to know its limitations. One of which is that we do not get involved with negotiated issues.

Senator Barnes: Okay, but it wasn't a negotiation issue though; it was about the amount of money spent on administration versus instruction.

President Dowd: I understand.

Senator Barnes: I am not asking for it in a sense of to use it in a union negotiation, I am not a union negotiator, but I am asking about it in terms of what you just described to us and the fact that we are hurting to provide an education to our students and yet our administrative cost seems to have plenty of dollars on that end.

President Dowd: That is a relative question and I don't think that Provost Scarborough will mind addressing this issue because he brought that issue up when Vice President Rouillard and I talked with him. He stated that administration will be looking at the dollars spent on administrators. He did not provide data. He stated that this is a preliminary discussion, and that we began a discussion that needs to

continue. That said, I hope my earlier remarks result in an honest examination of the actual cuts to administration v. those to academic affairs.

Senator Barnes: Good.

President Dowd: For clarification, Vice President Rouillard, the Provost did bring this issue up for discussion first, right?

Vice President Rouillard: Yes, I do believe.

Senator Jorgensen: Yes, you are talking about the committee, what was the most recent name?

President Dowd: Finance and Strategy. It used to be the old FAC which, if I remember correctly stood for Finance Advisory Committee.

Senator Jorgensen: When the University went through a disastrous presidency and administration and a new interim president was appointed, one of the very first things that he did was communicate to the Senate that he was reestablishing that committee and inviting three representatives to it. I think doing away with that committee is a terrible step backwards in terms of working with the faculty to face our future problems. Of course there are financial problems at all universities across the country, but faculty can be partners with that, but not if they are not at the table. If we are just being told after the fact that this is the way it is, how can we be partners? So, I would like to express in as strong as possible terms that this is a very bad decision.

President Dowd: I agree with you. I raised this issue with Senior Vice Provost Gutteridge and Provost Scarborough, and I believe I brought it up to Chancellor Gold as well. Not having the Finance and Strategy Committee as an outlet for Senate questions and not sharing information is what leads me to give the rant I gave earlier about the recently proposed budget cuts. If all we can do is react to administrative proclamation about the budget and budget cuts, then there should be no surprise that the faculty react badly to such proclamations.

Are there any other questions? If there are no other questions from the Exec and the Senators let's move on to the first agenda item.

As a prelude, this is a discussion of the University of Toledo policy, 3364-25-31. Its official title is "*CWA and classified/non union absenteeism.*" This policy is also known as the Staff Absence Policy. This policy has been discussed at Senate a number of times before this meeting. I have brought this policy back to Faculty Senate for further discussion because, if I remember correctly, the Executive Committee of last year promised to return this policy to the floor of Senate for extended discussion.

When speaking with senior administrators this past week, I was told by the Vice President for Administration that the Faculty Senate had no business discussing this issue. I reminded that Vice President that the Faculty Senate was charged by the Board of Trustees to discuss any issue that it find pertinent to the University, past, present, or future. I then informed that administrator that I, and the other

members of the Executive Committee, deemed this issue pertinent to the University because of its impact on every academic and non-academic unit at this University. This policy affects the operations and functioning of every such unit.

With us today to discuss this policy is Professor Barbara Floyd, University Archivist and Director of the Ward M. Canaday Center for Special Collections, and Kevin West, Senior. Human Resources Officer. Professor Floyd will discuss with you the “White Paper” authored by the UT Women’s Leadership Forum and Kevin West has agreed to provide perspective on this issue and perhaps address some particular questions. At this time I invite Professor Barbara Floyd to the podium for her address to Faculty Senate. As she approaches the podium, I would like to add one additional title retained by Professor Floyd, that of the 2006-2007 Chair of Faculty Senate.

Professor Floyd: Thank you, President Dowd. As President Dowd stated I am going to talk to you about an issue that is not directly related to the faculty. But it concerns a group of people whose dedicated service helps us to be successful faculty members. I am talking about the classified staff on both campuses. These are people who answer our phones, the people who help our students, the people who care for our patients, and the people who keep our university operating in a million different ways.

The Council of the Women’s Leadership Forum is a group that was formally recognized by the president and the provost back in 2005. Its mission is improving the status of women of all classifications on campus, from faculty to staff to students. With that in mind, in 2010 the WLF produced a “white paper” about the staff absence policy and what we see as its adverse impact on women.

What I am going to present today is an overview of that “white paper,” as well as an expansion of some of the points that have come to our attention in the two years since this report was prepared. This report as written was presented to many people. It was presented to Larry Burns in his role as Vice President of Diversity. It was presented to Provost McMillen and Chancellor Gold. It was presented to President Jacobs and, at the president’s request, it was presented to Kevin West, Chuck Lehnert, and Connie Rubin in Human Resources, and most recently, I shared it with Provost Scarborough. After our meeting with the people from HR as the president asked of us, we followed up with him with a memo that summarized the concerns that we had about the conversation with the HR members and the way our report was received. We sent the president the memo twice, and we have not received a response from him about our concerns. So I was surprised to hear that he indicated to the Faculty Senate when he was here last that he was not inclined to change his mind about this policy. He had not communicated that to us and we were really hoping that we could have the chance to discuss it with him again. But since he indicated his view on the policy to the Senate, and many of you in this room may have no idea what he was talking about, I am here to present to you the view of the WLF on this extremely important matter of a policy that we believe, for all the reasons I am going to discuss today, really needs to be done away with.

What is the Staff Absence Policy? It applies to AFSCME and CWA workers and basically what it says is this: for AFSCME employees, taking more than two hours of sick leave results in getting a point assessed to you. Now, this is not time beyond what you are given as a benefit as an employee--this is what you are given as a benefit as an employee. So, if you take the time which is given to you, you will receive a point. After twelve points within a given year you will be terminated. If scheduled to work on a weekend the

employee gets not one point, but two points if they call off sick. For the CWA workers on the Main Campus, taking more than two hours of sick leave results in getting one point, and sixteen points leads to termination. There are a few exemptions for this – employees with chronic health problems or who are caregivers for those in their immediate family who have chronic issues can request an exemption under the FMLA, Family Medical Leave Act. As far as we been able to determine, this exemption is only for chronic issues and not for the common illnesses that most of us deal with in our daily lives.

The policy impact: The WLF believes that this policy while it applies equally to men and women, has gender indications. This is because as women, we are not only responsible for our own healthcare needs, but we are also responsible for those of our children, our spouses, and increasingly for our aging parents. For the same reason that women's health insurance used to cost more than men's health insurance, women's health issues usually require more doctor visits and more time away from work. And women make up the vast majority of staff employees; I believe the last statistic that I had was about 75% of all classified staff. The anecdotal evidence which is included in the "white paper"--which if you have not had a chance to read I would urge you to read it--includes some very disturbing firsthand accounts of what this policy has meant to female employees. Statistically, its impact is about the same for men and women based on the most recent analysis. When we did our analysis, the policy had only been in place for two years on the Main Campus and at that time they would not provide me with the breakdowns of people who have been cited for corrective action based upon gender. So I had to go through the list and attempt to figure out who were the female and male employees. The point is, we have a policy that because of societal responsibilities, because of the anecdotal information, and because of the stress that such a policy creates for 75% of our staff, we believe this is a gender issue.

Other Impacts: The policy forces employees to come to work sick rather than to face losing their job. If patient care and student centeredness are among our primary goals, the WLF believes that we should not have in place such a policy that encourages this. We believe this policy is not family-friendly. I have never had children, but I know a lot of people who struggle with this, such as single mothers with young children and those with children in daycare. The decision whether to keep a child at home sick is often not yours, but rather it is dictated by the daycare or by the school. If a school closes because of an outbreak of an epidemic, that is not your choice to keep your child home even if they are not sick. If a daycare calls and says, "Peter has a runny nose and he needs to get out of here" that is not your decision--that is a decision made for you. So, it is particularly difficult for families with small children..

We all know our university's mission is to improve the human condition, but the WLF believes that this policy does not do that. As a kind of extreme example of this, back in 2010, right before we wrote our white paper, there was the H1N1 outbreak and we as faculty voted to suspend our class absence policy during that time because we felt this was a way to help students and help to control the spread of the disease. However, the staff absence policy was not suspended, and it remained in effect. The policy is uncommon among other public universities in Ohio; to date we have not found any other Ohio public university with such a policy in place. That is not to say that we are certain no such policy exists at other institutions, but we really did search. When you start searching through HR policies of institutions you know that they can get very cumbersome, but as far as we were able to determine we could not find any other Ohio university that has such a policy in place. This is a policy that does exist in a lot of for-profit companies, one in particular being Wal-Mart. But I would like to hope that we have HR policies better

than that. We believe this policy is out of touch with current Human Resource trends; often employers have established ways which if you have a child who is sick you can stay home and work from home. As a matter of fact, the federal government requires that all employees be able to work from home and they test it out to make sure it works. It seems to me that this is a 21st century concept and one that can certainly eliminate some of the issues related to this policy. The policy can lead to the termination of employees for reasons that are completely unrelated to their job performance. The policy reduces staff morale and I think we can all agree with that, if you read those comments in the “white paper,” these are from people who are really demoralized. Many current theories about successful organizations in the for-profit world state that staff morale is recognized as a key to a successful organization. It doesn’t seem to be in keeping with our stated institutional goal in our HLC report that we hope to be recognized nationally as a great place to work. The policy increases stress among excellent employees who fear losing their jobs. These are the same class of employees who have experienced three years of reduction in staffing. Many have lost their jobs and others are fearful. So we have something else to place added stress through this policy. The policy does not prohibit abusers from continuing to abuse the sick leave; all they have to do is complete a FMLA form and get their doctor to sign it. What I hear from a lot of people is that those same people who abused sick leave before this policy happened continue to--they just learned to work around it. So, it is not doing perhaps what it is intended to do. Additional paper work required to implement this policy costs us all money and sometimes it costs the employee money because to complete an FMLA form, some doctors charge for that service. We recognize that people do abuse sick leave. We probably have experienced that in our own office settings on occasion, but in the minds of the WLF this is a management issue that needs to be addressed at an individual employee level not by implementing a blanket policy that impacts all. We also discovered that this policy is not uniformly applied because some departments are very much sticklers while some supervisors say, “Come on. If you are a good employee and are sick for the day I am not going to charge you a point. ” So, it is not uniformly applied and it is not uniformly understood. Some people believe that if you turn in a note from your doctor then you don’t get charged a point, but that is not correct. If you take off less than two hours for a doctor’s appointment and you bring in a slip from your doctor you don’t get assessed anything. But, it is only if you are gone for two hours at the end of the day or two hours at the beginning of the day and you bring in a doctor’s form that says you had a doctor’s appointment. As we all know, it is not so easy to schedule doctors’ appointments during those times, especially when your illness has not been previously planned.

In conclusion, the view of the Women’s Leadership Forum is that no employee, male or female should ever have to choose between caring for their own illness or losing their job. No employee, male or female, should ever have to choose between caring for their sick child or losing their job, especially when both male employees and female employees depend upon their employment with the University of Toledo to provide them with health insurance necessary for their families. I think the policy has the possibility of encouraging desperate parents to leave sick children with those perhaps unable to provide appropriate care; I think we all have read far too many stories in the newspapers about some of the consequences of children left with people who really ought not to be in charge of them. In conclusion we ask: if we are an institution that has health care as a major component of our mission, why are we penalizing our own employees for being sick? Rather than have a punitive policy, we need an absence policy modeled on concerns of wellness both for the employee and the public and the students. That is the end of my report and I will be happy to answer any questions.

Past-President Anderson: Twelve points for two hours a point which is twenty-four, what is sick-leave providing?

Prof. Floyd: Two hours equals one point for a given day. So, if you are sick and you are out two-and-a-half hours that is one point and if you are out eight hours that is one point.

Past-President Anderson: Let's say that it happens to be two in a half hours stretch.

Prof. Floyd: I believe AFSCME employees get fifteen sick days per year.

Past-President Anderson: So those are eight-hour days.

Senator Barnes: So they can't take their full sick-leave time.

Senator Hamer: That was such a good report. I am wondering because it seems so clear what the correct and legal thing to do would be. I am wondering, number one that the response was how people would disagree about the right thing to do which is to do away with this policy. The second question is more for Kevin West, but what I know, which is little, that it seems like this is a real good legal case here. So, if the next step is to take this to the courts it would be a real waste to UT resources and an embarrassment to the institution.

Prof. Floyd: When we spoken to the various people about this policy I have to say that they really were sympathetic to our concerns. When we met with the president, those of us who are in this room including Senator Barnes will tell you that he seemed to want to do away with it, but subsequently I don't know what has changed his mind. I have a feeling that one of the issues is of course staffing in critical areas like nurses and health care assistants, which is a serious issue. But again, to me that is an issue where you deal with the individual employee and you don't deal with it with a blanket policy that adds stress and difficulty to a whole lot of people for a few people who abuse the policy. When we met with HR I think that they were not as sympathetic or understanding. Mr. Lehnert said that he had not read our report.

Senator Barnes: He also said UT has been really good to him and he was surprised to hear that it wasn't so good to everybody else.

Prof. Floyd: I don't think that he actually knew about this policy; I don't think he really understood fully what we were talking about. Also, he made the suggestion about why don't we just have everybody bring in a doctor's note. We are a health care facility; do we really want people running to the doctor when they have a sniffle or a common cold that is really best treated with remedies that we all know? That to me is a really inefficient way to address this problem, to make everybody get a doctor's note if they don't want a point assessed.

Senator Lee: I would like to express appreciation with your efforts with this report and I enjoyed reading it. But I also would like to add in a spin that you got in your last paragraph and reiterate about wellness, that parents are not always taking time off for illness with their children, but well-care and preventive care

for themselves and their families and it is in our best interest, we know this as a nation that it is in our best interest that people will have that preventive care and we shouldn't create any mindset that people should disregard it because it is something related to their work situation. It is in our best interest and the health of employees.

Senator Barnes: I would make the addition that when we were talking to Dr. Jacobs, one of the things that he said and I really pondered it because I don't know exactly what it means, but he was saying that he doesn't think that employees were entitled to the amount of sick hours that they have accrued, "Just because you have them does not mean that you can take them at your leisure." Correct me, Professor Floyd if I misstated what he was saying there, but I've been pondering that a lot because I feel like if you are contractually entitled to it, are you not entitled to it? Am I misreading what he said?

Prof. Floyd: That is how I remembered it, but it was a long time ago, over a year ago and we have not gotten a response yet.

Senator Barnes: He said something about management rights and how people are not entitled to all that they have that's contractually available.

Senator Anonymous: But the point is that it is women, it is 75% women. This proportion is affecting women employees which is just insulting, so what can we do to help you move this forward?

President Dowd: Can I ask your question in a little different format? This is intended for Mr. Kevin West. Let's suppose the best of all possible worlds. That is, let's suppose the "big shots" at UT wake up tomorrow and determine that this policy needs to be changed and that representatives from staff union, CWA and ASCME, also want to change this policy. What are the necessary mechanics for changing this policy? What would we have to do to see such a change?

Mr. Kevin West: The policy actually exists in the contract between the Board of Trustees and the AFSCME bargaining unit which is the nurses and the staff on the Health Science Campus side and that was negotiated between those two parties. The CWA in negotiations actually had a discussion with management about this policy and they said that they did not want to bargain the actual language of the policy within the agreement. So what they agreed to do is say, "Management, you come up with your policy" and they matched that policy with the policy that was on the Health Science Campus and we will then bargain the effects. So both of these bargaining units have already negotiated over what this policy says and kind of the point system that exists within this policy. Dr. Dowd, going to your point, if in fact the 'Big shots' as you called them decide that it needs to be a change there will be a discussion and possibly a contract reopener. But again, that has its own implications as well.

Senator Thompson-Casado: Kevin, can't we just reopen just that one issue and take it to a full vote?

Mr. Kevin West: They could do that, but because of that Toledo decision the whole thing will be open. I think some within the bargaining unit will have some issues with that. But, administration can just say, "We are not going to acknowledge the policy." AFSCME and CWA negotiated interest-based on these

issues and there was recognition in some areas that they did have an issue with attendance and they were trying to address this issue.

Prof. Floyd: I will have to say that this is probably not AFSCME's or CWA's idea, am I correct?

Mr. Kevin West: That the policy is not their idea?

Prof. Floyd: Yes.

Mr. Kevin West: The policy is probably not their idea, but the parties agreed that this will be the solution.

Senator Ohlinger: I don't make this comment in any way to sound "mean spirited" or contrary; I appreciate the presentation very much. But this sounds like a union bargaining issue, so why is it coming to the Faculty Senate?

President Dowd: This was my call. As President of your Faculty Senate I brought this issue to your Executive Committee. One benefit built into the Faculty Senate Constitution is continuity. That is, having served on last-year's Executive Committee I am quite familiar with the issues from last year that have continued to be an issue this year. The Staff Absence Policy is such an issue that concerns all faculty at this university.

Truth is that I asked the Executive Committee back in July to again bring this issue to Senate in early Fall 2012 and they agreed to that request. Since that time I have been asking Professor Floyd to address Faculty Senate about the Staff Absence Policy. But scheduling issues resulted in today's meeting being the first meeting we could discuss the Staff Absence Policy. Then the issue was whether any administrator would be willing to discuss this issue at Faculty Senate. Your Faculty Senate President literally had to beg senior administrators to send a representative to Senate for this meeting today. I very much appreciate Mr. Kevin West's attendance today and his willingness to address the issues raised about the Staff Absence Policy.

Senator Ohlinger: Okay.

President Dowd: I recognize Senator Ohlinger's point: the Staff Absence Policy has been a negotiated issue, and Faculty Senate does not involve itself with negotiated issues. However, I believe strongly that the impact of this policy has extended well beyond a labor-relation issue and, in fact, has provoked a gender inequity issue impacting every academic and non-academic unit across this university. As your Faculty Senate President, I deemed this issue to be pertinent to the University of Toledo and, therefore, exercised authority (via the Executive Committee) to include this issue as an agenda item for Faculty Senate.

The overriding reason I brought this policy to the Faculty Senate for discussion is that, in my opinion, this policy is archaic, unfair, and punitive. This issue deserves a much broader examination than Faculty Senate can provide, but a discussion at Faculty Senate is a good start. Note that the administration has

refused to consider this as a gender inequity issue. If the discussion today at Senate is not fruitful, perhaps this is an issue that needs to be brought before the Board of Trustees for a request of a reconsideration of this policy.

Prof. Floyd: I just want to say that we have purposely not contacted any members of the union about this issue because our report looks at it as a gender issue, and we did not want to suggest that they should be negotiating one way or another on this.

Senator Relue: I just have two questions. One, it seems that there is a contradiction here about the total of points that you can get before you are fired. I don't know how you can have a contract that contradicts the terms of what part needs to be enforced because you can't enforce both. My second question is do we have an idea of how many people we have lost in staff positions because of this policy?

Prof. Floyd: I believe I asked that and no one was able to supply me with that number. There are enforcement steps that you go through, you have a discussion with HR, then you move on to the next level, then the last is termination. I honestly don't remember what the statistics are, but I can ask for those for you. Even if it's not any, I believe the stress of this policy on women in particular is enormous, and a lot of people probably just come to work sick rather than be faced with those steps.

Mr. Kevin West: I think that raising this as a gender issue is appropriate and fair. I think that based on the analysis that we did on utilization of sick leave as well as individuals who were disciplined under this policy the numbers don't indicate that there's disparity based on gender. However, I do recognize the perceptions that are listed in the "white paper" and how that makes people feel. I understand that people are concerned about making that difficult choice, "I have to leave my child at home with someone else because I don't want to earn a point." But that is how the policy was actually negotiated and in fact if people don't earn points over a particular time they can earn additional money and that is in part of the policy.

Prof. Floyd: What I understand is that the incentive program was done away with.

Mr. Kevin West: It was done away with for AFSCME, but CWA is still getting that bonus.

Prof. Floyd: That is not what I understood.

Mr. Kevin West: Again, I think that it is an issue and we looked at the numbers and there are other issues of concern that we might look at as well; it is a complicated issue.

Senator Regimbal: Kevin, are you the Title IX representative for our campus?

Mr. Kevin West: Yes.

Senator Regimbal: You just said that you do believe that this is a gender issue, so if this is a gender issue then doesn't it also fall under a Title IX issue?

Mr. Kevin West: I think the concern is because of the number of women that are affected by this policy that it is driven by the sheer demographics of HSC.

Senator Regimbal: But that is what Title IX is all about. I thought that that had to do with discrimination.

Mr. Kevin West: Right, but when you look at the utilization of sick hours as well as when you analyze the people who were disciplined there is no average impact based on gender.

Senator Barnes: That theory is because people are not using their sick hours, right? They are coming to work sick and trying to make other arrangements in fear of not using...that is in a culture of retaliation.

Mr. Kevin West: Or people are saying, "I have two points and so I can take another point because I need to stay at home with my kid and I am nowhere near twelve points or maybe I can work from home so let me talk to my supervisor." All these things are options and I don't want you to leave this meeting thinking I am discounting that decision, but there are other options and ways to address this issue.

President Dowd: I would like to thank Professor Floyd and Kevin West for coming to Senate today and discussing this most important issue. If any Senator or non-Senator has any thoughts on this issue please contact one of the Executive Committee members and we will carry such thoughts and comments to the administration.

Moving forward, the next item on our agenda is Senator Molitor, co-chair of the Core Curriculum Committee to talk about some General Education issues.

Senator Molitor: Thank you. I just wanted to give you an update on what has been happening with the Core Curriculum Committee and some issues that we are now faced with for the upcoming year. As you remember we passed a revised version of the university general education core curriculum at the end of spring 2011 and last year the Core Curriculum Committee spent a good chunk of time approving courses to be included in the new general education core that took effect for students arriving at the university this current fall of 2012 semester. So now this new core curriculum and the newly approved set of courses are in effect for all of our new students. Although we were pretty busy approving all these new courses last year and we realized that there were some issues that are coming up. As this new core curriculum is being implemented we are seeing some issues as well. So, what I wanted to do is give you an update about some of these issues and perhaps how we are going to proceed and get your feedback as to how do you think we should proceed.

The first thing is in our approval of the new core curriculum we did not include a process for approving courses after the initial set of courses that we approved last year. We are now faced with a situation where people may want to add courses to the new general education core and we don't have a mechanism for doing it. Now this is a trivial problem to solve and it will probably be the first thing that our committee will tackle, but nonetheless we do not have any mechanism in place for this.

The second issue is the alignment of our new competency-based core curriculum with Ohio general education requirements. The state requires a certain number of credit hours in categories such as composition, humanities, mathematics, natural sciences and social sciences. Therefore we have to align our competency-based courses into these categories. For some courses, such as those in mathematics or the natural sciences, this is not difficult. However, it is not always easy to distinguish between courses in the remaining state categories. Mary took it upon herself to take the list of courses that we were going to approve and divide them up into these categories, and I think she did an excellent job in doing that. But nonetheless, she had problems with certain courses in the humanities and social sciences. Just looking at the competencies it wasn't always obvious and so this is something I think we need to address moving forward.

Senator Plenefisch: Is it absolutely necessary that particular courses be exclusively humanities or exclusively social science, cannot a course meet either one or the other?

Senator Molitor: I don't know the answer to that question, but I will take a guess. We will have to assign credit-hours to say that there are so many credit-hours for social science and so many credit-hours for humanities. So example, if there's a three credit-hour course we would say that there are two credit-hours social science and one hour humanities to count toward the state requirements for a minimum of six credit-hours of humanities and six credit-hours of social science in your gen ed. core. So, I don't know how we will deal with that. I don't even know if it is possible to split a course. The state might say no, it has to be one or the other.

Senator Plenefisch: Or have the course be optionally assigned to one or the other category.

Senator Molitor: Do you mean a student can decide?

Senator Plenefisch: Yes.

Senator Molitor: I don't think that is possible. But again, I am not the expert on this.

Senator Plenefisch: I think there are some courses in Honors that can be divided in that way, I am just curious, is that true?

Senator Sheldon: I don't know; I have not been in Honors long enough. I have not taught a course that would qualify like that.

Senator Plenefisch: Some of the seminar courses.

Senator Molitor: Are you thinking of the double-dipping courses?

Senator Sheldon: No, he is talking about seminar courses.

Senator Molitor: I don't know the answer to that. I don't believe you can, but that is something worth investigating. Moving forward, we also have an issue that right now we have two core curricula because

any current students that enroll before fall 2012 are still operating under the guidelines of the previous gen ed. core. And our new students that have arrived in fall 2012 are operating under the newly approved competency-based gen ed. core curriculum. We had Marcia King-Blandford come and speak with us in the spring of last year and she said the state does not allow this. The state requires one set of gen ed. core curriculum rules for your university. Her way around this was to take the two core curricula and combine them to make sure we have all the courses in the old one and all of the courses in the new one in their proper place. So, essentially we are now operating under the guise of a merged core curriculum as far as the state is concerned. We don't see it that way; we see it that we have one set of rules for students first enrolled before fall 2012 and another set of rules for students first enrolled during fall 2012 ... We don't know what the implications of that is. The state might come down and say, "No, you have to follow all the same set of rules," so that is something we need to investigate further

The next issue is that we are getting a lot of questions, especially from advisors. One of the things that we did last year and we would like to do again this year is to invite representatives from the ICA, Intercollegiate Advising Association, to join us and attend our core curriculum meetings. We are seeing a lot of questions and confusion when advising new students. One of the issues in terms of a competency-based core is how do you handle AP credit or transfer credits? This is a major issue that advisors are grappling with and we are still not sure how to handle it. Another question from advisors is in addition to fulfilling requirements in particular categories such as humanities, social sciences, mathematics, and natural sciences, do students have to take a set of gen ed. core courses that will fulfill all the different core competencies? These are some of the issues that we never fully resolved

Next, we have a university core curriculum that includes our general education core and it also includes multi-cultural courses. I should indicate that we did not change the requirements of the multi-cultural courses, so this requirement is still the same as it was before spring 2011. These are not competency-based multi-cultural courses, they are the same list of approved courses that satisfy our multi-cultural U.S. Diversity and non-Western multi-course requirement. But, one of the problems is that we have a requirement by the state to have a 36-hour general education core curriculum and many of the multi-cultural courses do not qualify for that because either they are not in the Ohio Transfer Module (OTM). The OTM is a set of courses that all public institutions are required to offer and all of your general education courses must be in that set of courses. Furthermore, many of these multi-cultural courses are at a level that would not qualify for what the state would consider general education. We have upper 2000-level, 3000-level and 4000-level courses on our approved list of multi-cultural courses, but the state would not accept these as part of the general education core. So, when Marcia came to talk to us, she told us about the accounting "gymnastics" she went through to make sure the state thought that we were satisfying their general education core curriculum requirements while at the same time allowing our students to take these multi-cultural core courses to satisfy this university wide core curriculum requirement.

On the multi-cultural course list we have a number of courses that satisfy what we call the double-dip option, so students can take a U.S. Diversity or a non-Western multi-cultural course that will also satisfy a requirement of a humanities or a social science course. We have a number of these courses what we call a "double-dip" course, but now many of these courses are no longer double-dip because they do not fall under the new general education core. In other words, they do not satisfy our new humanities or our new

social science requirements and so a number of courses that used to satisfy the double-dip option no longer satisfy that option.

Finally, when we approved this new competency-based general education core, there was going to be an assessment process that went along with these courses. There are actually two components to this assessment process and President Dowd alluded to one of them earlier when he talked about a student-based assessment process in which students would be required to submit portfolios for course work that was in their general education courses. President Dowd was talking about extending that to higher level courses that may satisfy degree program requirements to follow these core competencies through a student's degree program at the university and not just within the general education courses.

One of the problems with this process that was approved is there is nothing specified about how these portfolios will be assessed and by whom, what kind of process will be followed, what kind of data will be generated, who will review that data, and how would we use that to improve student learning. The other part of this process was an instructor-based assessment component which instructors will collect information about their general education courses. These data will then be forwarded to departments who will review it by some unspecified process, colleges will then collect the data from departments and review it by some unspecified process and then some unspecified Faculty Senate committee will put all that information together and put together a single report about the assessment for student learning in gen ed. courses.

Much of this assessment process is unspecified and yet to be determined, so there's a lot of work that needs to be done there. So, what does my committee need from you? First of all, please spread the word that although this assessment process is unspecified, we would still like instructors of general education courses to be collecting data relevant to the core competencies specified for their courses when submitted for approval to the Core Curriculum Committee last year. We are supposed to be assessing these competencies, so please make sure that your instructors are still collecting this data. Even though we do not have a process of what to do with it after collecting, we would like to make sure that these data are still being collected. One of the things that instructors and departments can do with these data is use it to improve student learning, which is the whole idea behind this process. So please take a look at the data and say, "Are there things that we can do to improve student achievement of a particular skill or particular competencies that are related to the general education core?"

Finally, we need your input. If you are aware of any issues or problems, or have any comments and suggestions from your core course instructors, advisors or colleagues may have, and colleagues may have, please feel free to forward them to myself or Senator Humphrys and we will be happy to address them. Thank you.

Senator Jorgensen: I have two comments: one is related to the third one of the previous slide, which "they can't be two different core curriculums," it just seems logically that if any institution is changing its general education core that it would have two and/or require all students to have the new core to be more restrictive. But, in the general policy in higher education it states a student can graduate under the catalog that they were admitted in, so how does the state handle this?

Senator Molitor: That's a good question and I do not have an answer to it. I agree with you. It happened the last time when we approved core curriculum revisions in 2008 and in 2005 before that, and presumably we did the same thing then.

Senator Jorgensen: My second comment is if you recall at the first meeting the board chair came and we had a very good discussion about various things and he commented that it took us so very long, nine years to come up with a core (we went through five different provosts during that time), but it seems we are further along than the state in terms of looking at competencies instead of just counting hours.

Senator Molitor: I would agree with that, yes. One of the things that I am very hopeful about is there is a lot of good ideas in this new competency-based core curriculum, and these are issues that we can work out. When we do work them out, we will have a really good general education core.

Senator Hewitt: We are not the only university in Ohio that has a competency-based core. The initial stuff was based on the University of Cincinnati, so has anyone looked to see how they addressed this issue?

Senator Molitor: We have not, but I will. Thank you for the suggestion.

Vice Provost Poplin Gosetti: I was just online to address the question about where you can count different courses within the state's distribution list; the state specifically lays out the types of areas in arts and humanities and natural science and social sciences, they list the specific course areas. From the state's perspective, the courses will be restricted to specific areas. If we do something different on campus it will still have to align back to the state.

Senator Barnes: Does the state prohibit a course counting in both?

Vice Provost Poplin Gosetti: They lay out specifically what can count as a humanities. For instance, it states under social sciences and behavioral sciences: anthropology, economics, geography, political science, psychology, and sociology, "...students must select at least two of the areas listed above." Then they do the same for arts and humanities, so I would interpret that as it falls under this if you have a course in sociology.

Senator Barnes: I wonder where they put women studies.

Vice Provost Poplin Gosetti: In interdisciplinary.

Senator Barnes: Okay.

Vice Provost Poplin Gosetti: Well, I think, let me check.

Senator Barnes: What does that mean in terms of fitting in those categories?

Vice Provost Poplin Gosetti: That's a good question. Let me read on that and I will get back to you.

President Dowd: Are there any other questions? I would like to express my personal gratitude to Senator Molitor and Senator Humphrys for restarting this work and for bringing their committee together to address this difficult work.

[Applause]

President Dowd: Now, for some old business. Past-President Anderson, would you like to give us an update regarding the survey update for AY 2015 retirements?

Past-President Anderson: Senator Cappelletty, Senator Duhon, and I have been putting together a survey for faculty in order to determine the likelihood of the advantage or disadvantage changes in STRS coming up because we feel that there is a very strong likelihood that it will be a rather large impact on various programs at this university if many people decide to retire all at once. The survey is a draft survey and we are looking at it now and we are going to present it to the Executive Committee at the next Executive Committee meeting. It is on Survey Monkey and we will release it when it is ready and when the Executive Committee is ready. I can just tell you that about half of it is demographic in the form of, what college are you in, what department are you in, what programs are likely to be affected if you retire? There are also some diversity questions such as, what's your gender and what's your race? Then there are questions that are a little more specific about what's the hole that you are leaving behind. Again, there are questions about how many credit hours you teach, how many graduate students you teach or what funding you bring in to the institution etc. whether you are a member of the graduate faculty or not or what roles you play that are crucial to the continuation of programs here at UT. If you are the sole advisor for students in a particular program and no one else has learned how to do it and you have been doing it for "100 years" and if you retire what's going to happen to the program. So, that is basically where we are and I hope at our next meeting we will actually present it to you for your approval.

Senator White: Who are you going to ask? Is this a consensus?

Past-President Anderson: Well, this is a good question. We are just going to invite all faculty to participate expecting those faculty who are not planning on retiring to not necessarily respond to it, but those who are going to retire we will encourage them to respond. That is a very good question and as a status...maybe you have some suggestions as to how we should handle that.

Senator White: Well, we can think about that at a later time.

Past-President Anderson: We did raise confidentiality and if you are a member of a small program and if it's obvious who you are and you send me let's say, "Small program "X" is going to be leaving as faculty member, what does that mean?" Is that going to inhibit people from responding or not?

Senator White: In addition, are you looking at solely tenured and tenure-track faculty?

Past-President Anderson: Yes.

Senator White: So, permanent faculty?

Past-President Anderson: Lectureships and tenured and tenure-track.

President Dowd: Are there any other questions for Past-President Anderson? No? Thank you, Lawrence, for your work on this issue. The last item on the agenda is a brief update from Vice President Rouillard on the evaluations of the deans that will take place this semester.

Vice President Rouillard: President Dowd and I met with Provost Scarborough to look at the survey instrument, he added one question and I forwarded the questionnaire to the Center for Creative Instruction, CCI, that administers these surveys. They may have to “tweak” the formatting a little bit, but I think that we will be on track to do the survey of two deans this semester.

Senator Jorgensen: About the timing, I believe their contract expires 30 days from now.

President Dowd: Yes and I believe Vice President Rouillard has additional information on this issue.

Vice President Rouillard: No, not from now, it is at the end of December.

Senator Jorgensen: Are you sure?

President Dowd: If I remember correctly from the breakup of the College of Arts and Sciences, the three new deans were all given contracts of identical length.

Senator Jorgensen: You might want to check that it is not December 6th during finals week rather than December 30th because either way it is still not very much time.

Vice President Rouillard: Okay, I will check.

President Dowd: This is a just a reminder. Your Executive Committee is “cutting its teeth” on the evaluation of deans that are taking place this term. These evaluations are on the administrative performance of the Deans of the Colleges of Visual & Performing Arts and Natural Sciences & Mathematics. Other than Dean Barlowe, I believe Faculty Senate will be evaluating all other deans in the spring semester. So, if we get feedback on the instrument used this term we can “tweak” it for use in the spring semester. Is there anything else on this issue?

Vice President Rouillard: As I said, it is in the hands of CCI at this point.

President Dowd: Is there any new business?

Senator Lee: I just have a question from my own understanding about the report about the policy because it just kind of seemed to end, so how are we closing the loop on where this is going next.

President Dowd: Are you referring to the Staff Absence Policy?

Senator Lee: Yes. What is the outcome of the presentation today? Was this just for information? Were you expecting a response from us?

President Dowd: I would very much like a response from Senators on this issue. This issue is very important to all that work at UT. If you have a comment on this issue, please forward it to one of the members your Executive Committee.

Senator Lee: So, just as individuals to give you feedback?

President Dowd: Would Senators want me to describe the implications of the Staff Absence Policy as part as my report to the Board of Trustees' Academic and Student Affairs Committee? Would Senators want me to include, as part of that report, the White Paper written by the Women's Leadership Forum – so Board members can read that White Paper?

I was intending to do both because I do not know if the Board of Trustees is aware of the impact this misguided policy is having on women across this university. When such inequity issues arise, I believe Faculty Senate has the responsibility to inform our community of such inequities – and that includes our Board of Trustees.

Past-President Anderson: I would like to move to endorse your presentation to the Board on this issue.

Group of Senators: Second.

President Dowd: Is there any discussion?

Senator Hill: I have one comment to make and I held it off earlier because you wanted to get on with things, and that is fine. I think that maybe HR might want to investigate polices at other institutions, especially in the marketplace. ProMedica Corporation has a policy that includes sick leave time and everything else is a standard policy...as a whole, so you basically have a distributive core of things that you can pull from rather than have a sick leave policy, absentee policy, leave of absence policy, or a vacation policy, everything is thrown into one and you pull from there when you need to pull and that is the way it works.

Senator Dowd: That is a good suggestion but, again, Faculty Senate has to walk a fine line on such issues. That is, Faculty Senate cannot involve itself with labor-relation issues. But we should inform our community on such issues and suggest that the Board consider such issues.

Senator Thompson- Casado: Can we move on that?

President Dowd: All in favor? Any opposed? *Motion Passed.*

Senator Barnes: I would just like to follow-up. After I asked President Jacobs about the sexual harassment policy a month ago in this room a few weeks later the policy had been amended on the policy

update system that addressed one of the concerns that the Sexual Harassment Taskforce had which there were no point people identified where people can consult confidentially. Those folks are identified in the policy and some of them may not know that they have been identified. As far as the Taskforce we believe that they had absolutely no training. I am sorry that Mr. West left because he has not been answering emails from the Taskforce about this issue. I really only know one person that was notified, but there are about eight or nine or even more people named, so my concern is that they are not qualified. But if they are named, are they qualified to deal with the person, a student especially, but a staff member as well, who comes to them seeking confidential advice about how to proceed on an extremely painful, sensitive matter. So, there was follow-up, but I don't think it is to the point of satisfactory yet.

President Dowd: I would encourage you to continue this discussion with your Executive Committee.

Is there any other business?

Are there any announcements or awards from your colleges that anyone would like to mention? No?
May I have a motion to adjourn?

Meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:

Lucy Duhon
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard

Faculty Senate Office Administrative Secretary.