

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of April 12, 2016
FACULTY SENATE

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

Approved @ FS meeting on 9/13/2016

Summary of Senate Business

Discussion of Core Curriculum Proposal

Discussion of Winter Break Initiative

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

President Keith: I call this meeting to order. Welcome to the fifteenth Faculty Senate meeting of AY 2015-2016. I ask that Executive Secretary, Lucy Duhon come to the podium to call the roll.

I. Roll Call: 2015-2016 Senators:

Present: Anderson-Huang, Atwood, Barnes, Black, Brickman, Cappelletty, Devabhaktuni, Dowd, Duggan, Duhon, Federman, Fitzgerald (substitute for D. Compora), Franchetti, Giovannucci, Gray, Gruden, Gunning, Harmych, Hoblet, Humphrys, Keith, Kennedy, Kistner, Kippenhan(substitute for A. Jorgensen), Krantz, Lee, Lundquist, McAfee, McLoughlin, Molitor, Monsos, Nathan, Oberlander, Ohlinger, Randolph, Regimbal(substitute for M. Edwards), Rouillard, Schneider (substitute for M. Caruso), Sheldon, Slantcheva-Durst, Smas, Srinivasan, A. Thompson, Thompson-Casado, Weck-Schwarz, White, Williams, Wittmer

Excused absences: Burnett, Denyer, Hasaan-Elnaby, Nigem, Prior, Quinn, G. Thompson, Wedding

Unexcused absences: Elmer, Farrell, Kovach, Malhotra, Mohammed, Schafer, Skeel, Willey

II. Approval of Minutes: Faculty Senate Minutes are not ready for approval.

President Keith: I am bringing this to your attention, we have new equipment, so we are not going to be running around with the microphone tonight, hoping to see how effective it is. In theory, according to Senator Humphrys, it can pick-up side conversations, so I caution you to whisper to your neighbor <laughter>.

Executive Committee Report - Your Executive Committee has been busy since the last Senate meeting. Aside from our usual meetings, we had a follow-up meeting with Jovita Thomas-Williams, Vice President and Chief Human Resource Officer, and met with Lawrence Kelley, Interim Senior V.P. for Finance and Administration. I attended a presentation on SALT, which is a program intended to help students make better financial decisions. SALT stands for salt – in its role as one of the earliest forms of money.

In my last EC report, I described our meeting with representatives from HMS Employer Solutions, the company UT was considering hiring to conduct our Dependent Eligibility Verification Assessment (DEVA). We left that meeting with two unanswered questions. First, did HR have documents that they could return to employees, and, if so, how would that work? Second, how did we go from employees showing their documents to an HR representative to hiring a third party to verify eligibility? We didn't address either question. What we ended up discussing was whether UT had hired HMS Employer Solutions to do dependent eligibility verification assessment as well as the process and timeline. Although

the contract with HMS was still being negotiated, the intent is to hire them for this year only. I had assumed that outsourcing the document verification would negate HR's need to keep any employee documents. I was wrong – HR will continue with the current process for new employees and those who experience a life changing event that affects their benefits, e.g., the birth of a child. The current process requires an employee to submit the relevant documents to HR with HR retaining those documents. We did advise that they consider getting out of the document retention business altogether and were told they would look in to it.

On April 18th, a *UT News* article will be published that explains the rationales behind the implementation of DEVA and our use of HMS Employer Solutions. In terms of the timeline, all UT employees will receive an email from HMS in September detailing the process with our document submissions to take place in November and December. We strongly advised that HR have rooms with the requisite equipment – on both campuses – where employees can come to scan and submit their documents. V.P. Thomas-Williams assured us that they would do so.

In our meeting with V.P. Kelley, he explained that he is trying to untangle how information is reported in the annual budget. For example, one item listed as revenue in current and previous budgets is expected investment appreciation. This is problematic for two reasons. First, our investments do not always appreciate – sometimes they lose value. Second, and more importantly, investment appreciation is not spendable income until we sell the asset, which is usually not the intent when the budget is built. V.P. Kelley is working on removing that item from the revenue column, which will take a few budget cycles unless we are willing to incur larger cuts to stabilize the budget. Other topics included a few out-of-the-box ideas that are not even close to moving forward as well as reintroducing incentives at the college and departmental levels to encourage the development of revenue enhancing programs. What's heartening to me is that we're being involved in these preliminary discussions, which allows us to be pro-active instead of reactive.

UT has signed a three year contract with American Student Assistance (ASA.org), which is a private non-profit company dedicated to providing student loan education, and enabling the development of financial competencies. The three year contract gives our students, as students and then alumni, access to all the resources and tools in the SALT program, which is designed to help students develop money knowledge for college and beyond. These resources and tools include web courses on budgeting, student loans, student loan repayment, credit and debt management saving and investing, taxes, etc., as well as financial advice. The plan is to make SALT ubiquitous across campus and integrated it into many first year activities. Senator Schneider was at that meeting and I asked her earlier if she had a few comments to make about that discussion.

Senator Schneider (substitute for M. Caruso): I attended the presentation myself. I'm generally a little skeptical of these kinds of solutions because most of them are online, so I took some time to go through the tools. I think there are two audiences that they can really help. Students can be engaged in looking at those tools in an orientation class or in some other venue, and parents because we have a lot of students here that are receiving substantial financial aid and simultaneously take out substantial loans, plus we have a lot of parents who this is their first child they ever sent to college and our systems can be hard to decipher. I think this tool, if we use it well, can be a real benefit. I know that we are planning on incorporating it into our Summer Bridge Program, into the Parent Orientation Program, as well as working through some of the units with students. So I am going to put my skepticism aside and be hopeful right now.

Senator Kippenhan (substitute for A. Jorgensen): What is the cost of the three-year contract?

President Keith: Did they tell us?

Senator Schneider (substitute for M. Caruso): They did not tell us. I know that Financial Aid has been a big supporter of this program, so I am assuming that somebody looked at the cost.

President Keith: Students have access. I mean, there's access to free stuff, but the three-year contract gives our students access [I think] forever as long as they are graduates at UT, for what that's worth.

Senator Schneider (substitute for M. Caruso): And parents as long as they note they have an affiliation with The University of Toledo. That's all they have to do is insert that they have an affiliation and then they can use the tools.

President Keith: Thank you, Senator Schneider and Senator Dowd.

Executive Committee Report cont'd: Yesterday President Elect Humphrys and I met with Celia Regimbal, Chair of Academic Regulations, representatives from the Provost's Office and Graduate Council, and Beth Hagen, who is the University policy coordinator. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the process for reviewing policies. Earlier this academic year, President Gaber stated that Faculty Senate and Graduate Council should review academic policies as they are created or come up for renewal. This is new – we weren't part of the process before. However, because we weren't part of the process, we currently have an unusually large number of policies to review. Although the Senate's Academic Regulations Committee has been busy and productive, given what's in the pipeline, it is unlikely to finish its work before the end of the semester. We are trying to determine if catch-up work can be done this summer. I'll give you an update on where we are on this topic at the next meeting.

We also discussed changes to the policy review process. Previous practice was to post a policy for comments twice – 30 days for the draft policy in which the vetting occurred, and then 30 days for the final version. Currently, the vetting occurs before policy is posted. The thinking is that by the time academic policies are posted for public comment, they should have been vetted by the appropriate faculty governance body. And, unless there are substantial comments, they will not be posted that second time.

I have an update on the Dean for the COGS search. Dean Jamie Barlowe, from LLSS, has been named as co-chair. The committee has identified five candidates for interviews. After those interviews, they intend to bring two candidates forward for public forums before the end of the semester. Bill Messer, the other co-chair, has assured me that the committee is cognizant of the need to have faculty on campus to attend the open forums.

In terms of what we're doing today, as you can see we have a packed agenda. First we have reports from Elections, Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Programs. The Academic Regulations Committee has a recommendation on the missed class policy for our consideration.

The Core Curriculum Committee has been working all year on a draft proposal that would define our core curriculum in terms of credit hours, requirements, learning outcomes and assessment of the learning outcomes. The committee has also merged five lists of possible general education courses to come up with a master list of all the courses that have been approved for our general education over the years as well as a list of courses that should be removed from our gen ed. because we no longer teach them or they have been dropped from the curriculum. Departments were consulted before a course was added to this last list of courses. This proposal is being presented for discussion only. Given your feedback, it will be one of the things we work on this summer with the new Provost, and will return to Faculty Senate in the fall for a vote.

We have two guests today, Dr. Susan Batten, Associate Professor, College of Nursing, and Matt Schroeder, President Gaber's Chief of Staff, to present the Winter Break proposal that I discussed in the last EC report. Are there any comments or reminders from the Executive Committee?

Senator Dowd: With regards to scanning birth certificates and marriage licenses for benefits verification, I would like to provide some clarity on this issue. For this issue Human Resources has transferred all risk from the administration to faculty members. And the odd part is that HR isn't actually participating in that verification – HR is outsourcing that to a third party. So my suggestion is that regardless of the quality of scanned documents a faculty member provides, that level of quality needs to be acceptable to HR.

President Keith: We were told that we can actually take a picture with our [personal] cell phone and that would be acceptable. Senator Dowd, not your cell phone of course, but most of us who have non-flip phones <laughter>. We will see, so I can't really answer that. We've asked these questions and have been assured that it shouldn't be a problem.

Senator Dowd: I am going to keep quiet.

President Keith: No, don't keep quiet because you are part of the reason why we keep asking these questions.

Senator Dowd: OK, then what does HR actually "do"?

President Keith: That I can't answer.

Senator Devabhaktuni: Thank you very much about the updates regarding the College of Grad Studies dean's search. There are some ups and downs which probably don't need to be addressed on the floor of Senate. We are aware that there are at least 10 applicants from various colleges and then the committee had the opportunity to go through the applications and then come up with a short list of five candidates. They are planning to conduct interviews for those five candidates and then bring two to the public forums. I think that is kind of giving faculty a very narrow scope of providing input from the candidates- for two reasons - it is such a small number; it is almost like saying, "a or b" and I don't think that number is appropriate. In other words, the committee consisting of about seven or eight faculty has a much bigger say of grinding the candidate pool from 15 to two and then all we get to say is "a or b" or maybe none, right? So that is a very narrow choice. I think we should bring at least three candidates or four, just like the provost search, to search for candidates.

President Keith: Is there anybody here who is on the search committee for the College of Graduate Studies?

Provost Barrett: Can I comment, but I am not on the committee?

President Keith: Yes, please.

Provost Barrett: My office has three searches going on – it's the dean of the College of Graduate Studies, dean of the Honors College, and the vice provost for retention. In all three cases I think the intent is to bring the people that the committee felt were highly qualified over to the various open forums or stakeholder groups to get feedback and input and that would be collected and the committee would collate it, that would be submitted to me. The new provost, Andrew Hsu, will be meeting with each of them either in person or by Skype and that will be disseminated out, and then he and I will consult and ultimately discuss it over with the president and a decision will be made. I want to make it clear that

Andrew Hsu will be very heavily involved. He's obviously going to be working with these people, I will not. The other thing that I would say is, the number of people tends to vary by how excited they are about the pool they got. I do not know how the COG dean's search will come out because they are not as far along. However, I can tell you for the vice provost for retention, the committee recommended two, and that's all they are going to do because we didn't have a lot of applicants to begin with, and that was who they felt was the qualified pool. My understanding is for the Honors College they're doing four. I would generally support something in the range of four or five as kind of the appropriate number for the vetting, particularly for an external search because you might have people drop out, but even internally. But you also don't want to waste anyone's time and effort if you just don't have the depth that you would otherwise want to go to. As I say, I don't know how the COG's will sort out, but there is not a deliberate attempt to narrow it to an overly small group.

President Keith: So we can always ask that they consider more than two. I communicated with Bill by email and he told me two, but two may not be the definitive number for the open forums.

Provost Barrett: I will actually send Bill an email now. I don't know where they're at, but I would think anywhere up to five would be acceptable depending on how the depth of the pool sorts out.

President Keith: Thank you. Would that satisfy your concerns?

Senator Devabhaktuni: Yes.

President Keith: Great. The Provost is on the case.

Provost Barrett: No, the Provost is on his laptop <laughter>.

Senator Ohlinger: I just want to give a real quick update on the Honors search because I am on that committee. We actually just met yesterday. We had an outstanding applicant pool. We've identified four finalists to bring to campus as early as May, hopefully next week, but if not by then, in two to three weeks. We understand that is tight, obviously with HLC here this week, two other searches in the Provost's Office going on right now, and then finals coming up. But again, we plan to have four candidates come in for on-campus interviews over the next few weeks.

President Keith: That is good news, thank you. Are there any other questions or comments? I am going to warn you that I am going to have to be a "stricter time keeper" today because we have a pretty packed agenda and I want to make sure that we have ample time to discuss the missed class policy, the core curriculum proposal, as well as hear from Matt and Susan in terms of this winter break "initiative." With that, I want to turn it over to the chairs of the Election Committee for just a very brief update.

Senator Molitor: I will make this very quick. Hopefully, you have noticed that the ballots for the final election for Faculty Senate, University Committee on Academic Personnel, and University Committee on Sabbaticals have been released. And hopefully everybody received emails saying in which election they are eligible to vote. Senator Weck-Schwarz and I would certainly like to thank our colleagues on the Election Committee for all their hard work and for "arm twisting" colleagues to agree to appear on final ballots and serve if elected. I'd also like to point out two things: for my colleagues in the Health Sciences and Social Justice and Human Service, your University Committee on Academic Personnel ballot will be done on paper. If you click the electronic link to vote, it will tell you that you can't vote for any candidate and that's because we had to combine the ballots for the two colleges because they will be merged and they will only have one representative on the University Committee on Academic Personnel. We've also been getting questions on University Committee on Sabbaticals and as a reminder, you may not even know the eligible electorate for the final ballot on the University Committee on Sabbaticals is the current

Faculty Senate membership. So you get to vote for all candidates regardless of college. Every faculty senator should have received a link to vote for the University Committee Sabbaticals and in that ballot you will see multiple colleges have candidates – Business, LLSS and Engineering. Then the ballot for Social Justice and Health Sciences representative will be coming on paper if you haven't already received it. I have a question from Senator Williams, please.

Senator Williams: I just confirmed this with another senator- we received paper ballots for the Committee on Sabbaticals.

Senator Molitor: That is correct. It should actually be just for one candidate and that is for the candidate to represent Health Science and Social Justice, and that should be the only one on the ballot. If you've received a ballot that had more colleges than that, please let me know. Please vote on the electronic ballot too because that has candidates for three other colleges. I apologize for the confusion- it was just an honest mistake.

Senator Devabhaktuni: Senator Molitor, your scheme is working. I confirm because I'm watching both of the candidates. You have a paper ballot for one college with five names on it and then multiple colleges in the electronic system.

Senator Molitor: Thank you. The reason for this is because the system keeps everybody restricted to whatever college they're in. As an example, if you were in Health Sciences, you could not vote for somebody in Social Justice to represent you on University Committee on Academic Personnel and that is why we had to issue paper ballots for this election. Hopefully, everything else is working. I will be happy to entertain any more questions or comments. Well, thank you very much, I appreciate it.

President Keith: Thank you.

Senator Weck-Schwarz: I might want to add something. One quick thing - vote!

President Keith: I think you are supposed to say, vote early and vote often <laughter>. Anyways, next on the agenda is the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and Senator Sheldon is the acting chair today, right?

Senator Sheldon: Yes. Senator Denyer is at a conference today and for the next couple of days, so she asked me to present the Undergraduate Curriculum. There are three modifications, ten new approvals, and then three clusters from the amnesty project. When this first got sent out to all senators I realized it was very skeletal. It kind of surprised me that anybody could be at a professional conference doing UT work, I guess, maybe I underachieve <laughter>. In this part I would like to go through it completely, but if you prefer that I separate it into three pieces then I will be willing to do that as well. I don't know if you all had a chance to look at the newest less "skeletal" spreadsheet. Is there any preference? It's all been vetted very carefully by the committee. Those are the three course modifications: Engineering, LLSS and NSM, and then we get into the new courses: Communication and the Arts, LLSS, and Social Justice and Human Services. I'm going to ask for a discussion question and we can go back to these if need be; it's just that President Keith is breathing down my "neck," I can feel it <laughter>. Senator Denyer said this is a quick, easy and swift process. Here is the cluster of the amnesty. Are there any questions or discussions about any of these modifications, new course proposals, and obviously, we can't look very far into the amnesty ones? Hearing no discussion and questions, I ask for a vote for what is before you today. All in favor please say, "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? *Motion Passed.*

[Please see the following link to view the above report:](#)

Course Modifications Approved by the Faculty Senate Undergraduate Curriculum Committee			
College	Course Impacted	Change	Rationale
Engineering	ENGT 1050 Computers for Engineering Technology	From ENGT 1050 to MET 1050	Only MET majors take ENGT 1050. Other programs now have their own version.
Language, Literature and Social Sciences	REL 4940 Religious Studies Internship	From Variable credit 1-4 to variable Credit 1-6	Permit student more extended time in the field.
Natural Sciences and Mathematics	PHYS 4310 Quantum Mechanics	Remove PHYS 3320 as a prerequisite and replace it with PHYS 3310	For all our degree programs we have eliminated the requirement for PHYS 3320. The necessary topics will now be covered in PHYS 3310, so the current prerequisite of PHYS 3320 should be replaced by PHYS 3310.

New Course Proposals Approved by Faculty Senate Undergraduate Curriculum Committee		
College	Course	Description & Rationale
Communications and the Arts	ART 1040 Fundamentals of Art Studio Technology	<p>This course introduces art students to the wide range of tools and technologies available in the Department of Art. Students will make connections between different modes of thinking and making. Students will acquire the skills necessary to enter a workforce that requires an understanding of the tools, techniques, and collaborative process necessary to respond to a rapidly changing global economy and job market. This is a web-assisted course.</p> <p>Rationale: This is a skills-based course that offers students in the Fundamentals block, specific learning opportunities that will give incoming students a comprehensive understanding of the tools available in the Department of Art. It is important for students to have the ability to start thinking cross-disciplinarily and conceptually from the very beginning of their careers at UT. This will support our program, allowing our students to make connections between different modes of thinking and making. The course will create skilled graduates who are more able to enter a workforce that requires an understanding of the tools, techniques, and collaborative process necessary to respond to a rapidly changing global economy and job market. A student will be far more prepared to undertake serious study in all subsequent art courses, as they will have the ability to analyze, interpret, evaluate, and integrate their knowledge of technology they may encounter.</p>
Communication and the Arts	ARTH 2550 History of Graphic Design	<p>History of Graphic Design introduces students to the history and theory of graphic design from the Roman codex to the modern poster. Topics examined include: how imagery interacts with text aesthetically and visually, the logic and development of typefaces, and the relationship and importance of graphic design to social and political developments throughout history. This three-credit course addresses graphic design from Western cultures and dynamic eras. ARTH 2550 partially fulfills the curricular requirements in Humanities and Fine Arts and is an elective</p>

		<p>within the Department of Art.</p> <p>Rationale: This course fulfills a need for students in both Studio and Art History programs. There is currently no other course that addresses this topic which the department feels is critical for our students. This course will help to ensure the deepest understanding of our visual culture.</p>
Languages, Literature and Social Sciences	HIST 3120 Women in Medieval Europe	<p>Women's lives in medieval Europe from a range of perspectives, including noblewomen, townswomen, peasant women, religious women. Students will gain an appreciation of how medieval women's lives were different from and similar to those of modern women, as well as a broader understanding of the European middle ages</p> <p>Rationale: This course would be a good partner to some of our existing courses on American Women's history.</p>
Languages, Literature and Social Sciences	REL 3000 Religious Studies Proseminar	<p>This course enhances students' professional development in fields related to religious studies.</p> <p>Rationale: There is a strong call for this course by REL students many of whom are seeking career direction, and by REL faculty and administrators since it will allow us to provide that direction in a systemic, organized and communal way and simultaneously create an opportunity for an exit survey.</p>
Languages, Literature and Social Sciences	REL 4630	<p>This seminar is a sustained exploration of whether religion is related to the occurrence of violence, peace or community-building, and if so, when and how.</p> <p>Rationale: Student demand (17 in Fall 2012; capped at 21 but let in 23 in Spring 2015). Cornerstone of new interreligious studies concentration (see REL major modification).</p>
Social Justice & Human Services	CRIM 4490 Criminal Forensic and Trial Practice	<p>This cross-listed capstone course will allow students to step out of the traditional classroom setting and participate in an applied skills course that will benefit them in the real world of Criminal Justice. Students will be presented with a case and will be responsible for the various stages of the investigative process as well as the trial process.</p>
Social Justice & Human Services	LGL 4490 Criminal Forensics and Trial Practice	<p>This course allows students to step out of the traditional classroom setting and practice hands-on skills. Students will be assigned as crime scene investigators, paralegals and attorneys and will be responsible for investigating a homicide, indicting a suspect and conducting a trial. Part I of the class involves investigative techniques for the homicide investigative process. Part II of the class exposes students to each step of the trial in a hands-on fashion.</p> <p>It is believed that this collaboration is unique and that there is no other class like this one in the country.</p>
Natural Sciences and Mathematics	ASTR 3880 Foundations of Astronomy	<p>Positional Astronomy and Time; Telescopes and Optics; Detection and Characterization of Light (Imaging, Photometry and Spectroscopy); Data Reduction and Measurements; Fundamental Techniques of Astronomy (Parallax, Magnitudes, Interstellar</p>

		<p>Extinction, Doppler Shift and Spectral Line Widths, Stellar Classification, Color-Magnitude and Color-Color Diagrams, Lightcurves, and Redshifts); Measuring Properties of Stars, Star Clusters, Galaxies, and the Universe.</p> <p>Rationale: We find that our Astronomy and Astrophysics majors are under-prepared for their 4000-level astrophysics courses. The solution is to develop a required course, to be taken sophomore year, that provides the necessary foundation in astronomy and its fundamental techniques. At the same time we are modifying our curriculum to require a research component for all our BS majors. The laboratory portion of this course will give the students the skills needed to begin their research experience.</p>
Natural Sciences and Mathematics	PHYS 4920 Senior Capstone Project	<p>Required senior capstone project for all physics and astronomy majors. The topics may involve physics/astronomy research, physics/astronomy education, research in a related field with an emphasis on physics/astronomy, internships with companies or other institutions with an emphasis on physics/ astronomy. Students should register for this course in the closest spring semester prior to graduation.</p> <p>Rationale: As part of our curriculum revision, we are requiring a research experience for all of our BS majors along with a senior capstone project for both BS and BA majors. This new capstone course is designed to guide the students through the requirements for the capstone project, which culminates in an oral presentation at our spring undergraduate research symposium along with a formal written paper on the project. This course is intended to provide a flexible vehicle for students to be able to choose a project that is meaningful for their particular program of study.</p>
Natural Sciences and Mathematics	PHYS 4950 Undergraduate Professional Development Seminar	<p>Selected topics on professional development as it applies to junior / senior level physics or astronomy major undergraduates. Specific emphasis will be on topics relevant to near-term professional goals of students (graduate school applications, job interviews, career pathways, CV/resume, professional presentation skills, and ethical research).</p> <p>Rationale: To better prepare our students for their future careers, we wish to offer a one-hour professional development seminar. The emphasis of this course will be on topics relevant to the near-term professional goals of our students (graduate school applications, job interviews, career pathways, CV/resume preparation, professional presentation skills and ethical research).</p>

Amnesty Project Courses Approved by Faculty Senate Undergraduate Curriculum Committee	
Engineering	All proposed changes for undergraduate courses
Nursing	All proposed changes for undergraduate courses
Pharmacy	All proposed changes for undergraduate courses

President Keith: Next, we have Academic Programs, which is chaired by Senator Ohlinger.

Senator Ohlinger: All right, from the Academic Programs Committee – nothing was sent out ahead of time, just in case you're wondering if you missed something, you did not. We are kind of in limbo regarding the one proposal that we're bringing to you today, the modification and that is through the College of Engineering. This involves construction engineering technology, electrical engineering technology, electrical engineering technology with mechanical concentration, and mechanical engineering technology. These all have to do with slight program modifications, no new program proposals. This was prompted by a need for the physics courses for these programs to be five credit-hour courses instead of four credit-hours and subsequently, that prompted further modifications, basically just swapping some hours and moving things around the curriculum to accommodate the additional hours. Except for those physics courses, all the changes are internal within the College of Engineering so it doesn't affect other colleges across the university. The total credit-hours for the program for a degree completion is unchanged, it remains the same; it is really a matter of the change in the physics course. The reason why I mentioned these are kind of in "limbo" is because those physics course modifications are still in the process of coming to Faculty Senate and they haven't reached the Faculty Senate level yet. However, talking with Senator Molitor and Senator Randolph and the committee as a whole, the recommendation was to bring this to Faculty Senate and approve these program modifications provisionally with the understanding that the physics course modifications will be approved subsequently. Again, that is just changing physics four credit-hours course to five credit-hours course. Senator Randolph is on the committee and he's in Engineering and is in full support of this, additionally Senator Molitor is here. Is there anything you can add to what I presented?

Senator Molitor: Yes. My apologies that we didn't clarify this with the committee, it is a little broader than physics. There have been changes in the past few years with regards to the Transfer Assurance Guidelines, or TAGs, for engineering technology programs which required us to change the structure of a few of our classes. These changes did involve physics in terms of the credit-hours for UT physics courses that satisfy our TAGs as well as a few Engineering technology courses. So that's essentially what led to the program modification to change credit-hours and to break up some courses. We had a few courses that combined lecture and lab, those are now separate lecture and lab courses. So we are responding to changes at the state level and that's essentially what these program modifications would accomplish.

Senator Ohlinger: And a full overview of that was discussed on the committee side. The main thing that was holding us up, to this point, was the approval of the physics modifications.

Senator Anderson-Huang: Which I should say something about.

Senator Ohlinger: Okay.

Senator Anderson-Huang: The department has no problem and certainly is in favor of doing it, however, there's some technical issue that's come up that hasn't been passed on to NSM Council for them to pass it on to Faculty Senate.

Senator Ohlinger: Thank you. I appreciate it.

Senator Dowd: When will this physics course modification be submitted for consideration by Senate? Are you asking for provisional approval? We are running out of calendar. How many meetings do we have left?

President Keith: One. Well, two if you count today's meeting.

Senator Dowd: We have one more opportunity for this Senate to meet. Is it reasonable planning to have one Faculty Senate approve something conditional on actions of a prior Faculty Senate? My concern is whether our actions today would in any way “tie the hands” of a future Senate? Do you know when the course modification will actually be presented to Senate?

Senator Ohlinger: Senator Anderson-Huang, do you have any idea when it might come through?

Senator Krantz: NSM Council has a meeting next Tuesday. We’ve already discussed the basic idea and I don’t recall any objections, so the likelihood if it would be approved, Senator Anderson-Huang, were there any complications?

Senator Anderson-Huang: There were not any complications.

President Keith: But, Undergraduate Curriculum will still have to review the course and we put a stop to new business coming forward to that committee.

Senator Molitor: If I can just address Senator Dowd’s comments? It is going to go across two senates anyway because a majority of the course modifications associated with the program modification have already been approved.

President Keith: What’s the benefit of doing it at this meeting, which is not clear to me? What is the benefit to Engineering?

Senator Molitor: It just gets it on the books because we’ve already submitted a bunch of course modifications reflected by this program change in terms of Engineering. So something is going to change next Fall; some of these courses have already been modified for the Fall semester. So we would like the catalog to reflect for those incoming students who are going to be taking those courses that this is going to be the program that they are following.

Senator Dowd: As far as I can remember, Senate has considered provisional approval very few times. Is there any down side for waiting until the fall semester? I understand the potential benefit of getting this material into the catalog. But, in my opinion, this is really stretching the notion of a “provisional” approval. I do not recall an instance that stretched across two different Faculty Senates. Senator Ohlinger, you have served on this committee for quite some time. May I ask for your thoughts on this issue?

Senator Ohlinger: It is definitely an exception. When it came to the committee, I think one of the concerns that Senator Molitor is bringing up is that the other course modifications have already gone through and those modified courses are in the catalog already, is that correct? So I guess this is where you see the “disconnect,” for the lack of a better word, between the courses on the books and the program that hasn’t yet been approved. So I don’t know what the best course of action is, but this is the recommendation and we wanted to see if it makes sense to get an approval pending the physics course approvals.

Senator Anderson-Huang: If the course modifications have gone through, that means that the courses as they appear in the catalog will not fulfill the full credit required for the program, is that correct because they will be missing one credit-hour from physics?

Senator Molitor: There’s going to be a transition; there’s always a transition when you do a program modification for students that are in the program and the courses that’ve been modified as part of that, that they have not taken yet.

Senator Anderson-Huang: Students have a choice, right?

Senator Molitor: Yes, exactly.

Senator Barnes: In my brief stint as chair of the Undergrad Curriculum Committee, we did consider a few things late to try to make, as clean as possible, a transition, and in a couple of cases we were able to do it without us actually being physically together. Maybe the committee would consider voting by email if it's approved online with no debate. We did it a couple of times in the interest of making things good for students and clear etc.

Senator Sheldon: I don't think the committee would have any problem with that other than the fact we are in the process of the amnesty project, which we are trying to clean up as quickly as possible.

President Keith: What is the preference of Senate? Either way, it seems like some set of students will be disadvantaged whether it is current students or future students.

Senator Molitor: Yes, I will agree with that.

President Keith: You guys are being really quiet.

Unknown Speaker: Can you put it into a vote?

Senator Ohlinger: We've met. This is coming forward as a recommendation from the committee. Is there any further discussion?

Senator Dowd: Yes. If these course modifications are considered for approval, who will report back to Senate to change the status from provisional approval to "full" approval? I am being a little facetious now – it will be either you or, however unlikely, someone who replaces you as committee chair next year. However, such a report must take place at Faculty Senate next year. Someone has to come back and report to Senate that the course modifications have been approved. For record-keeping purposes, we have to make certain a "full" approval actually occurs.

Senator Ohlinger: Exactly. I was going to say, me. I am going off Senate, but I can still be the chair until the new chair of Academic Programs is appointed. I am glad to oversee that and report back to Senate.

Senator Humphrys: The issue right now is one course, is that what we're saying?

Senator Ohlinger: It is actually two.

Senator Humphrys: Two courses that have to be modified or are new courses?

Senator Molitor: It is a credit-hour change. They are adding a recitation to the physics course.

Senator Humphrys: And we don't think that this can be approved or brought to the next meeting? I know we are running out of time, but it doesn't sound like---

Senator Devabhaktuni: We can actually vote provisionally with a condition that this is an approval for "six months" before which you need to bring it back to Senate.

Senator Dowd: In my opinion, no. A proposal is either approved, not approved, tabled or, perhaps, has a motion to *commit*. It's one thing to give provisional approval for a course, but we are talking about an academic program. And if that's the case, I would offer a friendly amendment. If you want to have an approval, perhaps we should drop this entire notion of "provisional approval." It should be either approved or not approved.

Senator Ohlinger: Okay.

Senator Dowd: That way we are not tying the hands of a future Senate and we are not tying the hands of a future Programs Committee. A future Senate may not like our decision, but at least we made one. Our decision today can always be altered later.

Senator Ohlinger: I understand, so the friendly amendment would be the proposed modifications with those changes within engineering and physics. And those proposed changes we will vote on as either we approve them or not approve them. Does that make sense?

Senator Wittmer: Senator Ohlinger, would you agree as a committee? I know we talked extensively about this – I think that the committee felt pretty confident about moving forward with the program if that helps anyone.

Senator Ohlinger: Thank you. We heard from Physics, and NSM's Council meeting is coming up.

Senator Krantz: There are no other decision steps to be made other than the approval from NSM Council and then a recommendation from your committee, correct?

Senator Ohlinger: That is correct.

Senator Molitor: Well, it will have to go to Faculty Senate Undergraduate Curriculum after, because these are course modifications.

Senator Ohlinger: But there is nothing else that Engineering or Academic Programs can do; we are done with it <laughter>. Academic Programs Committee is done, so our recommendation that we're bringing forward for a full vote from Senate is to approve the program modification to the programs as mentioned.

Senator White: I know someone has asked to call a question, but I want to make sure that I understand. For some reason the physics course modifications were not to be approved and then this decision becomes vacuous and so it's in essence provisional anyway or what am I misunderstanding?

Senator Molitor: If those courses were not to be approved then you will see another program modification coming from Engineering.

Senator White: Fine.

Senator Molitor: So we will have to approve the program modification or we will have to send in a bunch of course modifications to revert the associated courses back to their old form.

Senator White: You will have to change them back.

Senator Ohlinger: Eventually it has to happen anyway, right?

Senator Molitor: Yes.

President Keith: So, are we ready to vote?

Senator Krantz: Yes.

Group of Senators: Yes.

Senator Ohlinger: Do you want me to repeat the motion that's coming forward?

Senator Devabhaktuni: I think we're good.

Senator Ohlinger: All in favor please say "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? *Motion Passed.*

Thank you very much. [Please see the following link to view the above report:](http://www.utoledo.edu/facsenate/docs/Academic%20Programs%20Committee%20Report%20on%204%2012%202016.pdf)
<http://www.utoledo.edu/facsenate/docs/Academic%20Programs%20Committee%20Report%20on%204%2012%202016.pdf>

President Keith: Thank you, Senator Ohlinger. Next on our agenda is the presentation of the proposed changes to the missed class policy.

Senator Regimbal (substitute for M. E. Edwards): As President Keith indicated to you earlier, there has been a little bit of confusion about policy and consequently, when we last voted on policy I didn't realize the process in seeing that forward, but I understand it now. The *incomplete* grading policy information will go forward, hopefully in this next week or so.

So the policy I've asked you to consider for today has to do with the *missed class policy* – we have changed the responsible agent to the provost and then also added that the president of Faculty Senate should be a responsible agent for the missed class policy with the understanding that Faculty Senate should review policies related to undergraduate students in particular, and academic regulations.

In the next section - the green indicates the movement of word grouping, so the policy would read a little bit more smoothly. Students are expected to attend every class, that's the green section – that's moved from about the fourth line to over on this side. This is a current policy and this is what we're proposing: on this side of the addition is to put in some policy numbers. It's really difficult sometimes to figure out where things are coming from, so there will be an addition of university policy numbers. Also, adding the wording for absences related to student's disabilities, which is another university policy that we have and it continues on with what is currently the policy.

The next section that is added has to do with severe weather - the official agency that deals with severe weather that determines that we're in a Level 1, 2, or 3 is the Sheriff's Department, so if that report is out and if a student is unable to travel, we've added that in. As we all know that sometimes severe weather differs based on where you live, so going to school could be hazardous for your health if you live in Sandusky, but not necessarily hazardous if you live here in Toledo. The other change was to take out any other absences that the professor approves and just put "other absences" at the discretion of the instructor. Continuing on with faculty responsibilities- there have been some concerns that we make sure we upgrade [all] policy so it reflects what is currently being done, so consequently, the online course management system statement is added to the policy.

The next section is looking at faculty responsibility - for students participating in university sponsored activities, the instructors will provide such students with reasonable accommodations for completing missed exams, quizzes, and other required work. Courses that allow dropping a low grade or grades, faculty must offer the student reasonable accommodations for making up work missed due to a university sanctioned activity and may not require that missed work be counted as the low grade to be dropped. This is an issue that has been brought forward by students who have very definite ideas about this - they worked really hard for their grades, so they feel it is unfair that they don't have the opportunity to compete for all the points in a class - so that has been inserted in response to their concern. Continuing on, the responsibility of each instructor is identified in the syllabus, so that is the same. There are at least two methods of change, adding Blackboard, taking out written, and changing the word to "may" rather than "should." Continuing on to students' responsibilities, again, there is some movement. As soon as a student knows about the absence plan they use it, but in some cases, students really do not know in advance. The best example I can give you is a student athlete, he/she knows when they will be in competition and consequently, there's the possibility for missing class because of competition days. However, should they go to post-season competition, they are not aware when they might be competing and would not be able to tell the instructor at the beginning of the semester that they would be missing

certain days, and I would imagine that occurs in other instances as well - so as soon as the student knows of the absence plan and we're moving the language, again, so it's easier to read and adding Blackboard and the word "explanation." Approved written excuses for absences as outlined in the policy include, but are not limited to: doctors' note, funeral program, letter from the university office, or other excuses per discretion of the instructor. Another addition, students have the right of due process per policy - so it is the addition of the policy that addresses students' rights. Then the rest is elimination of language and moving that last statement which is in procedures, but actually it remains in procedures. Are there any questions? [Please see the following link to view the above report:](http://www.utoledo.edu/facsenate/docs/Missed%20Class%20Policy%20%20%20presented%20on%20April%2012%20%202016.pdf)
<http://www.utoledo.edu/facsenate/docs/Missed%20Class%20Policy%20%20%20presented%20on%20April%2012%20%202016.pdf>

Senator Molitor: I just want to comment on the university policy 3364-71-05 - I think that's academic grievance. If you're including a policy number and title, you should include the correct title for that policy. Then going way up, back towards page 1. On that bullet point, does it make sense to actually separate absences related to student disability as the second bullet point just because it's a separate university policy rather than characterizing it as personal emergencies?

Senator Regimbal (substitute for M. E. Edwards): I believe the idea was that persons with disabilities may have things that come up.

Senator Molitor: Okay.

President Keith: Which is a personal emergency is what you're saying?

Senator Regimbal (substitute for M. E. Edwards): Yes.

Senator Anderson-Huang: Is there any other word to use besides Blackboard, a more generic word?

Senator Regimbal (substitute for M. E. Edwards): Learning management system.

Senator Krantz: I was going to comment on that also. It is very specific, but if we foresee using that as a platform in the foreseeable future, it makes sense, but I agree with Senator Anderson-Huang's point.

Senator Regimbal (substitute for M. E. Edwards): So what is your comment related to?

Senator Krantz: The use of the term Blackboard specifically. It is one very specific piece of software.

Senator Regimbal (substitute for M. E. Edwards): So the suggestion is to change that to "learning management system," as it is mentioned before?

Group of Senators: Yes.

Senator White: Right. You used that term already, "online course management system."

Senator Regimbal (substitute for M. E. Edwards): So we will be consistent with that language, right?

Senator White: That makes sense in case we get out of Blackboard.

President Keith: Or they get bought out like Web-CT did.

Senator Regimbal (substitute for M. E. Edwards): Or if we use something different.

President Keith: Yes.

Senator Schneider (substitute for M. Caruso): I have to say that this is my least favorite university policy. It is my least favorite because I think the guidance that it offers to students and to faculty, particularly new faculty, is very muddled. For example, when we get down to deaths in the family, who gets to decide what counts as family? Is it defined as immediate family? Then what is your immediate family? Is that your nuclear family? I don't know how many students have sat around and said "he's my mom's second cousin and we're really close" and it is the fourth funeral they have gone to in the first four weeks of class. But on the other hand, a student is afraid to claim some family members, someone that's really immediate to their life and would count as "family." So again, I don't like the muddledness of this. I also think the biggest problem of this policy is that there's conflict between the first sentences of faculty responsibility where it says, *it is the responsibility of each instructor to decide what weight if any should be placed on missed classes in the computation of final grades.* Then the last sentence in Student's Responsibilities where it says, *in return, instructors are not to penalize students with excused absences-* we cannot imagine how quickly this could go wrong and it gives rise to numerous confusions for faculty and students. Should we ask students to consider a medical leave if they've got continuous absences? But yet the instructor says they won't penalize for excused absences, but every time a student was absent it was legitimate, they were sick. But, how are they going to fulfill the course requirements if they can't participate in group projects? They can't do in-class presentations and they can't do any number of other things that are part of the course. I don't know. I think this policy needs reconsideration.

Senator Molitor: If I can respond to something that may help clarify? It doesn't address your issue about repeated absences whether they are excused or not, it's contributing to course participating and learning. In that first paragraph about faculty responsibilities, perhaps you just add the word, "unexcused" – "what weight shall be placed on unexcused absences in computation of final grades."

Senator Schneider (substitute for M. Caruso): No, that is the problem because this is addressing excused absences. You can have a student who is absent sometimes because they are participating in religious observances, they are absent sometimes because they are attending family funerals, they are absent sometimes because they are sick, and they are absent other times because their child is sick. Students have complicated lives. How are we supposed to rejuvenate this under this policy?

Senator Barnes: I just want to second that. I've had a student athlete miss one-third of the class periods in my course and say, you can't penalize me because these are excused. If it's a seminar-style class, excusing some absences enshrines a privileging of certain kinds of experiences over others. I just don't like it and I don't think it is fair.

Senator Lundquist: I guess I would like to "third" that. I have to deal with situations, not only in my class, but faculty in my department, where somebody shows up having missed one-third of the class with an excuse which looks legit, right? There's a real problem there, and I am not sure what reasonable accommodations are to that. I can't recreate what happened in all of those classes for this one student. Much of what is learned in my class and the classes in my department is learned in the classroom; it's not that you can stay home and then try to do the paper, make it up somehow and pass it in – it depends on that experience in the classroom. So I don't know what to say to a student who's got a legitimate medical issue, or a legitimate emotional issue, or multiple deaths in the family. Often I would say, I think you've missed too much of the class to do your best work and do what the course is intending to do. If it is in time, I recommend that they withdraw sometimes, or they look into a medical withdraw. I don't know if I should be doing that.

Senator Regimbal (substitute for M. E. Edwards): I wonder if in the section under Faculty Responsibilities - in the second paragraph it says, “*the instructor must inform students*” then it goes on to say, “*providing the first week of the course in the course syllabus or in the online course management system of his or her policies on missed class related to issues including unexcused absences, makeup exams, and makeup work missed during student’s excused absences.*” I believe there are probably things where a student misses that and it isn’t really possible to make it up. Consequently, I think it’s important that, in my opinion, at the beginning of the class students [athletes] know ahead of time that they have to be there for that activity and if their travel schedule is such that they would be missing, then they do need to reconsider when they would take this class and work with you to find a time when they could take the class. Because given the option of “don’t travel or compete with your team and be here” is probably not a good option for them. In a case of illness, I don’t know what we do for students that miss because they’re sick. I do think that we need to look at that medical withdrawal, it is fairly stringent at the moment, but that is not on the docket for right now. I mean, it is coming up for consideration, but not today.

Senator Kippenhan (substitute for A. Jorgensen): I don’t like the sentence in the Student’s Responsibility part that the students use two methods to notify the instructor. Either they’re calling me because they have a flat tire or they send me email via phone. One is perfectly fine and they then can follow up to see if it was received.

Senator Dowd: I would like to comment- I don’t read email. So other methods should also be considered.

Senator Kippenhan (substitute for A. Jorgensen): Then you state that within your syllabus so students know how to get ahold of you.

Senator Dowd: Right. But we are responsible to make ourselves available through at least two forms of communication. The second time a student contacts an instructor is essentially a “backup.” More importantly, the additional method improves the probability that faculty members are aware of the student’s issue.

Senator Kippenhan (substitute for A. Jorgensen): I was happy being notified in advance, period.

Senator Regimbal (substitute for M. E. Edwards): This is the original policy and it does say that it is “strongly recommended.” It doesn’t say that you have to, but it does say, it is “strongly recommended” that you use two methods.

President Keith: I was going to say something, but please go first.

Senator Grey: I know that that first course is kind of “beaten-up” a little bit. But I just want to add that especially with athletes, some of them have been recruited to come to The University of Toledo and then take classes that are only offered once a year. So if they are not excused for those, then how do we keep those athletes that are so heavily recruited?

Senator Dowd: Good point.

Senator Regimbal: I don’t disagree. And if we believe that they ought to be able to get an education then I think that we have to work on both sides to accommodate. Sometimes it might be the suggestion that the travel schedule be altered a little so that they can complete your class and then get on the bus to travel or

possibly get to the field a little bit later. Having worked some with athletes, I know that they have difficulties sometimes saying something to their coaches that they might be late. I don't want to say they feel intimidated, but they just don't want to go up to their coach and say they're going to be late. But, if they were to go to the faculty athletic rep and try to work something out with the student I think that would be helpful. By NCAA policy, there has to be a missed class policy for student athletes.

Senator Anderson-Huang: The main reason civilizations collapse is due to built-upon bureaucracy. The more rules you apply, then the more difficult it is to decipher the rules and to work a way around them. So if there is any way to make this a little bit more fuzzy and a little bit shorter, and up to the intelligence of the faculty member and/or the student in their mutual conversations, that may be better.

President Keith: You know, I think that is just the opposite of what Senator Schneider just said. I think she wants it to be clearer and more precise or am I wrong?

Senator Schneider (substitute for M. Caruso): Or to have a sentence in there that says what my syllabus says: if you find it necessary to miss more than three classes this semester, excused or unexcused, please see me about continuing in this course. So then we don't get into this big long email battle or a documentation battle. I can talk to them and they can say to me "I am sorry, this awful thing happened in my life" and then I would encourage them to purchase a tape and we can find ways to work around it. But without my ability to say there is a limit to how many excused absences you can have and still fulfill learning objectives of this course, so if you find it necessary to miss more than this number of classes, then see me. Then it is clear to them that they're going to have a conversation with me and that's an opportunity for me to find out what's going on in their life and offer some alternatives like maybe withdrawing from the class, or maybe [them] getting a little tougher about their "cold" and coming in.

Senator Barnes: I have two quick points: First, the sentence about not penalizing students with excused/unexcused absences depends on which way you go with the policy. I also give credit for participation because of the seminar nature of our courses and so students who miss class, excused or unexcused, also take a hit in the participation area of the course. I am concerned that the excused/unexcused distinction is also going to create an opportunity to argue about grade, based on the idea that "This is an excused absence, so you can't knock my participation grade either; when I am here I participate and it's an "A", even though I missed 14 classes." Second, I just want to say again, just real quickly for the record – as when we looked at this issue before, I just don't like approving some people's absences and not others. I know this gives discretion to the faculty member, but I just don't like the university approving some people's important outside activities and not others; it just makes me uncomfortable. For us to be sanctioning some people's absences and not others just does not sit well with me.

Senator Lundquist: So I think what Senator Schneider and Senator Barnes just said is very wise. If there was a statement on a syllabus that said if you find it necessary to miss more than three classes come and talk to me, would that be a violation of this missed class policy? Would a student who then has missed three classes want to turn to this policy and say, what Dr. Schneider has said doesn't match the university policy?

Senator Barnes: I think it would.

President Keith: Can I ask, are we ready to vote on this? It sounds to me that---

Senator White: Let me raise another question. When this gets extreme to say, more than three, or more than ten or whatever, then we might legally or illegally encourage students to withdraw, but it doesn't matter legally or illegally because it is their decision; we don't have an *IW*. It is the students' decision to withdraw or not. But once the student – for unforeseeable circumstances and whatever adjectives that are applied in the other policy – cannot complete the requirements of the course, don't we give an *incomplete*? Whose discretion is that?

Group of Senators: The faculty's.

Senator White: So there comes a point when giving an *IW* is the students' discretion anyway, or we can say, you need an *incomplete*. Now, how do we make that up, that is another question? So I will go ahead, not claiming that I've ever done this or recommended it, but one can say, sit in the class next semester and we are going to make it up or whatever. That might be interesting to find out from the lawyers if that's a legitimate thing to ever even hint at, but that seems like that has to be the solution given that we don't have an *IW*.

Senator Lundquist: There is no guarantee that course will be offered next semester.

Senator White: Didn't we expand it to a year?

Group of Senators: Yes.

Senator Schneider (substitute for M. Caruso): But what if it's a course you only teach once every two years and somebody else teaches it on the opposite year?

Senator Regimbal (substitute for M. Edwards): The expansion was that you ask for an *incomplete* for one semester, then you can ask for it to be continued twice more.

President Keith: Just a second because we have a couple hands up.

Senator Lee: I have a question about the statement that says, the instructor must inform students in writing, example in the course syllabus or in the online management system – in the online delivery, do we not have to have our syllabus there? I'm just thinking about the syllabus because I've always been told where you have to have it for our students to be informed. So personally, I would state it very clearly that this better be in your syllabus because that's the place where you would answer to it if there was a problem. Like the online management system, is that like an item on your course menu?

President Keith: Thank you.

Senator Nathan: In the law school we have a much simpler policy which is, if a student misses more than two weeks of class, the student will not get credit for that course and we don't care why they missed, addressing some of the concerns people have expressed concerning excused absences. Athletes are a different issue. I think there are some constraints whether you can do that. Well, I don't think you can do that to an athlete because the university is forcing them to miss class, but I am just throwing that out there.

Senator Lundquist: Is that a consecutive two weeks?

Senator Nathan: No. If you miss more than 12 classes, you can't get credit.

President Keith: I don't think we are ready to vote.

Senator Dowd: I move to *commit*. For me, at least, too many unresolved issues are being raised at this time. I would benefit from the committee looking into these issues and reporting back to Senate before a vote of approval takes place.

Senator Schneider (substitute for M. Caruso): I second.

President Keith: All right. All in favor, please say "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? ***Motion Passed – Move to Commit.*** Sorry, Senator Regimbal, we are sending you back to your seat. Thank you very much.

Senator Krantz: I want to add to that, a consideration of a medical withdraw should be included in the discussion, going back to Senator Lundquist's point about 15-20 minutes ago. It is far too rigorous; if I understand it correctly, it is all or nothing.

Group of Senators: Yes.

Senator Krantz: There are legitimate times within a course or within a semester where one course which has a lot of in-class activities, that may not work, but another course that may have more hybrid or online activities, it may work.

President Keith: Thank you for your comment. Next, we have Senator Monsos.

Senator Monsos: This is everyone's favorite topic <laughter>. The Core Curriculum Committee has been trying to do several things this semester. We had five separate lists of what the core curriculum was, but none of those exactly matched the March 27, 2012 list that was voted on and approved by Faculty Senate. In addition, of course, since then some classes are no longer offered and additional courses have been approved and put forward. One of the things we wanted to do was get a new definitive list of what the core was. Plus, there's also the issue that the state has this statement in the guidelines for students for Academic Program Review, "*the general education comprises no less than 36 semester hours.*" To complicate that a little bit, they specify in the Ohio Transfer Module policy what 24 hrs. of those 36 hrs. are, but they don't specify the other 12, that is up to universities.

Provost Barrett: Wait, that's not entirely accurate.

Senator Monsos: What? What did I say wrong?

Provost Barrett: Well, they specify 24 as fitting in various specific categories and the other 12 are to be distributed through the same categories, but you can allocate within them as you wish.

Senator Monsos: I am sorry, that is a more accurate way to say it. They don't say where those 12 have to come from, but it is stated that these are the categories and they come from those categories. They also specify that they need to be lower-division level courses. If you look at what the state of Ohio does, that is that list from two slides ago – the list that we have in our current UT core. You'll see a problem right away as we don't match that. In addition, the guidance that we're getting from the state right now is that those 36 hrs. need to be courses that are in our OTM. There's been a great deal of discussion on this to

this point and there's been research at other universities on what they're doing- all of that is still kind of open for debate. It is clear from the state that those beyond the 36 hrs. do not have to be in the OTM. The draft proposal that we have, we have vetted somewhat; we've gotten some feedback from advisors because they seem like the logical group of people to give us some feedback on this. We've talked to the Provost's Office and now it's time to get some feedback from Senate, especially since the faculty is the one that owns the core curriculum and your input is extremely important. We also want to talk to the new provost once he is on to make sure that changes in that office is apprised of everything, we're apprised of what's in their minds, and we're moving forward on a good proposal. So with this proposal we are trying to meet the current interpretation of state requirements regarding the Ohio Transfer Module. Faculty always stare at me when I say that we currently state we have a gen ed. of 30-33 hrs. and we have the multidisciplinary courses and those two things together make up our core. So our thought is, let's just stop that "two category thing" and just call it the core, which is essentially what it is anyway. If we take the 36 hrs. that the state requires and the 3-6 hrs. of multicultural because we allow for a double-dip there – one of the multiculturals goes into one of the other categories – that would give us 39-42 hrs. If we clearly mark which of the courses are OTM, then any student intending to transfer, or considering transfer, is able to pick and choose courses from each of the categories that are OTM and in each category, except Arts and Humanities; those do constitute the bulk of that category. This provides a little more flexibility with students in degree programs because we don't just have to consider OTM courses or continue arguing about this point. It provides a unified framework for approval and review of assessment for the core curriculum. Currently we assess what we're calling gen ed., but we don't assess the multicultural.

We would like to start phasing into assessment of multicultural as well. The distribution is dictated by the state, or as we currently have it, it does not change- we have 6 hrs. in Comp and the state says 3 hrs., and then 3 and 3 each of the multicultural and the proposal will still allow for one double-dip. This is the big change - 39 is larger than 30 or 33, and so the proposal would require an additional 9 hrs. Those 9 hrs. would have to come from one of the seven categories that are currently required. To see if this can be possible, we did a review of recent graduates to see if they were already doing this, how many students wouldn't be disadvantaged by this process; nearly all met the standard already without it even being required. Most programs have electives; the other courses the students have to take in order to get up to 124 hrs. or whatever their hours are, so students are meeting this requirement anyway. This is one of the key things we wanted advisors to look at. The advisors found two programs in Health Sciences that are accredited programs that would be negatively affected by this because of their accreditation requirements- they couldn't find room for the additional courses, so we inserted this language into the proposal: "*In cases where accreditation requires students to take a discipline-specific non-core course that falls into one of the seven component areas, programs can apply to the Core Curriculum Committee for a waiver to include the discipline-specific course in that program of study.*" In this review that we ran of students who had graduated recently, that confirmed the issue with those two Health Science programs. We also found two current non-accredited programs that aren't in compliance now, so they also will need to review those programs in that case. They probably would review it now, although I haven't told them that we found this yet so they will be surprised. So what's most important that I think coming out of this today? I really want everyone to go back and look at the programs and have them double check this testing that we've done to see if it's accurate; will your students have trouble meeting this requirement or not? Is this something that we can consider moving forward? We also need programs to think about the core courses that they might specify their students take, that is something certainly you can do. It certainly happens in Sciences and in the professional colleges, however it doesn't happen as much in some of the other colleges, but that's changeable, that is something you can choose to do. You can say that we want all of our students to have this particular core course or meet this particular need. The proposal is also attempting to clarify some category names that have drifted over time. Depending upon what year or where you looked in the catalog or online, Arts & Humanities, which is what we're suggesting that it be called; it has been called Humanities, Humanities/Fine Arts, Humanities and Fine Arts, and Core Humanities. The registrar says this is a simple change to the description that she can do in about 30

seconds. She has already tried it out in a test system and it would come up saying Art & Humanities. The code itself would still be CRHM. The multicultural category also still remains problematic – Diversity of U.S. culture isn't the problem, it's the non-U.S. culture, which at one point drifted into being called non-Western culture, although the most recent vote on this issue by Faculty Senate was for non-U.S. culture. However, the coding is one of the things that leads us astray there because it's coded MCNW. It sort of leads you to say, non-Western instead of non-U.S. It would be nice if that coding would change, but that would require more work than a simple change to an inscription. We are not addressing transfer in this document because it is a very complicated issue and there is currently a group working on the transfer policy. Once that policy is completed and approved, then anything that isn't addressed that we will need to have in our document we'd need to start working on. Ultimately, we would like a special website www.utoledo.edu/core that is easy to find to house all of this information about the core. It is housed on the Faculty Senate page now, but it's a bit of a strain to get to it; it would be nice to have a clearer web address.

Senator Dowd: That is a really good idea.

Senator Anderson-Huang: Yes, it is.

Senator Monsos: The other document that I sent out to you is a course list, this is still in flux because I am still getting information on those, but it does include all the courses from the March 27, 2012 Faculty Senate motion with some exceptions. We ran another report asking for core courses that have not been taught in several years and followed up on those with chairs - a number of those the chairs confirmed are no longer offered and we are able to accommodate that. There are also three courses in the list that were submitted under the competency process and those three are pretty specific as to learning software and don't seem [to us] to be considered gen ed. courses anymore. So the Core Curriculum Committee feels that we should take away any such courses. They were never coded – they have not been offered as core courses, so it wouldn't be a change. No students have taken those courses as core courses. The 2012 course list did have some Honors courses that were submitted under the competency, and Senator Humphrys just raised this to us last Friday – the committee decided what category to put some of those in -there were a couple of business courses and a legal course and the committee assigned them to either Humanities or Social Sciences - Senator Humphrys' remembrance of that is that they didn't go back to the programs to make sure they were okay with that classification. However, we're unaware that that has been objected to by anybody, so we maintained that, per 2012. It includes all the courses that have been approved since 2012 except those that chairs said are no longer offered. In some cases we had some courses that were approved at the 3000- or 4000-level that aren't multicultural courses and we did remove those, I think it was just a handful.

Finally, Senator Krantz sent me his list of courses that he's been working on as part of his role as a faculty representative in trying to get things working better with our submissions into OTM. His lists had a few courses that are currently coded in Banner as core, but didn't appear on the list that we had going. So those have been added back in as well because they are regularly offered and they are coded as gen ed. and we approved them at some point and there's no reason to just arbitrarily stop. We are trying to make it the most complete course list of all the iterations of the core to have been. There's another one that's called, Courses to Remove from Core- Senate has no approved mechanism for removing courses from the core. This means that if a course stops being offered, it just sits there. There may be different coding changes, but it still keeps appearing on lists and confusing people and the same course keeps getting debated over and over. I think if Faculty Senate approved it, then Faculty Senate can also de-approve it, so this list would be a list for Faculty Senate to remove from the core. The next to last sheet are courses to expire from the OTM. The OTM's system is that every five years a course has to be renewed as an OTM course or it will expire out of the system. However, if you look at the courses listed in our OTM, many of them have been there for years and there's not an indication that they either expired or have been renewed- that hasn't been applied consistently so it may be that courses stay on that OTM list, even

though we no longer offer them and sometimes that happens for many years. So this would provide the Provost's office with a clear directive to what courses should be allowed to expire, if they ever do. Last, we were asked to create a glossary – Marcia King-Blandford had requested this and it turns out that that is something that Faculty Senate has requested and other places have suggested that we create such a glossary, and so we got one started here. These terms are related to the core curriculum and they have to do with the proposal. They use the terms that are used in this draft proposal. Obviously, if the draft proposal doesn't go forward or if it changes, then this list will also have to change. When the state had definitions for the terms, I used the state definition, otherwise we created definitions either from materials that already existed or we wrote them. If you think there are other terms that you think need to be included here, we would love to hear what they are so we can get them added into the list.

Senator Schneider (substitute for M. Caruso): Can you make this slide show available?

Senator Monsos: Yes.

Senator Schneider (substitute for M. Caruso): I love this presentation by the way.

Senator Monsos: Thank you.

Senator Anderson-Huang: In the past, and I don't know whether this was addressed many years ago, but in the recent past it was not addressed and that is, some programs have, let's say a math requirement in the program but that math course is not a general education math course or in the OTM, but it is still a lot of math, is there a way to make that approved?

Senator Monsos: Well, right now we've done that, but we used the word "accredited programs," we said if "accreditation requires it." If it is not an accredited program, we don't currently have language in the proposal. This is something Senator Krantz raised before, having to do with mapping courses that we would allow an upper-level course to substitute for a lower-level course. The state pretty clearly says they are supposed to be lower-level courses, so I am not quite sure how to handle that.

Senator Molitor: If I can address that? Our review of graduates over the past five years suggests that problem does not exist. There are no programs at this university where students were not graduating [without] satisfying the math or composition for the most part. Again, there are no programs.

Senator Anderson-Huang: Not satisfying the general education math, right?

Senator Molitor: Yes. So the courses they had were coded as general education courses.

Senator Monsos: You can see that Math has worked really hard to get their courses into the OTM; almost all of the courses that are in our gen ed. are in the OTM.

Senator Lundquist: Did I understand you say that in our core we have more credits than are required by the state and we need to apportion those courses into categories?

Senator Monsos: No. I said we have more credits in English Comp. We require 6 credits; we require Comp I and Comp II and the state requires 3 credits, which I think is equivalent to English Comp II, but I am not sure about that. But the state requires 36 and we have 30-33, so we have fewer course credits.

Senator Lundquist: Oh, I see. Thank you.

Senator Barnes: Related to the issues raised so far. I am curious about the history of the conversation around the non-U.S. vs. non-Western distinction in the diversity.

Senator Monsos: It went on for a long time.

Senator Barnes: So I heard.

Senator Monsos: And I think it has gone on in Faculty Senate for quite a while and it probably could go on now for a while. But ultimately, non-U.S. seemed more inclusive of everything than non-Western because non-Western would take out Europe and we have some courses now in that category that have to do with Europe. So if we really went with non-Western, then we should take those courses out, so non-U.S. seemed more inclusive. I think that's what swayed the vote finally.

Senator Humphrys: Senator Monsos, you are asking for us to vote on anything today?

Senator Monsos: No.

Senator Humphrys: Also, I just want to mention, thank you so much for all the work. Senator Monsos put in a great amount of work in trying to straighten out something that seems to have been almost impossible to straighten out and you've seemed to have accomplished it. Thank you.

Senator Monsos: Well, you can see that there are still questions, for example, Religion, Understanding the Monotheistic Religions. I talked to the chair some time ago and he said to "take this out of the core." I called him back and I said, you know, it is in the OTM and he said, "oh, yeah, it is in the OTM; let's leave it, but I am going to change that title because I hate it. I will see about getting it back up and functioning." Meanwhile, Senator Krantz met with him and I don't know if Senator Krantz met before or after or what, because we haven't had a chance to touch base on this because I just saw his list yesterday, but on that list it was back to, "take it out." So I need to go back to him and say, which is the final decision? So there are still questions.

Senator White: I have a quick question that somebody here might be the wise person that can help me get answered. On the list of courses that are on the way out, I am referring to Calculus I and II Honors, we reverted five or six years ago to offering Honors as a special section.

Senator Monsos: This one or the other one?

Senator White: Yes, that is the list. So, we offer Honors now as 1850 section 091 or something to that effect and 1860, maybe the same section number. I am not sure why that happened. We've wondered, is it more advantageous for students on their transcript to have this. I am glad I am asking the question because Senator Molitor seems to have an answer for me.

Senator Molitor: Regarding the Honors math courses, you may or may not remember that the Ohio Transfer Module will not allow Honors-only courses. So your Calc I 1850-1860 were in the OTM?

Senator White: Yes.

Senator Molitor: If 1920 and 1930 were in the OTM, then they would be removed. So that is why I think the decision was made to have Calculus I and II be Honors sections of a regular course rather than an Honors specific course.

Senator White: All right. Thank you.

Senator Cappelletty: On the math courses that were on the list, Statistics 2600 was there, but there are some off-shoots to the Statistics course, 2620 or 2640 – that is for the Biological Sciences. Does that need to be added to the list?

Senator White: Yes.

Senator Monsos: I am sorry, what were the numbers?

Senator White: 2640, we should get that OTM approved; it would be the same learning objectives as 2600. It is just designed more specifically for Statistics for Applied Science.

Senator Monsos: I would have to check whether that is on any of our lists as being in the gen ed. Is it not?

Senator White: It is probably not.

Senator Monsos: So remember the process is that it comes to Core Curriculum for approval to our gen ed. or the core first, and then it gets submitted as OTM.

Senator White: Right.

Assistant Dean Pollauf: I certainly wonder what happened to 2630 which used to be for Business and Economics. It used to be 2600 and 2630 as well. Did the course just go away?

Senator White: I remember the day in 1994 when I was “young” and just arrived, Harvey Wolff who was the chair at the time failed to persuade the powers-that-be that Statistics for Business should be taught by the department. So Statistics went over to the Business College and 2630, we kept it on the books for many years just in case some students couldn’t take their course at that time, or whatever, in the hopes that if they took 2630 that they would continue to grant credit for that in the Business College. We offered it simultaneous with 2600, so we didn’t offer any separate sections of it. No one has mentioned to us in the last several years so we had suggested that it go away. But, if there’s somebody suggesting to us then we should talk about it.

Senator Devabhaktuni: President Keith, are you keeping track of the time?

President Keith: Yes, I am.

Senator Devabhaktuni: Okay, just a reminder.

President Keith: Thank you.

Senator Monsos: As we are out of time, I encourage you to get back to me with any issues that you see or language that you think doesn’t work and/or “explosions of joy or hatred.” It will come back to you in the Fall. It will look different, I am sure. We discover new things about the course list all the time on a daily basis. [Please see the following link to view the above report:](http://www.utoledo.edu/facsenate/docs/core%20curriculum%20combined%20documents.pdf)
<http://www.utoledo.edu/facsenate/docs/core%20curriculum%20combined%20documents.pdf>

Senator McLoughlin: Real quick. I am sorry. You had mentioned two programs in the Health Science College that would be notified so that they can kind of make any changes.

Senator Monsos: The advisor who alerted us to the Health Science Programs feels that the language that we added about accreditation would take care of it. The two programs that we discovered that might not be in compliance - Senator Molitor just ran it for the last five years and there weren’t a lot of students in those other two programs, so we want to do a little more checking and then we will follow up on those for you.

Senator McLoughlin: Wonderful. Thank you.

President Keith: Thank you very much, Senator Monsos. Okay, the last item on our agenda is Matt Schroeder and Susan Batten. I need to pull up his PowerPoint.

Dr. Susan Batten (College of Nursing): It just seems like some things we just live with forever, but this is going to be new, I promise <laughter>. My name is Susan Batten and this is Matt Schroeder.

Matt Schroeder (UT Chief of Staff): I am the president's Chief of Staff at the university. I think I presented to this group maybe one time in the last eight months and so I thank you for having me back. This is simply an update and an update in sort of the "spirit" of the new way that this administration does business. Frankly, it is an update that probably really does not impact the faculty at The University of Toledo, but it is one that [I think] if we're successful, it aligns us with our peer institutions and it is not an uncommon model within higher ed. So, what Susan, and I, and other members of the committee wanted to just update you on today is winter break. For us, we are defining "winter break" as the period of time between December 25th and January 1st. Some universities call them "season days" or "winter holidays," but it is really the four days that make up that period of time in December. Many universities do this as an opportunity to boost morale, some argue cost savings opportunities, but rest assured, I am not here today to make that argument at all. I think until you live winter break, it is very difficult to have any type of a solid footing on any type of stance that will save the university money. It's really an opportunity to look at what has become a very quiet time here at The University of Toledo for those who are here working and it can be an unproductive time if you're relying upon others to get the job done.

Some of our Ohio peers, what we've looked at was on the institutional websites - we have our Ohio peers, our MAC peers, our aspirational peers and our peers in general. The list behind me, these are some of our Ohio peers and peers in general that offer a winter break and season days etc. So again, this is not uncommon. Where do we find ourselves today? Back in January we created an ad hoc committee and Susan Batten was kind enough to represent Senate on that committee. We met a few times to talk about the possibility of a winter break at The University of Toledo. I need to underscore that this is not a furlough; this is truly a winter break in the most sincere sense. Again, this is not a furlough. We've done a considerable amount of due diligence looking not only externally at peer institutions, but also internally at the number of different classified and unclassified folks that we have here that make up our employee base. We've looked at the average number of vacation hours that different employee classifications, on average, sit on, or bank. Then we also looked at what our accrued vacation liability is as it relates to our balance sheet, which is roughly \$16 million and that does not include UTMC. I come to you today knowing that the nine-month faculty we will lose in a few weeks and the 12-month will still be here, but honestly, there's a lot of heavy lifting that still needs to be done. It is our intent not to continue to move this forward over the summertime and then have a sort of "surprise" welcome back in August and "look what we've created" type of model. So, what we find ourselves heading as I stand here today, "we," being the committee, is that looking at our employee population: nine-month faculty- this does not apply to you, 12-month faculty- most are protected by the collective bargaining agreement, and then you have a small population of 12-month faculty, which in our eyes, all faculty are the same. So we've looked at our classified employees and in my definition of classified, in my HR profession, this is our hourly employees. Our hourly employees accrue vacation time at a much lower rate than our unclassified employees. There is a great sensitivity so that this employee population is not negatively impacted. So, what is being talked about right now in terms of the proposed model is that this group of employees would enjoy the four days off between December 25th and January 1st paid, and those that are defined as essential employees during this period of time, they can float whatever time that's worked at a later date. The unclassified employees – and this mirrors a model that Cincinnati put forward a few years ago – these are folks that upon Day 1 started accruing right around 22 days of vacation a year. We would look, working with that employee base, to adjust that accrue rate of 22 days down to 20 days in exchange for four days off between December 25th and January 1st. And then on the clinical side of the house, we have a couple folks on the clinical side that's on the committee. The clinical side is very difficult to talk or do anything like this with because they have patients to service and clinical is typically a little bit different in general when it comes to things like this. So really the focus is to come up with a model that demonstrates good-will to the employee base and to come up with a model that realistically looks at a period of time

during an academic year and fiscal year that is unproductive and to allow folks to be off, to refresh, travel, and be with family and friends, but at the end of the day, not really negatively impact them. Questions?

Assistant Dean Pollauf: I guess the one concern that I would really have is that it may be generally true that it's generally an "unproductive time," but student's service offices are on such a short turn-around between Fall and Spring semester -all of our academic reviews, probations, and suspensions have to happen, and grades generally don't get posted till a day or two before Christmas, so we would need to look at the whole calendar. We're back to walk-ins a week before school starts, which is usually January 2nd, and so where are the days to do that, and what is our due diligence as academic offices to the students regardless of whatever kind of winter break package we come up with, because they have to be notified when they are suspended?

Dr. Susan Batten (College of Nursing): That is one of the items that we had discussed and we don't have a resolution for. We are seeking information and input in service areas for students and service areas for faculty who are doing things over the 12-month timeframe. The other thing that Matt didn't mention is the service to animal labs – we call it "the hospital of human care lab," and the animal labs are important as well. I am not equating people to animals, but we can't ignore those labs.

Matt Schroeder (UT Chief of Staff): To piggy-back on that. What we're suggesting or recommending is nothing in terms of an extreme scenario where some universities completely shut their buildings. We understand very much, especially now going through the master planning process that our lab space is really spread out throughout all of our campuses, our two main campuses; so to say building "X" is offline for this four-day period is just unrealistic, and that is where I ultimately end up in my thought process and I think the committee as well because of that and the continued access to these facilities. It would be unrealistic, especially early on to say, oh, we are going to realize the utility savings of "x" when you just simply had a tough time controlling space.

Dr. Susan Batten (College of Nursing): Let me mention one other thing related to UTMC. UTMC, their representatives at the table talked about some of the clinics that actually close because the attending primary physician that runs it is not there. So they use mechanisms that are under AFSCME for people to sign up ahead [of time] and they rank who is off and who is not; they would continue to capture the opportunities not to have people working when the services are closed. What I am saying, if UTMC didn't have any providers there, then their staff would not be there and so they looked at that already. I am sensing that because we know we are a combined university and we need to think both sides and we're being frugal of those sides of it, but the hospital already has a mechanism that looks very close. In fact, we have a lot of people wanting time off and sometimes they can't grant it off because you have to have the 24-hour service, but in the clinics they definitely have some mechanisms.

Senator Barnes: I am sure you've covered this earlier, but I feel a need to ask, the unclassified and classified staff who you mentioned earlier, are you consulting with them about their feelings and questions about this?

Matt Schroeder (UT Chief of Staff): Yes. A lot of this is timing, given the schedule that you're on and knowing that the last meeting in April for Faculty Senate is a lot of housekeeping type items. So again, we want to make it to Faculty Senate first to be completely transparent. Conversations with some of those groups have not even happened yet – it is just based on the timing that we're on with the desire to get to you first. But yes, we will be, absolutely.

Senator Kippenhan (substitute for A. Jorgensen): The same thing. I am assuming that you took into consideration students that might be on campus during that period because they are either international students or they live in the Honors Village, which they don't have to move out during Spring Break so they can have access to services like dining.

Matt Schroeder (UT Chief of Staff): Yes. The students that live on campus typically during the winter break I believe are consolidated down or clustered to I-House. What I think will emerge from this is how “essential personnel” is defined is probably going to be different than what “essential personnel” is defined for in a level 3 snow emergency. We’ll simply put some of those end-of-semester or start-up-semester student centered services and just tie that down [to] housekeeping, but [also] keeping a dorm operational are going to be [our] “must haves.”

Senator Devabhaktuni: I don’t understand the tunes that apply to the song, so I am just going to ask some questions to clarify.

Matt Schroeder (UT Chief of Staff): All right.

Senator Devabhaktuni: Does this apply to departments’ secretaries?

Matt Schroeder (UT Chief of Staff): Yes.

Senator Devabhaktuni: It applies to them?

Matt Schroeder (UT Chief of Staff): Yes. It applies to all employees. Now, the heavy lifting that will need to be done, as I think Susan has alluded to, in the coming weeks and months is that at The University of Toledo we have roughly 94 different classifications of employees and through that spectrum of classifications there are different vocational pool rates, they are just different. Now it is time for the ad hoc committee to really go line-item by line-item to figure out who’s essential and who is not essential, not in a vacuum, but working with the different tables of groups – we need to figure out who needs to be here and who doesn’t need to be here, who would typically need to be here in a snow emergency, and in this four-day period, weather cooperative etc., and instead of accumulating comp time and that liability, is there a possibility on the facility side of the house to be a little bit more lenient on what an essential employee would be.

Senator Devabhaktuni: I just want to add a thought to this as a person who is in the Engineering building in addition to Senator Molitor during all the days including those winter break days that you’ve just mentioned <laughter>. When I walk through the building generally I usually run into staff members. Most of them are not around because they are working from home on their computers and they’re doing their research. Really from my observation they seem to have work that can be accomplished in two working hours, but they sit there and mostly keep looking at the clock waiting for it to become 5 o’clock. So the two extremes are to have them there all the four days is in my opinion one extreme, and then not to have them at all is maybe the other type of change that you’re thinking about. What I wonder, is there a way to be nice to staff and say, in good will, reply to their emails one time a day so none of the student emails that need to be channeled to professors or---

Senator Dowd: With respect, I believe we cannot do that. If they are off, then they are off, and we cannot require a response to an email message.

Senator Krantz: I think that’s if they are affiliated with the Collective Bargaining Unit or agreement.

Senator Devabhaktuni: What I am saying is they are not off, it’s only when you say they are off, right? What I am saying is, you don’t say they are “off.” What I am saying is, you can always be nice and say they don’t have to physically show up in the office and they can work on Virginia Beach---

Matt Schroeder (UT Chief of Staff): I see you are also mixing classifications because an unclassified employee in my mind is a salaried employee working till the job is done where an hourly employee means, you come in and you work till a period of time and if you work beyond “x” number of hours, then you’re required to be paid overtime, and so I think where you are going in your argument and discussion

really gets into the CWA-type employees, and they are protected by the Collective Bargaining Agreement. I think a lot of folks would argue that, in that four-day period are they essential or are they not essential? If they are not essential, then the work can wait till January 2nd or whatever the date is.

Dr. Susan Batten (College of Nursing): Or we can just have all the phone calls go to Senator Molitor's office <laughter>. I am being facetious.

Matt Schroeder (UT Chief of Staff): Thank you so much. I am sorry if I took more time than I was supposed to.

President Keith: No, we were running late. Thank you, Matt and Susan. Are there any items from the floor? Hearing none, I would accept a motion to adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 6:09 p.m.

IV. Meeting adjourned at 6:09 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted by:

Lucy Duhon

Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape Summary: Quinetta Hubbard

Faculty Senate Administrative Secretary