THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of February 2, 2016
FACULTY SENATE

http://www.utoledo.edu/facsenate   Approved @ FS meeting on 3/01/2016

Summary of Senate Business
Governor's Taskforce on Affordability and Efficiency
Parking Monetization RFP Review and Scoring Committee

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 Keith: I call this meeting to order. Welcome to the eleventh Faculty Senate meeting of AY 2015-2016. **Lucy Duhon,** Executive Secretary, called the roll.

I.   Roll Call: 2015-2016 Senators:

Present: Anderson-Huang, Atwood, Black, Barnes, Burnett, Cappelletty, Denyer, Dowd, Duhon, Elmer, Fitzgerald (substitute for D. Compora), Franchetti, Gibbs(substitute for A. Jorgensen), Giovannucci, Gray, Gruden, Gunning, Harmych, Hasaan-Elnaby, Hoblet, Humphrys, Keith, Kennedy, Kippenhan (substituted for S. Weck-Schwarz), Kovach, Krantz, Lee, Lundquist, Malhotra, McAfee, McLoughlin, Molitor, Monsos, Nathan, Nigem, Oberlander, Ohlinger, Prior, Randolph, Regimbal(substitute for M. Edwards), Rouillard, Schneider (substitute for M. Caruso), Skeel, Willey, Sheldon, Slantcheva-Durst, Smas, Srinivasan, A. Thompson, Williams, Wittmer, Wedding

Excused absences: Brickman, Duggan, Farrell, Federman, Quinn, G. Thompson, Thompson-Casado, White
Unexcused absences: Devabhaktuni, Elmer, Kistner, Mohammed, Schafer

II. Approval of Minutes: Faculty Senate meeting Minutes of November 24, 2015 and December 8, 2015 are ready for approval.

Academic Year 2015-2016. I ask that Executive Secretary, Lucy Duhon come to the podium to call the roll.

President Keith: Thank you, Executive Secretary Duhon. We have two sets of Minutes to approve and once we have approved these we will be done with Minutes from last semester. You should have received these Minutes yesterday. May I have a motion to approve the Minutes of November 24, 2015? Are there any discussions or corrections? All in favor please say "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? *Motion Passed*. Next, do I have a motion to approve the Minutes of December 8, 2015? Are there any discussions or corrections? All in favor please say "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? *Motion Passed.*

Thank you so much for coming to our second meeting in a row at the HSC. As you know, we moved this meeting to the HSC so faculty could attend both Faculty Senate and a Campus Forum on Diversity. That forum starts at 6 p.m. and it is being held in HEB 103.

Executive Committee report: This is a short EC report – not because we haven't been busy, we have. It's just that many of the issues and projects we've been working on are not developed enough to ask for your feedback or to give a report. For example, several EC members are on various SEP (strategic enrollment plan) working groups. These groups are meeting weekly because by mid-February they are expected to submit a situation analysis review to the SEP council. Senator Dowd is our representative to that council so I expect at a future meeting he will give us an extensive report on the strategic enrollment plan.

Since our last meeting, your Executive Committee has attended several meetings hosted by the Provost. President-Elect Humphrys and I met with President Gaber; we try to meet with her at least once-a-month.

At our meeting with the President, we gave her a brief history of our Gen Ed situation. As you know, for many years, we've had many conversations with the Provost's office as to whether our OTM courses need to be a subset or the entire set of our general education courses. This impasse has resulted in a backlog of Senate-approved Gen Ed courses, which haven't been coded as such by the Provost's office, and, consequently will not satisfy students' Gen Ed requirements. Since this issue is likely to carry over to the new Provost, we thought President Gaber should be aware of this history, for no other reason, if it comes up when the Provost candidates visit campus in the next few weeks.

We also asked President Gaber to encourage her senior leadership team to consider the Faculty Senate meeting schedule when they schedule campus-wide events that faculty would like to attend.

I do have information on spring enrollment. Comparing spring 2016 to spring 2015 shows UG enrollment is up in both headcount and FTEs. We have 201 more UG or 1.4 percent, however, since many of the new students are part of College Credit Plus, the increase in headcount translates into 12 more FTEs or 0.09 percent. Spring to spring enrollment at the graduate level is down. In terms of headcount it's down 135 students or 3.14 percent, which translates into a decline of 208 FTEs, or 6.94 percent. Some of the decrease in Graduate FTEs is an artifact of our decision last year to change the number of hours required for full-time graduate enrollment from 12 to 9 hours. Since the State's definition of an FTE is 15 credit hours, our new measure of full-time enrollment will, by definition, reduce the number of Graduate FTEs. To sum, considering both UG and Graduate students, we are up slightly in terms of headcount – 0.35 percent but down in FTEs by 1.26 percent.

Soon after taking the position, President Gaber established a regular meeting schedule with your Executive Committee. I mention this because our next meeting with President Gabor is this Friday. Coincidentally, both the FSEC and President Gaber asked that this week's discussion focus on the university budget. As is clear to everyone, President Gaber inherited both a short-term and a long-term budget deficit. The sizes of which are compounded by the bad assumptions that were built into the University's budgets over the past several years. For example, built into last year's budget was the assumption that undergraduate enrollment would grow by 2 percent and graduate enrollment would be flat. Instead, undergraduate enrollment stayed flat while graduate enrollment decreased by 9 percent. President Gaber has spent considerable time and effort searching for ways to address the resulting shortfall without making cuts while at the same time trying to develop options that will provide long-term fiscal stability. Since UT is in the process of developing next year's budget, I believe it's time to be briefed on where we stand on this year's shortfall as well as contribute to the discussion of what assumptions will go into next year's budget. You can look forward to a report on the EC's conversation

with the President and future agenda items that will help us understand the current state of UT's finances. If anyone has questions or comments, please let me know – I'll carry them forward. Yes, Senator Dowd, did you want to say something?

Senator Dowd: It is different this year to the Finance and Strategy committee. Your representatives work with individuals from the Office of Finance on budge assumptions, and other issues involved in building a budget. This year it has been heartening to have a president who actually wants to involve faculty in those discussion. That's a huge improvement over what occurred in the past. During the previous administration there was no "real" planning out of the Office of Finance. I mean that in the sense that budgeting is planning, and there wasn't any actual planning. The administration appeared to use whatever numbers fit their agenda and, then, in the fall semester, "surprise, surprise," we had an increase in the budget deficit. Well, of course we had an increase in the deficit because the previous administration knowingly used unrealistic budget assumption. Every year they "kicked the can down the road," instead of fully addressing the budget. So every year the deficit got larger and larger. With our president and our interim CFO we now have grown-ups addressing this issue. I very much welcome President Gaber's approach and effort on this issue.

President Keith: Are there any more comments? Thank you, Senator Dowd.

I've been asked to bring to your attention the two Campus Master Plan brown bags that will take place on Wednesday and Thursday. For the Main Campus, the brown bag is tomorrow – February 3, 2016, 11:30 a.m. to 1:00 p.m., Student Union Ingman Room. For the HSC, it's on Thursday, February 4, 2016, 11:30 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. in Collier 1200. It's my understanding these presentations will be about the completed analysis and what it means for UT's future. If you are unable to attend, Senator Fred Williams, our representative on the Master Plan Committee, will give us a report at our February 16th meeting. Senator Williams, do you have anything to add?

Senator Williams: Yes. There will [also] be meetings with the general community I believe tomorrow night and/or the next day. Those are also ways that people can come in and hear what they've come up with.

President Keith: Thank you, Senator Williams.

Finally, we were asked to name a Faculty Senate representative to the University's Healthcare Promotion and Wellness Initiatives committee. We named Senator Amy Thompson. Amy, I know the committee has only met once but is there anything you'd like to report at this time?

Senator A. Thompson: Sure. I had the opportunity to meet with some individuals who are part of the HR team as well as Healthy U such as Vicki Riddick. I think this is a really exciting initiative, something that we've been hopeful for, for a long time. Many of you know that there was an announcement during the time of enrollment that you can opt in for Healthy U. There's over 1100 faculty and staff that actually indicated interest and they were able to screen over 600 faculty and staff so I think that's awesome. They're working on trying to create monthly activities that faculty and staff can participate in such as walking challenges and future screenings. I think you are going to see a lot more in terms of social media around this and I know President Gaber has been very supportive for this. If you have any ideas of ways

we can make this program better, reach out to other staff and faculty. I am happy to take those thoughts back to the work team. Thank you.

President Keith: Thank you, Senator Thompson. As for our meeting today, as you can see we have a packed agenda.

The first agenda item is an Ohio Faculty Council report by Senator Rouillard. That's followed by a report from the Academic Programs' committee on baccalaureate degree requirements. Based on our discussion at the January 19th Faculty Senate meeting, the Academic Programs committee drafted a policy change that would reduce both the minimum hours and maximum hours required for a UT baccalaureate degree unless additional coursework is required to meet professional accreditation or licensing requirements. Following that we have reports from five of our standing committees. Core Curriculum and Academic Programs will present course and program modifications for our consideration. Senator Molitor, Co-Chair of the Elections Committee will give us an update on where we are in terms of using electronic ballots in our spring elections. Senator Giovannucci, Co-Chair of Constitution and Rules committee, will give us a brief update. Finally, based on our discussion at the October 27th Faculty Senate meeting, Academic Regulations will present us with a proposal to revise the part of our grading policy that covers incompletes.

The last two presentations are by Senators that the Executive Committee appointed to represent our interests on two University committees. First is a report by Senator Jorgensen who is our representative on the University's Parking Monetization RFP Review and Scoring Committee. Last fall, President Gaber formed this committee to examine the pros and cons of outsourcing UT parking as well as review the proposals provided by the firms that are interested in taking on UT parking.

Next is a report on UT's response to issues raised by the Governor's Task Force on Affordability and Efficiency in Higher Education. Approximately a year ago, Governor Kasich signed an executive order that established the above-mentioned task force. The EO required presidents and members of the boards of trustees of state-sponsored institutions of higher education to provide their perspectives, input and advice on a list of areas. Last summer, President Gaber formed a committee to come up with a list of action steps to reduce college costs. Senator Dowd is our representative on that committee and he will give us a report.

Are there any comments or reminders from the Executive Committee? Are there any questions from the Senators? Thank you very much. So moving on, the first item on the agenda is Senator Rouillard.

Senator Rouillard: Thank you. I am going to bring up a table for reviewing. Since my last report at Faculty Senate on November 24th, I've attended the OFC (Ohio Faculty Council) meetings in Columbus on December 11th and January 15th. At the December 11th meeting, we were given information about Senate Bill 6, the legislation that requires institutions to report their *viability reserve* (expendable assets divided by debt) *primary reserve* (expendable resources divided by expenses) and *net income ratios* (net income revenue divided by total revenues) to the state. The chancellor then created from these three numbers a resulting composite score that indicates the financial health of the institution, in comparison to other institutions in the state. So just for your information: the financial viability reserve number is calculated by dividing expendable assets by our debt level. The primary reserve is expendable resources divided by expenses. The net income ratio is net income revenue divided by total revenue. If you are

interested in learning more about Senate Bill 6, you can go to the Ohio Department of Higher Education website where they discuss Senate Bill 6 – on that website you will find these charts. I pulled up the chart, the last year available is fiscal year 2014- what you see when you look at this chart is our, University of Toledo, composite score is 3.8; we are right in the middle of the pack, we are the 8th one down among 14 public universities in the USO. The highest possible is a 5. At the January 15th meeting we had some discussion with Mr. Jim Bennett who is the CFO of the Ohio Department of Higher Education. He helped us learn a little about how you interpret these scores and in his assessment the idea is that it's the comparison that is important- it is not just a straightforward number. As you can see, the highest is Ohio State at 4.7 and the lowest is Central State [right now] at 1.0. The other discussion point that came up is when an institution reaches 1.75 for two years in a row or lower, that institution will be put on fiscal watch until the Senate Bill 6 number reaches 2.4. So Central State is in a bit of trouble, but according to these numbers we're [University of Toledo] okay. If you look further down on this website you will also see a reporting from Audited Financials from other institutions for the numbers that go into calculating this composite score.

I will also ask Quinetta to forward two sets of reports appended to FS minutes, but the scores back through 2000 are available at
https://www.ohiohighered.org/sites/ohiohighered.org/files/uploads/financial/SB6/FY13-SB6-Scores.pdf

Specific requirements for SB6 contained in the Ohio Revised Code are available at

http://codes.ohio.gov/oac/126%3A3-1

At the January 15th meeting Mr. Jim Bennett also discussed GASB68, the General Accounting Standards Board stipulating that public institutions carry the liability for state pensions on their financial statements. The State of Ohio voted to accept and require this standard. Such reporting typically means that institutions will look as though they are overextended; therefore the Ohio Chancellor will now produce two financial reports for each institution, one calculated with GASB68, and one without. Mr. Bennett also indicated that in FY2017, funding for higher education in Ohio will be almost equal to FY11 SSI plus stimulus funds.

The OFC also received a legislative update from Sara Kilpatrick, Executive Director of the Ohio Conference of AAUP. She summarized HB48, the concealed carry bill. This bill allows Boards of Trustees to decide the concealed carry regulations for their own institutional campuses and the institution cannot be sued for injury or death resulting from a gun on campus. The OFC subsequently passed a resolution opposing this component of HB48.

At the Jan. 15 meeting, there was discussion related to the College Credit Plus program. Presently, some faculty worry that there will eventually be pressure to change sensitive curriculum, since students as young as 14 are now in college classes. There were some stories shared with us of faculty who received some phone calls, parents who were angry that their 14-year-old was having discussions of a very sensitive nature in college course such as genital mutilation and these sorts of things. The parents don't seem to understand that their children are in a college classroom. Clearly, we're probably going to have to deal with such issues. That is all I have to report. If there are any questions, please feel free, otherwise, I will send you the website of these financial statements. Thank you.

President Keith: Thank you, Senator Rouillard. Next, on the agenda is Senator Ohlinger. Professor Wade Lee, do you want to be part of this?

Prof. Wade Lee: I am on call <laughter>.

Senator Ohlinger: Thank you, President Keith. You've seen this before; it has been discussed or mentioned a couple of times. It was presented at our last Faculty Senate meeting just for some initial discussion or feedback to give the Academic Programs Committee some guidance in terms of the hour requirements for Bachelor Degrees at The University of Toledo, pursuant to the guidelines published by the Ohio Board of Regents for containing a definition of what a Bachelor Degree is in the state of Ohio. Real quickly, again, the background on this: looking at the current degree programs that we have at The University of Toledo that exceed 126 hours. These are the programs in various colleges including: Pharmacy, Business, Education, Engineering, and the Arts. As was mentioned previously, we received justification on why these programs exceed 126 hours. If you want to read those, and this is thanks to Senator Molitor who gathered this information from the various programs.

College	Degree	Major	Required Hours
PH	BS in Pharmaceutical Sciences	Doctor of Pharmacy Major	136
BU	Bachelor of Science	Information Technology	128
CE	Bachelor of Education	Adolescent and Young Adult Education	128
CE	Bachelor of Education	Early Childhood Education	128
CE	Bachelor of Education	Middle Childhood Education	128
CE	Bachelor of Education	Multiage Education	128
CE	Bachelor of Education	Special Education	128
EN	BS in Bioengineering	Bioengineering	128
EN	BS in Construction Engineering Technology	Construction Engineering Technology	128
EN	BS in Chemical Engineering	Chemical Engineering	128
EN	BS in Civil Engineering	Civil Engineering	128
EN	BS in Computer Sciences & Engineering Technology	Computer Science and Engineering Technology	128
EN	BS in Computer Science and Engineering	Computer Science and Engineering	128
EN	BS in Electrical Engineering	Electrical Engineering	128
EN	BS in Electrical Engineering Technology	Electrical Engineering Technology	128
EN	Bachelor of Science	Information Technology	128
EN	BS in Environmental Engineering	Environmental Engineering	128
EN	BS in Mechanical Engineering Technology	Mechanical Engineering Technology	128
EN	BS in Mechanical Engineering	Mechanical Engineering	128
CA	Bachelor of Music	Music - Voice	128
CA	Bachelor of Music	Music – Piano	128
CA	Bachelor of Music	Music – String	127
CA	Bachelor of Music	Music – Guitar	127
CA	Bachelor of Music	Music – Instrumental Jazz	127
CA	Bachelor of Music	Music – Vocal Jazz	127

Senator Ohlinger cont'd: In the above table, Music programs and Arts, all undergraduate programs in Engineering, and programs in Pharmacy are subject to external accreditation or rules that require more than 126 hours. The IT program in Business was designed to be identical to the IT program in Engineering. Therefore, the Business program wants to exceed 126 because the Engineering version does so also for its external accreditation. Finally, there are two versions of the College of Education programs. The licensure versions of these five programs - all-the-less, all require 128 hours. They also offer non-licensure versions of these programs and those will require less, but these are all the ones that are greater than 126 hours. In addition, when The University of Toledo switched from quarters to semester credit

hours – the way the math worked out basically was that nearly all of our undergraduate Bachelor Degree programs ended up with 124 hours. As it has been mentioned before, the Ohio Board of Regents and basically what we've been following is a 120-hour minimum, but we had no formal policy in place for that. So the Provost's Office has asked for a recommendation from the Faculty Senate and the Academic Programs Committee. This is very similar to what was read at the last Faculty Senate meeting. Basically, we took what was provided to us by the Ohio Board of Regents, as the definition of a Bachelor Degree program and inserted The University of Toledo in various places and then mentioned about justification for a program greater than 126 hours. So the Academic Programs Committee is bringing this forward as a draft proposal recommendation for what a Bachelor's Degree is at The University of Toledo. I will read it through:

> "*Consistent with the definition in the Ohio Board of Regents Guidelines & Procedures for Academic Program Review published April 2015, a Bachelor's Degree at the University of Toledo is an award that requires completion of a minimum of 120 semester credit hours. Bachelor's degree programs should not exceed 126 semester credit hours unless it can be shown that the additional coursework is required to meet professional accreditation or licensing requirements. Proposals for new programs requiring more than 126 semester credit hours must provide justification for approval. Bachelor's degrees may be awarded for general areas of study, such as those recognized by the Bachelor of Arts and the Bachelor of Science degrees or in specialized professional and technical fields such as these recognized by the Bachelor of Fine Arts, the Bachelor of Science in Nursing, the Bachelor of Education, and so on. Although bachelor's degrees require completion of a specified number of credit hours, the length of the program can vary. For instance, bachelor's degrees may be conferred for a five-year cooperative (work-study plan) program, which provides for alternate class attendance and employment in business, industry or government. They may also be conferred in instances where the full complement of credits is obtained in three years.*"

Senator Ohlinger cont'd: As mentioned before, this was forwarded by the Ohio Board of Regents and it is available to the full Senate for discussion.

Senator Rouillard: I would like to commend your committee for having brought forth this type of language regarding graduation credits. I would like to thank the Provost's Office for carefully reading the Ohio Board of Regents Academic Handbook. This is a significant departure from what our previous provost was trying to force on us, something that was not in fact coming from Columbus, but was in fact coming from Complete College America which recommends capping bachelor's courses at 120 hours. I think this is a much more reasonable and a much more intelligent statement of what a bachelor's degree should be.

Senator Ohlinger: Thank you.

Senator Anderson-Huang: The sentence, "*Proposals for new programs requiring more than 126 semester credit hours must provide justification for approval.*" It might say *for approval of the additional hours* because the approval of a new program is separate.

Senator Ohlinger: Does that make sense to everyone*?*

Group of Senators: Yes.

Senator Molitor: If I can answer that somewhat - all new bachelor degrees have to go to the Ohio Department of Higher Education for approval. So I assume that language basically means that they won't approve a degree over the 126 credit hours unless you provide that justification.

Senator Anderson-Huang: Right. I am just saying that should be somehow included in a little phrase.

Provost Barrett: Since this is really about the degrees and not other types of programs, instead of that change, why not say, *proposals for new degree programs require more than 126 hours*. It's going to have to go to the state and we are going to have to justify it- Senator Molitor is absolutely right.

President Keith: Does that satisfy you, Senator Anderson-Huang?

Senator Anderson-Huang: Yes.

President Keith: So, all in favor of approving this change to the policy as amended with the additional word, *degree* please say "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? Thank you very much. ***Motion Passed.***

"Consistent with the definition in the Ohio Board of Regents Guidelines & Procedures for Academic Program Review published April 2015, a Bachelor's Degree at the University of Toledo is an award that requires completion of a minimum of 120 semester credit hours. Bachelor's degree programs should not exceed 126 semester credit hours unless it can be shown that the additional coursework is required to meet professional accreditation or licensing requirements. Proposals for new degree programs requiring more than 126 semester credit hours must provide justification for approval. Bachelor's degrees may be awarded for general areas of study, such as those recognized by the Bachelor of Arts and the Bachelor of Science degrees or in specialized professional and technical fields such as these recognized by the Bachelor of Fine Arts, the Bachelor of Science in Nursing, the Bachelor of Education, and so on. Although bachelor's degrees require completion of a specified number of credit hours, the length of the program can vary. For instance, bachelor's degrees may be conferred for a five-year cooperative (work-study plan) program, which provides for alternate class attendance and employment in business, industry or government. They may also be conferred in instances where the full complement of credits is obtained in three years."

[Applause]

President Keith cont'd: Provost Barrett, where does it go from here?

Provost Barrett: Just send it to my office and then we will work to get it on the Board of Trustees agenda so it can be formalized. I am not sure if we will send it over to a policy area or send it straight to the Board, but that will be something we will figure out.

President Keith: Okay. Thank you.

Provost Barrett: Thank you.

President Keith: Thank you very much. Next, we have some committee reports from Core Curriculum.

Senator Monsos: This is what was sent out to you, but in fact, since I sent that, another course has been signed off on; my committee already dealt with it and it is such a minor change, so I would like for us to also approve that as well.

Last December, 2015, you approved a title change in a course for Disability Studies 2020 and since that is a core course we also have to say "yes." My committee has said that's fine with them, they don't see any change in the course from the course title, so in addition to this ENG 2770 course we would also like to add DS 2020 for approval. This course is not a new course to the university, it is an already existing course, but it will be new to the core. They have applied to both gen ed. humanities and gen ed. multicultural US diversity. The committee has reviewed the materials and submitted it and is happy with it in both categories and would recommend that it would be approved. So those are two items, ENG 2770 as a new course core for gen ed. and multicultural US diversity, and then a course modification, DS 2020,

which you've already approved once, but you are going to approve again. Are there any questions? All those in favor please signify by saying "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? Thank you. ***Motion Passed.***

Course Student Learning Objectives (Attached)	(1) Students in American Minority Writers should learn to *analyze* and *evaluate* literary *representations of race and ethnicity* from the text and to *differentiate* between their own personal and cultural values, values of characters within the text, and the values of the text itself. (2) Students in American Minority Writers should learn to *describe*, *analyze*, and *evaluate* the relationship between literary form and thematic content.

President Keith: Thank you, Senator Monsos. Once again, we have Academic Programs.

Senator Ohlinger: I did have a couple of documents ready to present to this and it is actually just one item. We had a few modifications that we were going to actually bring forth for an actual vote today, so that is pending, course modifications and course approvals, and I realize that that committee is slammed, so we don't quite have those yet. But I do want to go ahead and present today a new program proposal and that is a Peace Studies major and there's also a Peace Studies minor that's been proposed and I have a question about that, I would like to have a little guidance from Senate. We do have one of the program directors from that new major here, Peace Studies. It did come through Academic Programs Committee and we met last week. The committee recommendation pending approval of the new courses was unanimously in favor. Dale Snauwaert is here and I would like him to say a few words so we can hear about it today, but we won't be able to vote on it until the new course proposals go through.

Prof. Dale Snauwaert: We are proposing 120 credit hours for the Peace Studies undergraduate major. The approach, the design for the major is interdisciplinary. It has a group of major core courses in Peace Studies along with a group of education courses as the core. And then it has a series of concentrations, 12 credit hours in various disciplines. The proposal has ten of those concentrations, 12 credit hours in Art, Communication, Disability Studies, Economics, Environmental Studies, Legal Specialties, Philosophy, Religion, Women and Gender Studies, and Sociology. The core problematic of peace studies is violence in its various forms: direct violence, structural violence, cultural violence etc. on all levels of the human experience from interpersonal to international and global. So it lends itself to an interdisciplinary approach by the nature of the subject. Our proposal is unique; in that it also puts a place on learning and the development of capacity as a central component of the pursuit of peace, that's the tie-in to education. The number of concentrations, it is an arbitrary number at this point but it can grow if other disciplines are interested in joining the major. So that is the basic outline of the major. We are also proposing a minor in Peace Studies which includes four other peace studies courses, plus two 3-hour course electives that can be chosen from the concentration courses.

Asst. Dean Pollauf: What degree is this?

Prof. Dale Snauwaert: It will be a Bachelor of Education. The organizational home is the College of Education and we're authorized by the state to grant that degree.

Senator Anderson-Huang: How many other similar programs are there around the country site?

Prof. Dale Snauwaert: There are about 200 Peace Studies programs in the country, but none within our area. There are three within the state of Ohio - Bowling Green has a minor in peace studies, but there is no major in our direct area. The state has a 60-mile radius standard and there's no peace studies program within that radius. There are about 450 peace studies programs in the world, mainly in North America and Europe; the field really started after World War II and has grown.

Senator Barnes: How many of them you know are housed in Colleges of Education? Is that also typical?

Prof. Dale Snauwaert: That is not typical. It is fairly uncommon and rare. Most peace studies programs have historically, at least, been housed in political science departments or sociology. I have a long interest in the subject, in peace education and peace studies. We have had conversations earlier about some kind of cross-college degree and I know in a sense our degree is that, but it has to have an organizational home, so since we were the drivers of it, it's coming out of our college. But it is fairly unique and our design is pretty unique if you look at various programs across the country and the world. I don't think anyone has the array of concentrations, for example, and the focus on education as a key element is fairly unique as well.

Senator Kippenhan (substitute for S. Weck-Schwarz): How many students do you intend will participate and get a degree in coming years?

Prof. Dale Snauwaert: We are hoping for 30-50 majors over the next years. Of course, more will be welcomed, but that is the rough call. The minor will have probably a bigger number.

Senator McLoughlin: Sounds very interesting. What is the future for a student who graduates with a degree in this program? What do they realistically project as the future for those students?

Prof. Dale Snauwaert: It is a very broad subject so that can lead to many different careers. It can lead to post-graduate study, professional study, a variety of areas of professions. But the jobs that peace study majors range from are government, to non-profit organizations, to criminal justice, to social kinds of work, welfare and lobbying, just a whole variety of pursuits that peace study majors pursue after graduation.

Senator McLoughlin: Thank you.

Senator Ohlinger: Are there any additional questions? Again, we cannot actually take a vote on it today. We, the committee will be bringing this back to a future Faculty Senate meeting for approval. One question, I don't know if it's for the full Senate, but if there's something you can give us some guidance on quickly then that's fine or we can discuss it later. But with the peace studies minor, one question that came up at the committee meeting is there are two electives of student's choice to be taken. When the original initial proposal came through, it just said *electives* and we recommended - and the Program agreed - that the electives come from those areas of concentration within the major or other electives can be approved by the coordinator. So that is what we would like the proposed minor to look like when we bring it forward, how do we do that since it's been approved with different language at the departmental and college level? Does it have to go back and start over? How do we expedite that process so we don't go through months and months again?

Senator Dowd: Are you simply seeking confirmation that the department has approved that change of language? How about an amendment?

Senator Ohlinger: It seems reasonable to me. I just wanted to make sure we didn't have to start over.

Senator Dowd: We shouldn't make it more complicated than it needs to be.

Senator Ohlinger: Right.

Prof. Dale Snauwaert: I can present the change to the department and the college as a memo of acceptance from those parties and we can add that to the proposal.

Senator Ohlinger: Okay. So we will bring that---

Prof. Dale Snauwaert: I don't foresee any resistance.

Senator Dowd: A copy should be kept in the Senate office for reference in case this issue is raised a number years from now.

Senator Anderson-Huang: It also should be stapled on the side of the curriculum tracking system when it is uploaded.

Senator Monsos: I think Marcia King-Blandford is the only one that could probably upload it at this point.

Provost Barrett: You can amend things up till a certain point, and it has left that point. If there's documentation that shows everybody is in agreement and aligned, there is no point with starting it all over. We will get it figured out.

Senator Ohlinger: Are there any other questions?

Senator McLoughlin: Just a quick follow-up. How many concentrations did you say [there was a number]?

Prof. Dale Snauwaert: Ten.

Senator McLoughlin: We've been dealing with this in our department of concentrations; there's a lot of overlap and folks are looking to clean up. Are they very distinct? It sounds like they are very distinct.

Senator Ohlinger: Across multiple colleges.

Prof. Dale Snauwaert: Yes, they are each distinct.

Senator Schneider (substitute for M. Caruso): Have those concentrations been discussed with the colleges that they will be operating in?

Prof. Dale Snauwaert: Yes. We met with each of those faculty and have gotten an approval. We went through recommended courses that they thought were appropriate, so everyone is on board in the concentrations.

Senator Ohlinger: You may have read it, but I am not sure. The new course proposals are peace study courses- I think there are five of them, is that correct?

Prof. Dale Snauwaert: Yes.

Senator Ohlinger: The other courses will be in the areas of concentration, and are existing courses.

Senator Schneider (substitute for M. Caruso): I just wanted to make sure.

Senator Krantz: Senator Schneider, just to expand on the answer - Environmental Sciences, we've received the overall proposal. We had recommendations from their group proposing which of our courses wouldn't make sense. We reviewed both of those pieces of information and actually added a couple pieces of information, so, yes, we were involved in it and yes, we reviewed it.

Senator Schneider (substitute for M. Caruso): Thank you.

Senator Ohlinger: Thank you very much.

President Keith: Thank you very much. Next, we have elections.

Senator Molitor: Well, I have some good news. The Election Committee has been hard at work. Well, actually let me amend that as well – the Center for Creative Instruction has been hard at work and getting a system set up so we can have an electronic election. Right now we are in a process for running a test election. In fact, I've been sitting and pounding away on my laptop getting the results from our mock nominating election. Members of the Election Committee as well as members of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (and I thank my colleagues for participating) have gone through a mock election for nominating and selecting candidates for simulated Faculty Senate, University Committee on Academic Personnel, and University Committee on Sabbatical Elections. So far, it seems to be working great. I received a few minor comments about the language that's associated with the ballots and I will be sending these on to CCI. I've looked at the results and from what my colleagues have told me about the candidates they have voted for, everything seems to be working great. I haven't noticed any issues.

The only major comment I have was with regards to linking the ballot with the voters' UT credentials. You will have to log into the system with your university login credentials, your UTAD id. It does not work like the deans' evaluations did. So if you remember the deans' evaluations, you would login with your UTAD credentials and the evaluation system would send you a link or code with which you would log in. With the election system, you login with your UTAD credentials and it sends you straight to the ballot. Given this direct link between the login and the ballot, somebody was concerned that the system could link the vote with the ballot. It turns out that is not possible the way the votes are logged. Once you login with your UTAD credentials and submit a ballot, the system only records that you have voted and it removes you from the list of eligible voters. So if you try to login again, and people have tried this during the simulated election, you can't vote more than once and there is no link between the voter's identification and the candidates that are selected.

I am in the process of setting up the final election and making sure that this works as intended. If it does, it looks like we are good to go. I would like to thank Bobbi Vaughn from the Center for Creative Instruction and I would especially like to thank Jamie Carothers from CCI as well. Jamie did a fantastic

job putting the system together and it's been really easy to administer. From my understanding, it is going to save Quinetta and Lisa Barteck, who runs the UCS and the UCAP elections, a lot of paper cuts <laughter>. Anyway, so far, this seems to be progressing and we are hoping to implement it for our upcoming Senate, UCS, and UCAP elections at the end of this academic year. With that, I will take any questions you may have.

Senator Humphrys: Senator Molitor, is there any thought that's been given to faculty getting email to let them know that they can vote?

Senator Molitor: Yes.

Senator Humphrys: Has your committee given any thought or talked about a follow-up email for people? Do you know what I mean?

Senator Molitor: I am not sure what you mean.

Senator Humphrys: For the people that haven't voted because I am just worried that people, it's a funny thing, but probably more people would notice something in their [physical] mailbox because it would be more unusual than an email.

Senator Molitor: That is a great suggestion. In fact, the way the system is set up, we can do it by email, we can send out a paper notice, and we can post fliers around campus. The system is set up to provide a single web address to submit your vote. No matter how you get this link, if you type it in from a piece of paper that is in your mailbox or if there's a link in your email, everybody's going to go to the same website. Then at that website you login with your UTAD credentials and if you're eligible to vote it will let you vote. If you're not eligible to vote, you can't get into the system to cast a ballot. So we will select ahead of time who is eligible to vote and in which election they are eligible to cast a ballot. This is one of the things I've been testing. So we can put fliers up around campus and students can try to go to that website and log in and they wouldn't be able to vote unless they have a faculty member's credentials. So yes, we can utilize multiple modalities in terms of getting out the vote.

Senator Anderson-Huang: We can also put the link on the Senate webpage for example.

Senator Molitor: I think that would be an excellent idea. In fact, we can also post a UT news item that ballots are available, so please log in.

Senator Dowd: With electronic ballots it will be so much easier for Quinetta and the Senate to conduct elections. Because of that, can we move up the timing of the election to avoid some issues experienced in the past? That is, in some years, we almost ran out of time to conduct nominating ballots and then final ballots. It would be nice if we could build in a cushion of a week or so of a cushion before the last Senate meeting of the academic year. I believe we would serve faculty better to have a little more time between the final ballot and the first meeting new Senators would attend.

Senator Molitor: I think that is an excellent suggestion. In fact, not only do I think that is doable, I think that would be the mode of operation from here on out. I hope to do that this year and I think we will be able to do it in subsequent years once we get all the lists together in a form that has to be uploaded to the system.   This list tells the system who is eligible to vote and who is eligible to be on the ballot. But the

ease in preparing these ballots electronically will save a lot of time. I am guessing, maybe Quinetta, you can tell us how long it takes for you to prepare all these paper ballots and send them out to everybody? We are maybe talking about two weeks?

Senator Dowd: I couldn't hear Quinetta's response. Every year it would take months and months to prepare the elections.

Senator Molitor: Once you get the list of eligible voters and candidates in its final form, we are talking an hour to get the electronic ballots set up and reviewed. So just from the amount of time we will save in preparing ballots electronically, I absolutely believe we will be able to get things done quicker.

Senator Krantz: Every list for verification and authorization is not going to be perfect, is there a mechanism in real time that somebody can send to a webmaster or somebody in charge?

Senator Molitor: Yes. Jamie Carothers thought about this and has given us a way to inspect ballots. Every member of the Elections Committee will be able to look at the ballots from their particular colleges, which is essentially the process we use now. We get the paper ballots sent back from us from Quinetta or Lisa before they are ready to go out and they ask us to review and make sure these ballots are correct. So we have the same ability to review ballots on this new system before we go ahead and begin the election.

Senator Krantz: I was actually thinking more *of* a faculty member who tries to log in and gets rejected.

Senator Molitor: Yes.

Senator Krantz: That is what you were explaining.

Senator Molitor: If that happens and somebody has been inadvertently rejected by the electronic system, we can set it up during the election so that this individual can vote. Did that answer your question?

Senator Krantz: Yes, it did. Thank you.

Senator Anderson-Haung: Back to the topic of making the elections earlier- that will also help the Committee on Committees get started earlier to set up committees somewhat in advance for the next year.

Senator Molitor: That is above my "pay grade" <laughter>. One feature that my colleagues really liked was the ability to verify your ballot before you hit the submit button. So you pick your selections, and before you hit the submit button, it takes you to a page asking to review and confirm your choices. From there you can submit your final ballot or return to revise your selections. I think everyone will appreciate this system once you see it in action. Are there any more questions? Thank you.

[Applause]

President Keith: Thank you, Senator Molitor. I think it is pretty clear after having this conversation that we are going to have to advertise the "heck" out of the fact we're doing things differently this year. In addition to that, we probably need to have the option for people to do a paper ballot if they still want to.

Group of Senators: No.

President Keith: No? We will talk about it at the EC meeting and they will probably tell me, "no, no, no, no, no."

Senator Molitor: Can I answer to that?

President Keith: Yes.

Senator Molitor: I think what we have decided was that the election will have to be one or the other. The Faculty Senate will have to decide if we want to do a paper ballot this year or if we want to do an electronic. Mixing them will be difficult because then you will give somebody the ability to vote twice. Because the electronic votes are anonymous, we have no way of verifying that no electronic ballot was submitted other than having that individual try to log in and seeing whether or not the system will allow them to cast a ballot.

President Keith: Okay. Forget I said it <laughter>.

Senator Kippenhan (substitute for S. Weck-Schwarz): It's a valid point. So when you send out your emails, say, if you are uncomfortable doing this electronically, please come to the office of, where you can get assistance in doing it.

Senator Molitor: Oh, submitting them electronically?

Senator Kippenhan (substitute for S. Weck-Schwarz): Right.

Senator Molitor: I think that is a great idea.

Senator Keith: I will add it to my list. Thank you. Next, we have Senator Giovannucci who is the co-Chair of the Constitution and Rules Committee.

Senator Giovannucci: I have a very brief update from Constitution and Rules. We were given the charge to get electronic elections going and obviously from previous discussions, that was resolved. We were also charged to define a "college" for the purpose of apportionment and also clean up the document, minor formatting problems. So on the latter issues, the committee met about four times and as we got in the weeds of this; it is pretty clear that it is difficult to deconstruct the three documents that actually comprise the business here, the Constitution, which any change require all faculty, plus there is also the rules and the appendix. Now, those latter two, changes can be made that require 2/3rds majority of Senate. It is unlikely that changes to the Constitution and all this will be done with the proper approval from faculty, Senate, and the Board of Trustees. So this year it is unlikely that all those things are going to get resolved. However, the issue of defining colleges, that [is something] we could do this year and I hope that would help guide the Elections Committee. We are currently drafting language that addresses that and we'll bring, hopefully very soon, a resolution defining what a college is and hopefully empower the Elections Committee to form that. So I think that is an important thing that we are trying to get done at least this year, and then next year there will be major changes to the Constitution; hopefully, turning the rules and appendices and some of the operational language in the Constitution into a bylaw section so it will conform to a normal document to the Constitution and bylaws. That is my update so stay tuned.

Asst. Dean Pollauf: I obviously missed a lot of this conversation, but when you say, "defining colleges," do you mean the context of representation? What are you defining?

Senator Giovannucci: Well, currently the colleges have undergone merging and so the library was considered a college at one point and [now] is not a college, yet they have representation. Also, some of the smaller colleges have very few faculty and currently they are required to have two senators and in some cases that might be lower for instance…The Senate has to decide what the minimum number of representation is. Those are all the issues that are going to have to be resolved down the line.

Senator Dowd: The discussion at the committee level has been to define the word "college" because it is throughout the Senate's Constitution, Appendices, and its Rules. We need to have this defined so we can consistently apportion seats on Faculty Senate.

Asst. Dean Pollauf: I kind of figured that what was meant, but I thought I should understand what was being discussed.

Senator Dowd: I am going to echo what Senator Giovannucci stated. The relevant issues are so intertwined across those three documents. For example, the Constitution specifies the number of Senate seats and the minimum number of representatives from each college. Well, that is kind of a rule and so belongs in a set of bylaws, not the Constitution. Further, the Constitution has also somewhat complicated that particular issue because it refers to the appendices on such matters. Now, these may appear to be minor issues, but there are enough of them that Senate should clarify the language in those documents. It is going to take time to untwine those issues.

Senator Anderson-Huang: This is a question for the previous speaker. I assume it will not be difficult to use the electronic elections process for voting on constitution amendments?

Senator Molitor: It would take a little bit of work from CCI just to change the ballot instructions. But in terms of administration and in terms of specifying who is eligible to vote, I believe this would be feasible.

Senator Dowd: The eligibility will be the same list of people who are eligible to sit on Faculty Senate. We have that list for elections and we will have that list for Constitution and Rules.

Senator Molitor: So that notwithstanding, what I am worried about is that this system is set up to elect people and provide names of people who are going to appear on your ballot. To run for a ballot initiative, we would have to put people on the list whose names are "yes" and "no." I don't know if we will be able to do that, but I can go back to CCI and see if we could add a fourth type of election. So we would have Faculty Senate, UCAP and UCS elections, and a fourth ballot for constitutional initiative elections. For a constitutional initiative ballot, we wouldn't specify who the candidates are. The ballot would consist of the initiative wording, a "yes" or "no" and the ability to submit a ballot. So I would see if we can do that and report back to the Senate. Thank you.

Provost Barrett: I am sorry if I spaced-out between the last two topics, so I don't know if it was covered already - we have two sets of mergers that have already been understood and planned out; we've got one that is very much in discussion. We got a Senate election coming up, are you going to try to adjust on the "fly" to whatever happens, or are you going to elect as is for next year, or just let it be for next year? I think we all need to think through how we are planning to approach that.

Senator Giovannucci: I think the idea is to try [for this year] to have flexibility for what is happening, but leave year-to-year flexibility in defining who are the colleges. That would be something within the bylaws of the Senate and could be voted on at the beginning of each election cycle to tailor the changes.

Provost Barrett: So might I suggest that you consider to put some calendar date in your rule that says for apportionment purposes, - the colleges as they exist on "x" day or on what gets elected for the next year - and that way once that date crosses, you don't have to worry about any mergers, unmerges, splits, accommodations and then you just clean it up the next year and then that way it is cut clean. Because, I am guessing whatever happens with LLSS and COCA is going to happen after you guys want to do the Senate vote and I am assuming that you are not going to want to undo it and redo it once that's happened, and so that is just something to think about.

Senator Giovannucci: That is exactly the discussion we're having at this upcoming meeting. We are working on the language to try to incorporate that.

Senator Dowd: I think that is a great idea. For example, consider the elections of the faculty currently in the Colleges of Health Sciences & Social Justice and Human Service. Although they are likely to merge next year, for the Spring 2016 election we are maintaining their number of representatives for each college on Faculty Senate for the next academic year.

Provost Barrett: Well, they've been basically pretty much approved all the way through the system and they've got one dean operating over both of them---

Senator Dowd: I know.

Provost Barrett: That is up to you, I am just saying- that one you could put on the other side of the vendor if you wanted to.

Senator Dowd: I'll give you an example from SJHS. For the purposes of Senate elections, and by request, the faculty members in Higher Ed have already been moved to the College of Education. The same occurred for a few Librarians.

President Keith: Thank you. Are there any more questions? Okay. Next, we have Dr. Celia Regimbal, Chair of Academic Regulations who is here to give you an update.

Senator Celia Regimbal (substitute for M. Edwards): Academic Regulations have been meeting and we divided the committee into working groups. The policies that are being looked at right now are the Drop- with that policy we need some information from Student Government to really understand better what they were asking for us to examine. We also need to understand the Drop Policy from the impact that that policy has on financial aid. The committee has been asked to review the Missed Class Policy. The working group is looking at the alignment of UT's policy with other institutions. I don't know if there was a particular request to consider a change to the policy just to make sure that we are in alignment.

The last policy that the ARC is currently considering is being brought forward today for suggestions and or recommendations and is not for a vote. The IN is part of the Grading policy and the policy was changed and apparently, the changes were not brought forward to the Faculty Senate. There was a

statement in the policy that says once a course is given an F, the student is required to re-register and retake the course to earn a different grade. So the suggestion of the working group is that comment would be dropped from the new statement. Another suggestion is the instructor of record would record the initial grade of IN and this will not be necessarily at the request of the student, but it would be the grade given by the faculty member for a possible lack of completion of work. During the recording of the IN, the instructor of record will provide the Registrar with a default grade and if the default grade is not provided, then the default grade will be an F – what we're hoping for here is that there is a form that you are asked to fill out if you are given a grade of IN and the default grade is in that form – what we would like to find out from the Registrar is, is it possible to put the IN/default grade in the grading record so the student will be able to see what the default grade is as well. Are there any comments about that request?

Asst. Dean Pollauf: I have two. One is that incompletes impact students' financial aid extensively, they are considered "not progress," so if you're automatically assigning incompletes you may be affecting a large number of people's financial aid if that's a default rather than give an F. Ironically, this took me years to wrap my mind around it, but, an F is completion. Students are disadvantaged from a financial aid perspective by [getting] incompletes. I am not suggestion that all decisions be based upon financial aid policy, but just understand that that certainly has an implication. The default grade also really worries me, quite honestly. What's the purpose of that? I mean, if you feel the student should earn the default grade then why don't you assign the default grade?

Senator Regimbal (Substitute for M. Edwards): Because the student could in fact have completed a preponderance of the work, example, a grade in a class is currently a C and they need to finish a paper or it's a B and they need to finish a paper, if they don't finish the paper then it goes to whatever they had earned up to that point in time. If they complete what's remaining then their grade can change to a better grade, but if they don't complete the work, rather than it going automatically to an F they are able to get the better grade, B or C. Does somebody understand what I am saying?

Asst. Dean Pollauf: If they are not earning an F then why would you give them an *F*?

Senator Regimbal (substitute for M. Edwards): It's the default.

Senator Dowd: Currently, if student receives an incomplete for their grade, they have one semester to complete the work. At that point they may ask for an extension of one semester. If the student does not complete the work then the grade automatically goes to an F and there is no recourse for that student. This policy is punitive. If a student wants to get earn a different grade from that F then they have to re-register, retake it, and re-pay for it. That is the reason the committee is suggesting an optional default grade and, perhaps, an additional extension.

Asst. Dean Pollauf: You can change the grade before the end of the semester. The F doesn't happen until the next semester passes.

Senator Regimbal (Substitute for M. Edwards): There is a form that you can fill out to change the default grade and that is available right now. What we are talking about is that you would be able to register that default grade so you can see it in Banner.

Senator Anderson-Huang: Why not just give the default grade and then change it to a higher grade later, I don't understand that?

Senator Regimbal (Substitute for M. Edwards): I think part of the conversations goes to the PR grade; a lot of people want to give a PR grade in undergraduate classes. With that said, if you are doing an international study and you're abroad, you don't have the opportunity to finish the work for your class and [you] come back so you are actually going to finish whatever you're supposed to do for that course, but grades have to be recorded, so that would be the reasoning for not giving them a B and then changing your grade to whatever, because they finished the work of the course once they returned. Does that make sense?

Senator Lundquist: Are you suggesting that someone does 75% of the work, and up to that point they have earned a B. You give them an incomplete, and if they don't finish the work they default to the B?

Senator Dowd: No, I apologize if we did make this issue clear. Providing a default grade is at the instructor's discretion. Faculty members do not have to assign a B or a C as a default grade. When appropriate, they could have the default grade be an F. Suppose your student completed 75% of the course work. This option lets the faculty member enter a default grade (C, B, or whatever) to be awarded in the case that the student does not complete the remaining course work. On the other hand, if the faculty member believes that doing so is inconsistent with their grading policy then the faculty member does not have to do anything because with not action by the faculty member the default grade will be an F.

Senator Regimbal (substitute for M. Edwards): And I would say that probably most students and instructors have a conversation about it, it isn't just assigned without a conversation.

Senator Molitor: I can think of two examples in which this would be required. First of all, I've had courses in the past where I would have a requirement where something has to be completed in order to complete the course. For example, when we were preparing our students for co-op, one of the things that has to be done is they have to update their resume and they have to complete a mock interview. And even though the resume and interview requirements only comprise 10-20% of the final grade, they can complete 80% of the course requirements successfully although they haven't completed the course requirements yet. So this would be an example where there might be an Incomplete with a non-failing grade. Another issue is what Assistant Dean Pollauf raised about financial aid. In addition to need-based aid, there is also merit-based aid. Suppose a student has completed some of their requirements and has a legitimate reason to complete additional requirements later on. If you give them a D, that can potentially impact merit-based scholarships. So giving this student an Incomplete may be a better option if you are convinced that there is a legitimate reason and that they are going to complete the course requirements later on. This should not be commonly used, and I hope this would be used only for rare exceptions.

Senator Schneider (substitute for M. Caruso): You said that you assume a conversation goes on with the student before an IN is given - actually, in order to complete the form if you're granting an Incomplete you have to have that conversation with the student and you have to put down what they need to do to complete the work. This is important just to have it, but it is also important in the case, let's say I gave ten students an Incomplete and then I die, who knows what to do with those students and/or you fire me and I'm gone and I won't respond to email then what do you do for those students? So I actually think paying close attention to that form would eliminate a lot of this problem and if the instructor retains a copy of that form when they get the notice that three of their students have incompletes and it's going to an F, the instructor can then pull the thing out and say okay, well, I noted on here that if they didn't finish up I was giving them a C and then at that point you can change the Incomplete to a C because the student hadn't

finished the work, you can enter your default grade at that point. So in a certain way if you use the form to assign incompletes, well you probably don't need a default grade.

Senator Lundquist: Or if you use it at all.

Senator Schneider (substitute for M. Caruso): It has been requested multiple times by me and a number of departments do use it and use it well.

Senator Lundquist: Well, I think it is a good idea that in order to assign an Incomplete the form has to be filed.

Senator Regimbal (substitute for M. Edwards): Right.

Senator Schneider (substitute for M. Caruso): Although, I consider that kind of problematic.

Asst. Dean Pollauf: Well, there is another issue too that has to do with the logistics of course offerings because if a course is only offered once a year, it may not be physically possible for the student to finish that Incomplete before it expires, so that is an issue. But I want to go back to something you said because this weirded me out a little bit – if you didn't approve the policy as Faculty Senate, how is it a policy then? How can we enforce it?

Senator Regimbal (substitute for M. Edwards): I said that .We really don't know how the change happened.

Asst. Dean Pollauf: Okay.

President Keith: President Jacobs signed the policy. I want to give you guys a little bit of a background; I was unaware that you could give an Incomplete and it could roll over to an F. I was under the impression that if a student came back with the work you can do a grade change from the F to an Incomplete to the new grade. I tried that and Terry Romer who is the Registrar, "slapped me down" pretty hard because it is no longer policy that you can do that. So Senator Dowd and I met with Terry and Kelly Moore at the time who was in the Provost Office, and we talked, and talked, and talked and Terry said he thought that if a backup grade/default grade can be something other than an F, that would eliminate a lot of faculty coming back and saying, I really need you to take this grade that was an Incomplete and rolled over to an F and give me another chance to give the student a grade before the student actually has to re-register and take the course again. He said he thought that would cut out a lot of the issue because I don't know if the backup grade would be a B, but if a student has completed 75% of the coursework and earned a B in that part of it and you calculated that the final grade would be a C-, at some point the student might decide that he/she would rather take the C- than try to do the additional work to get a higher grade, that is better than getting an F. So I think that is what we were trying to do with this. The registrar told us that they cannot code it into an electronic grade until the policy changes. So as long as we have the current policy, the default grade is an F. If the policy changes then we will have options and we could give a different grade.

Senator Schneider (substitute for M. Caruso): Does Banner have those kinds of ordinances?

President Keith: The registrar said that it did not. It's just they never used it because---

Senator Dowd: The registrar is simply following existing policy. Because it is not consistent with policy they cannot code it into electronic grades. If we want to have it coded into the system we have to change the policy.

Asst. Dean Pollauf: I guess my other concern will be is you cannot assign a default grade – if you say it is going to be a B and then it is something else---

Senator Regimbal (substitute for M. Edwards): If you don't assign a default grade then the grade goes to an F. The policy currently states that "*The student must complete the required work before the end of the following semester in which the grade is received (excluding summers); otherwise the grade will be converted to a grade of F by the registrar's office.* "

Asst. Dean Pollauf: What I am saying, to Senator Lundquist's point, you say your grade at this point is a B, but then that doesn't end up really being the grade that they get if they do no further work, either you miscalculated or you realize they only did 75% of the work so they really don't have a B, they have B over 75% and that's a whatever for the course. I would like to think about, if the default grade is put out there and for some reason that grade is not the grade granted---

Senator Regimbal (substitute for M. Edwards): But how would the default grade be put out there if it wasn't the grade granted?

Asst. Dean Pollauf: Well, wasn't that what we're saying, you have an Incomplete and a default grade?

Senator Dowd: No.

Senator Regimbal (substitute for M. Edwards): It says in the form, "…*the conditions for awarding this grade of Incomplete are those specified with the university's regulations. The grade of IN must be removed before the last day of classes of the term following the term…, otherwise, IN will automatically be converted to an F.*" Then it says, "…*This IN grade must be removed on or before by satisfying the following conditions. In the event that these conditions are not satisfied by the specified date, the grade of IN will be replaced by the grade of,*" at which point you as a faculty member have whatever choice you want; it can still be an F or a C. If you determine that 75% of the work is a D, they get a D in that class, but if they complete this, then you will figure in what the quality of the work was and assign the grade that you believe they are qualified for. It just gives the registrar direction and they won't do anything without policy direction.

President Keith: Senator Wedding has a question. But, can I just say that Senator Regimbal is asking for feedback today, we need to wrap this up because we have more presentations.

Senator Wedding: I am on that committee and I've been involved in some of these discussions that go on and on. What does a PR do to financial aid? If you are on financial aid you get a PR, at the graduate level does that impact financial aid?

Asst. Dean Pollauf: No because it is progress vs. incomplete.

Senator Wedding: Is there anything that prohibits us from using a PR at the undergraduate level as well as the graduate?

Asst. Dean Pollauf: Yes, practically, it will never go away. That is why we are discouraged from using them in general because there's no end date and they don't change; they never change unless you lose a faculty member or your department chair changes them.

Senator Wedding: If we are using them at the graduate level then why can't we use them at the undergraduate level?

Senator Regimbal (substitute for M. Edwards): Well, we can talk about that later, but this is for the IN. The IN would appear for one semester and if the work wasn't completed because one of the questions was, for how long this could be continued? The student can request a second extension and that would be between the student and the faculty member to decide. If the request for an extension was given and the coursework wasn't finished in that extension time, the option would be given to the student to request again, but if they did that, now the dean or administrator in charge of the undergraduate work would be the person who would also have to sign off on the extension request. So they could have that first IN and then two requests for extensions. Does that sound like an extraordinary amount of time? Is that acceptable?

Senator Dowd: Part of that addresses the earlier issue. Currently, if a student is awarded an incomplete grade they have one semester to complete the course work. But what happens if that faculty member is not available that semester? Or, what happens to that student if the course is not offered that next semester? Extending for an academic year provides the students with a realistic opportunity to complete the work with the instructor of record with the assumption that the course is offered within two semesters.

Senator Regimbal (substitute for M. Edwards): The last discussion was that the Records Office would be asked, if it is possible, to set up a notification system. So if a student has an IN grade posted on their grades then they would be notified that they have an IN and directed to what they're supposed to do in order to eliminate that IN grade, because I think sometimes students forget as well. I mean, they know that it's there, but they don't go out and look at their academic grades all the time, so it would be some notification that would say, "you have an IN and it needs to be completed and this is where you need to go if you have not completed the work." Does that sound like a reasonable request?

Unknown Speaker: I think hands down, yes.

Senator Regimbal (substitute for M. Edwards): So we should be able to come back soon with a policy.

Senator Krantz: Just for clarity of what you said, when you said "second extension," are you considering the IN initially given as the first extension? In other words, if I have a student that…from the Fall semester, I give the student an IN, they have till the Spring semester which is the first extension and then they can request a second extension which will take them through the Fall of next year? Is that the correct interpretation?

Senator Regimbal (substitute for M. Edwards): And then the suggestion from the sub-committee is that they would be able to request one more time.

Senator Krantz: Okay. That was clarification.

Senator Regimbal (substitute for M. Edwards): At that level the request would have to be signed off.

Senator Krantz: So effectively there's three semesters of extension, right?

Senator Regimbal (substitute for M. Edwards): Yes. That would take care of classes not being offered etc.

Senator Jorgensen: Going back to your first topic, I think you misspoke; you said "drop," but I think you meant withdraw. Drop is very different, it is only two weeks.

Senator Regimbal (substitute for M. Edwards): I stand corrected. Thank you.

President Regimbal: I would like to encourage you to send Senator Regimbal an email if you have any thoughts. Please let her know if you have any suggestions to help her come up with a policy. Thank you, Senator Regimbal. Next, we have Senator Jorgensen.

Senator Jorgensen: Thank you, President Keith**.** I was appointed by the Senate to be part of a committee called, University Parking Monetization Project. It comes through a state mandate that is called, Action Steps to Reduce College Costs, Ohio Taskforce on Affordability and Efficiency which came out in October. The governor, Gov. John Kasich, called on this task force to recommend solutions for institutions of higher education based on three key simultaneous needs:

- to be more efficient both in expense management and revenue generation.
- while offering education of equal or higher quality
- and decreasing costs to students and their families

The scope is [for] both two-year and four-year institutions and the deadline is October 1st. Specific to parking – recommendation 4B – operation review: "Each institution must conduct an assessment of non-academic operations that might be run more efficiently by a regional cooperative, private operator or other entity. This review should include dining, housing, student health insurance, child care, IT help desk, landscaping, facility maintenance, real-estate management, and parking."

This committee was established under the senior director of the supply chain management: associate VP of finance, and includes the chief of police, parking services, facility rep., athletic rep., representatives of Faculty Senate, PSA, CWA, Student Government, and the president's Chief of Staff, Matt Schroeder. We sent out RFPs for managing parking and gave a three-week window to reply, given the short deadline from the governor. Three bids were received - one of them was a local group and two were a national group. One of the national groups was previously hired by Ohio State. We gave them one week to provide further information, which they did do. The positive aspect – they would give UT "x" amount of dollars to take over this business, so we get an immediate infusion of cash. The downside is we have to pay it back with interest over a period of time. They are not going to lose any cash; the University of Michigan, for example turned down this opportunity. The terms are from 10-50 years. The local one was ten years to [to repay] while the national ones were for 50 years, which would provide the company a considerable amount of money. The national bidder manages hundreds and hundreds of parking lots.

Facts and ideas to consider: One, the university has a present budget shortfall. Secondly, the state is mandating a look at ancillary services. Thirdly, our parking rates for faculty, staff, and students are below

benchmarks. Fourth, there are contractual limitations on parking fees for varying times depending on what units[2] people are in. This is the information, you can't read it, but this is the one that I was given: The University of Toledo is at the top of the chart for comparison. There are three categories of parking costs given: high, medium, and low for each institution. The mean for the highest cost parking for faculty and staff of all these schools was $466.00 and the median $456.00 which is $351.00 higher than our maximum fee of $100.00. Our low for faculty and staff is $58.00, which is the Union contract. There are two Union contracts that have essentially the same parking rate. One of those is contractual until 2017 and the other one goes to 2018. The amount that students pay at UT is $250 across-the-board. There's a wide range for the various institutions; some are urban campuses and some are pretty similar to us and some charge considerably higher than us. We do have designated parking, we have zone parking, faculty and staff parking, and people can buy an individual parking place. So the suggestion is to look at possibly more zone parking, in particular for students who could trade cost for walks- you can spend less money if you don't mind walking a little bit; there's always parking at Rocket Hall, for example. One plan is to trade "no increase" for some students to keep their present rate at some locations. For students to park anywhere, their rate might very well go up. The second-tier rate will have no increase, but you will have to walk further to do it. The third tier you can park over at Scott Park.

So this last part is not the committee; the committee is just looking at the parking, it is not looking at the budget things, so the rates will probably rise in 2016-17 except for contractual limits. Somewhat maybe next year assuming a 2.5% increase each year to reach the median. But to make clear, and I ran this by Matt Schroeder, and he gave me the comment that that is not for the committee to decide how much the increase will be. The issue is, are we going to these outside groups? The first answer right now is, no. We declined all three of the offers. For the local group with a "ten-year" [term] – we may consider negotiating with them. There was no interest in negotiating with the two national groups. The committee's task is essentially over at this point because we have not decided to go outside. But the key item is zoning, with a tradeoff of walking vs. fees which overall would provide a little bit more cash. Are there any questions?

Senator Thompson: Is there any additional discussion about adding parking anywhere?

Senator Jorgensen: Very, very expensive. In fact, these long-term things talk about repairing and replacing over periods of time. Well, they are not likely to add parking when you have enough parking. I know nobody likes hearing that, but we have enough parking places.

Senator Kennedy: Senator Jorgensen, I am a little worried about the collateral legal problems. Who has to maintain the parking structure?

Senator Jorgensen: They would, but we are not doing it, remember we turned them all down?

Senator Kennedy: Right. The abstract, that seems to be the problem.

Senator Jorgensen: It was in the contract. We said how much will you pay and it was millions of dollars. It was detailed in the bid what they would do.

Provost Barrett: That was both ways, it was contractual. If they pay you more, then you are going to continue to maintain it and if they pay you less they are going to maintain it.

Senator Kennedy: Will the agreement have a *hold harmless* clause for the university if there's some kind of accident caused by the bad condition of the parking lot?

Senator Jorgensen: Like I said, the plan is not to go outside the university at this stage.

Senator Kennedy: Right. But maybe you want University Counsel to consider some of the collateral legal issues.

Unknown Speaker: On a related note, I am on the University Safety Committee and we do have a significant number of slip and fall accidents and I am just concerned with the greater the distance, the more likely the number of those conditions.

Senator Jorgensen: One of the issues we talked about is more shuttles around campus.

Senator Wedding: We are – like it or not – a commuter university. There are a lot of local people that come out here and if we want to have an enrollment increase in years to come I think we need to keep parking cost low for students. I think if we ever do go outside, whoever gets this is going to want some return on their money, which means it's going to come from students.

Senator Jorgensen: No decision was made.

Senator Wedding: I know that; I got that. I am just saying we ought to be looking at this from a standpoint of cost imposed on students. I don't care what they're doing in Ohio State and Cincinnati.

Senator Jorgensen: We are below the median for a lot of those schools.

Senator Wedding: That's fine

Senator Lundquist: I vote for trading cost for walks. I need to get 15,000 steps a day so I need to park far away. But I want a very cheap parking space in return.

Senator Jorgensen: In fact, there is the possibility. There's the low fee that AAUP and Toledo members pay, but the parking may be further away to keep it that cheap.

Senator Gray: I have a question because I am hearing this and there's a core group sitting here that resides on this campus. How is the discussion, related to Health Science Campus, because Rocket Hall is a long walk away <laughter>?

Senator Jorgensen: If I recall, there are no plans to change anything on this campus [Health Science Campus]. Are there any more questions?

Unknown Speaker: Topic of reserve parking; we have some parking spots past the Bowman-Oddy [building], 24/7 that are almost always empty. Also, we have lecturers and instructors who are changing buildings that are swapping chemicals with them and they can't get a parking spot close to the building they need to go into, so it would be nice to look into who needs a parking spot based upon their position when they're changing buildings a lot and stuff like that, or going to meetings on short notices, not just for the person who pays more.

Senator Jorgensen: The committee right now is basically done. How many full-time employees do you think parking handles right now? It's a quiz.

Senator Wedding: One thousand or two.

Senator Jorgensen: Only two people. They have like a dozen student workers or so, but there are only two full-time employees. So the idea of turning it over to some other organization wouldn't work and wouldn't save much money.

President Keith: Thank you, Senator Jorgensen. We are almost out of time. I am making a suggestion that we ask Senator Dowd to come back in two weeks and give his report. I believe you received a copy of it and I am giving you time to read it carefully. So, are there any announcements?

Senator Sheldon: I just want to remind faculty that undergraduate research proposals are due February 26, 2016. I have fliers here if anybody wants them. Thank you.

President Keith: Is there anybody else with an announcement? Okay. May I have a motion to adjourn? Meeting adjourned at 6:01 p.m.

IV. Meeting adjourned at 6:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Lucy Duhon   Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary   Faculty Senate Office Administrative Secretary