

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO Approved @FS mtg.2/24/09
FACULTY SENATE
Minutes of the Senate Meeting of February 10, 2009
<http://www.facsenate.utoledo.edu>

HIGHLIGHTS

President Lloyd Jacobs
Chair Undergraduate Curriculum
Chair Academic Programs

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 Jamie Barlowe called the meeting to order, **Nick Piazza, Executive Secretary**, called the roll.

I. Roll Call –2008-2009 Senators:

Present: Ankele, Bailey, Baines, Baker, Barden, Barlowe, Barnes, Barrett, Brickman, Caruso, Coventry, Crosetto, Denyer, Dowd, Dupuy, Fink, Floyd, French, Funk, Giovannucci, Hoblet, Horan, Hornbeck, Humphrys, Jenkins, Kistner, Klein, Laux, LeBlanc, Lehmann, Lipman, Lundquist, Nims, Olson, Peseckis, Piazza, Powers, Pryor, Ragu-Nathan, Randolph, Regimbal, Sharkey, Sheldon, Stierman, Teclehaimanot, Thompson-Casado, Tietjen, Wedding, Wolff,

Excused absences: Casabianca, Crist, Davis, Dismukes, Duggan, Elmer, Graham, Gunning, Lee, Metting, Szirony, Tietz,

Unexcused absences: Fournier, Hottell, McSweeney, Niamat,
A quorum was present.

II. Approval of Minutes: Minutes of 1/27/09 meeting approved as distributed.

III. Executive Committee Report:

Executive Secretary Nick Piazza asked the Senators to introduce themselves before speaking to get the speakers' names recorded accurately in the minutes.

President Barlowe: My Executive Committee report will be given after Dr. Jacobs.

Dr. Lloyd Jacobs: Thank you Jamie and thanks for inviting me again. It's astonishing to me the degree to which the world has changed from last year. A year ago we were discussing budget scenarios and abstract exercises, and this year, to follow Christine Brennen at graduation ceremony "...this ain't no dress rehearsal." And so the degree to which the world has changed during this past year, it is astonishing to find ourselves in a very different place a year later.

I would like to talk for just a few minutes and then take your questions on virtually any subject. I will start talking about the budget process. My guess is that you might want to spend some time talking about this process.

Education, in my mind, is the only reasonable way out of the current economic situation. There is no other way for the long run. The stimulus package, the bailouts all had their role for the short term. In the long term, in my mind, the only way out is education. Let me suggest to you that it is very tempting to consider the current circumstance a matter of cyclical occurrence, that sooner or later the cycle will turn and the market will bottom out and self correct the cycle, I don't believe that to be the case. This current situation

has to do with the fundamentals of prosperity. You physicists could study a cross section of the ocean or cross section of Lake Erie. There is a cyclical wave pattern that rides on top of water, but beneath it there is the fundamental in which one drowns or swims, and the cycle rides on top of it. I believe the cycle of bad loans is the self-directing nature of the market, meaning this cyclical phenomenon that rides on top of the fundamentals of prosperity.

I believe what we are facing today is different. It has to do with those fundamentals of prosperity. I invite you to think about those fundamentals of prosperity. They are technological know-how. They are the prepared innovative, adaptable workforce, good health, work ethic and other such sociologic fundamentals. In higher education particularly, it's my belief that education in general has to do with those fundamental federal reserve banks. The Federal Reserve Bank in Cleveland has done some very important work, suggesting that the single most important determinant of population, and population density is one of those fundamentals. The single most important determinant after mean year - round temperature is, in fact, the educational status of the population in that city. Cities with low educational attainment tend to lose population to cities with higher level of education. So, population density is connected to education. One of the fundamentals of prosperity is connected to educational institutions. In addition to that, that same report suggests that the main contribution of education is a certain adaptability, a certain malleability, and the ability to reinvent oneself, once a job is lost.

Adaptability is the single most important contributor through higher education. Fundamental adaptability and willingness to reinvent oneself is not characteristic of just one discipline or one set of disciplines. It's characteristic of a broad education. Other fundamentals of prosperity are health, the technological infrastructure, and the ability to understand and adapt to high-tech jobs. This is particularly important in a knowledge economy, as we move from manufacturing to a knowledge economy. Higher education is absolutely fundamental to the prosperity of an area or an institution.

I might go a bit longer on the subject, but today I wanted to point out to you that we are very fortunate. We are caught up in very difficult economic circumstances, but we are also very fortunate that the state administration in Columbus believes what I just attempted to voice. They believe that higher education is the way out of this mess. The governor has been a wonderful champion of higher education. Also, the Republican president of the Senate, Bill Harris, I think, gets it. The governor is putting his money where his mouth is and carrying out that belief. The General Assembly has committed to continue and improve access for Ohioans to higher education by keeping the level of tuition low. Out of hundreds of line items, only one line item actually had an increase and that was the state share of instructions line item. Higher education, in fact, was the only one with an increase. That's absolutely remarkable in my mind.

I expressed my appreciation of the understanding that the current administration has. So let me dig a little deeper of what that means. The line item was increased in the Governor's budget by 6%. If one adds up all of the line items to create an average of all of them, it should be noted that many of them were zeroed out. In the aggregate, the total increase to The University of Toledo will be about \$5.7 million if the Governor's budget is in fact enacted into law. Five point seven million is about 1% of our budgetary base. Although a great commitment on the part of the State, this constitutes about 1% of our budgetary increase. As you know, we have obligations to various groups for pay raises in the 3-5% range. Higher education inflation rate is 3.75%, and the general inflation rate on goods and services in this area is about 3%. So we have 1% budgetary increase offset by an approximate 3-3 ½% obligation. The arithmetic is not going to be easy.

Furthermore, we have a number of uncertainties. First, we don't know what the General Assembly will do to the proposed budget. Second, and more importantly, is the drama unfolding all week, today even in Washington. The Governor's budget is predicated on the receipt of significant federal economic stimulus dollars in the so-called compromise that was reached yesterday. So there are still a huge number of

unknowns and uncertainties. Even if the Governor's generous allotment to the higher education budget prevails and comes out of the General Assembly as proposed, we would still be looking at 1% increase.

So that's the picture from the outside. I will talk a little longer on how we propose to deal with this. As you know by now, we are doing the usual austerity program. The Board of Trustees is eating box lunches instead of using flatware and glassware. A number of my meetings where we usually had breakfast are now being held in my office without anything but coffee. But those things are largely symbolic. They don't really get you much in terms of real money. But they are important symbols to me. We also are curtailing travel. The most important thing that we have done is we've had a very tight position-management control function in place for several months now. It is my belief that it is much easier to leave an empty position by attrition than to delete an occupied position. So, tight position management is a responsible way of dealing with this, and we have been doing that. Those of you who have been in this business know that attrition turnover never occurs when you want it to occur; it always occurs when you don't want it to occur. Position management created a pool of people in places where it might be a lower priority and it tries to maximize the opportunity for people who stay with the organization. We are working very hard to create that kind of movement.

The most important thing is that this year again we are asking people to create budget scenarios, some unfortunately decremental as they almost always are. This is an approach widely used in government and many other organizations, to have budget hearings and to use as a conversational base decremental budget scenarios. If you remember last year, we introduced this approach by asking financial people to create a minus 5% and a minus 10% scenario. The fact of the matter was that it was excellent preparation for where we find ourselves this year. We were able to move about \$3 million out of less important priority areas into more important priority areas. Most of that was from backroom functions to the student interface. This year we are using the same process budget scenario creation and then a set of budget hearings. There are a number of differences, however. Instead of a minus 5% or a minus 10% scenario, we are asking for a minus 7% and a minus 15% scenario. The most important difference is that we are much more likely to accept some of those scenarios this year than we were last year.

I want to emphasize that this is not about across-the-board cuts. This is a way of creating scenarios from which we can enter dialogue, make judgments, and chose. This is not about a 5% or 10% or 7% or 15% across-the-board cut. I'm asking you to help me dispel that misunderstanding that this is an across-the-board cut. It would be very helpful if you would help me clarify that point because it continues in some corners to be misunderstood.

That is roughly where we are at. If the governor's budget prevails, that would mean we would be less likely to avail ourselves of 15% scenarios. More likely it would be to avail ourselves of 7% scenarios or even less than that. In general, we are asking people to think hard of ways to increase revenue. It's a lot more fun to increase revenue than to reduce expenses. So I'm suggesting that maybe as much as half of your budget submission may consist of revenue enhancement efforts as opposed to cost-reduction efforts. It is my understanding that everybody has been working really hard creatively, diligently and committedly to try and work through these times.

I would like to stop here and take questions on this subject or any other subject. This will be a difficult time, but you know how optimistic I am, that this institution will prevail, and that this institution will continue to thrive. We have had a couple of really good years. Aggressive building, aggressing recruitment, 28 new faculty hired. We might be looking at a couple of lean years. But I have no doubt that by keeping the eye on our mission, recognizing that we are fundamental to the human condition, fundamental to building and rebuilding our economic strength and prosperity, we will be successful and will emerge from this as an even stronger, more focused institution. I wanted to share this with you because institutions that do keep an eye on their strategic ball and on their mission do far better in tough times than those who don't. I will take questions now.

Senator Fink: When you do your budgeting how do you think of enrollment?

Dr. Jacobs: The single best way to enhance our revenue is to grow enrollment. No question about it. We have in our strategic plan a target of 20,000 of undergraduate students. We want to see if that's where we want to be, and to have the facilities, the housing, the staff, etc. We will be getting very close to that this year, and that's good. It will cause some problems because of some squeezes, but we are shooting for 20,000 and that translates to about 4,000 new, direct-from-high-school students. We don't do young people any favors by bringing them here, taking some of their tuition money and in six months see them fail. We will continue to try and balance certain selectivity. I have and Dr. Haggett has a deep commitment to improving our retention rates, which are currently okay, but not great. Sixty-eight percent for first and second year retention. I think we can get to 80% retention. I think we can get there.

Senator Fink: In the past, there was some talk regarding differential tuition. Is that something you are considering?

Dr. Jacobs: I have lobbied my heart out for differential tuition with the governor, the chancellor and every place I can. I do not believe it's going to happen this year. We have differential tuition ability on the graduate level, medicine, nursing, and other graduate programs. However, we can apply differential fees because differential fees are not capped. We have to look carefully at the College of Engineering, for example, and carefully raise the fees in some colleges. You have to be very careful not to price yourself out of the market when you increase out-of-pocket costs. I just don't see differential tuition this year.

Senator Sheldon: I'm in the Learning Collaborative. I am really interested in how you negotiate these terms, service electivity, open admissions and the new push for diversity. How are we going to deal with students who are admitted under open admissions, but need help that are designated developmental or remedial and where they fit in that certain selectivity portion?

President Jacobs: Your question raises a very fundamental conflict. It's very hard to do everything that everybody wants us to do. No question about that. But I think there are a couple of ways of doing this. One, as the law requires us, is to admit people who graduate from high school in the State of Ohio. So we can admit them, but inform them that their enrollment will be deferred to Spring semester. That's one way of beginning to introduce some activity. The University Guarantee Scholarship program is specifically designed to push our GPA in entering class upward because a GPA of 3.0 is required to be eligible for this program. At the same time, we hope to improve the number of under-represented minorities. Thus far, in the last couple of years, we've had increased enrollment, particularly among under-represented minorities. One of our primary commitments to the world is to recruit under-represented minorities. We need to greatly improve our support programs and we have been doing that. You have been a part of this for several years, and we need to continue to improve our support programs for students during their first year. If you make it the first year, you will probably make it through graduation. The tipping point generally is somewhere around Christmas. Rosemary Haggett and The Learning Collaborative are working very hard to improve and build those support structures.

Senator Peseckis: College of Pharmacy. What limitations does the State put on universities like tuition caps?

President Jacobs: Yes indeed. To the best of my knowledge, the State has imposed tuition caps for two decades, and it has been in the range of 5-6%. As you know, two years ago the cap was at zero percent. The Governor, in his State-of-the-State address, stated his intention to budget in such a way that the zero tuition cap would be extended one more year, and the tuition cap for the second year of the bi-annum budget would be at 3½ %. That is what he was planning to send it to the General Assembly. I believe that if it goes to the General Assembly, that body will extend the zero cap to the second year. Does this answer your question?

Senator Peseckis: Yes, so we will not be able to raise tuition?

President Jacobs: Yes, that is correct. We will not be able to raise tuition the first year, and 3½ % cap will be in the second year. HEIR, The higher education inflation rate, is running at about 3.7.

Senator Lehmann: Two questions. First, our paper had a story an experiment on saving electricity and it saved a lot of money. Why aren't we notified that we all should be participating in expanding this experiment?

President Jacobs: I'm not sure which experiment.

Senator Lehmann: The one where they saved thousands of dollars in certain areas.

President Jacobs: Saving electricity is very important. Our IT people are working very hard to set up a program that shuts off everyone's computers. It's an important issue. Incandescent bulbs are expensive, and facilities people are putting that together. I agree with your implied criticism. Maybe it should have been done by now, but it is underway.

Senator Lehmann: My second question is about evaluating the program which brings people from inner-city schools. I am very concerned that because of this program it might encourage grade inflation in city schools. What sort of rate of retention for any school would you consider necessary to maintain the program? Have you a way to dump people from a program if they don't stay in college because they are not well enough prepared?

President Jacobs: You are correct in saying I, too, am worried about grade inflation. Almost anything you do will have inadvertent consequences and grade inflation in K-12 is one of them. However, there are a number of ways one can hope to balance that. One of them, as the Governor suggested is to use the ACT test at the end of high-school as opposed to high school completion test. The ACT test is a more national standard, a more widely accepted standard that would help wash out some of that. The legislature two years ago established the Ohio Core Curriculum which will come into play in 2014, establishing a much more rigorous high-school curriculum throughout the state. That curriculum would have to be okayed before you can come to a four-year college. So there are some ways of balancing that danger of grade inflation. And you quite right, it is a danger. We have to continue and watch the measure of success of students, measure the frequency at which they do remedial work. My hope is that it goes down because of some of things the State has imposed.

Senator Lehmann: Certainly the programs are wonderful, it's just that one worries when bringing people who are not well prepared for college. I know you have plans to help.

President Jacobs: As I said, there is danger whatever you do. But I believe that specifically seeking out the 3.0 students from urban areas will help us build minority strength, and at the same time, elevate the likelihood of their standards.

Senator Dowd: You had mentioned that you were looking at cost increases of perhaps 3% to 4%. I am curious why we are continuing with the budget exercises of down 7 and 15%. There is a scale difference here.

President Jacobs: There is a scale difference a half of the seven and about a quarter of the fifteen. The point about that is my insistence that these are not across-the-board cuts. These are creations of scenarios that will allow us, in dialogue, to choose and pick and meet one another on a common ground in budget hearings and say how can we attain, what we need to attain, and still do something that doesn't feel like supporting cuts. It would be far easier for me, frankly, to say that higher education inflation rate is 3.5% - 3.7%, looks like a flat budget, and everybody is cut by 3.7%. In my life, I have done that, and I have regretted it. It is not the way to do it. It is far better to create scenarios with some cushion so that we can sit together and choose and not come at this with a uniform across-the-board cut of every function and discipline. It is far more disciplined, but in the long run it is far better. Institutions that utilize across-the-board cuts do not emerge from hard times a lot stronger.

Senator Barrett: I've heard on a number of occasions from you and Dr. Gold that we are not going to cut our way to greatness. When you discussed last year's scenario, it was also a kind of contrary scenario of what would you do if you got some extra money to help make this institution a greater place. Do you see any place for that in this scenario or are things so dire that you don't see any room for the other side of the coin?

President Jacobs: The former is the case. I absolutely see room for strategic budgeting. I cannot emphasize enough how important it is to connect the budgeting process to the strategic plan and the strategic direction. There are strategic imperatives, and we may, even in this difficult time, increase funding. After all, that's what Ted Strickland did. He said higher education is so strategic and value driven and so important to him and to the state that he is going to cut extra deep in the Department of

Transportation and increase funding for higher education. If you look at my history and the number of times that I delivered accolades to groups like this and elected officials, not very often have I been in this position. We need to follow that example.

Senator Stierman: Environmental Sciences. The concept of recruiting inner city students is very good. My concern is that they need to keep a 3.0 average and that might frighten some of those students in the STEM areas where the real future jobs are.

President Jacobs: I am worried about that, too. I have been out there saying that every single kid can make it to college and through college. This opens the door. Will it be hard? Yes. Will it be harder in some disciplines? Perhaps. That's arguable by some. It does open the door. In my mind, it's our long-term future and our long-term investment. So I'm willing to run that risk.

Senator Sheldon: This is perhaps really off track. I will not quibble with words like higher education, prosperity and success. But often those things are achieved on the back of the sweat of labor. Can you talk about this new interest in designating faculty as research active and reworking work load agreements?

President Jacobs: Sure I can, but I probably should refer this to Dr. Haggett. I wanted her to be recognized for moving that important program. I think that is for other discussions of the current and recently ratified collective bargaining agreement, which commenced a certain level of productivity for faculty, a certain level of contribution for faculty. I think that's good and it speaks volumes of your commitment to the mission of the institution. I think that's great. But nothing works unless you measure it, and the buzz word for the day is accountability. There are a couple of step, and one of them is we have to measure what that means. Because everybody teaches at a particular level, how would one count for other elements of our mission like research or community service? So we have to come up with some definitions of what those mean, how you count research or community service, and ultimately we can add up three or four lines. For example, if you teach at this level, you get this much credit, some sort of calculation of what the contribution is from an individual faculty member. That's the concept. It is an element of accountability ultimately, and the first step in creating accountability is measurement.

Senator Sheldon: Isn't that what we already call the ARPA?

President Jacobs: This is related to, but not quite the same as ARPA.

Senator Sheldon: From what I understand, everything that I have been asked to present to my chair is already on my ARPA, and that's measurable, I would think.

President Jacobs: That's good, we won't have to create a new database.

Senator Sheldon: Are you measuring faculty against faculty, departments against departments?

President Jacobs: At this point, we are trying to figure out the first step against some definition, some idea of what we are dealing with here.

Senator Olson: In the February 6, 2009, Chronicle of Higher Education, on page 87 there is an article on how downturns threaten faculty roles in running colleges. The upshot of the article is that administrations across the country are starting to claim that they need to act quickly, they can't consult faculty, and they can't go through the normal processes of review that they have had to in the past. What is your view on that?

President Jacobs: I have been at a half dozen institutions which from time to time have found themselves in difficult times. I've got to confess that there is a natural centralization of control in down times. It happened every single time and I have seen it at government hospitals and at medical schools. So there is a natural tendency to centralize decision making in difficult times. I think that's number one. Two, and it may be more important to your point, I read that article too. If we learn to have rapid cycle times and input on rapid cycles, than I don't think the argument holds. If our cycle time takes six months to get an input, then your argument does hold. Then we don't have time to gather as much input. Because I value your input, Mike's and everyone's, we will have to learn to do that on cycle times that it will allow that to happen and still allow us to make decision with quickness.

Senator Wedding: Article 10 of the collective bargaining unit pertaining to workload has remained unchanged for several years, and nothing is new in recent negotiations concerning workload. So anything that's going on now is not inaugural of what the union did or did not do during the last negotiations.

President Jacobs: My purpose to be here to argue your assertion and I will say this, the wording has not changed, but the notification of the intent of the management to do the measurement process did occur during the negotiations and restart of the baseline was a part of those negotiations. We may have to take that off line as a separate issue. But you are correct. The wording has not changed. It's a matter of saying that we want to try to avail ourselves of that particular accountability in this current contract. I believe that was discussed.

Senator Sheldon: Can I just say this, I wasn't saying what is in the contract was violated, it wasn't, but I find that my department there are changes occurring that violate the spirit of it, so it's no longer an agreement between my chair and me. It's an agreement between my chair, dean, the provost. So I find it in violation of the spirit of the contract.

President Jacobs: Can anyone in this era believe that it does not require the Board of Trustees interested in the contribution of individuals in departments or in colleges, or the president's office is not interested or the provost's office is not interested? Surely, you are not giving me the argument that no one above the game level should be interested in the contribution of the college or section or department.

Senator Sheldon: Sir, absolutely not. I'm interested in education and prosperity and success of this institution as well.

President Jacobs: So we share so much common interest and so let's see how you work through the process of beginning to develop accountability around those issues. We want to stay focused on all of that we share. We share a deep commitment to the future, and we share a commitment to prosperity, health, personal fulfillment, and longevity. We have spoken of that so often the last couple of years that I think we want to continue staying focused on this, particularly in these difficult times. But also we share probably the commitment to accountability and measurement, and often that's the area we encounter misunderstanding. But in good faith we will continue to work through those things.

I want to thank you again for inviting me here. But before I leave, I want to say one more time that I believe in this institution, I believe in what we are doing, I believe in the future of the world and this State and the local region. It is because of people like you who have that commitment that what we do is important and changes the world. I firmly believe that the work that you do is, frankly, the only hope for our civilization. There is no other way than education, so keep at it. In spite of the difficulties, the annoyances and the doubling up of the redundancy, keep at it. It is the most important thing in the world. Thank you very much.

President Barlowe: Motion for approval of minutes? Motion was made and seconded. *Motion passed.*

Budget issues are, of course, occupying the minds of many of us at UT, as they are at universities and colleges across the country—or to state it more accurately, as they are in every sector of this country and across the globe. Figures released yesterday indicate that the loss of more than 3.1 million jobs in the U.S. in thirteen months is the steepest and most rapid decline in U.S. history. And, as we all are painfully aware, the housing market, the investment and credit markets, and manufacturing industries—including the manufacturing industries in our own region—are also experiencing unprecedented losses.

In response to the economic crisis and President Obama's proposed stimulus package, an email communication from the American Association of University Professors states the following: "At the national level, despite disagreements about the particulars, Congress and the new administration recognize that the path to recovery is through bold, collective investment in key sectors, including higher education. The stimulus package under deliberation represents a major investment in our nation's human capital. The last minute compromise in the Senate, which we are fighting here in Washington with an open letter to the President and Congress, threatens to eliminate the 'higher education facilities modernization monies' and drastically reduce the 'stabilization fund' to states. We are also working to ensure that a focal point in subsequent rounds of stimulus efforts will be investment in faculty and staff, who represent our nation's intellectual capital . . . Faculty must seize this moment. Faculty should contact their senators and representatives to insist that the stimulus package coming out of conference deliberations between

members of the House and Senate should include both the higher education facilities modernization monies and the stabilization fund for states at the level proposed in the House version of the bill. At the local and state level faculty must educate and negotiate with administrators, policy makers, and the public about costs and expenditures in higher education.”

The direct impact on and consequences for the state of Ohio and for UT are still unknown, as Dr. Jacobs said a few minutes ago. The University is preparing for the worst, although, hopefully, the worst will not arrive. In addition, the University is addressing long-term budgetary issues, including structural deficits and a budget that has been deeply skewed toward personnel costs with the loss of adequate and appropriate funding for infrastructure and technological advancements. Dr. Scott Scarborough, Senior V.P. for Finance and Administration, is unable to be here today to discuss specifics of the budget development guidelines, but he is meeting with the Executive Committee on February 17, and I have invited him to speak at the Senate meeting on February 24.

Members of the Executive Committee and I have been involved in a number of budget discussions, including ones with the President, Provosts, and Senior V.P. for Finance. In addition, as I have announced before, Walt Olson from MC and a member of the Senate EC and Susan Pocotte from the HSC represent the Senate on the University Finance and Strategy Committee. The EC has also been involved recently in continuing discussions with senior administrators about shared governance. As I mentioned in an earlier report, we are developing a document of shared principles and practices that will be brought to Senate when it is completed. These principles include, but are not limited to, the acknowledgement of shared institutional goals among the constituencies involved in governance at U.T., as well as principles related to open and honest communication, respect and fairness, and the fostering of relationships that will benefit this institution beyond us as individuals.

In addition, I want to mention another initiative in which the university has been involved for the past year—that is, the issue of retention. Our primary focus thus far has been first-to- second year students with a plan to broaden the focus in the future. You will remember that the midterm grade reports are intended to help with retention—and that grading is open again. My reason in mentioning this initiative today, however, is to get us also to begin thinking of ourselves not just as faculty who deliver instruction and evaluate student performance, but also as faculty who actively participate in a culture of retention, a phrase I stole from Brian Randolph. A culture of retention—please remember that—and think how each of you might work to make that happen.

There are, in fact, many new and exciting initiatives on both campuses, some cost-effective, some cost-reductive, and some potentially revenue-enhancing. While it is difficult to think about new initiatives during an economic crisis, it is imperative that we do so. As the AAUP urges, we must be individually and collectively bold and strategic in a time of crisis, and we must participate and negotiate. Further, we must avoid cynicism, suspicion, distrust, and despair. As the 44th President of the United States says, we must allow for the audacity of hope.

This concludes the Report of the Executive Committee—any comments or questions?

Senator Lehmann: The higher education facilities renovation, renewal, modernization and the other thing about higher education was what?

President Barlowe: The other thing was the stimulus package that will go to States, the stabilization package.

Senator Lehmann: Yes, the stabilization package. I would like to make a motion if I’m allowed, that the Senate instructs the officers of the Senate to send a supporting letter to our representatives in Congress supporting the maintenance of these two aspects.

Senator Lipman: Secoded the motion.

Unidentified speaker: May I make an amendment that this should be a telephone call to their office, letters may take a long time.

President Barlowe: Right now it is hard to get through on the phone.

Senator Lehmann: Maybe an email or a fax.

Senator Barden: The local number is 419 number is not as busy as the 201.

Senator Piazza: I would suggest as a friendly amendment to what's been proposed, as an Executive Committee we can write this letter, but I think it would be better if it came from every member of the Faculty Senate, rather than just from the EC. We could write the letter and then distribute it to Faculty Senate who could then put it on their departmental letterhead and mail it out, or send it as an email, however they would like to communicate it to their representative.

President Barlowe: Paul is also suggesting something jointly written, right?

Senator Lehmann: That would actually be an excellent idea if such a letter was mailed. I still would like to see a letter instructed by senators. And as a faculty body, as a group who voted, hopefully unanimously would be a significant thing as well.

Senator Barden: Time is of the essence. If this is going out as a letter, it will be too late. The US Senate will have it this afternoon, the Conference Committee will have it in the next two days.

Senator Ankele: College of Nursing. Could this not go out to all faculty in an email form, stating anyone who wants to contact their representatives can and would it not be more impressive if all of us did this?

President Barlowe: Absolutely, that's a great idea.

Senator Stierman: I believe the initial motion should be carried out by phone, time is of the essence.

President Barlowe: Any other discussion? A vote on the motion. All those in favor,

Senator Dowd: Could you repeat the motion?

Senator Lehmann: That the officers of the Senate send a letter to our representatives supporting the retention of higher education facilities through their stabilization and stimulus packages.

President Barlowe: It's been seconded, all those in favor, please say "aye." Opposed, none.

Passed unanimously.

Ruth, do you want to put that forward as a motion?

Senator Ankele: I move that the letter be sent out to all faculty so they can do so as they wish.

President Barlowe: The email that I quoted from in my report came to everybody who is a member of AAUP, and there is additional information in there as well. Do we have a second on that motion?

Senator Piazza: Second.

President Barlowe: All those in favor, please say "aye." Opposed? None. ***Passed unanimously***

Paul, you won't see the email before it goes out. We just don't have the time.

Senator Lehmann: That's fine.

President Barlowe: Next on the agenda is Steve Peseckis.

Senator Peseckis: Last week we emailed you the list of new courses and course modification proposals and I asked for a feedback. In front of you is the consent agenda, any comments?

Senator Dowd: Is there a proposal here about research intensive courses?

Senator Peseckis: That's separate and we will discuss this later.

Senator Olson: I move that we accept these.

Senator Peseckis: All those in favor of accepting these proposals, please say "aye." Opposed? None.

Passed unanimously.

Course Modifications and New Courses
Approved by the Faculty Senate on February 10, 2009

New Courses

College of Arts and Sciences (ARS)

ARTH-3750	Art and Disease	3
CHEM-3810	Chemistry of sustainable energy resources	3
CHEM-4580	Bioinorganic Chemistry	4
PHYS-3400	Physical principles for energy sources for humans	3
PHYS-4400	Principles and varieties of solar energy	3
PHYS-4940	Internship in renewable energy	1-4
SOC-4650	Sociology of Latin America and Caribbean	3

College of Health Sciences and Human Services (HSHS)

HEAL-2750	Introduction to epidemiology	3
HEAL-3000	Global health	3

College of Engineering (ENG)

MIME-1200	Introduction to design	2
MIME-3330	Mechanics laboratory	1
MIME-3360	Vibration laboratory	1
MIME-3420	Fluids laboratory	1
MIME 3450	Energy Laboratory	1

Course Modifications

College of Arts and Sciences (ARS)

CHEM-3610 INORGANIC CHEMISTRY I 3 ch

- Update catalog description to: "The application of modern theories to the elements and their inorganic compounds. Physical chemical principles are used throughout. Prerequisite: CHEM 2420 or CHEE 2230 and 2330"

CHEM-3860 ADVANCED LABORATORY I 2 ch

- Not indicated on form but indicated in catalog description:

Change co-requisite from "CHEM 3710 or 3730" to "CHEM 3710 or 3730 or 4570"

- Update catalog description to: "Laboratory experiments and techniques relating to subjects developed in CHEM 3710, 3730, or 4570. Three-hour laboratory and one-hour discussion per week, see your advisor for proper section number. Approved chemical safety goggles meeting the American National Standard Z87.1-1968 must be worn by every student during every laboratory class meeting.

Prerequisite: CHEM 2420 and 2470 or 2490; Corequisite: CHEM 3710 or 3730 or 4570"

CHEM-3910 UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH II 3 ch

- Update catalog description to: "Research under the guidance of a faculty member. May be repeated. A maximum accumulated credit of 10 hours in CHEM 2910, 3910 and 4910 may be applied toward a degree. A written report is required. May be taken only as P/NC. Prerequisite: GPA (overall and in chemistry courses) above 2.5 and permission of department. Corequisite: CHEM 2420"

CHEM-4300 INSTRUMENTAL ANALYSIS 2 ch

- Not indicated on form but indicated in catalog descriptions:

Change co-requisite from “CHEM 3710 or 3730” to “CHEM 3710 or 3730 or 4570”

- Update catalog description to: “An introduction to modern chemical instrumentation and applications to chemical analysis. Topics include electrical, magnetic, nuclear and spectroscopic instrumentation.

Prerequisite: CHEM 3310 and 3360; Corequisite: CHEM 3710 or 3730 or 4570”

CHEM-4880 ADVANCED LABORATORY III 2 ch

- Not indicated on form but indicated in catalog descriptions:

Change pre-requisite from “CHEM 3610 and 3870” to “CHEM 3860”

- Update catalog description to: “Laboratory experiments and techniques relating to subjects developed in CHEM 4300. Six hours of laboratory per week. Approved chemical safety goggles meeting the American National Standard Z87.1-1968 must be worn by every student during every laboratory class meeting.

Prerequisite: CHEM 3860; Corequisite: CHEM 4300”

CHEM-4910 UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH III 3 ch

- Not indicated on form but indicated in catalog descriptions:

Change co-requisite from “CHEM 3740” to “CHEM 3740 or 4570”

- Update catalog description to: “Thesis level research under the guidance of a faculty member. May be repeated. A minimum of three hours and an acceptable thesis required for credit toward the B.S. major. A maximum accumulated credit of 10 hours in CHEM 2910, 3910 and 4910 may be applied toward a degree. A written report is required. May be taken only as P/NC. Prerequisite: GPA (overall and in chemistry courses) above 2.5 and permission of department Corequisite: CHEM 3740 or 4570”

COMM-2150 EDITING AND GRAPHICS 4 ch

- Change pre-requisite from “COMM 2100 NEWS WRITING” to “None”

- Update in catalog description: Drop reference to prerequisite of COMM 2100

FILM-2320 VIDEO I 3 ch

- Update catalog description to: “An intensive production seminar course where digital video is explored as a means for creative expression. Students purchase supplies. For majors and minors only, or by permission of instructor. Prerequisites: Comp I and Grade of C or better in FILM 2340. May not be taken simultaneously with FILM 2310. Writing-intensive (WAC) course. “

FILM-3310 FILM II 4 ch

- Change pre-requisite from “UNDERGRADUATE LEVEL FILM 2310 MINIMUM GRADE OF D-: to “GRADE OF C OR BETTER IN FILM 2310 AND 2320”

FILM-3320 VIDEO II 4 ch

- Change pre-requisite from “UNDERGRADUATE LEVEL FILM 2320 MINIMUM GRADE OF D-: to “GRADE OF C OR BETTER IN FILM 2310 AND 2320”

FILM-3980 CINEMA STUDIES TOPICS II 4 ch

- Change credit hours from “4” to “3-4”

FILM-4370 CINEMA STUDIES SEMINAR 4 ch

- Change credit hours from “4” to “3-4”

THR-2000 THEATRE PRACTICUM 1 ch

- Change grading system. Undergraduate catalog was written “This is a request to change the grading system from P/NC to a letter graded course.”

THR-4110 MODERN AMERICAN THEATRE 3 ch

- Change title to “CONTEMPORARY AMERICAN THEATRE”

College of Education (EDU)

PED-4920 STUDENT TEACHING SEMINAR 3 ch

- Change credit hours to “1-3”

-

SPED-4060 SPECIALIZED INTERVENTION IN INFANCY AND EARLY CHILDHOOD
4 ch

- Change credit hours to “3”

SPED-4100 FIELD PRACTICUM WITH STUDENTS WITH MILD/MODERATE
EDUCATIONAL NEEDS 4 ch

- Change credit hours to “3”

- Update course description: “This course's purpose is to implement strategies and techniques for teaching students with special educational needs. Students will have the opportunity to work in educational settings with experienced teachers. One hundred twenty hours of required field.”

College of Engineering (ENG)

CIVE-3620 AIR POLLUTION ENGINEERING I 3 ch

- Change pre-requisite from “CIVE 1170” to “PHYS 2140”

MIME-2000 STATISTICS AND MEASUREMENTS LABORATORY 2 ch

- Change course title to “MEASUREMENTS LABORATORY”

- Change pre-requisite from “ENGL-1930” to “ENGL-1930 AND EECS-2340”

MIME-3310 MECHANICAL DESIGN I 3 ch

- Change pre-requisite from “CIVE-1160, MIME-1650” to “CIVE-1160, MIME-1650 AND CO-REQUISITE MIME-3330”

MIME-3370 MECHANICAL VIBRATION 3 ch

- Change pre-requisite from “MIME-2300, MATH-3860” to “MIME-2300, MATH-3860 AND CO-REQUISITE MIME-3360”

MIME-3410 THERMODYNAMICS II 3 ch

- Change pre- and co-requisite from “MIME-3400” to “MIME-3400 AND CO-REQUISITE MIME-3420”

MIME-3430 FLUID MECHANICS 3 ch

- Change pre- and co-requisite from “MIME-3400” to “MIME-3400 AND CO-REQUISITE MIME-3420”

MIME-3440 HEAT TRANSFER 3 ch

- Change pre- and co-requisite from “MIME-3430” to “MIME-3430 AND CO-REQUISITE MIME-3450”

College of Health Sciences and Human Services (HSHS)

CARD-2370 ULTRASOUND INSTRUMENT MECHANICS AND WAVE PHYSICS 1 credit hour

- Change prerequisites from “MATH 1320” to “MATH 1320 WITH A C OR BETTER”.

HEAL-2700 COMMUNITY HEALTH 3 ch

- Change course title to “INTRODUCTION TO PUBLIC HEALTH”

- Update catalog description to: “Introduces students to the structure, organization and methods of public health including an emphasis on protecting and improving the health of populations via research, needs assessment, program planning, program implementation, and program evaluation.”

Senator Mary Powers: Chair of Academic Programs

All the new programs, proposals and program modifications are posted online at curriculumtracking.utoledo.edu. We have three program modifications and one new program. The first item I would like to talk about is from College of Education, a program modification.

Senator Olson: Point of order. Programs are now on the consent agenda and all you need to do is say that these are the programs that were approved by the committee and recommended for Faculty Senate approval, and then ask for a vote.

Senator Powers: Thank you, Walt. All those in favor of the consent agenda, please say “aye.” Opposed? None. *Passed unanimously.*

Academic Programs Committee Report – February 10, 2009

All new programs and program modifications are posted at: <http://curriculumtracking.utoledo.edu/>

Item 1 – EDU – Physical Education – Program Modification

The changes are needed for state mandated transfer assurance courses.

Item 2 – EDU – Early Childhood Education Degree Only – Program Modification

The changes are needed for state mandated transfer assurance courses. One course, SPED 4010 Early Child Dev., will be taken out of inventory.

Item 3 – HHS – Associate Degree in Cardiovascular Technology – Program Modification

The modification consists of adding minimum grade requirements for specific courses in the curriculum.

Item 4 – HHS – Minor in Public Health – New Program

This minor would be offered by the Department of Health and Rehab Services in response to recommendations from the 2006 Consensus Conference on Undergraduate Public Health Education.

For future new program proposals and program modification proposals that would impact course offerings from other departments, please note the Academic Programs Committee requires that the contact person for the proposal would communicate with the affected departments about the changes and how the proposed changes could impact their course enrollments before the Academic Programs Committee would consider the proposal. Evidence of the communication should be included with the program proposal form.

Senator Peseckis: There are two more items that the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee discussed. The first one has to do with FYI courses. Other committees on campus are considering issues such as academic journey. The idea is that we improve retention for students so that their experience here will be more rewarding, more exciting, give them a reason to want to come here and to stay here. Give them skills and experiences that will make our graduates distinctive. While these other issues are still developing as proposals, one of the issues that came up which we realized as important was the FYI courses. They were initially proposed in the 1990's and since then different colleges have taught them in different ways - but not all colleges have always taught them. In recent years, all departments have been offering them. Since the curriculum is owned by the faculty, we want to reaffirm the support for the FYI courses at this time. We want to affirm the use of FYI courses as important elements in the education of students, for retention of students at the University, and to position them so that in the future they could play even more important roles in our curriculum. In order to do that, there has been discussions that we need to use more updated technology in these courses, such as ePortfolios. We want students to use such newer technologies and to have instructors have access to common elements for use in teaching these FYI courses. We want to have made available curricular materials that faculty could draw upon, that they could customize, so that there would be a core of materials to help instructors. This would make it easier to teach these courses. It would also make it easier to establish relationships between different FYI courses so that, for instance, if a student decided to change her major or College, what the student learned in that FYI course which was not major specific would still be useful. We want there to be some commonality amongst College FYI courses, like between Arts & Sciences and Nursing. There would be some things that are common and that serve as a base. So the Curriculum Committee discussed issues connected to FYI courses and out of that we recommend the following resolution.

The Faculty Senate approved the following resolution on February 10, 2009.

“Be it resolved that the University of Toledo Faculty Senate supports existing guidelines for the offering of First Year Information (FYI) courses along with the updating of such courses to current methodologies and faculty-identified learning objectives that enhance student retention and success before and after graduation.

Be it resolved that the aims of these First Year courses are to make all first-year undergraduate students welcome and engaged at the University of Toledo. Through inquiry, self-reflection, participation, and problem solving, the courses are to assist first-year students in clarifying their goals and in developing strategies and skills for their academic journeys at the University of Toledo and beyond. Current methodologies are to include the use of a common electronic portfolio system and mutual curricular materials that can be customized.”

BACKGROUND: An orientation course was piloted for incoming UT students in the 1994-95 school year as part of the First Year Information (FYI) program, following guidelines and criteria developed by the FYI Advisory Board composed of faculty and staff. Following Faculty Senate action in winter quarter 1995, it was expanded to every undergraduate college for processing through their curricular bodies, to be fully implemented in the 1995-96 academic year, as outlined in a memo from Vice President for Academic Affairs Judy Hample dated April 3, 1995. Parameters developed by the FYI Advisory Board were presented in the memo and include:

“Effective fall 1995, each college is asked to offer a mandatory, interactive, one [quarter] credit (which counts toward graduation) graded (A-C, NC) orientation course which meets a total of 100 to 110 minutes per week in a combined recitation/lab format. All new degree-seeking students enrolled in the fall of 1995 and thereafter will be required to complete the FYI orientation course in their entry college during their first quarter of enrollment at UT. Non-degree seeking students may be required to complete the orientation course as deemed necessary by the adviser or the associate dean in the college of entry. The enrollment goal is 25 students per section: a maximum of 35 per section may be enrolled for fall 1995, but a maximum of 25 in subsequent quarters.

In developing the course, it is equally important to keep in mind the Advisory Board’s guidelines for a ‘core’ curriculum within the FYI orientation course: library instruction, information on campus resources and locations, advising and academic regulations, goal setting and educational planning, time management, how to study for exams, how to succeed in college, major and career information, and registration procedures. Additional topics which instructors are encouraged to include are the following: assertiveness training, computer literacy, learning styles, reasons for attending college, stress management, test anxiety, how to read college textbooks, how to take lecture notes, and how to take essay and objective tests. This course offers the flexibility to incorporate college and department specific information and skills. Instructional pedagogy in the orientation course will be interactive as much as possible, incorporating small groups and collaborative learning techniques.”

Several significant changes have occurred since the implementation of this course in 1995, not least of which are the transition to a semester academic calendar in 1997, advances in technology and student preparation, developments in pedagogy, merger with the Medical College of Ohio in 2006, several cycles of institutional strategic planning and University System of Ohio emphasis on the ease of student transfer between institutions.

A widely representative discussion by faculty, staff and administration has been occurring since December, 2007 to clarify what has now become known as ‘the academic journey’ for each UT student. One noteworthy outcome of those discussions is that the FYI course was identified as an essential, universal starting point for ultimate student success, and should be examined to assess its currency with the many changes that have occurred since 1995.

As a result of those discussions, piloting of potential updating to orientation courses was begun in fall 2008 by providing instructor training and developing example assignments to encourage and document attainment of restated outcomes. These outcomes remain true to the original intent of the course, and support other elements of the academic journey now under discussion. Voluntary adoption of the outcomes, use of eFolio to document their attainment and a recommended textbook were encouraged.

Senator Stierman: You mentioned here the common electronic portfolio system. I was very frustrated last semester trying to use one that is currently available. I had long talks with Information Technology specialist about this. Are we going to settle on one system and collectively evaluate one system?

Senator Peseckis: There is a committee of faculty that have been working on ePortfolios. They are focused on it and hope to come out with a single recommendation maybe as soon as this month. We are not endorsing a particular system, but rather the use of updated technology which includes ePortfolio. The details of which system, that’s something that still needs to get worked out.

Penny Poplin Gosetti, Interim Vice Provost: We put out an RFP for a system that can do ePortfolio, assessment, and early warning functions. We have gotten 6 responses from vendors to the RFP and they responded to particular priorities and things we want in the software. We are in the process of reviewing those right now and hope to have a decision made by March. One of the criteria was the ability to provide training to faculty and staff users.

Senator Peseckis: Our committee anticipates the adoption of graduation portfolios. While what we are saying is that it should begin in FYI classes, many programs could then use these ePortfolios to have

students collect examples of work in their portfolio which document their progression and successes. In the end, students will have something to show to potential employers or post-graduate programs when they graduate.

Senator Barden: I want to contextualize this, as you recall the famous re-engineering the curriculum State of the University about year and a half ago, it was perceived that this was an administrative thing being done under the tower. What's going on now is the faculty has joined this academic journey, which was faculty driven in the first place. Mary Powers and I are on it from Academic Programs Committee, Steve is on it, the Chair of Faculty Senate is on it, Brian Randolph is on it so now combined the Senate instrument along with this Faculty committee, and what you are getting from Steve is just one piece of it. It's very relevant to Walt's comment on The Higher Education article. In fact this has taken a long time to get this far.

Senator Lehmann: Are graduate student required to take the FYI courses?

Senator Peseckis: This resolution applies to first year undergraduate students only graduate students are not required to take FYI courses.

Senator Barrett: I want to ask a quick question about how the old FYI courses are received by the students? Is this something that helps retention of students? Is it something the students are excited about?

Senator Peseckis: I cannot speak for all of the FYI courses at the University. I have experience with only those in the College of Pharmacy. Sometimes it does depend on a student and an instructor. Generally students find them very useful, they do get oriented and find out things that are important

Prof. Ben Pryor: I know that there is some assessment data in the College of Arts & Sciences and maybe in all FYI's that shows that students are generally satisfied with FYI and that it meets its objectives.

Senator Peseckis: They are successful and useful.

Senator Barrett: It seems to me if we want to further institutionalize and support the concept and we have the data, why wouldn't we consider the data before we did it.

Senator Peseckis: If nothing else, we are supporting that they at least make the data available to all instructors so as to make the courses the best that they possibly can be and to position them so that they will play a greater and more important role in students' experience here. This is one element where we can get all the students who come here to share, and we have an opportunity as faculty to introduce the students in the long run to a very exciting concept.

Senator Dowd: Please clarify something that Senator Barden said, is this coming from the Faculty Senate Curriculum or from some separate ad hoc committee?

Senator Peseckis: This resolution came from Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee and input from other undergraduate committees.

Senator Barden: Everything coming right now is coming from the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee.

Senator Peseckis: This is the time to do this.

President Barlowe: I just want to remind everybody of something Steve has said a couple of times. We are not approving FYI. It was approved 14½ years ago by Faculty Senate. The learning objectives are the same, but when we went back and looked at it, we realized that we now have better delivery mechanisms and better pedagogical methods than we did fifteen years ago. This resolution is about updating this course. We are not adding anything or re-approving it.

Senator Lipman: Does FYI include post-secondary education students? Or students that come in after two years with some transfer credits?

Senator Peseckis: No.

Senator Randolph: College of Engineering. I think it depends on the college in terms of post secondary students. We ask all direct-from-high school students to take the course. The transfer students are case-by-case, based on an advisor's evaluation and if they took an equivalent course at another institution.

Senator Lipman: Has the committee looked at this or are you offering this just from your college?

Senator Randolph: This is specifically from the College of Engineering

Senator Peseckis: The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee does not originate programs and course proposals, we don't tell Colleges what to do. We respond to proposals that faculty make. In some ways, this particular resolution, and the next one that we will discuss, are unusual in that we are trying to be a little proactive. So, if you are asking how FYI classes are running, or who takes them, we don't have control over that. That's something we can have a discussion about.

Senator Dowd: Calling the questions.

Senator Barden: The Learning Collaborative supports the FYI courses and the FYE initiatives, so there is a support system from The Learning Collaborative already in place.

Senator Peseckis: Calling the question. All those in favor of with the addition of the first year, undergraduate students, all those in favor of the resolution, please say "aye." Opposed, "nay" ***Resolution passed unanimously.***

Separate from this but along the same vein, we propose that there be a new option to have certain courses designated as "research intensive," same as some courses are designated as WAC or Honors courses, and that courses could be designated as "research intensive" in accordance with defined criteria. The advantage of doing this would be that one could concur on the undergraduate research and activities of students who apply the scientific method or critical thinking a distinction that would lead to a richer course experience and would be distinguished on student transcripts. This would be an extra incentive for potential employers to hire our graduates.

Senator Dowd: I want to preface my statement by saying I'm a strong supporter of the Office of Research and several years ago I worked very hard to help establish that office. I like the idea of a research intensive designation. However, I cannot support this proposal and I recommend that the Senate does not support it either based on the four requirements listed here. Specifically, I object to the idea that the office of Undergraduate Research is going to mandate that my students have to present their presentation to anyone other than myself or that class. Secondly, that a final written report by my students have to be submitted to your office – an administrative office. Third, your office is going to pick which courses are research intensive and not Faculty Senate? In the strongest language possible I object to these requirements. The research designation I like and I would support, but I cannot support this proposal with these requirements. Your office, an administrative office is now getting into the area of academics. And I do not agree that the designation would be similar to that of honors designation or writing across the curriculum course. Writing across the curriculum courses do not submit any writing to an administrative office. The evaluation of students' academic activities is made by the instructors, the faculty member. What you are suggesting here is that the specific academic activities of students will report to an administrator. I think the idea of a research intensive course is a good idea but you're way over-reaching on this. This is administrative creep into the classroom. Further, you are asking Senate to transfer its authority of granting such designations over to the administration.

Dr. Thomas Kvale: What I am envisioning with the Faculty Senate's approval would be that the advisory committee who are The Office of the Undergraduate Research serve as the approval committee for the research intensive identification of the courses. All except for the Office of Research Development and the Student Government representatives have faculty status.

Senator Dowd: But that's not Faculty Senate.

Dr. Thomas Kvale: I would be very happy if Faculty Senate would add committee members to the approval committee.

Senator Dowd: There is nothing stopping you from packing your committee with other members.

Senator Olson: Approval of courses is part of the objective of a Faculty Senate in the area of curriculum. That area is specifically reserved for Faculty Senate and Faculty Senate review and approvals. Giving a designation by an administrative office, The Office of Undergraduate Research strongly violates that principle. It starts down a slope where another office wants a designation, so now they start getting it. We have one body, this Faculty Senate, for reviewing these.

Senator Peseckis: The idea as I understand it is that if a faculty feels that their course warrants such a designation, then the request would come from that faculty member teaching that course, or a section of that course.

Senator Olson: But it still gets approved by Faculty Senate, not the administration.

President Barlowe: In order to have a class designated as a WAC class, it does have to be submitted to a committee which decides whether or not that designation is appropriate for that course in general or whether it's appropriate for the course on a single semester basis. And that committee does make that designation and that submission must be made.

Senator Dowd: Who appoints members to that committee?

President Barlowe: The director of the WAC program.

Senator Caruso: Arts & Science Council appoints the members of the WAC Committee. The director of The Writing Center is Chair of that committee. The courses are already approved. Existing courses are asked for writing intensive designation.

Senator Dowd: But it's not the administrative making that designation.

Senator Olson: It needs to be Faculty Senate designation.

Senator Caruso: I agree.

Senator Barrett: Could you clarify conceptually a couple of things for me. Putting aside all the jurisdictional issues, it sounds like a great idea. It may help students find jobs; I think getting a quality intensive research experience is a great idea. The criteria sound like they are designed to be relatively rigorous, but it seems to me if this is actually the case, if it is that rigorous, it wouldn't apply to a huge percentage of our students. Maybe five, ten, fifteen percent, as opposed to WAC, where I think it is a requirement that everybody has to take a WAC class. Do you envision this being expanded in such a way that almost everybody takes a research intensive course, or do you see this as something that really cherry picks, as being for those who seek it out and is designed to be something out of the ordinary yet obviously main stream enough to be readily available for those who want it? That's what I don't have sense of from here.

Senator Barden: WAC is not required by everybody, it's only required by the College of Arts & Sciences. The other thing is the analogy between WAC and this RI designation is exactly right. If a faculty member has a research course and doesn't want to go through the process, you have the course just the way it was before. It is totally voluntary. As to the make-up of the RI Advisory committee, I see Senator Dowd's objection. He is right that there should be some formal body of faculty vetting this designation process, and I would suggest that the Curriculum Committee of Faculty Senate is that body. What's behind this is simply making sure faculty members can't just say, okay, my courses are research intensive courses, I will hang up a shingle and that's it. There has to be some control of it, and Dr. Kvale has put forward a

good set of criteria. What he is asking for is for this to be created as an option. It's always voluntary. Nobody is going to impose it.

Senator Dowd: One issue is, is it determined by faculty or is it determined by an administrative office? The other issue is you are overreaching. The idea that students must present their research to a wider audience than their class is quite new. That is not done in WAC courses. Students in WAC classes do not submit the writing to someone outside of their classroom. The notion that the Office of Undergraduate Research has to have a copy of all this work? Why would the Office of Undergraduate Research require that? What is your justification or motivation for mandating that my students send a copy of their work to you?

Dr. Thomas Kvale: The motivation is that it would be a better resource for undergraduate research.

Senator Peseckis: We will talk about that, but let's have just two more questions.

Senator Stierman: My comment first of all is would a presentation to the entire department constitute a broader audience?

Dr. Thomas Kvale: That is my reading on it.

Senator Stierman: Would an abstract serve as a report to the Office of Undergraduate Research?

Dr. Thomas Kvale: Very likely.

Senator Stierman: One part of the research is that you have to tell people about it.

Senator Peseckis: In our committee, we identified many ways that a student or faculty could chose to present the research to a wider audience. A faculty member chooses to have their course designated as "research intensive." If they do not want to have the course fulfill the criteria, they do not have to ask for the designation. It is an option.

Senator Olson: My comment has to do with academic freedom. The paragraph four of the requirements violates academic freedom in my belief. It violates it from the standpoint that instructors alone are responsible for the content of their course. By forcing them, even if it's voluntary to get the RI designation, It still violates their freedom of teaching their course by being required to submit this report to an administrative office.

Senator Peseckis: We are not talking about the content of the report. It is whatever a student has chosen to do.

Senator Olson: It violates the freedom by virtue of the fact that they have to submit a report.

Dr. Thomas Kvale: What about the college of Engineering the senior design synthesis?

Senator Olson: There is no requirement we submit that report anywhere else.

Dr. Thomas Kvale: Including the college office?

Senator Olson: Including the college office.

Senator Peseckis: Could a student do no report?

Senator Olson: The instructor requires a report but it doesn't go beyond the instructor.

Senator Lehmann: If the instructor decides to waive seeing a report, how would anybody know?

Senator Olson: They wouldn't. It's up to the instructor.

Senator Lundquist: I believe the honors projects are collected and kept in the Honors College.

Senator Barden: The honors projects are similar though.

Senator Olson: That doesn't make it right.

Senator Barden: This is the nature of research, Walt. Our Honors students' theses and projects are also posted on Ohio link. Every honors thesis is turned in to me for publishing. Not for me to scrutinize or grade. It's because it's a public forum. Now we are going a step further. Every citizen of the State can look at it. It's a service that we do on behalf of the students to get the research out there. Total public availability—that's the nature of research.

Senator Olson: If an instructor says, this does not merit external publication, it should stop right there.

Senator Barden: If it's in honors, it has to get the thesis advisor's signature, then it has to get my signature. If that's a violation of academic freedom, then...

Senator Olson: It's a violation of academic freedom if you require them to give the report if an instructor feels.....

Senator Lehmann: If it's not suitable to show it to people, it can't be passable. It wouldn't be put up if it failed, right?

Dr. Ben Pryor: As a faculty member who might someday wish to teach a "Research Intensive" course, I would like a few questions answered just so I'm clear on the concept. I know that Philosophy might not be the first thing that comes to mind when for research intensive designation, but I imagine that a student or I voluntarily submit a syllabus to get it designated as research intensive and if that designation is suitable then the student would voluntarily sign up for this course. Knowing full well that the student would be asked to do all these things, at the end of which the student would have to do all those things and then get the research designation on his or her transcript. If a student does not want to do those things and does not sign up for this course, and if I don't want to do those things, then I do not submit the course. Is all that true?

Dr. Thomas Kvale: Absolutely. It's the instructor's prerogative if the entire course is research intensive or just sections of it and how those four RI criteria are met. Just like every single course at this university has course descriptions, and this is just another set of criteria like course descriptions.

Senator Olson: We need to do some thinking on this I am going to move that we table this resolution.

Senator Dowd: Second.

Senator Peseckis: If you say "aye." It's tabled. If you say "nay" then it won't be tabled and there will be further discussion.

Senator Dowd: Can I offer a friendly amendment?

President Barlowe: Not after the motion.

Senator Peseckis: All those in favor of tabling it say “aye.” Opposed, say “nay”? The “aye’s” have it.

Resolution Tabled at FS on 02-10-09

The University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC) proposes that the following resolution of support be approved by the Faculty Senate.

“Be it resolved that the University of Toledo Faculty Senate supports the designation of undergraduate courses as “Research Intensive” according to criteria crafted by the UT Office of Undergraduate Research in conjunction with Faculty for the purposes of promoting undergraduate research and distinguishing it on student transcripts.”

Senator Lehmann: How do other institutions deal with this?

Dr. Thomas Kvale: Other universities such as University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill have adopted "Research Intensive" course designations.

Senator Olson: Point of order. This motion has been tabled and at this time the discussion should stop.

Senator Dowd: For this issue, perhaps the Executive Committee (EC) could invite Tom Kvale to the EC meeting to further the discussion.

President Barlowe: Absolutely. One announcement before we adjourn. I was asked to remind you that the “Getting to Professor Workshop”, that is in part sponsored by the Senate, will be on Monday, February 16, from 3:00–5:00 pm in SU-2592. Included on the panel are Dr. Haggett, Robin Kennedy from the College of Law, Tim Fischer from Environmental Sciences, Chair of Curriculum and Instruction Dr. **Leigh Chiarelott**, and the chair of DPC, Dr. Ted Keith from the College of Engineering. Jackie Layng will be moderating.

Any other old business?

Senator Lipman: I need a clarification, how did this resolve?

President Barlowe: It’s tabled so it needs two-third votes to get it out.

Senator Lipman: Is it going to the Executive committee for further discussion? So if we have suggestions can we direct them to the Executive Committee?

Senator Peseckis: This was not an agenda item, this was a resolution.

President Barlowe: Okay, thank you.

Is there any new business? If not, may I have a motion to adjourn? *Motion was made and seconded.*

V. Calendar Questions:

VI. Other Business:

Old business: None

New business:

VII. Adjournment: Meeting adjourned at 5:50 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Nick Piazza
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Kathy Grabel
Faculty Senate Office Administrative Secretary