

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of January 14, 2014
FACULTY SENATE

<http://www.utoledo.edu/facsenate> Approved @ FS meeting on 2/11/2014

Summary of Senate Business

Senator Mary Humphrys and Senator Scott Molitor

Senator Paul Hewitt

Emily Kramp

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

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

I. Roll Call: 2013-2014 Senators:

Present: Present: Bailey, Black, Cappelletty, Caruso, Chiarelott, Cochrane, Denyer, Dowd, Duggan, Duhon, Edinger, Ellis, Elmer, Federman, Gilbert, Giovannucci, Gohara, Gunning, Hamer, Hewitt, Humphrys, Keith, Kennedy, Kistner, Kranz, LeBlanc, Lundquist, Molitor, Monsos, Moynihan, Nigem, Ohlinger, Plenefisch, Porter, Quinlan, Regimbal, Relue, Rouillard, Sheldon, Skeel, Templin, Thompson, Thompson-Casado Van Hoy, Weck-Schwarz, Wedding, White, White, Williams

Excused absences: Anderson, Brickman, Cooper, Crist, Farrell, Hoblet, Moore, Moynihan, Springman, Srinivasan, Regimbal, Teclehaimanot

Unexcused absences: Frantz, Hasaan-Elnaby, Randolph

III. Approval of Minutes: Minutes from November 5th and November 19th Faculty Senate meeting are ready for approval.

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

President Rouillard: May I ask for an approval for the Minutes of November 5th and November 19th? Quinetta circulated those to you earlier for your review. Is there a motion to approve the Minutes from the Faculty Senate meeting held on November 5th? Any discussion and/or corrections? Any opposed? **Motion Passed.**

The Executive Committee report: I'd like to begin by summarizing info from the last round of BOT meetings on Dec. 16 and 17. Mr. Morlock's presentation to the Finance and Audit Committee stressed that "We are not rich, but we are not broke, either." The FY15 project financial improvement target is \$18 million (to cover an 8million projected shortfall and \$10 million in depreciation). The Clinical Enterprise is projected to have a 4.5% operating margin. There is an assumption of a 2% u/g enrollment decrease.

The BOT Clinical Affairs committee had a discussion about the Family Practice Residency Program closed at UTMC and established at St. Lukes. CMS (Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services) was recently at St. Luke's and determined that because this program was essentially one that moved from UTMC to St. Luke's, it was not a new program and not eligible for federal money. This residency program will likely be moved back to UTMC.

My report to the Academic and Student Affairs committee will be attached to the minutes of this FS meeting.

FSEC met with the Provost on Dec. 19. and among other things discussed the College Credit Plus program. In response to the question about the insistence on the DL format for this program, Provost Scarborough explained that the TPS union contract doesn't allow our faculty to teach in synchronous video courses broadcast on the high school campus. In response to a question about the projected level and quantity of students, he stressed that the high school will decide which students are prepared to take these DL college courses; and that one of the main goals of this program is to establish a relationship with these high schools.

On Thurs. Jan. 9, FSEC met with Vice Provosts Traband and Barrett to discuss course pass rates and gen ed. The preparedness of DHS appears to be increasing, the rate of Ds, Fs, Ws appears to be slowly decreasing in the DHS group. But overall, there remains some concern about the course failure rate.

The Jan. 8 issue of the Toledo Blade reported that UT had signed last fall a letter of intent with a Chinese university of Huaqiao to possibly establish a branch campus here at UT. There is also a letter of intent that Mr. Lehnert signed with the Shenzhen Branch of Northwest Polytechnic University to "work together to establish a U.S.A.-based aviation and pilot training program in Toledo." Two letters of intent to OBOR regarding a BS in Aviation Flight Science and a BS in Aviation Science and Administration suggest proposals will follow on June 30, 2014 for programs to begin in Fall 2014. [*These letters are attached to the minutes.*]

I admit to a certain amount of concern. I have heard from colleagues that BGSU's aviation program has been losing money and has been outsourced to a third-party.

Therefore, I have invited President Jacobs and Provost Scarborough to meet with FSEC to outline these projects with FSEC prior to presenting these to FS.

Finally, enrollments. It is still early in the semester to have final figures. FSEC was told last Thurs. that we were then down 3.7%, most likely due to the weather emergency. We've also heard another estimate that we are only down 1%. We will give you more accurate figures at the Jan. 28 meeting.

That ends the Executive Committee report. Are there any questions or comments? Okay. Let's move to Senator Humphrys' who has a very brief report on OBOR and the Ohio Faculty Council.

That ends the Executive Committee report. Are there any questions or comments? Okay. Let's move to Senator Humphrys who has a very brief report on OBOR and the Ohio Faculty Council.

Senator Humphrys: Thank you, President Rouillard. This is a summary of the December meeting of the Ohio Faculty Council. Our guest at that meeting was Gordon Gee, who was appointed by the Governor to

head the Commission on Quality and Value in Higher Education. Dr. Gee is conducting a listening tour the results of which will be included in a report his commission will release in the summer of 2014. The goal of the Commission is to create a 21st Century vision of quality and value in Ohio's Higher Education institutions. Just kind of a brief summary of the points that he brought up: he suggested that Ohio's public universities need to explore new avenues of income. He gave as an example that OSU handed over management of its parking operations to an outside vendor, which resulted in an up-front payment of \$483 million. Part of that money will be used to hire 500 new tenured or tenure-track faculty over the next 10 years. Dr. Gee also mentioned that higher education is currently the "darling" of the Ohio budget process because of the cooperation it has shown during the budgeting process. We, as a committee, realized that Dr. Gee obviously has the ear of the governor—and vice versa, the Ohio Faculty Council members felt that the following comments by Dr. Gee were of note:

- Faculty members are the best initiators of change.
- Boards of Trustees try to run universities as businesses, which is a problem.
- Bureaucracy is the biggest hurdle for universities.
- Talent and culture are the two most important things within universities.

Dr. Gee said that historically the case for supporting tenure was to protect academic freedom. He noted that every court case he is aware of has favored academic freedom—an obvious suggestion that tenure is no longer necessary.

In other business, the OFC discussed the Ohio legislation that has passed to allow a student to have voting rights on public universities' Boards of Trustees. It is up to each BOT whether or not to allow this type of student participation. Are there any questions?

President Rouillard: How many faculty is OSU hiring with this parking revenue?

Senator Humphrys: They are hiring 500 new faculty which include tenured and tenure-track faculty over the next ten years.

President Rouillard: Thank you.

Senator Humphrys: I believe they said they are using \$100M of that money that they gotten to do so.

Senator Edinger: Just out of curiosity, does that money come out of student fees or parking fines, so it is just taxed in another way, right?

Senator Humphrys: Well, yes. However, I looked a little further into it after the meeting to see because obviously it is a sizable amount of money that they were getting up-front; it is a 50-year contract that they signed with this company. So from what I could read and found out by doing a little research, obviously the company foresees it being able to make a sizable amount of money over the next 50 years. I'm sure as far as where the money comes from, it has to come from students as you were saying. But they provided OSU that amount, \$483M up-front for that 50-year contract.

President Rouillard: Thank you, Senator Humphrys. Next, we have an update from the Core Curriculum Committee.

Senator Molitor: First of all, I want to let you know that the Core Curriculum Committee got together with the Provost and Alana Malik who is here today. We have come up with a pilot scheme for assessment of general education courses offered this Spring. I am going to send out a letter to the chair of any department that is offering a gen ed. course this Spring and we are asking them to document their assessment process. The instructors and the department will get together for each general education course they offer and provide a list of student learning outcomes that they will assess, and the performance observations they use to assess those learning outcomes in that given course. We are not asking for a report from each section of the course, we are asking for one report for an entire general education course. We will rely on the department to get together and synthesize that information so by the end of the semester we will get a report back that says what were the learning outcomes that were being assessed and what were the source of these learning outcomes. Gen ed learning outcomes can be from the core competencies approved by the Faculty Senate Spring 2011. However, these learning outcomes can also come from OTM and TAG requirements, degree program requirements or other sources of student learning outcomes. Finally, the report should specify the measures used to assess those outcomes and a summary of those results. We will collate this information and we will use the results to finalize a process for assessment. These results will also be used to provide feedback to the departments offering those general education courses about their assessment process and suggestions for improving student performance in those courses, which is the whole point of this exercise.

So that is the good news. The bad news comes from the ongoing saga of what constitutes our general education curriculum. I was invited by President Rouillard to meet with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee this past week and we met with Vice Provosts Traband and Barrett. They have received a letter from somebody from the Ohio Board of Regents that said the Ohio Board of Regents interpretation of the relationship between general education and the OTM is that every course within a 36 hr. general education curriculum had to be an OTM course. We've been going back and forth on this issue. The most recent proposal that we forwarded suggested that was not necessarily the case that as long as all of our OTM courses were part of our general education curriculum, they did not have to comprise the entirety of the general education curriculum. We believe the provost did receive this letter of correspondence from the Ohio Board of Regents, but there may be some confusion from within the Ohio Board of Regents. If in fact it is true that all of our gen ed. needs to be OTM, or at least the first 36 hours of our gen ed. need to be OTM, this will be a big problem and many degree programs will have to increase the number of credit hours in order to satisfy their degree program requirements as well as this OTM/general education requirement. And so that presumably is the direction that the state of Ohio does not want us going in and we are going to pursue this further.

Past-President Dowd: Has the Provost's Office provided you with a copy of the letter from OBOR?

Senator Molitor: I have not seen it yet.

Past-President Dowd: I ask this because Senate has received similar reports in the past and I would recommend caution before pursuing this line without verification.

Senator Molitor: I would agree. In fact, when this issue first came up last Spring I did a survey of general education curricula throughout the state of Ohio and it would appear that just about every university in the state of Ohio would be violating this requirement, which also suggests that that may not be the case. Furthermore, Senator Humphrys' conversations with her colleagues on the Ohio Faculty Council also suggest that is not the case as well. So, we submitted a gen ed. proposal that we were hoping to get further comments on and then approve it at the next Senate meeting. We are not going to put it up for vote at a Faculty Senate meeting until we have definitively answered this question.

Senator Hewitt: For the spring courses, when you talk about all general education core courses, what list are you referring to?

Senator Molitor: That is a great question. We have assembled a list of courses that are currently coded on the system as a general education course. This list of courses extends back to our previous version of the general education before we approved competency based courses in Spring 2012. We have also included ten additional classes that we approved in Spring 2012 that were not originally coded on the system. So we basically made as inclusive of a list as possible.

Senator Hewitt: Will departments be required to assess all such courses?

Senator Molitor: Yes.

Senator Hewitt: I see. I wonder is there time enough for me to resign <laughter>.

Senator Molitor: I should point out, we have made the assessment process as simple as possible.

Senator Hewitt: Do you know how many classes on that list and how many students?

Senator Molitor: You have about eight or ten classes on that list.

Senator Hewitt: I think there's slightly more than that.

Senator Molitor: Okay. We're leaving it to you to decide how you want to assess this. We don't want you to assess every student in every section. The form asks what are your learning outcomes, and what measures are you going to use to assess these outcomes? What are the results of this assessment and what actions, if any, need to be taken? We are trying to make it as simple as possible because as much as you don't want to have to individually assess 3,000 or more students, we don't want to see all of this data. We really want a kind of a snap shot summary of what you guys do. So once you get this letter, hopefully it would put your mind somewhat at ease. If there are any questions from you or any other chairs please have them contact me and I will be more than happy to assist them with this process. Are there any more questions? Thank you.

President Rouillard: Thank you. Now we will have an update from the Constitution and Rules Committee, Senator Hewitt.

Senator Hewitt: Good afternoon. The Constitution and Rules Committee was charged by President Rouillard to take a look at the issue of apportionment, in light of the constitution. The language of the constitution is fairly clear and if implemented strictly would lead to some...results -- in particular there is at least one college, Honors College, with very few faculty.

Senator Sheldon: There are three tenured/tenure-track and two lecturers.

Senator Hewitt: So there are five faculty members. The minimum requirement of two per college seems excessive. The solution in 2010 was supposed to be temporary in regard to the Library and Honors faculty as a single constituent unit and we were asked to revisit that. There was an expectation at the time that a permanent solution would be found, but there has not been one. So the Constitution and Rules Committee was supposed to come up with something by the end of this academic year so we can get something more permanent. I think that part of the problem is that when the language in the original constitution was drafted, we had a fairly clear sense of what it means to be a college. There are various units that are called colleges, in particular for graduate students The College of Graduate Studies but there are faculty there, but that is not their tenure home and that is not where their undergraduate programs are housed. Since then, there seems to be a lot of vacuum-energy in the upper administration, some are from virtual colleges popping in-and-out of existence; some have faculty and some don't; some have one or two and some don't. In my reading of the constitution essentially there's no flexibility. It is a very rigid document that doesn't allow the flexibility to interpret rules when situations have changed. So, the best solution I think was the one in 2010. However, there's been little work in the meantime to come up with a permanent solution but that effort was not completed. In particular it was not possible to complete a revision of that in time for the elections for this year if we start working on that basically now, is that correct?

President Rouillard: Yes.

Senator Hewitt: In the middle of December and we don't have a timeframe to come up with a permanent solution. So the Constitution and Rules Committee is proposing for this one last year we run the elections with the same clause as in 2010. The Library and Honors College will continue to be recognized as a single constituent unit for the Senate elections of spring 2014 and we pursue a permanent solution to present to Faculty Senate this academic year.

Senator Sheldon: My problem with that is that the last academic year, Honors and the Library had representatives serving on Faculty Senate standing committees. This year Honors was not given a slot on any Faculty Senate standing committee. That is not exactly a complaint because last year I sat on all of them for Honors, but it seems to be that there is a breakdown of communication perhaps between the Library and the Honors College where there was never a great cooperation and we never sat down together. So to ask us to continue to cooperate when we are two very different bodies who are not cooperating or not trying to cooperate and we can change that is problematic to me. I mean, this is my last term as a representative from COIL which was the original agreement. Considering that the Library sits on absolutely every single Faculty Senate standing committee and not one single Honors faculty does, kind of tells me that Honors won't even be represented on this body next year.

Past-President Dowd: I am chair of the Senate's Committee on Committees. If no Honors faculty members were appointed to Senate committees this year then that was truly an oversight. I apologize to you and the other Honors faculty for that oversight. I want to recognize and thank you for the tremendous service you have provided for many years, routinely serving on five or six standing committees each year.

Senator Sheldon: There was more than five or six, you know that <laughter>.

Past-President Dowd: I don't doubt Senator Sheldon – knowing that it could have been seven, eight, or nine committees. I very much appreciate your service. However, there is an issue that Senator Hewitt is raising that provides Senate with a significant opportunity. The long-term solution Senator Hewitt is talking about would provide Faculty Senate the opportunity to define what a “college” is for the purpose of determining representatives to Faculty Senate. For example, Faculty Senate could deem the Library to be a “college,” with appropriate representation on Faculty Senate. So there are a number of opportunities that we can consider while working towards the long-term solution that Senator Hewitt is discussing. At the same time we can, perhaps, address the issue of Honors representation on standing committees. An issue to note is that Senate's Committee on Committees is constitutionally bound to appoint individuals from the Library to, I believe, five of the eight standing committees; this is one aspect of apportionment that you are raising today. I hope we can address that issue as we work towards a long-term solution.

Senator Duhon: But regardless, in the constitution, Article III under Membership and Organization states that—each the colleges and the Library, regardless whether the Library is defined as a college or not, shall have two representatives.

Past-President Dowd: You are absolutely right. What we should do is deem the Library a “college” with respect to Faculty Senate. This would not only clarify the issue of representatives to Senate, but also clarify the appointments to standing Senate committees for both the Library and the Honors College.

Senator Hewitt: In terms of long-term solutions I guess I am very much interested in your input especially if you are aware of some of the history with this issue. There are various things that you can do; you can tweak the parameters and you can add flexibility to the constitution. There are lots of things that you can think about to address the long-term situation. But I do think that one of the things that we ought to seriously consider is to take control again of the definition of what a college is for the purposes of constituent representation and that is something that I think is lacking from such a document. Again, the document is a curious mix in a certain sense. This document is not simply the rules governing this body nor is it the rules governing the sole operations of a given population. It is kind of funny the way it is laid out. At the moment I don't see any other better long-term solution, but that is not to say that this proposal is a good short-term solution. I agree with you, it is not, it is far from being a good solution. It is the least worst that had come up. I take very seriously the charge to come up with a permanent solution so this is the very last year we do this.

Prof. Caruso: I just wanted to be sure that everyone is aware that what we were attempting to do this year was to somehow have the Library have two reps and Honors have one. I tried everything I could think of and Senator Hewitt kept shooting it down because the constitution just won't allow us to do that even though I tried my hardest to do that. So as much as I don't like it either, I don't see any other solution at this point without keeping it at the one point the way it is.

Senator Hewitt: We can try to amend the constitution to do that; to shorten the amendment I don't see how we can do a solution like that. But it seems to me that for something that has as many consequences essentially as even that relatively small tweak, it's something that we should consider over more time than we have really, to get the elections going this year. And I do believe that it is...that the sense of the

constitution for the Senate to ask the Constitution and Rules Committee in particular for the definition of various terms. This is essentially the interpretation of the term, "college."

Senator Denis White: I have an order issue. Has the Constitution and Rules Committee met?

Senator Hewitt: No. The Constitution and Rules Committee has not met.

Senator Denis White: So this isn't a proposal from the committee then?

Senator Hewitt: It is; we met from cyberspace. I've asked the Constitution and Rules Committee and I sent around this proposal and all but two responded -- all in support of this proposal.

Senator Denis White: Is that right? I am on that committee and I don't recall that email.

Senator Hewitt: You are on the committee?

Senator Denis White: Yes.

Senator Hewitt: I sent it to the list that I was given of the members of the committee.

President Rouillard: I will verify and if we made an oversight then we apologize in advance.

Senator Hewitt: Do you want to table this until the committee reconsiders it?

Group of Senators: No.

Senator Hewitt: Not everyone on the list that I have responded; those that I have on my list -- all but two responded.

Senator Kennedy: The committee was polled by email and many of us responded.

Senator Hewitt: Two people did not respond, Senator Wedding and Senator Taylor, and everyone else did. But you, Senator White, were not on the list I was given so I will correct that list.

Senator Sheldon: Again, and this is not a criticism to you, but this kind of goes to the heart of what we heard a lot from administration over the years in terms of they are moving fast and we are not. To have such a document that can't move as swiftly as the administration is detrimental. To have a college whether or not it assigns a baccalaureate, which Honors obviously does not, have faculty -- and in the fall will have three faculty -- theoretically with absolutely potentially no representation is I think a very dangerous precedent.

Senator Hewitt: I agree with that and again I think the document should be closer to the operating rules for a legislative body than it is now. In particular there ought to be a mechanism that handles such issues

and that would be my way of writing this constitution so we can handle such things without these kinds of traumatic consequences. But this is the document as we have it.

Past-President Dowd: There is every reason for next year's Faculty Senate's Committee on Committees to appoint an individual from Honors to every standing committee, and that a representative from Honors can certainly attend Senate meetings. But honestly, the only alternative option we have at this time is to ask a college with multiple representatives to give up one of their seats on Senate so Honors can have one. We are literally at that point in this discussion.

Senator Sheldon: And the Library has done that previously. Is there any other college willing to come forward?

Past-President Dowd: That is the question. Is there a college that has several seats on Senate and would be willing to willing to give up one seat this year so our colleagues in Honors can have a representative in Senate?

Senator Sheldon: Well, does that really follow the constitution and rules?

Past-President Dowd: Perhaps it is not inconsistent with the constitution. In the past there have been some colleges who selected an individual from a different college to be their representative on a Senate standing committee. That has happened at the committee level, but I do not recall it happening at the Senate level. Correct me if your interpretation is different. If my college wanted to appoint a faculty member from Honors I do not see why Senate would object. But that decision would be left to a college to decide. I believe it would be inappropriate for the Senate Executive Committee to turn to a college and ask it to give-up a seat in Senate for a year.

Senator Hewitt: Essentially we can consider that. I mean, I haven't thought of that, but the one thing we can do is lump together Honors with a different larger college and hope that there's better cooperation between those two colleges. I didn't sense that there would be much interest in that.

Past-President Dowd: I was just speaking to the inflexibility in the constitution that Senator Hewitt is talking about.

Senator Hewitt: In fact, I went to the point of asking what the natural tenure home would be for the faculty in Honors if they were not in the Honors College; where might they then naturally pair-up -- with what college? Again, apart from that I don't see a constitutional solution.

Senator Molitor: I agree with you.

Senator Hewitt: It is not constitutional to accept some interpretation like that.

Senator Unknown: What would be an answer to that question?

Senator Hewitt: What question?

Senator Unknown: What college would you folks be in, the three of you?

Senator Hewitt: There is not one single college.

Senator Sheldon: I don't know for certain

President Rouillard: Is there anything else? So Senator Hewitt, would you like to present a resolution?

Senator Hewitt: Yes. The Constitution and Rules Committee recommends that the Senate affirm for the Senate elections of spring 2014 the decision from 2010 *mutatis mutandis* regarding the apportionment of Senators to academic Colleges. Specifically we recommend that: The Library and Honors College will continue to be recognized as a single constituent unit for the Senate elections of Spring 2014.

Senator Molitor: Do you want to table it in terms of if some other college comes forward to agree with having Honors as one of their seats?

Senator Unknown: I think there needs to be a discussion at the college level before anybody can answer that question.

Senator Chiarelott: We've been doing informal caucus and nonverbal caucus in Education and so let me propose that we will talk with the Dean about the possibility of partnering with the Honors College for governance purposes to come up with a model or a plan that stays within the rules of an existing constitution to allow representation with us.

Senator Sheldon: I really appreciate that and I agree. We are really only asking for one seat. We are a small college and we are not a "bad" college to be associated with right now.

President Rouillard: So that is a motion: to table the resolution until we have an answer from the College of Education. Is there a second to that motion?

Senator Unknown: Second.

President Rouillard: All those in favor of tabling this resolution please signify by saying, "aye." Any opposed? *The resolution is tabled.* Thank you, Senator Hewitt to you and your committee for all your hard work on this.

Alright, we have another piece of housekeeping. We have lost one of our Senators on the Executive Committee to Thailand, Senator Mary Ellen Edwards is teaching there this semester. We miss her truly, but in the meantime we do need to nominate a substitute for her on the Executive Committee. Are there any nominations from the floor?

Senator Relue: I would like to nominate Senator Keith.

President Rouillard: Senator Keith, are you willing to serve?

Senator Keith: Yes.

President Rouillard: Are there any other nominations?

Past-President Dowd: I move to close the nominations.

Senator Molitor: Second.

President Rouillard: All those in favor for closing the nominations? Okay, well, I think Senator Keith, it is a “done-deal” <laughter>. Thank you very much; we appreciate your willingness to serve.

President Rouillard: Alright, then that brings us to the issue that was alluded to in Senator Humphrys’ report and that is student trustees on the university board and their eligibility to vote and Ms. Emily Kramp is going to discuss that.

Emily Kramp: Hello everybody. I just want to kind of give a little background about the student trustee voting rights. I don’t know how many of you have heard about it. It did pass in early December so I guess it is more informative than to try to persuade your opinion at this point. So, what it was is essentially allowing our Board of Trustees their right to choose if they would like to allow our student trustees the right to vote. I am going to kind of give you some background on the arguments. The pros were that it is a stronger voice for our students on campus. We are actually a minority state that did not allow our student trustees the right to vote. It also guarantees that student trustees have the right to attend all committee and executive sessions which our student trustees already did that beforehand but this guarantee that right. Some of the con arguments like why wouldn’t you want it to pass was the whole political thing because a trustees’ appointment is only two years long which I guess the same governor can appoint two student trustees and we have two votes, but it is kind of in a minority voting. The biggest con argument was the legality of it because there was a worry that the students had too much conflict of interest on the Board since most of the decisions directly impact us in a way. They can actually get into legal trouble if they do have a stake in what they are voting on. Student Government took the stance that we wanted our student trustees to have the right to vote and we actually passed a resolution in our Senate last year supporting it. Our perspective on the con argument is that when it came to the legality aspect our hope would be that if students are going to take on this high-profile position, they should recognize the responsibility that it has and also educate themselves on when they should be recused from voting or not, and if they are not comfortable they can ask the Board to not give them the right to vote. So we were in favor of the House Bill. We actually signed a letter with a bunch of student governments at our Ohio Student Government Association last semester and right now we are writing a letter of thanks to our legislators and we’re also going to write a letter to our Board encouraging them to allow our students the right to vote. Also it was discussed at the Ohio Student Government Association, that once this House Bill passes that we will start working on as Ohio Student Government to get our students the right to vote on the Ohio Board of Regents. I do have two additional things that might interest Faculty Senate. I do have the results of the employee survey for the smoking ban. We had about 1500 respondents from employees, 987 (which is about 65%) voted in favor of the smoking-ban, 457 (which is about 30%) voted “no,” and 65 (which is about 4.5%) voted “not sure.” So that was actually pretty “in line” with the student response too. I actually have a presentation this upcoming Friday to the University Council where I am going to propose that U-Council passes a proposition in support of a smoking ban on Main Campus. Finally, this is a piece of legislation that was passed at our meeting right before finals week which is why you may not have heard about it yet because I was a little bit focused on other areas at the time. But a piece of legislation was passed requesting that all lectures over 100 students would be filmed and recorded for students to have access to their lectures. I was hoping that you all would be in favor of supporting us while we pursue this. It is meant to be a way to aid our students to succeed academically. It is a great study tool for students who do have it. Our hope is to help students achieve academically.

Past-President Dowd: I understand the potential benefits to students from filming lectures; however there is an ongoing issue of who will own the property rights to those lectures. Will they be owned by the university or by the faculty member? And if you can convince the administration that the lectures will be owned by the faculty I think that would go a very long way in convincing faculty members to participate in such a program.

Senator Edinger: In terms of the voting rights for the student trustees, what's the relationship between the student trustees and student government?

Emily Kramp: Student Trustees actually have to go through an appointment process of Senate before they can go up and be interviewed by the governor. Last year we actually had six students come up before us and they submitted an application and everything, and Senate voted to send them on or not. After that point they do have a slot in our meetings where they can come and give us an update. Most of the time they come about once per semester to update us about what they are working on. The president and the vice president of Student Government normally have a pretty good relationship with the trustees and we communicate a lot with our trustees in that aspect.

Prof. Pollauf: I was wondering in the context of your 100-plus student classes if you look at "5" sections of the same class, does each one have to be taken or is there just one representative?

Emily Kramp: I will be honest with you, we weren't focusing on implementation at this point. It is more of this is what the students wanted and go from there; like the smoking ban, focusing on getting it done.

Prof. Pollauf: It is a resource issue, who is going to do the taping, how's it going to be done, who is going to pay for it, and where's it going to be stored?

Emily Kramp: I can tell you that we talked about it in Senate and the wording of our legislation stated the university-maintained archive. That was the wording of it, so as far as implementation outside of that is something that we would have to tackle once I start presenting this, but I want to get your support before I start pushing it on.

Senator Hamer: What was the rationale to tape these courses?

Emily Kramp: The reason we didn't just put "taped" was for ADA compliance so that was a big thing we looked into. The reason behind wanting to record a lecture of that size is because 100 seemed much more reasonable to ask for right off the bat.

Senator Hamer: One thing that might be considered would be working on note-taking skills because I think sometimes that doesn't happen and as a skeptical professor I think that it might be a good way of not having to go to class which I would not be in support of.

Emily Kramp: I understand. The thing is most of us are all adults in college and we are paying tuition and I would say as a student if I don't want to go to class I should be able to use my resources and not go to class, but do I think that is a good way to go on as a student? No, obviously. I don't think that we should not have a beneficial thing for our students just because some students might abuse it. That is kind of the other thing that we talked about in our Senate when it came to that aspect.

Senator Kennedy: I think there are some other issues that you might want to consider. As a lawyer I'm skeptical that you can compel anybody to make a copyrighted work, so you will need an opt-out provision.

Emily Kramp: Again, that's an implementation thing.

Senator Kennedy: A major one though.

Senator Hewitt: We have been using...in our business calculus. I think it's been relatively successful. I don't know whether it led to decline in attendance, I don't think so because large lectures are often unpopular anyway. I think it has been valuable to students. One is a technical implementation issue and the one thing that would definitely affect faculty willingness to do this has to do with ADA compliance. We still do not have a satisfactory support from the university administration regarding closed captioning of the video and other compliance issues with ADA. At the moment the only solution we have is either, if a student requires captioning and the individual faculty member is not willing to put in the tens of hours per week to do it themselves, then we have to simply pull the video and not make it available, that is what ADA requires. So far we've had various discussions, the people in the Provost's Office and administration that has been the best we've gotten so far. Make sure you get the money up front.

Senator Edinger: There's a difference between pure lecturing and I know 100 students is what you think of in regard of pure lecturing. But also there are classes that are large when there's a lot of interactive discussions among the students and the faculty and those are hard to capture online and for some of us we believe that may be one of more the important elements of the classes, that exchange, and you would end up with the faculty member running up and down the crowd to get the student's response or holding the microphone up in the crowd. That is a limitation depending of the style of presentation, if we were to put it online.

Emily Kramp: I guess I'll just throw in a personal reason why this is important to me- I consider myself a good student. I go to class and I do take really good notes and it is really easy to miss things. That is what I think this is trying to get at is that even when you are a really diligent student, sitting at a lecture for 60 minutes is kind of hard to make sure you are getting everything in one point in time. So our ultimate goal is to try to get students help here at UT.

Past-President Dowd: This may be a good idea but only for the faculty who want to participate in this program, especially if the resources Senator Hewitt mentioned were provided. This project could work and I encourage you to pursue this issue. However, I believe the legal issues need to be worked out before this proposal can be adopted by a majority of faculty members.

Emily Kramp: I can come and present more at a later Faculty Senate meeting after I put a little more work in it.

President Rouillard: We can certainly do that, we can invite you back. Thank you. That brings us to items from the floor. I think I saw the Provost here.

Group of Senators: He just stepped out.

President Rouillard: I was going to ask if he wanted to entertain any questions. In the meantime, are there any items from the floor?

Senator Molitor: Is there any update on the search for the dean for the College of Medicine?

President Rouillard: I haven't heard anything. We have some faculty members here from the College of Medicine, is there anybody who can update us.

Senator Unknown: The committee has been formed and that's all I know.

President Rouillard: Are there any other items from the floor?

Past-President Dowd: Is there anyone from chemistry here today? I heard that there is going to be a dedication to an emeritus, Dr. Lance Thompson. He's been a long-serving faculty member and he retired 25 years ago and he's still been active at the university. I will try to get the information to you, but there's going to be a dedication in a seminar room in the Student Union. I don't know when he started at the University of Toledo, but if I had to guess, the early 1950's.

President Rouillard: Anything else from the floor?

Senator Lee: This is just public health awareness, as people come out of hibernation, support people not coming to work ill and support your students.

Senator Krantz: A follow-up question to that, there was a campaign to get students vaccinated in the fall, are flu shots available anywhere on Main Campus?

Senator Lee: There was a campaign in the fall for students. I will refer them now to student health services

President Rouillard: If there's nothing else then what I would like to do is take this opportunity to forward your thanks to Quinetta for her belated Christmas gift and to thank her for all her dedication to the Faculty Senate.

[Applause]

President Rouillard: Are there any questions? May I call this meeting to adjourn? Meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

IV. Meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted by:
Lucy Duhon
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape Summary: Quinetta Hubbard
Faculty Senate Administrative Secretary

