

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of September 13, 2011
FACULTY SENATE

<http://www.utoledo.edu/facsenate> Approved @FS mtg. on 9-27-2011

HIGHLIGHTS

Amy Allen, Penny Poplin Gosetti, Heather Huntley

Note: The remarks of the Senators and others are summarized and not verbatim. The taped recording of this meeting is available in the Faculty Senate office or in the University Archives.

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

I. Roll Call: 2011-2012 Senators:

Present: Anderson, Batten, Brickman, Cappelletty, Chesney, Crist, Cuckovic, Dismukes, Duhon, Ellis, Franchetti, Hamer, Hammersley, Heberle, Hewitt, Hornbeck, Hottell, Kistner, Kranz, Lee, Langan, Lipman, Lundquist, Mason, Molitor, Moore, Moynihan, Ohlinger, Peseckis, Piazza, Plenefisch, Powers, Randolph, Regimbal, Rouillard, Slutsky, Solocha, Teclehaimanot, Templin, Thompson, Thompson-Casado, Weck-Schwarz, Wedding, White, Yonker

Excused absences: Cavalier, Cooper, Dowd, Duggan, Hoblet, Humphrys, LeBlanc, Malhotra, Moore, Nandkeolyar, Sheldon, Shriner

Unexcused absences: Giovannucci, Hey, Hill, Nazzal, Skeel, Tinkel, Willey, Wilson

II. Approval of Minutes: Minutes from the August 30th meeting are ready for approval.

III. Executive Committee Report:

President Anderson: I am calling the meeting to order. Welcome all to the second Faculty Senate meeting of academic year 2011-2012.

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

Minutes from the August 30th meeting were sent yesterday for your review. May I have a motion for approval of the minutes? Second? All in favor? Any opposed? Please let the record show the Minutes from August 30th meeting have been approved.

Two important meetings occurred in the last two weeks- one of the University Finance and Strategy Committee, and one our own Executive Committee hosting Vice Provost Margaret Traband. Each of these meetings focused on the fall enrollment figures, what they mean for the future of the University, and how we might better serve our students in these times of economic stress. The fact that our total enrollment is down 2% in head-count, and 2.8% in FTE is troubling, but actually relatively flat under the circumstances. As we have known for some time, demographics and higher entrance standards have predicted slight decreases. Two areas remain distressing. The first is the rapid rise in fees charged on top of tuition. Families come to enroll in the fall, having prepared for tuition but then are surprised by the fees added on. Returning students find that they cannot register because they have some “hold” on their accounts, often financial. Dr. Traband reported that 35% of non-returning students have holds on their accounts. In addition, the economy has had a severe effect: in 2008, 26% of returning students were Pell-grant eligible, while 39% of non-returning students were Pell-eligible. In 2010, those numbers had risen

to Pell-eligibility of 46% for returning students, and 63% for non-returning students. Clearly costs are preventing students from returning to session. Under these circumstances, the Executive Committee recommends three actions: first, we need a full review of all fees charged, and a more public notice of what those fees are. Second, we need to reduce or eliminate late fees that build up much too quickly. Mr. Burns did mention that students may negotiate payment plans without interest that are much more long-term than the installment plan publicized. We feel that this information must be made much more readily available to students. Dr. Trabant stressed another related action we faculty can take. Keeping in mind the expense of textbooks (nearly \$1000 in some programs), She reminded us to make more deliberate use of placing books on closed reserve at the Library. In addition, while texts may be cheaper off-campus, students on financial aid cannot get the large discounts available from the campus bookstore. Therefore, it is a good idea to be sure that the assigned texts are at the bookstore; students will still have the option of looking elsewhere if they have different sources of income. That concludes the Executive Committee report. Are there any questions?

Senator Thompson-Casado: Was there any discussion about what's going on with financial aid? Because I have a number of students who do not have their text book(s) because their financial aid has not come in.

President Anderson: That's a very good question. We did discuss scholarships that are under that situation. There are a number of endowed funds in the foundation that are supposed to go towards scholarships that have not been available until well past the registration deadlines. So that has hampered student's registering for classes. I think that everybody does recognize that there is a problem. However, I have not heard of your particular problem, but it is certainly related.

Senator Lipman: Do we have any data on student debt? I'm referring to graduates or non-returning students' amount of debt that characterizes their status?

President Anderson: Being only a few not very well intelligent people we did not think to ask that question, i.e. Executive Committee but we will certainly bring it up. Do you have any knowledge of that, Senator Rouillard?

Senator Rouillard: I can give you an anecdotal evidence of one student who had a full scholarship to the University for tuition. She also did a Masters degree with us where she had tuition remission and a stipend. She tells me that now since she has graduated, she is now paying back \$500.00 dollars per month for ten years. If you do the math it comes to about \$60,000 dollars or \$10,000 dollars per year that she borrowed for her living expenses.

Senator Lipman: I have anecdotal evidence that compares to that as well. I think that we should get a full report at some timely moment during this semester.

President Anderson: A student debt for living expenses might be a little harder to track, but we can still make an attempt of it.

Senator Hamer: I have two comments. First, when people go through the FAFSA process early on they do not get any indication that there's a ceiling lifetime limit on student loans. Therefore, a student may up their standard of living during the first couple of years when they probably didn't need the money, so they are going to run out before they graduate. That is something we should look at because when students get the financial aid notification there is absolutely no notification about that. Secondly, I think that we should also look into the discrepancies between the number of non-returning students who are Pell grant eligible and the returning ones. I think that a lot of the non-returning ones did not pass their classes. We

have to look a lot better at how we are helping freshman students because they are not making it, the ones that are Pell Grant eligible.

President Anderson: Alright. Is there any further commentary?

Senator Solocha: You mention the bookstores, but bookstores are becoming obsolete. Is there any thought about using different technologies to sort of get rid of that problem? For example, they are using e-books at St. John's University instead of books.

President Anderson: I certainly litigate it in all my classes; none of my classes have text books.

Senator Solocha: That's an issue contractually that we have; because when I was chair of the department we had Barnes and Noble come to the College of Business and tell us that we had to have every faculty member use books. I would receive a list of all of the faculty members that did not use a book and I was forced to talk to them to make sure they did use a book.

President Anderson: That sounds a little extreme, but not unheard of. One of the comment(s) that was mentioned, apparently Mike Dowd is not here, but I will speak for him. There was a study of various universities and it was found that if a university or even a group of faculty members who are all using the same text book go directly to the publisher they can then negotiate a much better deal then compared to Barnes and Noble. So, we could be proactive on that front as well. Are there any other comments?

Senator Heberle: Just briefly, that is e-books cost as much as regular books, but if we would encourage the library to look into getting the e-books that we use for classes then perhaps it would help.

President Anderson: That brings up another comment that is coming later. Okay, let's move on to the reports. Unfortunately, due to an emergency Senator Dowd is not here today to report on the progress of committee appointments. He did tell me that the Curriculum Committee, the University Core Committee, and Constitution & Rules Committee are all hot on the agenda for Committees on Committees, which will be meeting this Friday, September 17th and they should be populated very soon. Our next report is from Dr. Piazza, our representative from the Ohio Faculty Council.

Senator Piazza: Thank you very much. As you all know I am your representative to the Ohio Faculty Council. We meet monthly with the Ohio Board of Regents and we serve as an advisory board to the Ohio Board of Regents. At our last meeting, September 9th there were two issues that were considered by the Ohio Faculty Council. One was the current status of Senate Bill 5 which is now known as Issue 2. The Ohio Faculty Council voted to approve a resolution calling for a No-vote on State Issue 2. and to encourage Senate Bill 5 to be defeated. The second item of the discussion which was discussed quite extensively is the notion of what is now being called, "Enterprise University." I thought that it might be useful to try to discuss what is an "Enterprise University" and what does it mean. Several states have created charter or what we call here in Ohio, "Enterprise Universities" as a cost saving measure. These states relieve the Enterprise University of much of its regulatory burden. The cost savings because its burden has been lifted allows states to reduce their state share of instruction because the savings realized by the Enterprise University off set the cuts. Ideally universities experience greater savings than cuts and actually has more revenue after expenses when it becomes an Enterprise University. The University of Cincinnati created a committee to investigate the viability of Enterprise Universities in Ohio. They recently issued a report where they found that Ohio already has the lowest level of regulation of any state that may have benefitted from regulatory relief. And the cost savings that other states have realized would probably not accrue to Ohio's universities. Only Ohio State is currently positioned to benefit from Enterprise University status as it is currently proposed. While the University of Cincinnati and perhaps one other Ohio university would find the Enterprise status as essentially revenue neutral. All other Ohio

universities under the current proposal and currently as it stands will probably lose money that they would then have to recover through increases in tuition and fees. It appears that the real benefits for Ohio universities will only be in the area of construction relief, it will be cheaper to build a building. Interestingly, this construction relief has already been passed by the legislature and so it is now available for all universities regardless of status. As it currently stands, no legislator has yet to adopt the issue of Enterprise Universities or to introduce it to legislature for consideration. As long as the savings are not there, the Enterprise University idea may be a nonstarter. Some members of the OFC were concerned however that universities might be pressured to seek enterprise status as a way of reducing the state's higher education budget. Since seeking enterprise status will be voluntary any losses that result in tuition increases could be described as self-inflicted. The OFC is planning to meet with Chancellor Petro in our October meeting and it is hoped that we will be able to get further information about this enterprise proposal and where it seems to be headed. We will also be discussing other issues at that time with Chancellor Petro. So, if you have any issues that you would like to have brought to the Chancellor you can bring those to my attention. Are there any questions? Thank you.

President Anderson: Several policies of great faculty interest are posted on the policies review page at http://www.utoledo.edu/policies/draft_policies/index.html.

These policies include revised academic policies that all faculty and students should be aware of, and policies that have a strong impact on our work environment. Please review these policies, inform your colleges and constituencies of their existence, and encourage writing comments to alter them if necessary!

- Credit hour equivalents on workload agreements
- post-tenure review
- chair review
- information technology

In addition, you should know that the College of Innovative Learning is considering discontinuing many journal subscriptions very critical to faculty scholarship. I want to bring to your attention about the wide range of these policies. The undergraduate academic policy collection has seventeen policies that are very redundant of past policies. Some of them are slightly rewritten, and some of them are brand new, and some of them are just composed differently. But, those are the sweep of policies that we as faculty and the students must be aware of. They include all sorts of things like academic honesty policy, grievance policy, and various other items that you should find very interesting. I highly recommend that you look at those and make sure that they meet your particular level of approach to these kinds of issues. Once they are made firm policies of the University then I would certainly suggest that you at least post links to those policies on your syllabus for your courses so students will know where to go and what to look for. Also of interest are a number of other policies here, but of course there are other policies that are of particular importance for nursing, medicine, and life science etc. I am particularly interested in talking about the policy listed under University Faculty Workload and if you go there you will find faculty workload measurement and reporting requirements. Each department and dean will have the authority to create their own rubrics for credit hour equivalency in the classroom. For example, research will compensate for credit hours in the standard teaching research service workload agreements. It is a very vaguely reworded policy at this point. It does give a lot of authority to individual colleges which I think is very good. But on the other hand, it makes the comparison from one college to another a little more difficult. I certainly suggest that you look over that policy very carefully and see if it applies to your own department.

Senator Thompson-Casado: Could you help me understand that one, per policy because when I looked at it, it looks like it's what's covered in the CBA?

President Anderson: It is actually quite close to that.

Senator Thompson-Casado: So, if we have a CBA then how can we have a policy that dictates something different? I guess I do not understand the focus of the policy.

President Anderson: The focus of the policy is to those cases where they are not fully delineated will expand on the elaboration. For example, the College of Arts and Sciences went through a lot of log processes of setting up elaboration issues for promotion and tenure; which in fact cover a lot of these things. And for the most part they are probably okay. But this is something that came out of about twelve or so strong research faculty in the college of Natural Sciences and Mathematics in meetings directly with the President. They tried to offset the President's recommendations that were presented to the Board originally about how every faculty member has to have 75% teaching etc. Now, of course the President did not seem to be aware of collective bargaining agreements either. This is something that the AAUP should also look at, particularly for those faculty members that are not directly under AAUP.

Senator Thompson-Casado: That is what I thought it applied to. I did not realize it was applying to everyone until someone explained that to me.

President Anderson: The post tenure review policy is another one that you should look over. It does apply to all tenure faculty in the Judith Herb College and in the various Medical Colleges that are not bound by the collective bargaining agreement. The next policy is over department chairs which appear to take the authority over chairs away from deans and take it directly up to the higher administration. If the higher administration is unhappy with the performance of a particular chair they would go around the unit and terminate that chair's contract. So, it seems to be taking away the deans responsibility for the effectiveness of the chair that is under that dean. So look over that carefully and be sure to make your comments. I want to make you aware of those things so you can go to the site and write in your particular comments. There's another one that has a lot of talk going on around which is the Information Technology Policy. Again, it is pushing for single platforms in computing technology and it says, "...*All computer procurement purchasing will coordinate all purchases for computing with Information Technology. For non-bulk purchases, purchase card holders must contain Information Technology approval for computer purchases made with purchase cards.*" So, read that carefully and submit your comments.

Senator Regimbal: The Information Technology Policy seems to add a whole other level of review. If departments have money available for them to spend then I don't understand why we have to go to another level of review to get approval to spend money to buy. Secondly, we have gone through this before, everyone has the same platform. That does not fit in a college in a university environment. Actually, I don't think it fits in any college requirement. I have to be a Mac user. I've always used a Mac and I drive both platforms. If the director of technology actually walks through campus he would find out that there are a number of administrative variety kinds of computers that are available. I think this takes away from our academic freedom.

Senator Hammersley: I would concur. This is an outdated main frame kind of a mindset. It is not looking at new devices such as various tablets, portable computers in a sense to have SSB drives for storage; it's just backwards looking forward and I think that it has no business as a policy. It should be taken back and rewritten as something that will look forward to the future rather than "we are the main framers, we control the world" which is the kind of IT response. The point being is they are to service your needs and you are not to be doing it just because they want it done. This kind of attitude in most universities is going to rub it out. In fact, it was brought up at University of Michigan in 1982, when the new chief of IT came from...and the first thing he did is have a mass purchase of personal computers for everybody on campus whether you want to use it in the university or out. Okay, the main frame, the MTS system which was the terminal system at that time. They can do the high performance computing, they can control themselves; they can handle the high performance graphic work stations and this stuff. But the

little stuff, come on; leave it to what is best done. If a professor wants to use a keynote on iPod, IT's job is to support it. They are to make sure that you have it plugged in the HT monitor connector, so you can walk in and plug-in if you have forgotten to bring yours along.

President Anderson: One other comment that I want to bring up which I don't think it is on the policy review, however it certainly came to our department's attention that the College of Innovative Learning is considering discontinuing many journals subscription which are very critical to faculty scholarship. For example, virtually all the national and international journals that are of importance to physics and astronomers will be discontinued with the statement "oh, they will be available in OhioLINK," but unfortunately they are also not being continued in OhioLINK for the same budgetary reasons and the OhioLINK collection does not go back in time. There are arguments to make to convince our publishers to turn to open source journals. In fact, many of our publishers are going that route. But so far they have decided to be open source journals only up until two years ago, whatever two years ago means in any particular time. That is everything older than two years will be open source back to whatever period of time they have gotten around to putting on open source data basis. So, that means the most recent two years of anytime are still not available from an open source place I believe that message went out to all deans and department chairs if I read the list correctly. Certainly look that over and see if you find things that will completely destroy your scholastic activity as we have found in our department.

Senator Molitor: If you type in catalog.utoledo.edu and then click on the academic policy link it actually has a link to the policy website. It doesn't actually explicitly list in detail the policies that are relevant to students. In fact, if we require them to click on the search link to academic policies and type in search terms etc. sometimes it comes up what you are looking for and sometimes it doesn't. I think the academic policies need to be laid out for students to see in one place like our old catalog was whether it is in pdf. form or print form etc. This policy website is not the appropriate form for catalog related policies.

President Anderson: Remember these are drafts.

Senator Molitor: Yes, I know it is a draft, but there is a policy website with all approved policies as well, and that essentially is replacing our University's catalog. I'm referring to the general section that has policies listed on the front and I don't think that is appropriate.

Senator Lundquist: Can you tell me if making a comment on this policy page will have any effect at all? Does anyone read them? Does this cause them to delay putting a policy into effect?

President Anderson: I am going to refer to our Provost.

Provost McMillen: Thank you, Sara. It actually does make a big difference with the policy. The comments are read. The policies are often changed because of your comments. I sincerely suggest all of you make comments because the policies afterwards are reposted. There are a number of people who are dedicated to reading them to review the policy. We recently reviewed the computer policy among the deans and again, I certainly encourage you to comment on that because that is not a final draft. I will assure you that the policies have been changed.

Senator Heberle: Just out of curiosity, what stage are the draft policies in when they get posted on the web? In terms of how long a policy will be discussed for process or is it different for every policy?

Provost McMillen: It usually is posted at the beginning. If you look at the policies you will see a responsible agent's name at the top of each one. This is how the process goes and has been long going for four or five years. It is partly caused by the merger and policies conflicting. It is partly caused by policies going out of date. It is partly caused by people deciding on a new policy. At each point a responsible

person or agent is identified for each policy. The responsible agent finishes a draft and then that is when it gets posted. They then contact the Policy Committee, including myself, a number of other individuals, and Beth Hagen and at that point it is posted for comment(s). On some of them, an old policy that is ten and fifteen years old that has never been looked at is sometimes hard to find a responsible agent. The Policy Committee does that themselves.

Senator Hammersley: Just to speak about the library. It is not a problem that we do not carry a journal if the OhioLINK does, but as a position in the department of internal medicine, I am now a member of the America Society of Mechanical Engineers so I can get access to the journal list, but I can't get it from the system at least the old components that I looked at from the past does not allow me to get stuff beyond two years. So, to have to put the burden on the faculty members for platform cross and departmental research evaluation, that makes it tough. So, if we are going to discontinue it we need something in our policy that OhioLINK is supported and it does keep these. Frankly, I don't care where I get a pdf. from, but I need it. To have both of them decide that they are not going to do it is just as ridiculous

Provost McMillen: If I may respond to that. The OhioLINK in general modified a couple of things like President Anderson said, "because of some new information." This problem that emerged over the past week is basically a problem with OhioLINK. OhioLINK lost its long time director who was a moving force for negotiating low rates. He was there at the beginning of OhioLINK. Since that time extraordinary problems have occurred and journals were eliminated without input from the sources whether they were public libraries, or universities libraries, or other state libraries. It has become an increasing problem and this is the latest. Ben Pryor and I were in a meeting with the deans just before this meeting and Dean Pryor gave a report on recovering many of the journals that were cancelled by OhioLINK. OhioLINK has always been a strange organization and I am just coming into some knowledge myself; it is not simply "go to the store and pick out what journals you want." There are contracts that are written and we pay a flat fee. According to Dean Pryor, we actually pay a smaller fee than many of the other universities, although we get about equivalent to what everyone else gets. Our first reaction was "give us whatever we owe on the journals you are cancelling and we will buy them ourselves." Well, it turns out that it doesn't work like that and that is why we have to make a financial commitment to cover them, but we will do that. However, I am afraid that this is going to be an ongoing issue for us that is going to be partly out of our control. There's supposedly a debt over \$6 million in OhioLINK. No one knew about it until recently because of the change in administration. But like I said, I think that there's some misconception. I think that there is going to be a lot at stake over this during the next couple of months among many universities. It is going to be interesting if any of you that have colleagues at other universities that might report on this as well. OhioLINK is part of O Tech which is a part of the Board of Regents and the Regents may have to bailout OhioLINK as part of a budget amendment for the new budget. The state's revenue continues to be strong. We will work with Dean Bjorkman, Lawrence, and other chairs in Natural Sciences to rectify the situation. We will also be alert to other situations coming from chairs and deans.

Senator Duhon: I just want to add something as a member of the library. The OhioLINK membership situation is very complex. It has grown more so over the last couple of years. Shares were originally decided based on journals subscriptions and over time as schools converted from journals subscriptions to online resources the feeling is that probably it should be a new formula spreading the cost of shares among the eighty plus schools. OhioLINK as an organization has solicited input from individual library institutions on usage of resources to determine needs. It is very complex being that there are so many different levels of schools from two year colleges to schools like Ohio State to determine what the core needs are. As a consortium we do get a great deal from some of the other sources. Individual schools will not be able to purchase some of the resources and they will have to go out on their own. OhioLINK still has a place, but it is probably time to look at a different formula, and I think that is what we are looking at.

Senator Wedding: Do we still have inter-library loan to other states?

Senator Duhon: Yes.

Senator Wedding: Is that still available and has not been impacted by this?

Senator Duhon: No. There's a cost affiliated with that too. It is not a free service. It is a service that libraries pay into through OCLC, and there are copyright charges associated with borrowing and lending. So, it is a solution, but again, it is not cost free.

President Anderson: Okay, I think that we need to move on because we are running out of time here. Is Dr. Amy Allen here? Amy is going to monitor a short discussion. If you have further questions about the core competencies and their implantation in general ed courses, I will turn the floor over to her.

Dr. Allen: I do not have a formal presentation. There were some concerns and there may still be some unanswered questions that you may have. I think one way to start is by looking and letting you know about the question(s) that came up on the index cards (that we used at the last session two weeks ago.) I am not able to stand here and answer every one of them, but I do want to address the one question that came up multiple times and that was: Will some courses still satisfy state gen ed but not be included in our new competency core? That seem to be one big permeating question that hopefully we can get on the same page about. This is my understanding of the procedure: each semester (this is by our conversation with Marcia King Blandford) the University submits to the state the courses that we are honoring for the state distributive re requirements. In other words, we tell the state what is meeting the state distributive requirements from our institution each semester. So, the intention is once these all get done and put into place with the competency base and the rubrics that the University will not be recommending and state that has not gone through this core competency proposal and approval as meeting a state distributive requirement.

Senator Hewitt: I guess I don't understand it exactly that way since 2/3rds of students will not take a general ed math course. There are only going to be two general ed math courses, but everyone will still have to take distributive requirements in mathematics. So, it will be many distributive math courses that meet the distributive requirements, there are only two in general ed, everything else is problematic. So, we are only going to submit at most two courses for this process for review and the rest has to be available for distributive requirements and they are not going to be general ed.

Dr. Allen: Do you mean by program requirement 3000 level and above?

Senator Hewitt: No, I mean they are not general education.

Dr. Allen: That's another good question.

Senator Hewitt: Your definition of general education includes the fact that there is no prerequisite. What do we do about the students that come in and are placed into calculus? We discussed this issue this summer, 2011. There's a difference between distributive requirements and a general education part of the core, they are very different concepts. The distributive requirements have to be done to meet the state of Ohio requirements. But, the core is a different issue. Large parts of the general education requirements could be by-passed by some students, in the extreme, depending on how they are place. So it is not a check list of course. That is what distributive requirements are for.

Dr. Allen: Then it will need to be the University will give the state a list of courses that meet distributive requirements that are not gen ed courses.

Senator Hewitt: Correct. I will have to for math.

Dr. Allen: I understand what you are saying.

Senator Rouillard: I didn't remember this particular qualification that there will be no prerequisite(s). If we are having gen ed courses at 1000 and 2000 level then 2000 level courses will typically have prerequisites.

Dr. Allen: I am not familiar with the language on how that initial resolution was written because I was not part of the process at the very front end of it. So, I think that it's worth taking a look at it. I know it said 1000 and 2000 level for sure. I don't recall seeing anything in there about prerequisites in the language of the resolution; I don't have it in front of me.

Dr. Poplin Gosetti: I think there was conversation about thinking about a course in terms of prerequisites as not being so discipline specific that it loses the flavor of general education. But I don't think there was a statement that stated absolutely no prerequisites. Does that make sense?

Senator Rouillard: Yes.

Senator Lundquist: I was under the impression that once we got this thing going, every course that use to be in gen ed will be removed from gen ed and we will be putting more back in. I thought that was the University requirement for multi-cultural courses will also disappear, is that true?

Dr. Allen: I don't think so.

President Anderson: My comment on that is that particularly the competency that is personal and social responsibility that does have elaboration that concerns multi-cultural and diverse population(s) would be looked at very closely and that's where it would appear; courses that choose to submit personal and social responsibility as their primary or secondary competency that they are going to access are from that list. Again, if no courses are submitted that carry those elaborations then we will have to go back and ask the submitting departments to ensure that those things are there.

Senator Lundquist: I think I understand that, but that is not my question. When students are getting ready to graduate and they are looking at their degree audit, will it still list a multi-cultural requirement as necessary for graduation?

President Anderson: How are we identifying a multi-cultural requirement?

Senator Lundquist: It is in the catalog.

President Anderson: Well, it is maybe in the catalog as the course is listed as presently satisfying the multi-cultural requirement, but if you look at their syllabus sometimes they don't. So again, that would be up to the University Core Committee and Faculty Senate to monitor those things to make sure they are in fact meeting a diversity requirement.

Senator Thompson-Casado: President Anderson, I thought from the conversation last week that we said the DARS report is not going to change and competency is something else. So the multi-cultural and non-western courses etc. will not change. I thought that was stated last week.

President Anderson: I wasn't there last week.

Senator Thompson-Casado I'm sorry, at the last Faculty Senate meeting.

Dr. Allen: I think when we said the DARS would not change that was an initial "it is certainly not going to change at the front end of this process" because system wise we are going to make sure everything is in place. It sounds to me what I am hearing, and correct me if I am wrong, is that folks are feeling that there's still a definite need to find a way to document and justify the diversity issue and we need to find a way to keep that in when the new competency model is put into place. Are you just concerned that that is going to go away or are you just questioning how it all fits?

Senator Thompson-Casado: The multi-cultural requirement came through the University, it came through Faculty Senate, and it came through the Curriculum Committee.

Dr. Allen: Right.

Senator Thompson-Casado: That can't be changed by a Core Curriculum Committee that is doing something different.

Senator Rouillard: It is a graduation requirement and not a gen ed requirement.

Dr. Allen: So, it does need to be ingrained in this process.

President Anderson: Or it needs to be overturned.

Senator Thompson-Casado: Exactly, but it has to go through the process of it being overturned.

President Anderson: Right.

Senator Krantz: Just for that point and also to make a comment about Paul's point earlier. To be really specific right now proposal is for the general education component of a new core curriculum. The multi-cultural is higher up and will not be overturned with this proposal; we as a committee will probably get to that next year and at that time the discussion will reopen. To make a clear point about Paul's comment, in many of the Sciences we have two different versions of introductory science courses. I can give you an example, Geology or Environmental Science that is basically general education courses that are usually 1000 level that are open to anybody, no prerequisites. Then we typically have one course that is specifically for our majors and that would be a program of study course which is the point that Paul was making. So, there has to be a mechanism by which if (the example that Paul gave) an incoming student places out by AP credit or testing etc. that they would check off that they did satisfy the competency. But, there's a distinction to be made between course credit and satisfying the competency.

Dr. Allen: Remember at this point the competencies are not high stakes for students.

Senator Krantz: Correct.

Dr. Allen: At this point there's no plan to say "John Doe, check, check, check and or Jane Smith, check, check, check." There's no plan to do that right now, but the purpose of these are for program evaluation and program improvement. So, I would assume that the assumption would be if they test out or are placed at a higher level that it is assumed that the lower competencies at a lower course have been met.

Senator Hewitt: But there's still an issue for meeting the science requirement with a lab. Again, that is a graduation requirement, it is independent though.

President Anderson: That's a state requirement.

Senator Hewitt: Correct. So this general education for the core is something quite different.

Dr. Poplin Gosetti: The conversations that I'm hearing now are all good questions. What we are coming to is a very different model than the proposal that was discussed, Amy I don't think you were part of those previously. But the notion of competency was not you met the competency at the general education level, "check it off you've done it" the notion of competency is that it went throughout the academic experience and general education was the beginning piece, they are the 1000 and 2000 level classes and the prerequisites are more truly foundational in terms of skills and knowledge basis that we hope that students will have when they enter in their general courses. The idea of the proposal was to rethink the general education, understanding the restraints of distribution within a state and to think differently about these common set of courses. One of the things that we discussed among our combined meeting was to sort of challenge that we had in thinking about the language of the core which we used to talk about our general education courses and general education and core curriculum. As part of this conversation with this group as well with that group becomes very confused about the core competency, what was the general education and the distributive list? Was it tagged? I think the idea was to rethink the general education from a standpoint of a core element of courses that set the student on the road for their major and their minor. Therefore, it might be a limited pool of courses. It might be courses that it might mean we need to come up with a way to think through English Composition, Math and those courses that students test in at a higher level, how do we handle that notion of going through general education from a competency standpoint when they are not yet completed in a basic course. Also, to rethink how we are doing our own general education distributive list which impacts the multi-cultural requirements. If we go back to that list, my fear is that we are growing out carefully. Some of the ideas that are coming I think are general education. In other words, if we just say we are doing these competencies in addition to what our distribution list was then we are sort of going against the whole issue of thinking about general education and thinking about competencies from a beginning standpoint. I think your question is good though, but how do we resolve that? That is an important question and I think that we spent a whole Faculty Senate meeting talking about that and I don't know if there was a resolution. But, I guess I argue for reconsidering that distribution list as it existed being that it will lead you back to thinking in a way that doesn't allow us to struggle with it as much. Does that make sense?

Dr. Allen: It goes back to what we stated two weeks ago, one of the first things that I said was that we all and myself included need to set aside how things are in the interest of trying to think about how things might be; not that one is better than the other, but that they are different. In order to think about in paradigm having to set that aside, but not having to forget about it. I think that we are doing a pretty good job about it, thinking about it and talking back and forth to see how this fits.

President Anderson: The resolution says, "*By approximately 15th of October departments should have submitted proposals.*" That date is rapidly coming towards us. The Senate approved that resolution with that date, but it did leave some things out. For example, it says "*it is to resolve to endorse the work of these two committees to reframe the competent core experience in terms of the following five competencies.*" We are only endorsing the work by that statement and not necessarily the competencies. "*... And complementing these competencies general education portion of the core will be distributed over to disciplines as it is required by the state of Ohio and it will not include courses 3000 and above. The Senate recognizes these competencies are not fully defined and many may evolve as they are implemented. By the time that each competency matures for initial implantation college councils and Senate will have the opportunity to ...*" Well, we are rapidly approaching that point if we are to get actual proposals in from departments and colleges to approve for next fall's academic year. Ultimately we will need from this body, even leaving off the problem of diversity and multiculturalism where I think we can

keep is before October 15th we will have to approve the competencies as they are stated. Now it can still be a temporary approval in a sense that we recognize the competencies may evolve as time goes on. But, to give the department the insurance that their work is not going to be undermined in the next few months. I think we need to approve the competencies as they stand, at least for the courses that are being submitted for the fall, 2012. We also need to approve the rubrics that are being used for that initial realm; you should have all had a chance to see the rubrics, but it is getting really late if departments are going to be submitting proposals that say they will be looking at these three elaborations from this particular competency they have to be ensured that those three elaborations are there and won't be changed within a year or so. We also have to approve the submission form. So, those three items really should be taken care of at the earliest opportunity. We had a chance to discuss them and I hope you had a chance to take them back to your constituents. I know that they have been discussed at some college councils and they been discussed at the workshops that Bob Snyder has been holding. I have not attended all off the workshops, but it is my understanding that most of the questions have been ultimately answered in them and people have gone away feeling fairly comfortable about the process. There are two other things that we need to approve. One of them is actually approving criteria for selecting the courses; we have to do it by October 15th when the Core Curriculum Committee is going to start looking at these in detail. The Core Curriculum Committee had to be advised about what selection process they are going to use. Finally, we have to approve the notion or not approve the notion and come up with an alternative that UT will send to the state as approved gen ed courses, only those courses can continue competency assessment. It may be that we have to change that particular idea to accommodate higher level courses that clearly ought to fulfill mathematics distribution requirement for an example or any other kind of requirement. So, I think that I would like to propose a resolution. *"Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of the University of Toledo approves the five competencies, the rubrics for assessing those competencies, and the proposal form for submitting courses, as published at the Senate meeting on 30 August 2011, for courses to be approved for inclusion in the 'general education' portion of curricula in the academic year 2012/2013."* So that gives departments security that things are not going to change all at once. If a year from now we find that the rubrics are not good the courses that are approved will still keep their approval in the process of recertification. Remember, we are also going to be looking at the courses at a more timely basis to update them and to make sure that they are meeting their requirements. But this will give us a one year head start. Are there any questions about that?

Senator Rouillard: I have a question about the forms actually. I am anticipating a little bit about the criteria for determining .We've been working on ours this week, but it didn't occur to me to ask then that the number of sections that we historically offered and the number of sections that we would like to offer, it asked for enrollment, is that current enrollment or is that enrollment that would please the gen ed committee? I ask these questions because we do not know yet what the criteria are. If the criteria are if you can offer a gazillion sections of courses with a gazillion students in it that is what will get you into the gen ed core. We may be shooting ourselves in the foot. So I will ask for an amendment to the proposal form that the number of sections in enrollment be left off the form.

President Anderson: It is already on a form for submitting a new course.

Senator Rouillard: Right, but we haven't approved that form yet.

President Anderson: There's a standard form that we have for new courses now and on there now is expected enrollment, but a number of sections should not be on there. I would hope that you would put down numbers that you would like to see happen, you and your department think that would best meet the needs of the University community, that is what you put when you say expected enrollment now on a course submission form. I'm a little leery with taking it off the form just because I think that it is useful information.

Senator Krantz: In the wording that you have up there it does not make a correct link, so I would advise against it because it will be other courses that the 1000, 2000, or 3000 level should meet the state distributive requirements that will not be part of the general education curriculum for the University of Toledo. I would also propose that probably a Faculty Senate committee will be a perfect venue mechanism. For those of us that were involved with the discussion this summer were somewhat surprised at the mechanism that the University does once a semester lives, I was completely unaware of it. I think that we as faculty should have some input to that selection.

President Anderson: That's a very good point.

Senator Templin: The rubrics for assessing those competencies based on what was panned out on the 30th I am not seeing rubrics. The old high school teacher in me is saying where are the rubrics? Rubrics provide levels of performance.

Senator Krantz: just to clarify, the rubrics are for a student entire career and not just for introductory courses. In an introductory course you are likely to get them from level one or level two, and maybe up a level, but you are not going to get them all the way up to level four.

Senator Plenefisch: I have a comment about the rubrics. At the top of a rubric it states "UT student must demonstrate..." but yet what you have said is the courses must demonstrate that they set students on a path of these competencies. Rubrics are talking about a student demonstrating something but you want to look at is how the courses themselves set students on a path. My question is how do these rubrics match with assessment of the course?

President Anderson: Well, that is what goes on in the proposal. Yes, course instructors will tell and describe the assignments and how those assignments correlate with the elaborations on how they are going to be effective. That is not something that we are going to tell you how to do, that is something that we hope you will come up with for your particular situation.

Dr. Allen: Again, I think that it is important that we keep the big picture. The accountability is what we are after, and for us to be accountable we have to provide some data. In order to provide data we have to assess students. And in that way we can look at how that class and that course is feeding into the courses program on a system where students are working to.

Senator Hewitt: So what's on top is what we set for the competencies and we are paying attention to it as students graduate. So this core which now goes through the entire curriculum at some point it will have to be assessed at several levels to make sure they are meeting all these competencies. So as students leave Math 1200 for example, our basic general education course they may very well be at various elaborations at factual knowledge. But as they go on, let's say nursing courses etc. there are other opportunities to assess their progress on a scale up to and possible including a capstone experience in which we will assess how many of the students are meeting the objective.

President Anderson: Are there any other questions or discussion? All in favor for approving this resolution, but understanding that we still have some complexities that we still have to deal with? All in favor? Any opposed? **Resolution Passed.** Do we have any items from the floor that we need to discuss?

Senator Ohlinger: I have been asked as a Senator of our college to get some feedback on policies and procedures for colleges to have in place for academic performance committees. Do we have an academic performance committee? How does that lead? How does that lead in terms of decisions about students that are in academic difficulties? We are currently looking at our process to see if it's in line or out of line

with what other colleges do. So I want to try to get some feedback from you, so don't be surprised if I approach you after the meeting.

President Anderson: So we are going to have an hour long discussion of the self-study report. It is still in draft form, but it is rapidly approaching the date when the draft is no longer a draft and would become the formal report. We are supposed to be discussing today the introductory overview of that report and criteria I and criteria II. The purpose of this discussion is to get more faculty input on this report. Is it a good report? Are we meeting the objectives that the HLC has stated that should be our objectives? Are we properly representing ourselves? Is there enough data present to show that we are representing ourselves well? Are we representing those portions where we think we are not doing so well and we can approve?

Senator Thompson-Casado: President Anderson, did you say an hour long discussion?

President Anderson: Yes, till 6:30 p.m.

Senator Thompson-Casado: Why was that not put on the agenda?

President Anderson: I sent a message out Friday about it. I apologize that it was not put on the agenda for an agenda item.

Dr. Poplin Gosetti: As we begin I would ask the class how many read criteria I and criteria II? I see a few hands up.

PowerPoint slide

Higher Learning Commission Self-Study Feedback Request

Dr. Thea Sawicki

Institutional Overview

1. Institutional profile
2. Major changes since 2002 reaccreditation
3. Response to 2001 – 2002 site team observations and 2005 focused visit
4. Accreditation history
5. Self-study process

Criterion 1: Mission and Integrity

The organization operates with integrity to ensure the fulfillment of its mission through structures and processes that involve the board, administration, faculty, staff, and students.

Criterion 1a

The organization's mission documents are clear and articulate publicly the organization's commitments

Summary:

Strong, clear and concise mission, vision and values statements that enjoy broad understanding and support from faculty, staff and students

Generally for Criterion 1a

Intro discusses creation of the current mission statement from the two merged institutions' mission statements. Describes the "extensive, respectful, passionate, and constructive discussion" about the mission that included discussion of terms and phrases such as "improving the human condition," "public, metropolitan research university."

1. **Clarity and broadness of mission documents** - Reports on a survey that was conducted to gather data "on the understanding of faculty and staff members about the mission and vision statements as well as their perception about how others in the campus community understand the statements." The self study reports that the "vast majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, 'I feel I understand UT's mission statement.'"

2. **Definition of internal and external constituents** - Diversity and recognition of varied constituencies defined and report notes that this is prominent subject of discussion in core component 1b
3. **Commitment to high academic standards and advancement of excellence in higher learning** - Identifies in all documents, language that speaks to this example of evidence
4. **Articulation of student learning goals** - Identifies in all documents, language that speaks to this example of evidence
5. **Evaluation and revision of mission documents** - Describes recalibration of Directions
6. **Mission document availability** - Describes examples of document availability
7. Summary – Strong, clear and concise mission, vision and values statements that enjoy broad understanding and support from faculty, staff and students

Criterion 1b

In its mission documents, the organization recognizes the diversity of its learners, other constituencies, and the greater society it serves.

Summary:

- Commitment to student diversity and to raise standards and reduce academic support services creates tension
- Commitment to increase non-student diversity by 5%

Challenges/Recommendations:

- Use national searches to recruit for administrative and leadership positions
- Find innovative ways to balance higher college admission standards and our historic open-enrollment status

1. **Documents** - Reviews:

Mission statement, Core values, Definition of Diversity, Directions 2011 Strategic plan, College Diversity Plans, University Diversity Policy

2. **The Office of Equity and Diversity and the Diversity Commission**

3. **Student diversity** - Presents university organizations supporting student diversity. Discusses development of African American Student Enrichment Initiatives Office, Latino Initiatives Office, Cultural Ambassador Program, Culture Building Institute and the movement of Eberly Center to Office of Equity and Diversity. Present data on diversity in recruitment and retention, faculty and staff, administration
4. Student Summary: Commitment to diversity and the commitment to raise standards and reduce academic support services create a tension. Discussed is raised college admission standards, development of the Gateway program, Ohio's performance-based funding model.
5. Other Constituent Summary: Directions plan to increase diversity by 5%, use national searches to recruit for administrative and leadership position should help improve diversity
6. Challenges/Recommendations:
 - Find innovative ways to balance higher college admission standards and its historic open-enrollment status
 - Begin discussion for partnering with Owens Community College, Northwest State etc to dually admit underprepared students to they obtain remedial, developmental course work at CC level before transferring
 - Continue remediation programs without state subsidy
 - Continue to admit students who meet increasingly high academic expectations and come from geographically and culturally diverse backgrounds.

Criterion 1c

Understanding of and support for the mission pervade the organization.

Summary:

- Mission is publicly displayed and accessible
- Widespread deliberation on issue of student centeredness
- Discusses survey results that show broad support, BOT code of ethics, unit constitution and bylaws, unit mission statements aligned with University mission statement, links to university mission statement on other university unit web pages, media such as toledo topics report, town hall meetings, and "the President's Perspective"
- Examples given where mission has driven hiring, etc.

- ???
- Recent reorganization efforts have resulted in widespread deliberation on the issue of student centeredness articulated in the mission statement.

Criterion 1d

The organization's governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the organization to fulfill its mission.

Summary:

- Highly qualified leadership team
- Development of two strategic plans
- Effective communication challenged in its public, explicit modes, though present and at work in implicit modes.

Challenges:

- principle of shared governance continues to evolve and remains central challenge
- Succession planning
- Discussion of USO, authority given by the state, role of BOT, role of president all as defined by the state of ohio
- Description of the executive positions and structure of colleges
- Committee representations, unions, college governing councils

Principle of shared governance has been a topic of considerable discussion in recent years

Like many universities and colleges the University has struggled at times with the inherent tension between the desire on the part of the faculty for extensive deliberation and study and full participation in important decisions involving the University and the ever-increasing need for the University's administration and BOT to act in a timely manner.

Results from survey presented including comments from survey participants

Summary: President has assembled highly qualified team focused on advancing mission of the new university

Studies for and development of two strategic plans

In midst of the change, effective communication is challenged in its public, explicit modes, even though it is present and at work in its implicit modes.

Challenges – Strong tradition of faculty participation in decision making and well defined governance structures, however, the principle of shared governance continues to evolve and remains a central challenge. Tension exists between the idea of full and careful debate of important institutional initiatives and the need for expeditious action on the part of the administrations.

Challenge of succession planning and developing and grooming candidates to fill key leadership positions in the future.

Recommendations – use survey findings to reinvigorate conversations that result in development of action plan for implementing common understanding of and process for shared governance.

Criterion 1e

The organization upholds and protects its integrity.

Summary:

Mission-document based commitments are carried forward

Projected financial conditions have potential to challenge how commitments are realized

1. Congruence with mission
2. Fiscal integrity
3. Local, state and federal laws
4. Administration of clear, fair policies
5. Student academic integrity
6. Research integrity
7. Co-curricular and auxiliary program integrity
8. Commitment to external constituents
9. Public communication
10. Complaints and grievances
11. Summary and evaluation

Criterion 2: Preparing for the Future

The organization's allocation of resources and its processes for evaluation and planning demonstrate its capacity to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its education, and respond to future challenges and opportunities.

Criterion 2a

The organization realistically prepares for a future shaped by multiple societal and economic trends.

Summary:

- Planning processes informed by active engagement at multiple levels.
- Important to maintain relevance through innovation and change

Challenges:

- Ability to rapidly invest in emerging education technologies, maintain globalization programs, and maintain physical plant.

Recommendations:

- Continuously scan environment to anticipate impact of changes on educational programs and learning environment
- Assess return on investment in community economic development initiatives
- Strategic planning – objectives of directions 2007
- Planning for emerging factors such as globalization, technology, demographics
- Planning for university function in a multicultural society
- Environmental scanning
- University environment is supportive of change
- Incorporating history, heritage into planning processes
- Decision-making authority
- Summary

Summary:

Planning processes (e.g., strategic planning) informed by active engagement at multiple levels.

Importance of maintaining relevance through innovation and change

Challenges:

Economic trends challenge ability to rapidly invest in emerging education technologies, maintain globalization programs, and maintain and preserve physical plant.

Recommendations:

Continuously scan environment to anticipate impact of changes on educational programs and learning environment

Assess return on investment in community economic development initiatives

Criterion 2b

The organization's resource base supports its educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future.

Summary:

- Operating budget increased steadily since merger
- Resources accrued through savings from integration of operations reallocated in support of instruction and academic and student activities
- Fiscally positioned to maintain/strengthen quality of education programs

Challenges:

- Reductions in staff
- Reductions in state support

Recommendations

- Ensure student services resources are optimally aligned in support of the learning environment and student success
- Adoption of performance-based budget and resource allocation model
- Resource allocation
- Ensuring educational quality
- Summary

Summary:

Operating budget increased steadily since merger

Reallocated resources accrued through savings associated with integration of operations in support of instruction and academic and student activities

Fiscally well positioned to maintain and strengthen quality of education programs

Challenges:

Reductions in staff are making it more difficult to effectively provide student services

Reductions in state support will challenge capacity of university to maintain breadth and academic quality of educational programs and maintain tuition structure that continues to provide access to diverse student body

Recommendations

Evaluate student services and processes to ensure resources are optimally aligned in support of the learning environment and student success

Economic realities require university to use existing resources in most efficient manner possible and continue to prioritize academic and support programs. Increased emphasis and adoption of a performance based budget and resource allocation model will be necessary to ensure strategic programs are strengthened.

Criterion 2c

The organization's ongoing evaluation and assessment processes provide reliable evidence of institutional effectiveness that clearly informs strategies for continuous improvement.

Summary:

- Assessment processes inform continuous improvement.
- Students overall are satisfied, yet opportunities exist for improvement
- University continues to explore methods to better measure and assess student satisfaction at unit and institutional level

Challenges:

- Excellent data processes; however, timely implementation of improvement plans is at times inadequate

Recommendations:

- Explore ways to measure and assess student satisfaction
 - Invest in programs that improve student academic success retention and graduation rates.
1. Evaluation processes
 2. Review of academic, administrative subunits contribute to organizational improvement
 3. Innovation and entrepreneurship
 4. Research funding
 5. Enrollment strategy
 6. University support for its evaluation and assessment processes
 7. Summary

Summary:

Assessment processes inform continuous improvement.

Student centeredness survey shows overall satisfaction and opportunities to improve student satisfaction

University continues to explore methods to better measure and assess student satisfaction at unit and institutional level

Challenges:

Excellent data processes; however, timely implementation of improvement plans is at time inadequate

Recommendations:

Continue to explore ways to measure and assess student satisfaction

Invest in programs that improve student academic success, retention and graduation rates.

Criterion 2d

All levels of planning align with the organization's mission, thereby enhancing its capacity to fulfill that mission.

Summary:

- Clear evidence that UT plans for the future and allocates resources based on mission.
- Can better create connections between budgeting and strategic planning processes
- Continued history of systematically aligning planning to mission
- Directions 2007 and 2011 provide evidence of commitment to and prioritization of educational quality and student learning.
- Planning processes center on mission, vision and values

- Implementation of organizational planning evident in operations
- Recalibration of Directions 2007 strategic plan
- Involvement of internal, external constituents
- Strategic planning allows reprioritization of goals
- Earlier planning efforts
- Summary

Summary:

Clear evidence that UT plans for the future and allocates resources based on mission.

Room for improvement (e.g., cementing connections between budgeting and strategic planning processes)

Continuing history of systematically aligning planning to mission

Directions 2007 and 2011 provide evidence of commitment to and prioritization of educational quality and student learning.

Where are the drafts? How do I send comments?

Drafts are posted on the UT Self Study website at: www.utoledo.edu/accreditation

Link to send feedback is located on the website

utselfstudyfeedback@utoledo.edu

Deadline is **Wednesday, September 21st**

Your feedback is critical to the completion of the self-study!

President Anderson: Thank you Dr. Poplin Gosetti. This concludes today's meeting. May I have a motion to adjourn?

IV. Meeting adjourned at 6:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:

Lucy Duhon
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard

Faculty Senate Office Administrative Secretary.