

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of February 26, 2013
FACULTY SENATE

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

Approved @ FS mtg. on 4-09-2013

HIGHLIGHTS

UT Board of Chairman Koester Requests to Hear Student & Faculty Concerns
A Core Curriculum Proposal – Waiting for the Provost
Reinstate of the Alcohol, Tobacco, & Other Drug Prevention Specialist
Spring Evaluations of the President, Chancellor and Eligible Deans
Provost Scarborough: After Implementation Cont'd

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, Dowd, Duhon, Franchetti, Hamer, Heberle, Hey, Hill, Hottell, Humphrys, Jorgensen, Keith, Kennedy, Kranz, Langan, Lundquist, Molitor, Moore, Nigem, Ohlinger, Plenefisch, Randolph, Regimbal, Relue, Rouillard, Teclehaimanot, Templin, Thompson, Van Hoy, Weck-Schwarz, Wedding, White, Williams

Excused absences: Brickman, Cochrane, Cuckovic, Denyer, Lee, Ellis, Gohara, Thompson-Casado Hoblet, Moynihan, Piazza, Quinlan, Sheldon, Yonker

Unexcused absences: Cooper, Crist, Duggan, Edinger, Giovannucci, Hammersley, Nazzal, Rooney, Springman, Tinkel, Willey, Wilson

II. Approval of Minutes: Minutes from January 15th meeting are ready for approval.

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

The Minutes of the January 15th meeting of Faculty Senate have been distributed to Senators. May I have a motion to approve those minutes? Is there a Second? Any discussion?

Senator Relue: I noticed in one of the senators' comments the word, "suet," I think it is supposed to be "suit."

President Dowd: We will contact the Senator who made the comment and ask for clarification.

Senator Relue: It was an unknown Senator.

President Dowd: If there is no objection, I will examine the context of that word and, paraphrasing Monty Python, exercise supreme executive authority by suggesting a substitute word to Secretary Duhon for the Minutes. Thank you.

Is there any further discussion? All of those in favor of approving the Minutes of January 15th please say, "aye." Any opposed? The Minutes to the January 15th Faculty Senate meeting have been approved. Thank you.

The Executive Committee report will be very brief today because we have a full agenda. In case you are unaware, three Vice Provosts have reviewed the various teaching workloads that were submitted by Main Campus deans to the Provost's office approximately two weeks ago. Recall that the Faculty Senate was asked to name three faculty members to serve as an advisory committee to the Provost on that matter. Faculty Senate has yet to receive such an invitation from Chancellor Gold. That said, the faculty group I just mentioned includes two faculty members from the Main Campus, Dr. Anthony Edgington from the Department of English and Dr. Ronald Fournier from the Department of Bioengineering, and one faculty member from the Health Sciences Campus, Dr. William Messer Department of Pharmacology. That group has been given a small binder containing the various requests for exceptions and exemptions to workload increases. Each member of that group will simply state whether he believes the exemption is justified. They have just begun that work.

As you know well, the implications of the latest workload exercise has been rather traumatic for just about every faculty member, chair, and most deans. I suspect that the extremely compressed time-frame of this exercise is due to the need to build the budget for next year. And they cannot build that budget until such workload issues are settled. So I suspect official decisions on workloads and the requests for exemptions should be forthcoming rather soon. Are there any administrators in attendance willing to comment on this time line? Is Vice Provost Barrett still in attendance? In case Senators do not know, John Barrett is a bright and shiny new vice provost. However, after spending this past week on workload agreements, I don't know if the shine is still there. John Barrett is a Law Professor and is a Past President of Faculty Senate. Vice Provost Barrett, can you shine any light on this issue?

Vice Provost Barrett: Well, at the end of last week and over the weekend the provost and the workload committee met with the deans of each of the colleges. We had one final college meeting this morning. We had various things that we wanted the deans and their various department chairs to continue to look into and to clarify/cleanup, and I expect to be hearing something back on that soon. The three of us on the workload committee went over workloads, and we are meeting with the provost tomorrow to try to wrap things up as much as possible, but this was a process where we had to be educated by the colleges as well as having specific comments for them about proposed workloads and course caps. Sometimes we did not understand that a particular class was being taught in a lab with limited equipment, for example. When we met with the deans we almost always heard from them that they needed to look into the issues we identified, so I suspect that there will be a little more back and forth that goes for another week or so just because of the very nature of waiting to hear back, but we are trying to wrap it up as quickly as possible.

President Dowd: Does anyone have any questions on that particular issue for Vice Provost Barrett? Thank you, John.

Provost Barrett: You're welcome.

President Dowd: As I mentioned at previous Faculty Senate meetings, the Board of Trustees passed a resolution mandating all governance and organizational constitutions, bylaws, etc, to be revised by June 30, 2013 to make certain no element in any of those documents is in conflict with the constitution of the University Council. This includes the governance documents of Faculty Senate and Graduate Council, each College Council, as well as every other organization, including Student Government. It also includes the governing documents for every college and every department at this university. At the minimum, each and every document must insert a "supremacy clause" and a "delegation clause." Please permit a paraphrasing of these clauses. The "supremacy clause" states that if a conflict exists between a document and the University Council constitution, the provision in the University Council constitution "wins" in all such conflicts. The Board of Trustees specifically mandated this "supremacy clause" be inserted in each document. In contrast, President Jacobs took it upon himself to require the "delegation clause" be inserted in each document. No surprises here: the "delegation clause" states that all power and authority has been delegate by the Board of Trustees to the President, and the President may further delegate such authority to other university units at his discretion. This also means that the President may choose at any time to repeal any such authority. I do not know if the Board of Trustees is aware of the President's insistence of the "delegation clause" be inserted into each and every document.

As I also mentioned previously, a group was formed to pre-screen each and every governance and organizational document at this university to see if any contain elements that are in conflict with the University Council constitution. I have a couple thousands of pages of such documents that I must read tonight in order to prepare for the meeting of that group tomorrow. I will keep Senate informed of that group's activities and recommendations.

Next, note that your Executive Committee originally scheduled Cameron Cruickshank to address Faculty Senate today. He was going to talk about "Interns in Ohio." Mr. Cruickshank is an outside consultant that has been appointed as Interim Vice Provost for Enrollment Management. Yes, a non-employee has been appointed as an Interim Vice Provost. That said, "Interns in Ohio" is a program to increase the number of internships our students receive and improve the experiential learning of our students. This should be a worthwhile program. However, Mr. Cruickshank very recently cancelled his appearance before Senate today. Perhaps your Executive Committee will be able to schedule him to address Senate at our next meeting.

As you can see from our agenda, today we have Drs. Humphrys & Molitor to discuss UT's Core Curriculum, A resolution on the Reinstatement of the position of Alcohol, Tobacco and other Drug Prevention Specialist, and Provost Scarborough to continue his discussion from the previous Senate meeting.

That concludes my portion of the Executive Committee Report. Are there any Executive Committee members who would like to add anything to this Report? Are there any questions from Senators? From non-Senators?

For our first agenda item, we are honored to have with us today Mr. William Koester, Chairman of the University of Toledo's Board of Trustees. If you recall, Mr. Koester addressed the first meeting of the Faculty Senate this year. At that time he promised to return to Senate later this year – and he is a man of his word. I'd like to take a moment to note that when I spoke with him last week about the deep concerns faculty members have over the recently announced workload policy and perpetual budget shortfalls under President Jacobs, Mr. Koester said that he wanted to come to Senate to hear the concerns of the faculty. So I encourage both Senators and non-Senators to take this opportunity to express their concerns to Mr. Koester. Note that because he must travel tonight, current weather conditions will cause him to leave our meeting after he addresses your questions.

On a personal note, I have known Bill ever since he was first appointed to the Board which, I believe, was in 2003. He and I agree on some issues and disagree on many others. However, when Bill and I disagree, he has never been disagreeable. With that, I invite to the podium Mr. William Koester.

Past-President Anderson: Can we suspend procedural guidelines during this conversation so these people who are not senators can address questions directly to the speaker?

President Dowd: Did everyone hear the suggestion from Past-President Anderson? He raised the issue of permitting both Senators and non-Senators the opportunity to question the speaker. If I may infer a meaning to that question, I believe Past-President Anderson is reminding me to clarify Senate procedures. Please know that all members of the university community have the right to speak at every Senate meeting. This, of course, means both Senators and non-Senators. With that clarification, I invite to the podium Mr. William Koester, Chairman of the University of Toledo's Board of Trustees.

Board Chairman Koester: Thank you, President Dowd. It is an honor again to be here. President Dowd and I had previous conversations I think we met at a football game and we kind of went back and forth; I refuse to ride on a motorcycle though. We really developed a relationship over the years and not just because we are chairs of our organizations. I really appreciate the times that we had to talk. In fact, I had a chance to talk with Prof. Rouillard a couple of times with Prof. Piazza and pretty much I come when I am invited. I am very honored to be invited and invited twice, so I don't know if that gives me anything. Maybe if I come back I may get a...before my term ends which is the 1st of July. When I spoke to you in August I spoke to you a little bit about myself and we talked about the kidney issue that was going on at the UTMC at that time. We talked about improving the human condition which is our mission and then I talked a little bit about appointing Dr. Scarborough as our new provost. But today as President Dowd said, I really want to turn the tables a little bit. What is really kind of strange here from my perspective is I was always sitting out there taking notes while you were lecturing to me and I guess I feel a little funny maybe talking to you so I want to turn the tables and say, I want to hear from you. I want to hear what you have to say because you are the people that have the knowledge. You are the conduit that is inserting that knowledge into our students and into our customers. I appreciate it and it is very important for me to try to hear what you have to say. I really honor the service that you give our students today because I know the service that faculty gave me back in the 50's when I was here and there's a lot of people that I can kind of think of as I remind myself, particularly, Dr. Don Hewing who was that one professor that had the key to my mind and without him I don't think I would have gotten through here. In fact, I have a feeling when I see the Engineering Department today I probably wouldn't have gotten in under the current

standards and if I would have gotten in I would have gotten out. But fortunately, we still honor and see students around here. Anyway, I take my responsibility as board chair very seriously. I spend a lot of time coming to various events; I am kind of known as the “Trustees that always shows up.” I think it is important to find out what people think in various different places. I’ve been involved with the university almost nine years. I sit on the College of Engineering Deans Advisory Committee, and I sit on the College of Business’ Family Business Council, and I sit on the UT Foundation Investment Committee, and I am also sitting on the UTIE Board of Directors. It is important for me to be here, so I guess what I am going to really tell you is we on the Board really care, I really care about this place. I care about this university; I live it and I love it and I am trying to do and we are trying to do what we believe is best for the university in our path. With that, I am going to open it up because I want to listen to what you have to say.

Senator Relue: I guess what I would like to say with respect to those workload issues that’s been going around- I know you love the university and all of us do too and our primary concerns here is making sure that when students come to us and take our classes that they are leaving here with the knowledge that they need. And a lot of that has to do with us being prepared enough to be able to teach them. One of the concerns that we have about the workload policy is that it increases the number of classes that potentially we are going to teach; there is a limited amount of time available for that, so things are going to slide as a consequence to that – either the quality of the education that students are going to get or the ability for us to interact with graduate students which is very time-sensitive because they do a lot of one-on-one work or our service to the institution by serving on bodies like this, or Graduate Council, or any of the other committees that are established as the university reorganizes itself and goes about its business. So, as someone who is very student-centered and I try to be every day, my main concern is, how am I going to be able to educate these students and give them their money’s worth and give them the quality of education that they are supposed to get if I already don’t have enough time to get everything done within a year?

Board Chairman Koester: Let me just hold before answering for just a second because there are other people that want to talk about the related issue.

Senator Hey: I have a comment that is related to that. To “piggy-back” on that, the area of concern for me is cutting into research time. I think all of our areas are very research sensitive, but I am working with technology all the time and technology is constantly shifting. I am trying to teach my students shifting technology constantly, so without the extra time or the necessary time to keep up with that it becomes obviously even more complicated.

President-Elect Rouillard: I would like to comment on the deal that Dr. Jacobs made with Dean Barlowe, Constance Fitzgerald, and a faculty member I believe is from Religious Studies whose name I don’t remember right now. Dr. Jacobs proposed a question, “All of this humanities and social science research is lovely, but can you afford to do it, can we afford to do unfunded research?” I think a faculty member explained it quite clearly, “We can’t afford not to do it.” But I would like to reiterate for you and the other members of the Board of Trustees- The importance of research even if it is unfunded research is where we go to rejuvenate ourselves to bring back inspiring material for our classrooms to inspire our students to continue learning and to provide them with a model of lifelong learning. To do anything other

than that is to present a static view of knowledge and teaching and we – especially our students – cannot afford that.

Senator Barnes: For me in my discipline, I would like a underscore, to emphasize there is no way with a 4/4 load and a 30 student limit per class that I can deliver the same quality of education that I deliver today, and I already have proof of that. I am very proud and pleased about what my students learn and I will not be able to give them the quality of feedback on their writing, and on their homework, and on their in-class work if I am asked to teach another class or a class with 30 students; the quality will not be there.

Senator Jorgensen: Thank you. You are the Trustee that is here all the time and various places of this university and we appreciate that, thank you. I think the major idea that I want to send to the Board of Trustees is that, in a very short period of time the direction of this institution is being changed from the top in a way that would be very hard to recover from. From what was on the order of 40% research we are now mandated down to 20% and that means a 50% decrease in the contributions that we do whether it is in technical areas, social areas, or humanities areas. Does the Board realize this is now the policy of the university? If we are cutting 50%, unless you are bringing in a grant our research.... And we are increasing our teaching loads while sometimes faculty now teach hundreds of students and we increase those for additional classes and you heard about the challenges for doing that - we are moving ourselves in a short period of time to a very different type of institution and if we are doing that then the Board of Trustees needs to know that. I know the word is, universities move fairly slowly and faculty don't like change. I think faculty do like change in various technology and there are other things in the classrooms that are different now than it was ten or twenty years ago. The business model is to change quickly. We all know cases where the business moved so quickly that they lost what their mission was and went bankrupt. But, universities can't do that because we have a broader and more long-term mission than that and if we are making a dramatic change over a short period of time and frankly, it is formed and directed by a leadership that doesn't have the experience of leading the academic mission of a major university; we are making that change and this is going on in front of the Board of Trustees.

Board Chairman Koester: Let me talk a little bit on how I am looking at things and how I think the Board is looking at things, just remember I am one of ten. What we see is a pressure rising nationally, locally, and it is in-state as well that we are reaching in essence how they limit with regard to condition. We really are not able to increase our tuition much beyond where we are at and that is always a hard question to answer, but we are seeing it. The President of the United States in his *State of the Union Address* addressed this and I am paraphrasing it, but it was something like, "If you people don't address it, I will." What that meant, I am not positive, but certainly we are seeing national pressure being applied to hold down tuition and fees. Statewide, we are seeing at the state legislature legislation being proposed that would force certain workload requirements on state university faculty. We have been opposing that at this point and we would like to handle that ourselves. Of course, the other issues that we are seeing are our former students as well as current students' debt rising and other issues. So, what I am saying is, from the top down our ability to raise revenue we are seeing pressure that we think we have to address and we don't think we can continue to raise fees to cover additional cost. Now we are trying to take a look inwardly to say, "Okay, what can we do to deliver a quality education and reduce our cost?" and one of the issues that we look at is faculty workload and there are a number of other issues that we looked at too and we are trying very diligently to address all of those issues. But, the way that I kind of look at it and

the way I think our organization looks at faculty workload is over the years (prediction) if you been a tenure- track or a tenured professor there's been a lot of emphasis on coming and doing research and doing your publication etc. and this is something that we tried to create and certainly the peer reviews that faculty have created have certainly emphasized the area of research. We don't oppose that. We think that that's absolutely necessary as well. I am a licensed practicing electrical engineer and I have to take so many credit hours or CPU's to maintain my licensing and I recognize that. I almost had a "picnic" because when they passed that legislation it wasn't that they passed the legislation and all of a sudden we had to do continuing education, we were always doing continuing education. There is no way I can stay up in my field and as a matter of fact, I have been slipping away from my field because I haven't been able to stay up this much with the amount of time that I put in at the university. But at any rate, I truly recognize and fully understand the need to continue to educate ourselves and that may not necessarily just be you getting continuing education in whatever your field is, but I also recognize that it is also the research that you do and that is the study that comes out. I also understand that in research it is not just educating yourself and getting yourself prepared through your classes because I am an engineer I am more on the science end generating new knowledge, research is generating new knowledge and we understand that. The problems that we see is in terms of trying to take a look at, we think if the pendulum for doing research is slowing a little bit further this way and a little bit less towards the teaching side we would like to see that pendulum swing a little more towards the teaching side. We are not saying that you shouldn't be doing research. We are looking to see if we can improve that efficiency to see if we can improve that area. I know it is a change, but I recognize and I think it is something that all the universities have to address, not just ours. I think if we can address it properly here and if we can get the thing moving in some way responsibly we believe that we can control this ourselves and we can do this in-house rather than in a year or two having some legislature or some government bureaucrat come in and force changes on us, or quite frankly, if we really can't finance the operation and then we have to start doing what Bowling Green is doing and that is laying off 10% of their faculty or something like that, we don't want to do that. We think if we can get a little bit more swing towards teaching not trying to do less in research. Well, I guess we will have to do a little bit more in research, but try to swing that in just a little bit towards the teaching area we think this can really go a long way in helping. There are a lot of other things we've got to do in controlling some of the cost and I am working very closely with the administration area. I served for nine years as part of the Finance Committee on the Board and I looked at financing very closely. As a matter of fact, I am criticized that you guys get into more detail that they would like, but at any rate, that is how I'm looking at this thing and I think the Board is looking at. We want to see the research continue but we also want to see the teaching if we can move that way. New professors are our best teachers and to some degree we are keeping our best teachers out of the classroom. I think I have a lot of understanding on a certain issue I think I mentioned to you before that I have a son who is a professor at the University of Minnesota. He is a research science guy and he teaches engineering. He is one of the guys that does bring in a lot of money for the university, so I know what his teaching load is.

Senator Relue: With respect to the research end of things, I think doing research doesn't mean that you aren't teaching. Doing research is a different kind of teaching because you are usually working with graduate students. If you talk to Dr. Komuniecki at all over the past couple of years and looked at the projections for where we really need people to be educated in it is graduate education and that is really the growth area because undergraduate education really isn't going to be enough for the workforce in the future, they are looking for very highly trained people which requires graduate degrees which is what

research really is. We have a significant population of our student body whether it is graduate students or not. If you take time away from the research end to move to the undergraduate end what you end up doing is jeopardizing the graduate programs and the graduate education of the institution. Now, whether or not you can make that up by increasing the undergraduate enrollment I don't think that is where the growth is. I think the growth is if you look at the projections it's in graduate education. The other comment that I want to make is with regard to the finances of this institution. I think if you look around the room and ask anybody whether or not they think they have been flush with money in their departments over these past years I don't think you are going to find anyone that thinks they have had more money in their budget than they know what to do with. We all feel like we are kind of skipping along with the amount of money that is available to us. What we would really like to know is where this money is going? Where have the funds been going? The colleges themselves based on the data that we got from Mr. Dave Dabney are all operating without losses and I realize that does not include support services and utility and things, but how much money do we have to make within individual colleges' above our expenses to be enough? That is something that we would like to know.

Board Chairman Koester: I did not bring any financial documents with me, but maybe I can speak a little bit on a thousand, or foot level, or something on it. Since the merger we operate about a \$800M operation and that is approximately our revenue. We have probably four main revenue sources. The largest revenue source that we have is probably the patient fees. So, the hospital patient fees are our largest single source of revenue. If you are taking this down please don't hold me to it because I am taking this from my mind. Maybe Dr. Gold could "hit" me off on that, but I think our patient revenue is about 30-32% of our annual revenue. Tuition and fees are our secondary fees which are probably around 29% of our revenue. Auxiliary services are our third area and probably the fourth area would be contributions. But, that tells you kind of where approximately the revenue is coming from. Where are the expenses going? Obviously, the most significant expense is salaries with regard to academic salaries, health care, nursing, administration, and so on. The other significant area is benefits and benefits are rising significantly and we are doing the best we can to try to control those. A month or so ago I went over the budget areas and just about every budget area I've seen has been covered not expanded at the same rate of the associated areas. Is there a specific area that you think we are spending too much on or do you think we are not?

Senator Barnes: What about the bonuses?

President Dowd: Please wait, if you will, Senator Barnes. I would very much like to jump into this discussion at this point. Academic Affairs has been shrinking at a shocking rate. When faculty members retire they are not replaced with tenure track faculty members. This goes back to Senator Jorgensen's point about the long term implications of the new university policy of replacing research active, tenured/tenure track faculty members with non-research active Lecturers. I understand that hiring Lecturers is a cheaper alternative to research active, tenure track faculty members. But this also goes back to the quality issue raised by Senator Relue – the university is not spending any money on academic affairs. From my perspective, how can the University of Toledo claim it is a research institution if it no longer hires or replaces research active faculty members? How can the University of Toledo deny claims that it is now striving for Community College status given the Provost's stated policy of replacing research active faculty members with non-research active Lecturers?

Further, let me ask a question I asked one of the Main Campus big-shots who stopped by my office today. When was the last time the Board of Trustees was given a presentation about an academic program from the Main Campus? The last such presentation to the Board I remember was about three or four years ago, given by Dean Naganathan. Such presentations to the Board do not happen anymore for Main Campus programs, but they are frequent for particular Health Science programs. Where is the Board's interest in learning about all academic activities at UT? I ask this because it appears we are not investing in on core academic issues. I recently had lunch with the Vice Chairman of the Board, Joseph Zerby. He must of thought I was a fool when I told him that my department was not able to buy chalk for classrooms because in terms of budgets, my department does not have two pennies to rub together. I have asked CFO Dabney many times for data on where President Jacobs is spending UT's money. But he refuses to provide any relevant data. However, I do know where UT is not investing its resources, and that is in the area of academic affairs. Apparently, President Jacobs will not devote the resources for significant assets such as research active faculty members – or for smaller items that might seem insignificant to some but essential for instruction, like buying chalk for classrooms.

Board Chairman Koester: I can tell you where we are not spending the money, it's not on my salary and my expense account which is also zero. I can tell you this, you are probably wrong in Dean Naganathan's statement because Dean Naganathan every year does his State of the College Address and we had him do an abbreviated session of it last Spring. We do listen through the various academic programs. We have a young woman from Engineering, Roch...be honored by the Board for the work she is doing. She did not make out a presentation, but we do try to take a look at academics. I got to agree with you, one of the issues that is always formal with the Board is money and trying to figure out how do we raise money or how we allocate money. But again, I go back to say, are you seeing areas that we spent money improperly on or are you seeing money that could be allocated in some other areas?

Senator Barnes: I was going to ask about the \$100K bonus that was awarded to our new first-time provost after four months of serving the university as provost in addition to the \$389,000 salary that he makes. What was the thinking behind that large of a bonus for a relatively inexperienced academic administrator four months into his service?

Board Chairman Koester: I would say this, from the Board's perspective, what we do is we try to allocate budgets, but we give the president of the university judgment to hire whom he believes he should hire and to hire them at the salaries that he believes it would take to get the person of that particular value. Now, if the person does not perform or if that person fails to meet whatever Dr. Jacobs has set forth then there will probably be action taken. But I can say that the Board does not exercise any direct authority over telling the president who he should hire or what he should pay them. My guess is he probably believed that this is what he felt he needed to pay the new provost that would be competitive in what he saw in the marketplace.

Senator Barnes: My question is about the bonus though, since it's probably more than a lot of our annual salaries. So, it is difficult to be asked to work 25% more with no more pay when people are getting bonuses larger than our annual salaries after only serving the institution in that capacity for four months.

Board Chairman Koester: Generally, what I would say is when we offer bonuses we usually offer them either as some incentive or some way we can control cost. If they don't meet whatever the performance...with regard to that bonus, for instance, I see our faculty athletic representative, Dr. Regimbal back there and she was at the ball game Sunday which was probably one of the most exciting games. We came back from being down by 12 points with about ten minutes to go. Anyways, what I was saying, we pay Tricia Cullop on salary and bonus area and when she performs she gets a bonus. Generally speaking from the Board's standpoint we direct administration to set salaries at levels and bonuses with regard to performance that they believe is in line with whatever they think the market is. With regard to Tricia Cullop, we probably can't pay her enough to keep her in the market, but we are going to try.

Senator Heberle: I would suggest that most people in this room think that there are way too many resources going to administration on this campus. I just want to know where the accountability is if we have declining enrollments and burgeoning deficits. When are you going to evaluate the president that you give so much power to hire administrators one after another and to increase the number of vice provosts exponentially over the last seven years? I also want to know when the current president's contract is going to end-- is there is an end to it? Or if he has been anointed in perpetuity according to your sense what his abilities are?

Board Chairman Koester: I can tell you President Jacobs' contract isn't in perpetuity.

Senator Heberle: Have you evaluated him since he came in to office?

Board Chairman Koester: Yes.

Senator Heberle: Did you make public last year's evaluation of his work or evaluate him according to standards you are holding him to in terms of deficits and in terms of enrollment and in terms of benchmarks of quality?

Board Chairman Koester: We did a year ago. We evaluated him at an Executive Committee meeting back in October.

Senator Heberle: Where are the documents?

Board Chairman Koester: We did not make it public.

Senator Heberle: Why not?

Board Chairman Koester: I didn't see any particular reason to make it public.

Senator Heberle: We work for this person. Why not? That makes absolutely no sense. Our evaluations are all public record. I get evaluated every year and if I am getting tenure I am evaluated every five years and that is public record. Why isn't President Jacobs' evaluation public?

Board Chairman Koester: The previous evaluation is public we just chose not to make that evaluation public.

Senator Heberle: Why?

Unknown Speaker: So you are saying an institution that gets 21% of its funding from taxpayers' supported dollars will have certain things secret and other things not, is that your statement?

Board Chairman Koester: Actually, there is about 16% of our funding that is from the state right now and it is in the budget. Generally, the Board feels that certain personnel matters should be held confidential.

Senator Heberle: There is no precedence for that. Where did that come from? Why would an evaluation of a president from a major university be held private or a secret?

Board Chairman Koester: We didn't do it in any formal manner.

Senator Heberle: Why not?

Board Chairman Koester: I think the previous year was probably due to expense.

Senator Heberle: Expense of what?

Board Chairman Koester: We decided not to spend the money.

Senator Heberle: Spending money on making it public?

Board Chairman Koester: No. The previous year we hired a firm (I can't remember the name of the firm) to do an evaluation and we ran that evaluation through a number of Board members and a number of faculty members and students and so on and that evaluation (I can't remember what we spent on it exactly) was tens of thousands of dollars and we chose not to do that this year.

Senator Heberle: Well, that is one heck of a way to use taxpayers' money I will tell you that. Especially, when we don't use it to ...

Board Chairman Koester: Well, actually, to answer your other question, I think the president's contract runs to 2016.

President Dowd: Senator Heberle made a very good point. What were the criteria the Board used to evaluate President Jacobs? What may be important to the Board could be very different to the students and faculty at this university. On a related issue, note that President Elect Rouillard will address Faculty Senate later today about the evaluation of President Jacobs.

Senator Thompson: Just a couple of comments. As I think about this process of how this planning is evolving it is very disturbing as a faculty member. In terms of faculty input many of us have participated in focus groups and committee meetings and trying to get forward our prerogative on things which is really not being implemented. As you go forward and you look at changing things like workload really is abandoning the situation. This weekend I was at a meeting where there were many MAC schools there from my program and I was asking each one of them, "Is your workload going up and are these changes happening on your campus?" They laughed at me. They said "A 4/4, are you kidding? We do research and we do other things" and these were places that weren't as research-intensive as the University of Toledo. I said, "Well, we are getting ready to do that at my institution." Then I said, "We are going to increase class sizes and we are going to do this and this and this etc." If you think that the problem seems to be that our numbers are down which is causing this I am not going to disagree with that. But, the idea of marketing larger class sizes and faculty will teach more and if you look at some of the things that are being done from a student service standpoint and one of the things that's been navigating through Student Senate is we have cut alcohol prevention on this campus which is the leading problem for students dropping out. We cut a counselor position and we have a waiting list for mental health services. We cut a sexual assault position that is very important on a college campus and many of our advising positions, the things that are a threat and keep our students here and keep them in school. These are positions that are not huge salaries. No study was done for this, these were blatantly gotten rid of and people would say, "Well, we can provide that with peer education." Really, we are going to have a student take another student to go get a rape kit? Really, we are going to have another student go and do alcohol education with them and have it be effective? So these decisions are being made and I don't know how and they are really impacting our students. When we look at the quality of instruction and we look at what we can give our students you don't need ...study to show more students in a class really is going to improve learning and attract more students; let's put that on a flier, "Bigger class sets come to UT." Those are the things I think we need to think about. Physically, even if we make these changes economically will that really make a huge difference when we look at the overall deficit that we have? Should we be looking at other areas and other pots of money? What is sucking our money away? Because I can tell you if you look at Kent State, they are building. If you can look at other programs, they are hiring faculty and we are not. So, something is very very wrong here if we are unique in a bad way. Why do we have a \$36M simulator that no one knows probably in this room what it does? Why did we have that built? Why are we being forced to teach more and do the work when people are getting bonuses and getting raises when we have not? I don't mind taking one for the team and I don't mind teaching more if I have to, but let's all take the load and let us all take the cut, not just the faculty. And let's listen to the faculty, let's get their input and not pretend to listen. I think that becomes really important.

Senator White: I believe that the future of the University of Toledo is in our young faculty. Students will come and go, the administrators and faculty are old.

Board Chairman Koester: I hate to tell you, but you are young. Prof. Wedding and I will be two old guys I know the people that these buildings are named after <laughter>.

Senator White: I would like to say that I am older than I look. But anyhow, when we are going from a 2/2 load for somebody doing unfunded research, I don't think Senator Rouillard made this up about administration wondering can if we can afford to continue doing unfunded research. We have a need for

unfunded research which many of us are here doing, particularly many of our young faculty, particularly in our department. It is almost impossible to get a grant in Mathematics and Statistics. We need our computers and not much more. We don't need the massive amount of equipment that other people need so the money is simply not available. We apply, our young, energetic and excellent faculty are applying, but it is almost impossible to get a grant to do that. So when we shift our load and when we state that the smaller classes which are tied to our smaller programs can't run then we are not only putting people's research goals and dreams in jeopardy, but we are putting their goal of mentoring young students, undergraduate and graduate, in jeopardy and so I believe that the road we are headed on makes the notion that we are going to attract young excellent faculty to the University of Toledo impossible. So I am deeply concerned and I know you are deeply concerned about the future of the university too, but the money that you are saving by these various edicts that have come down I believe pales in comparison to the price we are going to pay in terms of the inability we are going to have in attracting young excellent energetic faculty.

President-Elect Rouillard: Since you brought up an issue of not having the numbers right in front of you, I just happen to have them. Also to follow Senator Jorgensen's question, where the money is being spent? If we look at the salaries of the combined institution we see \$319M in salaries in a \$800M operation and we see about 1/3rd of that again for benefits. If you look at the non-clinical enterprise which I guess is the academic enterprise we see a budget of \$215M for salaries and about \$86M in benefits. If you look at the clinical enterprise you would see that salaries are budgeted at \$103M and about \$27M for benefits. Dr. Scarborough could correct me if I am wrong, but on the college income statements that I've seen that was distributed by Mr. Dabney I believe that faculty salaries were budgeted at \$88M, so that tells us a lot about where the money is being spent and where it is not being spent. It is not being spent as much on faculty as perhaps you would like to believe and I believe those numbers will speak for themselves.

Board Chairman Koester: Basically, the numbers are being spent on salaries; whether they be salaries for faculty, administration, hospital personnel etc. the money is being spent on people for the most part. Now, when you take a look at the financial operations of this place the hospital operates quite a bit differently than the academic enterprise. I like to refer to the hospital somewhat as a "retail operation" and I hope I don't insult the medical community in that area. Basically, what I am really saying is that the hospital operates almost on a day-to-day basis. If patients don't come in that place every day and if patients aren't being served every day the hospital could be out of business very quickly, so it operates very much like a retail business. We have to keep the hospital up-to-date in terms of what services and equipment that we have to provide our patients loads with or we will lose them. So when we take a look at equity equipment at the hospital we are driven by whatever the market is and we try to focus on applying different areas. Right now we are focusing heavily on the cancer area because we believe the cancer area is where the greatest need is. So the hospital tends to be more...intensive and we have to believe that we have to supply what we need to operate that issue. The other area that we see is in the medical school and of course, if you take a look at the hospital revenue it is actually stronger than the academic revenue.

President-Elect Rouillard: But it comes with way more expenses too.

Board Chairman Koester: It does and it is a harder institution to run. But, we look at running the hospital more like a retail operation and we look at it and trying to focus. There are approximately 120 different specialties out there and we are focusing on four or five, so we are trying to limit our budgets in there and we are trying to control cost as well as we can. One of the things that the hospital does is that it provides significant revenue to operate the medical academic enterprise and if we didn't have that revenue there we would not be able to offer the quality education that we believe that we see on the medical side. Right now if you take a look at our medical school and try to measure it on various levels – one of the levels that we measure it on in terms of funding our medical school we have the highest tuition control. We don't like this, but we kind of win the data for having the highest tuition and the highest tuition cost for our medical students. One of the things that I didn't get into in the academic enterprise and this becomes kind of an interesting area and again, I don't have the numbers with me to be able to state the chapter and verse, but when we talk about administrative cost, what is an administrator and what is an academic? How is that defined?

Senator Heberle: By salary I think.

Board Chairman Koester: I am trying to figure out how we define someone in the academic area versus administrative area. For instance, would a dean be an academic or would he be an administrator?

Group of Senators: Administrator.

Board Chairman Koester: Would a department head be an academic or an administrator?

Senator Heberle: They are administrators. What is the point of the exercise for distinguishing, it is not the question.

Board Chairman Koester: Well, the point that I am making is that it is difficult to define what is an administrator versus what is an academic cost. For instance, I think Dr. Dowd is a department head and is classified as an administrator, but he also is a faculty member who teaches. And so, the lines get a little blurry and I would like to be able to see if we can get the lines clearer in terms of what is an administrator cost versus what is teaching cost.

Prof. Purviance: If I may, I would like to talk about the philosophical question of what is a student rather than what is a budget or what is an administrator? Today we heard a number of very eloquent speakers and professors here. I am a professor in the Philosophy Department and my concern is with the students' ability to develop their verbal presentation and reasoning skills. In each one of the particular courses that I teach, every student needs to be able to master material and conduct a presentation of that material that they discussed and questions regarding that topic. So, these kinds of skills in philosophical presentation and philosophical arguments – data and so forth – take time in the classroom. They take preparation time for the faculty member to work with those students whether it is my discipline or my subject or others. We need that small class so that every single student can give and receive that kind of interaction and discussion – that is the kind of education that we need for students. We need it in general education as well as in the degree programs that students take. Are we going to lose those opportunities if we make our classes too large and if we make our opportunities for interaction with the professor too scarce? That is

how you get to be an honor representative and competent student coming from the University of Toledo and that is where we compete with Virginia Tech. and similar institutions that are strong in the sciences and strong in the liberal arts.

Board Chairman Koester: I understand that. I guess I don't want to take up all your time here. I understand what you are saying and this kind of goes back- I was a business man, but I am retired. As a business man I had to look at what my sources of revenue are and what... I can produce. I couldn't do everything. I tried to do as many things as I could. I also took a look at various areas where certain businesses, let's say certain areas I believe that I had to do to continue to make the company the company that it is. There were certain things that I made more money on and certain things I made less. But the old rule of, "I can't lose money on every job to make it up in value" and this is a problem that we do have at the university; we want to do everything. I would love to be able to do everything. But we are limited with regard to the resources that we have. And then trying to limit with the resources that we have and trying to provide the services that we have to provide we are looking at trying to make choices to try to get that going. If we can teach one more person in the class, does that break the thing? Do we get one more thing done? It's a matter of trying to look to see how well we can allocate our resources. We would love to do everything, but we are obviously going to be limited and so we don't want to eliminate research and we want to improve teaching and we are looking to try and do the very best that we can in those areas. I can tell you this, by talking with my son who is at the University of Minnesota, at the University of Minnesota the faculty voted to take a 1% pay cut across the board to try to balance their budget, they did that last year. So, it is not a fun area in terms of trying to balance the dollars, but we are trying to balance.

President Dowd: With apologies, I have to run this meeting by managing time for our activities. Senate has business to discuss. Time constraints force one last question for Chairman Koester.

With apologies, I have to run this meeting by managing the limited time available for all our agenda items. Although our conversation with Chairman Koester could continue, Senate has other business to conduct today. Time constraints force us to permit one last question for Chairman Koester

Senator Hamer: Actually, I wasn't going to say this, but several years ago when the custodial support staff were being cut our faculty tried to make that offer as well and we were told to keep our mouths shut, so that is something that we might want to re-visit. My real comment was to thank you for coming because it is really wonderful that you came and you listened and also to say, I think what you just said is so very important that we can't do everything. I live a couple blocks from here and it is very embarrassing to have everybody in Toledo on campus knowing about the UTIE thing that is going on which seems a long way from educating their children. It is losing lots and lots of money and spending a lot of money on salaries and not having an answer to that, I just say, "I am sorry, I don't have an answer." I hope that our Board and our administrators will address that. I think what Prof. Susan Purviance was just saying about focusing on the students is so very important. If I teach one class of undergraduates which is about thirty students, let's say they are going to bring in revenue inflow of \$60K which two of those classes will cover my salary and benefits. I think it is really important for us to remember that the only reason that we exist as a state university is to serve Northwest Ohio and educate the children, the students, and the professionals in it; otherwise, if we are not going to educate those students really well, we should not

exist. We should operate out of Columbus because there is no reason to have this expense. I teach a lot of students and my main teaching is students who can't afford their books until their student loan comes in and so often they start class six weeks behind because their finances were messed up. I didn't ever understand not having money like that and to value the access to what public education has for them. They are incredibly smart people and we do a pretty good job educating them for the most part and it is absolutely criminal if we forget what our purpose is and go into buying fancy medical equipment that these people will never afford. They are not going to get cancer treatment, neither is their mom or grandmother because they are on Medicaid. So their tuition for my little class should not be re-routed into the Medical Center. It should not be re-routed into UTIE and so it is so heartening to hear you say you pay attention to the budget and the details it is so very important and I am so glad that you do because my students' tuition should be supporting their education not somebody else's bid for a great...of something they will never have access to.

Board Chairman Koester: I can talk a little bit about UTIE. I have been involved with UTIE since its conception. Matter of fact, I actually made a contribution to the University which actually started UTIE. UTIE really became Dr. Johnson's idea. I am going to give you a little history and I hope you can take a few minutes out of your time. There were a number of pressures to start UTIE. This was Dr. Johnson's idea and he talked about the "Technology Corridor" and that was his language, so the "Technology Corridor" actually became UTIE. His idea was, universities are being drivers in their areas of economic development and he would focus on sorting value that spun off from Stanford and he also talked about the "research triangle" which is the (University of) North Carolina, (North) Carolina State, and Duke area. The state of Ohio was given directives to the universities to get involved in economic development and get involved in various areas. One of the things that we also have at the university is our tech transfer area in terms of taking knowledge and ideas and so on and intellectual property that would be coming out of the university to see if we can commercialize that, so this became kind of the idea to setup UTIE. When UTIE first started Dr. Johnson was actually the first president of UTIE, but when he was moved to Abu Dhabi Thomas Gutteridge moved in there on a temporary basis to take the job and then Dr. Jacobs put in Rick Stanley as the president. UTIE got funded in two different areas. Basically, Dr. Jacobs moved \$10M from the auxiliary funds; none of the funds that went into UTIE came out of the academic, SSI, or any of the state funding. There was an additional \$5M that came in to UTIE which was money that was actually in the foundation, this is part of the old foundation that came over from the Medical College. Two elements that came in in that \$5M which was basically paper, it was not real dollars. It was basically some stock that came in and the stock was not tradable and it has been kept on the books at a certain value. When it was transferred in it was transferred in at very little value, but the stock had very little value or almost no value. The other area that has come in from UTIE which has been profitable is some things that MCO had developed along the area of gross anatomy. We have some software that was developed by CCI which is the Center for Creative Instruction, but anyway, that software is marketed through McGraw-Hill and that software is providing a half a million dollars a year (don't quote me) in royalties that are coming back in. With regard to some of the other activities that are going on in UTIE that is basically a venture capital operation. We are investing in very risky areas. It takes ten years to bring a drug or device on the market. One of the areas that we just began funding and Brent Cameron... – this is where we have a non-invasive for determining glucose for diabetes. If we can eliminate pricking your finger and running a blood test and we can do it by taking a picture with our cell phone and sending it to our insulin pump, wouldn't that be a fabulous type of thing that could help 67M diabetes patients.

Will this be successful? We don't have the farthest idea if this will be successful, but we are investing in theat. I would be happy to come back and talk about UTIE. It is an honor to be here. I am always willing to listen and Dr. Dowd knows that I am, I hang out in his office every once in a while. He gives me water every time I stop by. I appreciate being here. Thank you.

President Dowd: I very much appreciate Board Chairman Koester coming to Senate to hear some of the concerns of his faculty members.

The next agenda item is a discussion from Mary Humphrys and Scott Molitor talking about our core curriculum.

Board Chairman Koester: I am very sorry that I have to leave, but I have to see if I can get back before the snow hits.

President Dowd: Given the time spent with Board Chairman Koester, I have to adjust the agenda for this meeting. During the Senate's discussion with Board Chairman Koester, I spoke with Provost Scarborough and explained that Senate must conduct some specific business at today's meeting. I asked if he would be OK with me "bumping" his planned discussion until the next Senate meeting. I appreciate Provost Scarborough's understanding of our time constraint and I look forward to his address at our next meeting. Is there any objection to this modification to our agenda?

As I mention moments ago, the next agenda item is a discussion from Drs. Humphrys and Molitor, Co-Chairs of the Faculty Senate Committee on the Core Curriculum.

Senator Humphrys: We wanted to bring up a couple of things to Faculty Senate and we are not asking for it to be voted on today, but perhaps at the next meeting. It is like a continuing scandal of the core curriculum. We've at previous meetings given you a background of where we stand. Just as a little bit of a refresher and to bring you up-to-date, we know that Faculty Senate approved the new general education courses last year, but a piece of information that we probably haven't talked much about in the past was once that was passed then Provost McMillen went to the Board of Trustees and gave a presentation and indicated that the Faculty Senate had approved pairing down the core from approximately 300 courses to about 100, which was true. But, the problem is that that core that was the reduced core that we approved was never implemented. By that, I mean, it does not get implemented until it is uploaded on the system and of course, Faculty Senate does not have any ability to do that. So, what we passed last year was never uploaded on the system. So it never was actually put into effect and so what that leaves us right now is when we, President Dowd and I met with the provost representatives in December we found out that the state said we can't have a course in the general education core without it being part of the Ohio Transfer Module which meant that our old/current core does not have courses that are all OTMs. Our new core that we passed last year did not have courses that were all part of the OTM, so it leaves us with an old core and a new core and a set of OTMs because our university does have a set of courses that are in the OTM, but we don't have...corresponds. So, we are not meeting the state's requirements of our old core and our new core. What we, Senator Molitor and I are waiting for what we were asked by the Provost's Office in December was to supply them the syllabi for the courses and the new core that was not part of OTM, so they can go to the state to see if the state will approve those courses as being part of the Ohio Transfer

Module and thus they can be part of our general education course list. We haven't gotten an update on that, so we are dangerously close to having another academic year that we would have a general education list which is not approved by or fit the guidelines of the state.

President-Elect Rouillard: I would like to point out, I just learned yesterday that some courses that we were offering as dual enrollment are also in jeopardy because they are not part of OTM. Apparently, up until now we got waivers from the state to offer those courses, but that may not continue and I think this has got some other bigger implications, particularly, if we are trying to do this 3-year graduation program and now we have this other issue that will cause complications.

Senator Humphrys: As I mentioned and Senator Molitor and I talked a lot about, we were trying to push ahead with this, but we can only go so far without having a list of the courses. We know what is currently part of the Ohio Transfer Module, I know that Senator Molitor knows this better than I do, what percentage of those OTM courses are part of our general education courses?

Senator Molitor: Our general education are approximately 70% OTM.

Senator Humphrys: So, we are coming at it from a point of view that again, we are going to be dangerously close to not being able to get an actual approved core curriculum; approved in terms of what the state has, with what their guidelines are. As you know and have been talking about, we definitely feel our students deserve better and we want to be able to present to them an actual accurate list of courses. If the course does not get coded as our courses from the list that we approved last year- if they do not get coded in the system as satisfying the humanities and social science requirement, we found out that is what the advisors go by and I am sure that is what the students go by. So, just by us passing this last year this is not something which will be actually put into effect because we can't take that step, we don't have the ability to do that.

Senator Hamer: Senator Humphrys, what can we do as Faculty Senate to help move that along?

Senator Molitor: Actually, that is what I was going to talk about. What we want to do is actually step ahead and correct this and then by doing it now we give ourselves the opportunity to make sure that these courses do get implemented and coded on the system appropriately by the end of this academic year so that they are ready in time for the Rocket Launch once it starts in June. Because what we are proposing will take effect for students entering the university in Fall 2013. So what we've done, Senator Humphrys and our committee has put together a proposal that we hope will address the issues that the state had with our core curriculum. This is our general education core and basically what you are seeing here is a proposal that we are going to present to Faculty Senate in two weeks at our next meeting for approval. So what we are basically asking is any objections please speak now. What you will see in orange are the changes to our existing policy. So what we have is a core curriculum that consists of two components - one is this general education component which is governed by state requirements. So we are basically complying with the state's requirements by making this proposal. So anything in our general education core curriculum will have to be part of the Ohio Transfer Module. That means if someone wants to enter their course into the university's general education core curriculum they will not be coming to Faculty Senate for approval. They will be going to the provost and asking the provost to submit this course to the

state for inclusion in the Ohio Transfer Module. At that point, any course in the Ohio Transfer Module will be considered part of our university's general education core curriculum.

We have been following the state's policy in terms of the breakdown, so we have: 6 hrs. of humanities, 6 hrs. of social sciences, 6 hrs. of natural science with at least 1 hr. of that 6 hrs. taken as a lab, 3 hrs. of mathematics and 6 hrs. of composition. So that has not changed, that is still the same requirement which is also the state's requirement. Now, we are adding an extra 9 hrs. Before, this 9 hrs. requirement was taken care of by multi-cultural course requirements, but it turns out that the majority of those courses were not in the Ohio Transfer Module. So we are saying each degree program has to go and find 9 hrs. of course work that can be from any category in the Ohio Transfer Module and individual degree programs will decide how they fulfill this remaining requirement. This will be a requirement that we are asking all colleges and all representatives to look into. In the proposal that was sent around with the meeting material today there is a list of courses that are currently approved for the Ohio Transfer Module and the last page contains those courses that we are still waiting to hear about. Please take a look at those and talk to your advisors and talk to people who are in charge of the various undergraduate degree programs. This is the one requirement we think can cause some issues for everybody so we want to make sure we are putting forth a proposal and hopefully it is not causing any issues for anybody.

Prof. Edwards: What are OBOR's regulations about general education for lower-division and upper-division? Last year we were going through this process where four courses were approved through the Ohio Transfer Module and we were told we can only do freshman and sophomore level courses and we will do junior and senior level courses later, what happened to the junior and senior courses which make up a large percentage of our core courses?

Senator Molitor: The state will not accept 3000- and 4000- level courses for the Ohio Transfer Module.

Unknown Speaker: For the Transfer Module, but they can still be part of the general education core?

Senator Molitor: They cannot. If it is not in the Ohio Transfer Module it cannot be part of our general education core curriculum.

Unknown Speaker: Okay, so then what happens to upper-division courses in the programs that require general education out of the upper-division level?

Senator Molitor: That is what we are asking degree programs to tell us what shortfall or what they can't do in terms of this proposal. We need to know that. We have not heard from any degree program specifically that has an issue with this proposal. But I will also make a proposal about the multi-cultural course requirement that may accommodate what you are saying.

Senator Jorgensen: Two unrelated questions. In terms of the 9 credit hrs. that the department would choose for the remaining hours, presumably there will be a place for some flexibility in there?

Senator Molitor: As long as it is an OTM course.

Senator Jorgensen: I mean a department needs some flexibility for the students so they are not locked into curriculum for the students. For example, for one of the sciences a student may have to take a particular economics class?

Senator Molitor: No. The degree programs can say any 9 hrs. for degree course work, that is going to be up to individual degree programs. Some degree programs may have to say, for example, Engineering, we have to take all those courses for natural sciences and mathematics to be able to meet the requirement.

Senator Jorgensen: Okay. I have another unrelated question. Are you saying that there would not be a Core Curriculum Committee of Senate?

Senator Molitor: No, I will get to that in just a minute. That is a good question

Alright, there's also an issue with the interdisciplinary course category. Right now I don't believe we have new courses in the Ohio Transfer Module that are considered interdisciplinary courses, but if we do get courses that come up in the Ohio Transfer Module that are interdisciplinary we are proposing that they can count for those remaining 9 hrs. but they cannot count for the first 27 hrs. because we have no good way for splitting up credit hours in terms of those courses. So we would be able to say, "Put two credit hours into humanities and one credit hour into social sciences."

Past-President Anderson: But it could mean interdisciplinary in humanities courses.

Senator Molitor: In the Ohio Transfer Module courses are coded as humanities and social sciences, but we can't have a split between humanities and social sciences courses; it has to be one or the other. We are still making this rule; this is not a state rule. We also decided to maintain the requirement that in the humanities and the social sciences the courses must come from two different disciplines and again, we are waiting for degree programs to tell us that this is going to work. So if this is going to be an issue, this is not a state requirement; this is our own requirement and it is something that we can certainly consider if it becomes an issue. Now, to get at the next part, we also have a multi-cultural core curriculum requirement and we are proposing to maintain that so students must complete 6 hrs. of multi-cultural course work and this now will be in addition to the 36 hrs. of general education.

Senator Keith: Why does it have to be in addition to the 36 hrs.? Why can't it be part of the 36 hrs?

Senator Molitor: It can be part of the 36 hrs. if the courses are in the Ohio Transfer Module. We have a requirement down here that says, "If the course is multi-cultural and also in the Ohio Transfer Module then it can apply as a "double-dip" course. We had this rule in the past and we would not be changing that.

Senator Keith: So, three of the hours would be in the 36 hrs. and the other 3 hrs. could potentially be part of...

Senator Molitor: Yes, that is correct. Thank you for clarifying that. We are also proposing a change to the multi-cultural course requirement. In the past we had two categories of multi-cultural courses, non-

Western Culture and Diversity of U.S. Culture. We are now proposing to add a third category for Foreign Languages. This is to accommodate students who have been taking foreign language courses that previously counted towards our general education core curriculum but these courses have been excluded by the state from the Ohio Transfer Module, therefore cannot count in our general education core. We thought this is the most reasonable solution to this problem and appropriate I might add, since we feel that learning a foreign language is a multi-cultural thing to do. So, the Core Curriculum Committee believes this is a solution to this issue. We can create this third category for the foreign language courses that were previously in our general education core curriculum, but now they are no longer in our general education core curriculum. These courses will automatically be included in this new foreign language category in the multi-cultural core curriculum. So now students instead of having to choose one Diversity of U.S. Culture and one non-Western will now get a choice from two out of the three categories.

Senator Hottell: I have an incredibly stupid question that is coming from the Chair of Foreign Languages, let me just say that first. But, when you are saying foreign languages do you mean our elementary and intermediate language acquisition courses as well as the culture courses that were there before?

Senator Molitor: The courses we are talking about are any foreign language courses that were previously in our general education core but now have been excluded because they are not considered to be part of the Ohio Transfer Module. So that may be just the language acquisition courses because your cultural courses are currently being considered for OTM inclusion. But, if those courses are denied OTM inclusion then they would follow this multi-cultural course category.

Senator Lundquist: This group of courses can be at the 3000- and 4000- level?

Senator Molitor: These courses can be at the 3000- and 4000- level because these courses are not covered by the state's requirements. So, we are proposing that all courses that were previously in our multi-cultural course category continue as is so that they remain in our multi-cultural course category.

Senator Humphrys: I also think and this may answer everyone else's questions as well. The thing is, right now the only courses that we have in our general education choice list are courses that's in OTM which means that that can't be and that is why we have to rely on the Provost's Office to take our plea, for example, those previous courses that we approved last Spring that are not part of OTM - we are counting on the Provost's Office to take the information that they asked for and we've provided to the state to ask for approval because if you look at the courses that are included in the OTM which who knows when those were approved so many years ago that a lot of those courses aren't offered any more. So, we are really counting on the term my grandmother used, "Really talk turkey here." Last year Provost McMillen told the Board of Trustees that we pared down 300 to 100 courses and that is not accurate - we did it, but it was never followed through on. I want to make sure it is in the Faculty Senate Minutes that the Faculty Senate did its job to do what the Board had asked to be done but it never went any further and it wasn't anything we could do. Just to be blunt, we are really at an impasse if we don't get the cooperation from the Provost's Office.

Senator White: I am ignorant of this, so forgive me and it is a “dumb” question. Relative to the courses on the last page, transfer seems to be implying that other universities may need most of them, or some of them, or all of them have equivalent courses that students can transfer those credits, is that a correct assumption and if so, does this fit with what is in the Ohio Transfer Module?

Senator Molitor: The more I learn about this I feel that the Ohio Transfer Module is a very bad name for this because not all of these courses are offered at other universities. That is not a requirement for a course to be included in the Ohio Transfer Module.

Past-President Anderson: What has to be transferable is the credit, right? You get the science credit if you take a course that is related to science.

Senator Humphrys: You see, that is kind of deceptive because anything can transfer in, but whether it counts, it is the counting part that we found out. So, it is those transfer assurance guides that are tagged and they are really here for transfers into the OTM.

President Dowd: I want to make sure everyone understands that we are bringing this issue back for further consideration by Senate.

Senator Humphrys: Right.

President Dowd: The issue is that each Senator should discuss this issue with their respective college colleagues.

Senator Jorgensen: To transfer the way it was, what it meant is that a student that is completing that unit here at the University of Toledo, had they transferred all the classes so basically we have to agree then if they went to another institution they are deemed to have met it at that institution, not course-by-course.

Senator Molitor: General education.

Senator Jorgensen: You have not answered the question about oversight of the Faculty Senate.

Senator Molitor: Because multi-cultural courses have to be approved still, so this will be the Core Curriculum Committee’s responsibility and we still have assessment issues related to the Higher Learning Commission, so, yes, the Core Curriculum Committee is still in business. The last thing I want to emphasize and follow through on what Senator Humphrys said, I don’t want to rush this process, but I really think it is important for us to vote on this proposal so that we can follow up with the provost to make sure that they are on the system by the time our advisors start registering students for classes in June – that our advisors can look and see that these courses have been coded and can appropriately advise students in terms of what our true general education is.

Senator Wedding: Why don’t we vote today?

Senator Molitor: I still need your feedback on issues.

President Dowd: I want to let you know I truly appreciate your work on this issue. Please extend my gratitude to each of your committee members.

Okay, next on the agenda is President Elect Rouillard.

President-Elect Rouillard: At the last Senate meeting we had a representative from Student Senate who asked us to pass a resolution in support of their resolution to reinstate the position of alcohol, tobacco, and other prevention specialist. We did a quick on-the-floor draft of a resolution. I wrote it down and forwarded it to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee members who seemed to be pleased with it. That resolution will be forwarded to you in an email tomorrow by Quinetta. It is very simple. It is simply, whereas the Student Senate passed a resolution on the reinstatement of this position and Faculty Senate supports that and also the reinstatement of that position. Also, since I am here I will give you a quick update on the Faculty Senate evaluations. We are going ahead with the evaluations that are listed on the agenda. I have been to speak with people at CCI. I spoke with Bobbi Vaughn about dates to get this going and it looks like it will be possible to get this survey off and running as soon as we come back from Spring break. So, Monday, March 11th I believe you will see the surveys for your appropriate dean for you to vote. In response to Senator Heberle's question, I would like to remind the senators that Faculty Senate evaluated Dr. Jacobs and Gold two years ago and those evaluations are available to you in the Faculty Senate Office in U-Hall. Those are Faculty Senate evaluations of those administrators and those are available to you to look at even if the Board does not release its evaluation to us.

President Dowd: On that point, I do not know where the electronic copies of those evaluations reside. However, Faculty Senate has hard copies of the past evaluations of President Jacobs and Chancellor Gold. Anyone interested in reviewing the results of those evaluations can contact the Faculty Senate office.

Senator Jorgensen: One of our responsibilities as senators is to really encourage our colleagues to participate in this evaluation and some are fearful that they are not really anonymous, so whatever you can do to convince them that they are anonymous get our colleagues to fill them out. They are often dismissed because it is only 10% of the faculty.

President Dowd: Chair Koester spoke about an evaluation of President Jacobs last year. I will try to find out additional information the next time he and I meet. I too encourage all faculty members to complete this year's Senate evaluations of President Jacobs, Chancellor Gold, and selected deans. Is there any other old business? Is there any new business?

Senator Jorgensen: The evaluations are on paper so it is open record, isn't it?

President Dowd: If any part of the Board's evaluation of the president is on paper then we should be able to request it. Any other new business?

Senator Regimbal: I would like to make an announcement and it has to do with my position as a Faculty Athletics Director, there is a men's basketball game on...at 7:00 p.m. It is a big deal because our team has

done really well. If you have not met our coach yet here's your chance to meet him. We have a great coach and I think he works hard. Our team is doing well academically and we would love to you go and support the men's game. Also, senior night for our men's basketball which will be on March 5th and we have two women's games left and March 3rd and March 6th is our senior night for our women's basketball teams. It will be really fun to have faculty there to at least recognize senior night.

Senator Unknown: What is senior night?

Senator Regimbal: Is where they recognize the...

Senator Unknown: Oh, I thought it was for old people <laughter>.

Senator Regimbal: No, but I can ask.

President Dowd: Are there any other announcements? May I have a motion to adjourn? Meeting adjourned at 6:01 pm.

Respectfully submitted by:

Lucy Duhon
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard

Faculty Senate Office Administrative Secretary.