
Summary of Senate Business

Dr. Constance Schriener, Associate Provost for Faculty Development

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 Rouillard: I call this meeting to order. Welcome to the thirteenth Faculty Senate meeting of **Lucy Duhon**, Executive Secretary, called the roll.

I. Roll Call: 2013-2014 Senators:

Present: Anderson, Black, Brickman, Chiarelott, Cochrane, Cooper, Denyer, Dowd, Duhon, Edinger, Farrell, Federman, Frantz, Giovannucci, Gunning, Hasaan-Elnaby, Hewitt, Hoblet, Humphrys, Keith, Kennedy, Kistner, Kranz, LeBlanc, Langan, Lundquist, Molitor, Moore, Nigem, Ohlinger, Plenefisch, Porter, Quinlan, Randolph, Regimbal, Relue, Rouillard, Springman, Srinivasan, Teclehaimanot, Templin, Thompson, Van Hoy, Weck-Schwarz, Wedding, White, White, Williams,

Excused absences: Bailey, Cappelletty, Duggan, Elmer, Gohara, Lee, Moynihan, Sheldon, Thompson-Casado

Unexcused absences: Caruso, Crist, Ellis, Gilbert, Hamer, Monsos, Skeel, Willey

III. Approval of Minutes: Minutes from February 11th and February 25th Faculty Senate meetings are ready for approval.

Academic Year 2013-2014. I ask that Executive Secretary, Lucy Duhon come to the podium to call the roll.

President Rouillard: Thank you, Lucy. Our next order of business is approval of Minutes. Quinetta sent out two sets of Minutes. She sent out the February 11th Minutes, but I think the February 11th Minutes are actually the January 11th [sic] [actually the 14th] Minutes, so we will come back to those at another time, but consider the February 25th Minutes. Is there a motion to include those Minutes? Minutes from Faculty Senate meeting held on February 25th are approved. **Motion Passed.**

The Executive report: As you know last week was a very eventful one. I ask for your patience and allow me to update you on a few items. March 17 BOT Finance and Audit Committee considered the issue of re-integrating the Family Medical Residency program at UT by July 2014. UT is considering relocating the program either at a site it owns on Glendale Ave., or at a site to be leased on Anthony Wayne Trail, Parkway Plaza. The estimated related costs of 3.1 million will come from money left over from the Promedica collaborative agreement (1.1 million), .5 in remaining bond money, and 2 million from institutional reserves.

On Friday, March 21 at UC, Mr. Morlock gave a budget update, stating that the 18 million improvement was attained in the following way: there were 4.5 million in refined budget assumptions; 7 million in administrative reductions; 2.5 million in decreases to program investments; 1.6 reduction in HSC academics; and 2.4 million reduction in hospital budget. Mr. Morlock stated that contrary to rumors, carry forward money would be reinstated. He also explained that he planned to eliminate the RCG from the position evaluation process, and would substitute another group for hiring processes.

On Monday, March 24, FSEC met with Mr. Chuck Lehnert. To discuss recently announced letters of intent with Chinese universities. Mr. Lehnert stressed that his role was simply to create the relationships and that the Provost office would deal with the academic details. We are scheduled to meet with the Provost this week and will discuss academic issues that need to be vetted with faculty before any new programs begin and before students are recruited.

We note that McCreary has received several invitations to speak at Faculty Senate about his role in the One World Schoolhouse and the Lab School and Simulation. He has declined once again, saying he prefers to present to smaller groups.

Finally, you are all aware, I'm sure, of the recent announcement that Dr. Jacobs will step down as President in June of 2015, a year before his current contract extension ends.

On Friday, March 21, FSEC met with Dr. Jacobs. In response to our request for updates about UTIE, Dr. Jacobs stated that he considered Mr. Rick Stansley to be a man of integrity and a success entrepreneur, that if he had a fault it was that he was perhaps too entrepreneurial. He explained that Mr. Fall will be Chair of UTIE, but not CEO, and that the Chair position will likely be unpaid. Dr. Jacobs repeated that investments to UTIE came for what he called ancillary funds, though we countered that auxiliary funds are created by student money. Regarding hospital issues, Dr. Jacobs admitted that UTMC was perhaps too small to ever be self-sustaining.

Shortly before that meeting, it was announced that Dr. Jacobs will step down as President in June 2015, a year before his current contract extension ends. I speak now not as FS president, but as a 13-year member of this community. This is the lowest point I've seen at UT: in terms of morale, enrollment, and academics. The Jacobs' leadership has shown a decided lack of integrity, a disregard for academics, a disdain for faculty, and a willingness to treat students as cash cows. This leadership adopts fads rather than research and evaluate methodologies, or invest in full-time faculty and faculty development. This leadership believes in no administrator left behind. Its chronic re-organization of the institution has provided window dressing resulting in damage to academic programs and to our reputation. Regular budget shortfalls are followed by stellar spending, the SIM center, paid for out of institutional reserves recently being the most egregious.

While we, as faculty dedicated to our students and to our profession, work to assure responsible stewardship of our university, this president has stifled the vaulty voice at every turn. It is time re-assert the faculty role and responsibilities in program development rather than allow administration to organize academic programs in the shadows in an effort to find the wealthiest students. It is time to re-assert the faculty role and responsibilities in financial and budgetary decisions. It is time for faculty to have direct two-way communication with the Board of Trustees. It is time for full disclosure.

If there are questions or comments please feel free? Now, let's move on to our next item on the agenda. I'm happy to welcome Dr. Constance Shriner of the University Teaching Center who tells us that she's delighted about being the highlight at today's meeting.

Dr. Shriner: Thank you, President Rouillard. I was here in the Fall and shared what my vision was for the Teaching Center and what I hoped it would become. So I'm here today just to give you a status report, an update on what we have accomplished in the last six months. I thought the best way to do that is to show you the website. I'm going to give you a bit of information today that you'll never be able to remember, so I'll show you where it is on the web in case the time comes in the future when you would want to refer to it.

I am Connie Shriner and I'm still splitting my time between the Health Science Campus and here. I have thoroughly enjoyed the time that I've been here. I've met a number of you; so many people who are truly invested and dedicated to their teaching. There's nothing that makes me, personally happier than to work with other educators who see this goal, and to work with them and to help them in any way I can to make their efforts easier and more successful.

We did create a webpage and it is connected to the Provost page, it's the University Teaching Center. If you look for it in the alphabetical listing it will show up under "U" for University Teaching Center. I hope that I have responded to the charge that I was given by the Provost's Office as well as my vision that I've shared with you in the Fall. The first thing I want to call your attention to is one-on-one help, a "Service Request Form," which is a sounding board for faculty, new faculty as well as faculty who have been here, such as any individual request – whether it's putting together a syllabus, learning how to use the technology in your classrooms, trying to develop new strategies such as active learning strategies and things that are of interest for individual faculty. We have a request form that's on the webpage. It's just a form that faculty can fill in. If I'm not the person who can help you, I will find someone in Learning Ventures or someone else in the institution that can provide that kind of input. So, if a faculty member is looking for some help, someone to talk to about their ideas, they shouldn't hesitate to contact us, that's the one-on-one help as needed. We also put together a series of small group training sessions and presentations and those can be found on the website under the link that's called, "TechTalks." We have had several successful small group training sessions using the Green Screen studio where faculty can make their own short videos and incorporate them either in online materials or in your classrooms. We also have had some larger sessions where we've talked about the concepts like the flipped classroom- what does it do to flip your classroom. We actually had a panel presentation where faculty shared their experiences. We do plan to continue that kind of program maybe through next year. I did put together a survey that the office of Institutional Research has been sending out. So far the response has been pretty good; we got close to 300 surveys returned. Based on the inputs from all of you, we will come up with topics that will meet the interests of faculty. I also plan next year to have a standing one-day-a-month meeting like the third Thursday, but I don't know what day it will be, but it will be a standing meeting or a discussion of some topic related to our educational mission. We also subscribed this year to a resource of electronic webinars; it's put out by a company called, "Innovative Educators," and many of you may have gotten emails from them about webinars and conferences. We were able to buy a subscription to over 100 different recorded webinars that are available to all of you, faculty, staff, graduate students, and tutors that work with students. If you prefer the self-study, to look at something on your own, this goes to "Go2Knowledge," and I think you'll find it very valuable. There are six categories: student success,

teaching and learning, technology, at-risk populations, campus safety, and organizational development. These have been pre-recorded over the past few years, but I think it's a very good resource you can use either independently or perhaps before a meeting such as a common interest within a department or some office in one of these topics; so that's another resource that I'm excited about. It's like having 100 different invited speakers come to campus and talk about these content areas. Another initiative that I had told you we are working on was to reinstate the student observer program and I'm happy to say that we have four students who are trained and ready to go. This is a faculty-initiated process. If you are interested in objective feedback from a student's perspective on some aspect of teaching, they will meet with you first and you tell them what you're interested in having them look for and note during the class. They will come into your class several times if needed and then generate some feedback for you. Some faculty use this as part of their promotion materials at that time of their career and others just use it as informative feedback. It is strictly confidential. The students are paid by my office, but they are here to serve you and to give you useful feedback on your teaching. If you are interested or know anyone that's in your department that is, it's a request form that you can access through this link on the webpage. The other thing I would like to draw your attention to is we have a LibGuide that was put together by Mark Horan in the library. This is an amazing collection of resources all focused on teaching. He has identified a number of books that are available and on reserve, electronic journals, newsletters, just a real variety of electronic resources that focus on many different aspects of the teaching mission: assessment, instruction, use of technology, and even educational research. So I encourage you to check out the guide and to see what's posted out there. And then lastly, at the bottom of the webpage, we always try to keep a list of upcoming events. It will change from month-to-month as we have new things coming. But we tried to create a webpage that would be informative, that would contain resources for you to use it independently as well as to keep you informed about what we have going on. I can take any questions. I feel very pleased about what we been able to put together. And it's as important to me today as it was when I was with you in the Fall, that whatever we offer is in response to what the faculty would like to have the Center provide. So, if there are ever ideas or suggestions that you have for content, for topics, for approaches please let me know because if this resource isn't a value to all of you, then I fear that I've probably failed tremendously. Are there any questions about what we're doing?

Past-President Dowd: I do not have a question, but I would like to comment on your activities. I am glad to hear that the Student Observer program is coming back to life. That was such a great resource for tenure-track faculty members. First, they received feedback on their teaching and, second, it provided them with documentation on how their teaching has improved over one, two, or more years. That documentation was very important when those junior faculty members submitted their applications for tenure and promotion.

Dr. Shriner: Yes, I'm very happy to have it available. And the four students that we recruited, I'm just extremely impressed with them and I feel very confident that they're going to do a great job.

Past-President Dowd: May I clarify what I meant a moment ago? I didn't mean that the Student Observer program benefited only tenure-track faculty members. While that program ~~it~~ really helps them during the tenure process by showing improvement in teaching activity, tenured faculty like myself can certainly benefit from that program because we always can get better at teaching <laughter>.

Dr. Shriner: Thank you. I am glad as well.

President Rouillard: Thinking about the student observer programs, is there a way to incorporate that into the online courses as well? It might be interesting to get a student perspective from someone who is not in the course to see how easy it is to have...or to not have...

Dr. Shriner: I know that Learning Ventures currently uses a nationally approved and recommended approach called, "Quality Matters" to access the materials that are posted online, but is there something a student could observe, maybe participating in some of the online activities? I don't know.

President Rouillard: To get a student's perspective might be useful.

Dr. Shriner: I'll see what we might be able to do.

Senator Weck-Schwarz: Have you talked about a standing meeting day that you would like to establish; maybe every Tuesday and Thursday. I would suggest perhaps having varying days so people with different teaching schedules can attend.

Dr. Shriner: So a Thursday one month and then maybe a Friday the next?

Senator Weck-Schwarz: Yes, something like that.

Dr. Shriner: I know. It's so difficult to plan anything because people have different schedules, but I will keep that in mind.

President Rouillard: Thank you, Dr. Shriner, for coming.

Dr. Shriner: Thank you.

President Rouillard: Next, on the agenda is the discussion of a resolution regarding the core curriculum. You have it on the agenda. We do already have a change that actually reflects this current resolution. We want to make it clear that it is repeated requests made by Faculty Senate of the previous Provost's Office to code and those requests were not filled. So again, this is a discussion period. We don't have to vote on anything today unless you end up feeling ready to do so. We can also include in this discussion some communication that happened in a meeting just prior to this meeting with several senators on Core Curriculum with the provost. We had Mary Humphrys, Scott Molitor, David Krantz, Kristen Keith, Karen Hoblet, Vice Provost Barrett, and myself (I think that was everyone) to discuss a little bit more core curriculum and the way forward. So I'll leave it to you as to how you want to handle the discussion, if you want to talk about the resolution, or if you want to hear from some of the members of that meeting, or hear from the provost about core curriculum.

Senator Wedding: In the "therefore" clause which you don't have up there yet, it says "*it was never implemented by the administration,*" could we make that be, "the Jacobs' Administration," capital "A"?

President Rouillard: Yes. Is there anything else?

Senator Molitor: I would just like to add, based on the conversation that we had earlier today, it seems like everyone in the room was in agreement that the pre-Spring 2011 core curriculum is our starting point. Realistically, there's just too many courses from the Ohio Transfer Module that are missing in our Spring

2012 gen ed., so effectively whatever we decide after this resolution, we are going to be starting from that point.

President Rouillard: I would like to add, some of the difficulties reflected by what I call a “parade of provosts” prior to Provost Scarborough’s tenure in the office. We had a provost who was not coming from an academic position and probably didn’t quite understand what this was all about. I think we had a lapse with communication with OBOR, but I’m confident under Provost Scarborough’s tenure that that is an entirely different matter and we are in regular communication with OBOR. We also asked after this meeting that communications between UT and OBOR be copied to Faculty Senate, Core Curriculum, and Academic Programs Committees and I think that will also help with the flow of information. Some of the other issues that came up earlier this afternoon were what some of our starting points are. Some of the starting points are related to the latest version of the state handbook mandating 36 hrs. for gen ed. We have long not been in compliance with that aspect of the general education stipulations. In addition, there is this discussion of the 120-credit hr. graduation maximum. That hasn’t passed yet, it is still under discussion, but that will eventually figure into the discussion. Is there anybody else from that meeting that would like to comment?

Senator Anderson: Was there any discussion about the HLC?

President Rouillard: Yes; the importance of highlighting our philosophy of gen ed., although we’ve had a description in the catalog for years that also professes [cut off].

Senator Anderson: Or referring to competencies back in 2002 or something like that in some sense.

President Rouillard: Right. And in fact that particular philosophy statement is a little bit more mapped to the current delineations stipulated by OBOR. And all of this is not to say that competency based considerations are not important. I think someone said this in an earlier meeting that all of the work that we did on competency-based education while it may not be a useful map for figuring out what our core curriculum is with regard to the OTM, what it does do is give us a different way in how we might access our courses in a very valuable way that we might access our courses. And I think that the plan that the Core Curriculum Committee came up with to allow people to choose which rhetoric better fits their assessment methodology is a very useful one. Provost Scarborough, do you have anything that you want to add to this conversation?

Provost Scarborough: Well, I think everyone will agree that we had a very productive meeting today. Not only did we agree on a starting point, but we also agreed on a framework to move forward to try to get all these issues resolved. I thought there was a 100% level of consensus on how to approach the OTM versus 48 hrs. going forward. We agreed to bring to this body at a future day some options for moving forward with the 120 semester credit hr. cap bachelor degree programs, except for those that would have accreditation or licensure requirement for a higher amount. So I thought it was a good place to start and it went much further along than I would have hoped for, which is always a nice thing to experience. I think we will be in a place where we will be able to provide a clear answer to HLC when they come, as to what is our general education and our method of assessing learning outcomes going forward. I felt good. If anyone felt differently about the meeting, I would invite you also to report the meeting, but I think I saw a lot of smiles from the faces walking out of the room.

President Rouillard: Is there anything else? Do you want further discussion on the resolution, or do you want to vote on this resolution, or do you not want to vote for this resolution?

Senator Wedding: I think we should vote on this and send a copy to everybody that's on the Board to further emphasize just one more thing that has happened in academics over the last years under Jacobs. I think it's time we took a hard stand on stuff like this and we're doing it now. I think it's going to be more to come.

President Rouillard: Is there anyone who wants to call the question and move that we vote on this?

Senator Molitor: I call the question.

President Rouillard: Is there a motion to specifically vote on the resolution?

Past-President Dowd: Excuse me, President Rouillard, but we first have to vote on calling the question.

President Rouillard: Okay. All those in favor for calling the question please signify by saying "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? *Move to Call the Question Passed.* Now we can entertain a motion.

Past-President Dowd: So moved.

Senator Lundquist: Seconded.

President Rouillard: All those who are in favor of this resolution on the core curriculum please signify by saying "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? *Resolution Passed Unanimously.* Thank you very much.

Resolution on core curriculum

Whereas FS passed a competency-based core curriculum on April 26, 2011 before our last HLC visit;

Whereas FS approved a new set of core courses on March 27, 2012;

Whereas it is the responsibility of the Provost office to code courses;

Whereas repeated requests by FS of the previous Provost office to code said courses have not been fulfilled;

Whereas OBOR OTM courses are not mapped to competencies;

Whereas OBOR now requires that an institution's core curriculum total 36 hours and be identical with an institution's OTM courses;

Therefore, for the sake of our students and their advisors and to accurately reflect that the Faculty Senate approved competency-based core curriculum was never implemented by the Jacobs Administration, be it resolved that the Faculty Senate recognizes that the approved core curriculum course list in existence prior to the competency-based proposal remains in effect.

The schedule doesn't have any other speakers for today. We can still call it an early meeting, but there is one other topic that I would like for you to be aware of. This was brought to our attention by Senator Humphrys in her role as our representative to the Ohio Faculty Council- and that is language in a House

Bill related to faculty workload. I believe that this may in fact have been split-out from the budget bill. It started out in the Biennium Budget Bill and I think it's been split-out now into a separate bill. But it does specifically address faculty workload: *"Not later than December 31st the state university shall report on institutions faculty workload policy and evaluation workload policy. Institutions recommendations to modify workload policy to increase the institution's advocate faculty workload by 10% in combined areas of instruction, advising, and research."* I think we saw this in Ohio in another piece of legislation from 1994 and it's coming around again. Senator Humphrys also forwarded to us a resolution that was passed by Wright State University regarding this workload. Senator Humphrys, did you want to talk about either of these issues?

Senator Humphrys: Sure. I don't definitively understand the political ramifications, but apparently it's actually still part of the Budget Bill I believe.

President Rouillard: Oh, it is?

Senator Humphrys: Yes, that's my understanding. It's just a portion of it. And what we've been told at the Ohio Faculty Council is that although very similar wording has appeared in previous budgets, that section had always been pulled out of the budget in the past and the legislation didn't address it. It appears that it's going to stay in the bill this time. So, we've kind of come from it being rumored that it will be part of the legislation to the fact that it appears for sure and the potential is that this will be voted on probably within the next two to three weeks. There are several institutions of the Ohio Faculty Council that are looking into doing something like what you are displaying. Also, I believe there were three other institutions' faculty senates that are going to pass something similar, as well as the Ohio Faculty Council that is also going to put together a resolution we're going to pass.

President Rouillard: When is your next meeting?

Senator Humphrys: It's April 11th. They were afraid if we as a committee waited until our next meeting to put together a resolution and pass it, it would be too late.

President Rouillard: And this is from Wright State. We can also circulate it. Quinetta can also send it to you via email. I brought this to ask Senate if this is something you would like your Faculty Senate Executive Committee to work on and bring to you or does somebody else want to work on a resolution?

Senator Cooper: This seems like a bad idea, maybe stating the obvious, but 10% of what they base it on. It just seems like this is something somebody thought of as a "good" idea to help improve the cost of college education, but I think we all think that's a...poll, but the implementation may be a bad idea. My concern by doing a resolution -- that may be one bad idea followed by another bad idea because we may feel "warm and fuzzy" doing a resolution, but the way the state legislature process goes, that's going to go to some legislator and it's going to be put in a stack of letters from different constituents that may or may not go to their aid who help develop policy. It seems to me that if we're serious about doing something about it, the way to act on this is to get in the legislators' offices and meet with them one-on-one and explain to them why this is a bad idea. I just came back a week or two ago and spent two days down in Columbus on another legislative issue and my sense is that the legislators are responsive to constituents in their office. A lot of their decisions are made from aids who are advising them because candidly, most legislators aren't experts in higher education.

President Rouillard: As one can see <laughter>.

Senator Cooper: My suggestion, if you want to get serious about this, then the thing to do is get some people down in the state capitol and do some lobbying and make this go away.

President Rouillard: Senator Humphrys, does the Ohio Faculty Council do legislative visits?

Senator Humphrys: Not to my knowledge, at least in the year that I've been attending. There's not been any mention regarding that. Also, we've had a couple of legislators come to us to address an issue, but we've never appeared before the legislature.

Senator Edinger: We've heard three things recently that affect the cost of student education – one is housing cost increasing. Another is administrative bloat and the third one is the decrease in the amount of what the state has given to higher education over the last several years. So, it seems that if we're going to offer a suggestion rather than just saying, "we don't want to increase our workload" we ought to tell them there are other ways to address this problem and more importantly would have impact on limiting students' cost without diminishing education.

President Rouillard: That's a good point.

Senator Thompson: I do think this is something we as a Senate definitely need to entertain and address. I used to be a lobbyist for a few years so I would suggest that a resolution would be appropriate. But I also agree that the work needs to be done individually. I think when you can go and hand a resolution and use that as something to testify for example, a committee, or give that as part of your advocacy tool kit, or a packet you are going to give to your legislator that is really effective. I also think we really need to use word-of-mouth and talk to our colleagues about this and really encourage them. My guess, many of our faculty are not aware of this; they are not paying attention to this. And so legislators really need to hear from us about this and talk through email or however we choose to do it, but I think a resolution would be appropriate.

President Rouillard: Okay. Senator Humphrys, do you know if they're still doing testimonies?

Senator Humphrys: I can find out; I don't know, but I can certainly find out.

President Rouillard: Okay.

Senator Molitor: I was just going to add that the basis of this resolution should be the fact that the costs to students are actually going to increase if we increase faculty workload because you're going to get a reduction in the quality of education. You're going to get worse retention. If faculty are going to be doing advising then you are going to have lower retention. You're going to have more students leaving college without a college degree and with a higher burden of financial aid loans and things like that.

President Rouillard: Well, faculty already does advising.

Senator Molitor: I know.

President Rouillard: To me it's not the quality of advising, it's the quantity of time.

Senator Molitor: Yes, exactly. If we're the sole source of advising, on top of already what we have to do, then it is certainly going to worsen the quality of the student experience. And we've already seen what happens when we get rid of staff such as counselors for sexual abuse or alcohol and other drug dependencies; that will also worsen the student experience and worsen retention and the ability of students to complete their degrees.

Past-President Dowd: Like some others in this room today, I remember the discussion of that issue when it came up 20 years ago. I also remember one of the more innovative, but "snarky" responses by faculty to a proposed 10% increase in workload – and that was simply hold additional office hours.

Senator Anderson: I was just going to ask this question, how do you measure an increase? How do you measure 10% more advising? Yes, maybe by office hours. How do you measure 10% more research? How do you measure 10% more teaching? Yes, you can put more students in a classroom, but what is the metric in the end?

Past-President Dowd: That is correct. I would like to follow up on that point and some of the other points made earlier. I believe it involves explaining to legislators what a 10% increase will actually mean. I think they may have had good intentions in mind but they do not understand that giving a hard number like 10% without specifics does not really have a lot of meaning other than for the measurement issue that Senator Anderson raised.

Senator Giovannucci: I don't want to put Dr. Scarborough on the spot, but this seems like something that also administration would be interested in addressing because essentially talking, that adds to their job and it adds another layer of reporting and assessment of reports provided. It's another layer of bureaucracy; in addition, faculty have some concerns about this, so it might be useful to encourage administration. Also the Board or whoever can weigh in on this so we can hear their thoughts about this.

President Rouillard: Dr. Scarborough, do you want to answer?

Provost Scarborough: The Inter-University Council is essentially the lobbying arms for the Ohio state public universities. They've already began a lobbying effort against the proposed legislation. Evidently, it's not only the cost of higher education that is a driver for the sponsors of the bill, but also, those who believe that universities need to do a better job with advising. So those are the two primary motivators that are evidently behind the introduction of the bill. One other piece we need to bring up before legislation one more time, they have begun the lobbying against the bill and already received some feedback from the bill sponsor. The bill sponsor had essentially said, "How come, IUC we are only asking for a report?" that's all the bill requires. So, given that, IUC was told to go back and if they can't get the bill defeated they will then use a strategy that tries to get the bill amended by essentially deleting item B from the bill. If that fails, if they can't get item B deleted from the bill, then what they're going to try to do is to add the last sentence (I believe) "instruction, advising, research and other service" to it again, remind bill sponsors that that's another key part to faculty workload. Everyone agrees what's the baseline period. Some presume the starting point when the bill goes into effect, but nobody really knows.

President Rouillard: Do you know if the University Council has anything posted in their Minutes or their documents related to their trying to lobby against the bill (this part of the bill)?

Provost Scarborough: I'll check; I don't know.

Senator Relue: I'm still trying to understand what this bill means. If they have all of the components of the job description for a faculty member listed, but they increase workload by 10%, it seems to me that they are reducing compensation, is that correct? So basically instead of working 40 hours per week, we are mandated to work 44 hours per week. Can they do that? That is really what this comes down to.

President Rouillard: That's a good question. I think Senator Krantz had something he wanted to say.

Senator Krantz: This is for Provost Scarborough. Do you have any insight? One, what is the underline assumption on the part of these legislators? Do they really believe that we are not working hard enough because that seems to be the underline message?

Provost Scarborough: I don't know whether or not they believe you're not working hard enough. I think the presumption is, they think of the things that we're choosing to work on, we're not choosing to work on advising enough. So actually, it might be very intentional they let the word "service" out; the presumption being that if they asked everyone to work 10% more, they are probably not also suggesting a 10% pay increase. What the problem is, they're suggesting a reallocation of everyone's time – to spend less time on the omitted service element and more time on the advising element is one person's speculation of what's behind the bill. That addresses one motivation which is related to advising. The other motivation related to cost, the idea there is, that that particular sponsor is interested in helping institutions have the ability to increase the instruction aspect relative to the total factor...so those are the two motivators that I've heard explained to the bill.

Senator Porter: How urgent is it that we go down there and lobby? When is this bill going to be passed? If this is in June then we need to be going down there.

President Rouillard: No, I think it is actually in April.

Senator Humphrys: Within the next month.

President Rouillard: So, if there is a way to go and testify, we could certainly send out an announcement. If there is a resolution that we could draft and put out to you by email for comments we will ask you to participate that way.

Unknown Speaker: Do the legislators have oval offices that would be more easily assessable?

President Rouillard: I imagine that could be another option, one could email legislators on your own and mention your feelings about this part of the budget.

Senator Hoblet: I think this is good idea for Faculty Senate to make note of all of their legislators and start to make calls. They take note of this. Every call, they get an aide who takes down the call, who it's from, the number, and the topic. So, I think it is time for all faculty to get involved and inundate our state senators with our voice saying, this rings of a negative presumption as Senator Krantz was asking that we are sitting on our hands so-to-speak, and have lots of time to add another 10% to our workload. Personally speaking, I barely get my work done on a weekly basis. I do not have another 10% to give without working a 60-hour work week and maybe more every week. That assumption is off the mark and for the legislature to think that we have lots more to give clearly is a misconception. We need to change that vision for them.

President Rouillard: That's a good point. It is also easy enough to email.

Senator Hoblet: You can Google your senators.

Senator Lundquist: I don't know if this is happening over at the other universities, but for the last few years this institution has gone through some pretty traumatic workload negotiations of one kind or another. I think a lot of people have already increased their workload at least by 10%. And this doesn't distinguish between tenure-track faculty and lecturers, but a lot of lecturers at this university went this year from a 4/4 to a 5/5 teaching load which (if I do the math correctly) is more than 10% already. Are we going to be looking at what workload is today and then think about 10% more, or think about what workload was four years ago and then look at 10% more?

Senator Giovannucci: Along those lines, a lot of accrediting programs say, "Medicine, you can't come up with new courses" and that is dictated by accrediting bodies. It doesn't even abide. It doesn't make sense.

President Rouillard: Is there anything else? Okay. So, Faculty Senate Exec can draft something. You can always keep in mind comments that we heard here today. You can contact legislators on your own via phone or email. There is one announcement, Senator Regimbal do you want to bring up?

Senator Regimbal: Yes. I passed out an event that is going to happen on our campus, Walk the Water. We are going to have a walk/run. The money will go towards a development building unit we sent to other countries to purify water. The people that carry water are women and children. These students are trying to do something to improve the human condition so I hope that you would at least share this idea with your students and possibly support a student and make a donation. Thank you.

President Rouillard: Any other announcements?

Senator Wedding: There are going to be more articles published in the Toledo Blade over the next few weeks, maybe this week, and I encourage you to read the Blade. You can also read it online because there are going to be articles of interests at this university.

President Rouillard: All right then, is there a motion to adjourn? Thank you. Meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

IV. Meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted by:
Lucy Duhon
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape Summary: Quinetta Hubbard
Faculty Senate Administrative Secretary