

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of November 5, 2013
FACULTY SENATE

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

Approved @FS meeting on 1/14/2014

Summary of Senate Business

Dr. Cameron Cruickshank, VP of Enrollment and Distance Learning

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 sixth Faculty Senate meeting of academic year 2013-2014. **Lucy Duhon**, Executive Secretary, called the roll.

I. Roll Call: 2013-2014 Senators:

Present: Bailey, Barnes, Cochrane, Cooper, Denyer, Dowd, Duhon, Edinger, Edwards, Elmer, Federman, Frantz, Gohara, Gunning, Hamer, Hasaan-Elnaby, Hoblet, Humphrys, Keith, Kennedy, Kistner, Kranz, LeBlanc, Lee, Lingan, Lundquist, Molitor, Monsos, Moore, Moynihan, Nigem, Ohlinger, Plenefisch, Porter, Quinlan, Quinn, Randolph, Regimbal, Relue, Rouillard, Springman, Teclehaimanot, Thompson-Casado, Van Hoy, Weck-Schwarz, Wedding, White, White, Williams

Excused absences: Allen, Brickman, Cappelletty, Crist, Duggan, Ellis, Farrell, Hewitt, Sheldon, Srinivasan, Templin, Thompson, Marchionni

Unexcused absences: Gilbert, Giovannucci, Skeel, Willey

II. Roll Call: 2013-2014 Senators:

III. Approval of Minutes: Minutes from September 10th and September 24th Faculty Senate meetings are ready for approval.

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

The Minutes from the September 10th and September 24th Faculty Senate meetings have been distributed; do I have a motion to approve the Minutes? Is there any discussion or corrections of the Minutes? All those in favor say "aye." Any opposed? Let the record show the Minutes from the September 10th and September 24th meetings have been approved. Thank you.

President Rouillard: On Oct. 24, Senators Mary Humphrys, Steve Peseckis and I, along with Dr. Lawrence Anderson-Huang met with VP Peg Traband and Marcia King Blandford. Here are some items from that discussion:

---The college credit plus program will include on-line, blended and face-to-face classes which will have to coordinate with high school class times. The first group of courses to be offered in this initiative will be UT courses that are part of the OTM.

---Since programs with more than 50% modifications must go through the state approval process, perhaps UT could use the state form internally to collect the needed information at the beginning of our own in-house process. Perhaps this could be used as an attachment in the curriculum tracking system.

---It was mentioned that some courses in professional programs seem to go directly to the Chancellor for approval and not to FS. Who has the authority to enter the courses into Banner for HSC.

---ways to avoid the end of the year rush in new courses and modifications submitted to FS and to facilitate open enrollment for students. Institute a final date of mid-Feb. for course submissions.

---curriculum tracking system's historical archive function in contrast with Banner which is merely a course inventory.

---items that should be included in syllabus, such as SLO with verbs from Bloom's taxonomy

---request that we develop a philosophy of gen ed and an overarching statement of gen ed. I've requested the Core Curr. Committee work on a definition that clarifies the role of gen ed in our programs of study.

On Oct. 28, FSEC met with Dr. Cam Cruickshank and Dr. Barbara Copp Miller, new director of Learning Ventures. Dr. Cruickshank spoke on design principles for the support and administration of online degree programs in preparation for his presentation here today.

On Oct. 31, FSEC met with Provost Scarborough and Chancellor Gold.

Chancellor Gold informed us that a consultant is scheduled to meet with the different constituents in the college of Nursing in January.

Provost Scarborough discussed the new main campus initiatives directed by Bill McCreary, that is, the development of educational simulation games in potential partnership with such entities as MS, IBM or OI; and the lab school for which he is writing grants. Ottawa Hills will likely be a part of this program.

Additionally we discussed the issue of chairs being left out the process of determining which courses are developed as flipped classrooms, or as DL courses, causing scheduling and staffing problems; the potential for DL course initiatives to compete with face-to-face enrollment; how payment for development of DL course materials affects ownership of copyright.

Finally, I have asked the Core Curriculum committee to develop an overarching statement about gen ed (its definition and purpose in programs of study); the Constitution and Rules Committee to consider any changes to the constitution regarding representation in the light of our 3 news colleges; and members of

the Elections Committee, along with Quinetta Hubbard and Lisa Barteck to update the lists of faculty eligible to vote in next spring's elections.

Very quickly I will ask Senator Mary Humphrys to come up and give us an update on the curriculum tracking system before we move to Dr. Cruickshank's presentation.

Senator Humphrys: This is information that is actually “hot off-the-presses” because this meeting contests the curriculum tracking system which actually just ended right before this (Faculty Senate) meeting began. There was a lot of information that was put across and we tested and I would say that Dr. Steve Peseckis was also at the meeting and I think it went very well. Essentially, just to give you a quick update – we have a current online curriculum tracking system which can be found online, curriculumtracking.utoledo.edu and anyone has access to it by using their UTAD information. But essentially, the system that will be tested today is that someone initiates modification and new course proposals by the information that they put on that electronic tracking system as far as a contact person and also the college that it is coming from. It starts an automated generated email approval system, and that is where people have had problems with it in the past. We tested that today and they made improvements and it seem to go very well. So, what would happen is if you initiate it then your department chair will be notified by a particular email that this new course proposal or modification is waiting for approval. And then, changes can be made right on up through/within the college. So, for example, your department chair can make a change, your dean can make a change, and there's a college curriculum committee and with all of these changes you can view the updated version. Some of these things are related more to the actual curriculum committee as opposed to issues with the curriculum tracking system. What would happen is, it will go on through this automatically once the dean approves it and then it goes on to the next person which we would assume will be the college committee and so on. Finally, after all those things get approved and it goes on to the Faculty Senate with the modification of the new course proposals, it actually goes through the system and it's uploaded onto Banner, the initiator of the course modification is automatically sent an email to indicate that it is now officially on Banner and that would help with some of the issues that we had in the past where people never knew that their proposals had gotten through. There were several changes, President Rouillard had called a special sub-committee to put together a report and we went item by item through those issues and it will be some changes being made to the new system and they have already made some of these changes already. One of them is that you couldn't print out an actual readable copy; in other words, it was like a screenshot and if the name of the course surpasses the bottom space in the box then you only got what was in the box. They have now come up with an actual printed view that you can actual print where you can see everything you entered. They do have that and that is a big improvement, Steve and I were really happy with that. Also, we had suggested (Dr. Anderson-Huang was at the meeting also) that there be two additional boxes put on the electronic form. One would be a box where rationale for a change toward the new course would be given. That had been eliminated recently; the “reason for change” box had been encrypted in recent years. We suggested that they put that back in. So, you can say the reason we are changing the prerequisite is “x, y, z” or whatever. Also we requested that an additional box be added for notes that you can make as far as, for example, the undergraduate curriculum committee would want to change some minor things -- those boxes can be put in so they can make those comments, so someone can see what has been changed. So the electronic system we put through, we had a pretend course and different people had access in terms of approval and it worked very well, so I think we're hoping this new system will work better.

When will the new system be put into effect? Right now we can access that curriculum tracking by curriculumtracking.utoledo.edu, the current system which had some of these things that we didn't like, they are going to push forward with the new system and put it on January 2nd and so we are going to try to kind of test it and see what the kinks are and Dr. Peseckis has mentioned that he would like people who have any core changes/ modifications for new courses that he would like to have them done and through the system by mid-February. And so I think it would be very helpful for people who are thinking about modification to ask the first thing Spring semester and start the process so we can get a pretty good idea what actually works the way we are hoping it does. I would say in general the changes that were made were the changes that we had suggested and so that was very positive. Are there any questions?

Senator Teclehaimanot: The curriculum tracking system is significantly improved. However, there are some minor issues that need to be addressed: specifically, fields for a new course title proposal.

Senator Humphrys: They haven't put in the new updated changes yet, but if you wouldn't mind, email these things to President Rouillard and what we can do is we can take that back to them as they are making the changes.

Senator Relue: Who is going to notify people who are signing this? If there's a date, is that going to come from the Provost's Office?

Senator Humphrys: Yes. Actually, Peg Traband was at the meeting and so was Marcia King-Blandford and they have updated them. The new system should have updated and they assured us that they checked and they double-checked all those things. So, that is certainly an ongoing question to make sure that that's right.

Senator Relue: How far up the food-chain can you edit before you hit enter?

Senator Humphrys: You can only edit up through the college; once it leaves the college it can't be edited.

Senator Relue: Who in the college can do the editing? Is it the submitter?

Senator Humphrys: The submitter can edit. The thing is, once you submit, your editing capabilities are gone. So, once the initiator submits it and it goes to the department chair then the department chair can edit, but once they submit it, then the dean and I don't remember the exact order. And that is the checks and balance thing that we talked quite a bit about and that is something that we may want to investigate. Once you hit submit, your ability to make changes has ended.

Past-President Dowd: Suppose a person submits a new course proposal and it is subsequently edited by the department chair. Can we then have the system send an email to the original submitter notifying him or her that the proposal has been modified?

Senator Humphrys: That is not how it currently is.

Past-President Dowd: I understand. But perhaps such notification would improve the process. That said, I am not really worried about department chairs editing a proposal. However, I am concerned about two issues. First, I am concerned that college committees and college deans can edit a proposal without an automatic notification being sent to the individual who submitted the original proposal. Such

notification seems to be rather important before the proposal is actually forwarded to either The Faculty Senate or The Graduate Council. The second issue I and quite concerned about is why college deans are being given the authority to edit a proposal. There is no reason for that authority.

Senator Humphrys: That is a question that I think is a good question. And I think that is one of the things that the note box was put in there for the initiator even though they can't go in to edit they can go in and see what has been edited. Whereas without that notes box, unless you word-for-word had the original copy next to you and you're looking back and forth, you really wouldn't know what's been edited because it's not a different color or a different font. That part was a process issue that we probably should discuss further. As far as the electronic part, we can have control over it and how we want it to work, but this is how it is currently working.

Senator Krantz: Is the new system going to be a little more consistent as far as Macs and PCs?

Senator Humphrys: That is a really good question and I don't know the answer to that because somebody asked at the meeting today about whether or not it will work on an iPad and I got the impression that it wouldn't, so that is something we should check into.

Senator Teclhaimanot: It works fine on a Mac.

Senator Humphrys: Oh, it works fine on a Mac. Thank you.

President Rouillard: Thank you, Senator Humphrys and thank you, Dr. Peseckis and all the other people that have been working on this project over a long period of time. Thank you to the Provost's Office for also working on this issue with us. I would like to move now to Dr. Cruickshank's presentation, welcome.

Dr. Cruickshank: Thank you. So, originally I was scheduled to come to the Faculty Senate today to share some thoughts about design principles to support and administer online programs here at The University of Toledo. This is an eight-page document that I've been working on in partnership with deans, both on the Main Campus and the Health Science Campus, faculty, and the Provost's Office for some time now. Last week, Barb Kopp-Miller and I sat with the Executive Committee of Faculty Senate and went through all those proposed procedures and it went well, it was a nice meeting, but I was advised to talk about other things today. So instead of going through an eight-page document of processes, what I propose to do is summarize that document down to a handful of slides and talk about this proposed organizational structure. I was advised that it might be good to learn about what the current UT online degree programs are and hear a little bit more of what our enrollment trends have been over the last several years, so I will start with that. I know there are a lot of questions and maybe concerns or some misinformation about the College Credit Plus Program so I'd like to make sure we discuss that planned program and then at the end leave plenty of time for questions. I know there are a lot of questions, but if you can let me get through the content, about 30 slides, then I will stay here and answer as many questions as you have.

Let's start with a little bit of background about World Campus. You may recall that back in December of 2012 the strategic plan for the Main Campus was released and it included the creation of what was known as, UTXnet World Campus. Well, since then we shortened that name and we are calling it, World Campus now. And that is the sub-unit that coordinates and supports administration of online degree programs here at The University of Toledo. One can say that it is just a continued evolution of online

education here at UT. As you'll see in a moment, this is the proposed organizational structure for World Campus. You will see two facets- on the left-hand side, what is currently known as Learning Ventures and a series of departments and personnel that are already in existence to support and provide services to faculty and students to support online education. UT Online is also an existing moniker given to those individuals who support students with recruitment and student services. So with the next several slides I would like to summarize what these proposed departments would do, very high-level, and then talk about a couple highlights and new things that are going on within those departments.

The first one is Instructional Design and Development: This department would be responsible for working with faculty to help build high-quality, engaging, and well-designed online courses. The work roles of the individuals employed in this department would include folks like a director for instructional design and development, instructional designers, and multi-media developers. It's noteworthy that all of these personnel are already in place. These are people you know, work with, and have respect for, people like Peter, Phoebe, Claire, and Mingli and these are folks that have been helping faculty design courses for a very long time. What might be a little bit different and new is we implemented a course development team approach. In this course development team approach we are partnering subject matter experts, faculty who are experts in their area with multi-media developers, and instructional designers which is depicted in this sphere on the screen, the blue one, the smallest one in the middle. The subject matter expert, a fulltime faculty person, has assistance from an instructional designer and multi-media developer to help create these high-quality online courses. In that sphere outside in the yellow one you will see a bunch of other little teams or folks that are there to also provide assistance and support. So for example, we need to be ADA compliant and there are individuals on campus who are experts in ADA and they would be part of that accessibility compliance team. There will be folks from the offices of Accreditation and Assessment that can help with program-level assessment just like high-level courses. And there will be a technical support team, folks that can help with the Blackboard, Echo 360, and other sorts of things that can help create these courses. Finally, the largest green circle there is project management where we are able to assign human resources to be able to help keep these projects on time, on track, and on budget. These people would help call meetings. They will help bring in resources when/if additional resources are needed. This course development team we've experimented with back in January or February when we launched the first series of six courses and we've since refined this and eliminated some people from that core development team to make it more streamlined and better to work with.

The second department we are proposing and calling it, Learning and Academic Technology. These are folks that will be responsible for managing the institutional learning management system or Blackboard and will also help with other academic technologies, things like lecture capture and online course evaluation instruments and outcome assessment tools, and a faculty services personnel management system if that was needed. The roles, the people that will be directing Learning and Academic Technology: educational technologist, LMS coordinator, network architect, systems administrator, program specialist, and other folks. All of these personnel are in place and they are employed in two separate departments, these are people like Jeff, Tony, Justin, Adam, and Dennis. A lot of people that are performing these roles are in two different departments and our proposal is to merge these into one department and call it, Learning and Academic Technology. The good news coming out of this department is that there are several Blackboard enhancements that our institution has made investments in. The first one is Learn which is the basic learning management system which been in place for some time. In the budget process we also requested and were able to reallocate some resources to also purchase

Blackboard Collaborating, Blackboard Outcomes, and Blackboard Analytics. It just doesn't show up here very well, but with Blackboard Learn we are recruiting one of the most up-to-date releases which is versus 9.1 Sp13 Active and the Blackboard Explorer feature, which is a part of Blackboard Learn, also has the ability to pull in content from other systems including Khan Academy content. Blackboard Collaborate will replace the connect tool that we have been using and it would integrate writing Blackboard and have... provide us with some web conferencing capabilities such as virtual classrooms, virtual office time, and virtual meeting spaces. It also provides mobile collaboration with other committees. Blackboard Outcomes helps us with the planning and reporting of student learning assessment, and Analytics is another add-on feature that allows us to do some more types of reports, and Dashboard integrates nicely with the learning management system and Banner. Some good news there, some additional tools, not only make good high-quality courses but also do some good follow-up on learning and outcomes.

Another potential department we could have is one called, Faculty Services. This department could be used as an optional service to support academic colleges in identification, hiring, training and assigning of part-time instructors. Potential roles could include a director of Faculty Services -- someone who can do faculty recruiting and training and someone who can do faculty scheduling. These personnel are not in place for this department and again, this is one that's been proposed and I am sure there are some questions about that.

The next department that is listed on that original organizational slide, we are proposing to call Online Developing and Compliance. This is a one person shop. Sue Ann Hochberg is currently serving in that role. For those of you who know Sue Ann, she's got a J.D. and she has a professional legal background. She would be responsible for investigating opportunities for new online programs and would work closely with the academic units to create these feasibility studies to see if new online degree programs are feasible. Sue Ann also helps us with state authorization in order to launch our degree programs offered in certain states outside the state of Ohio; we have to get permission from the state and there are important documents that need to be in those.

Let me spend a few minutes talking about this online feasibility study concept because I think it is a great opportunity for the folks in Learning Ventures to partner with folks that are in the different departments and colleges. What's being proposed is that these feasibility studies would be required in order to propose these new potential online degree programs. What would happen in these feasibility studies is that we would examine the anticipated demand for a proposed program. So, we would want to make sure there's enough student interest to offer a new degree program. We would want to understand who our competitors are and see if this is a crowded marketplace already or if there really is some unmet need that we can tap into to help serve more learners. We want to understand how much it would cost us to market to students and enroll them because it's one thing to have a program that's in demand, but if it costs us lots of money to market, it might not be very profitable for us as an institution to be able to offer those degree programs. Finally, what's the potential for enrollment for net tuition revenue? We might have a really good idea; a really interesting program that we are passionate about, but if it can only enroll 20 students over a four-year period it might not be something that we choose to endeavor. The ways these feasibility studies would work and have been working, again, Sue Ann would work closely with the academic departments to do this feasibility study and after the department is happy with it we would submit it to the college dean, provost/chancellor, and to the president for approval. The outcome that we

would be looking for is the permission to move forward with the funding of the development program -- the funding to develop the program and to staff it with the requisite number of full-time and part-time staff to be able to launch that degree program to learners. And that is the exciting thing about this feasibility study is that you have someone that can help you look into those things and get the funding that is needed to launch a new degree program.

The final department in World Campus is known as, Online Admissions and Student Services. These people are already in place and these individuals are responsible for helping students enroll the first time and provide services to students after enrollment. We have three work roles in this department, a director and her name is Shannon Neumann, three admission representatives, Brian Mitchell, James and one success coach and her name is Jessica. So that is the proposed...structure of World Campus. Again, I want to emphasize, the majority of individuals are already here and on our payroll. We really are proposing that we make some minor organizational changes to the names of the departments and merge a couple together.

Based on the advice from the Executive Committee of Faculty Senate last week, they think it would be interesting to know we have a total of 28 degree programs that are available 100% online. From those 28 degree programs, there are nine of them that are Associate Degrees, nine of them are Bachelor's Degree Completion or Degree Completion programs, and two are full Bachelor's Degrees, seven Masters, and one PhD program. There are also 11 Doctoral of Nursing and Practicing Degree programs and we have 11 certificates. So those are the current programs that we have 100% online. As far as headcount enrollment trends, here is the Fall headcount enrollment of students that are enrolled in 100% online courses or 100% online degree programs. Approximately, half of those 1,000 students who are enrolled this Fall are enrolled in degree programs where they can earn a degree 100% online. The other half, are students who are taking all of their courses online because of convenience or some other reason. As far as course enrollments, that's individual courses. So, if one person takes three courses that would be three course enrollments. Here is the trend that's been going on since way back in the Spring of 1998, this phenomenon of more online courses is not new, it's been going on for some time. In fact, UT has been a market leader in online course offerings. For the Fall of 2013, we had 11,359 course enrollments and we anticipate for the Spring of 2014 to have over 12,000 enrollments.

So, that summarizes the update for World Campus and now what I would like to do is shift attention to the proposed World Campus College Credit Plus Program that we've been speaking about and working on for the last couple of months here at UT. The first and most important thing to understand is that there's a pending state mandate for public universities and two-year schools in Ohio as well as public high schools to be able to offer these programs to students. This House Bill 59, also known as the Budget Bill, was originally proposed back in the Spring of 2013 and it has been contemplated with various stakeholders throughout Ohio for some time. We, The University of Toledo, have been involved and engaged in the conversation through our appointed individuals down in Columbus, the Inter-University Council; so we've been participating in meetings and conference calls to try to help shape what this thing can look like. It is important to know that there are many stakeholders, not only for four-year publics in Ohio and two-year publics in Ohio, the private colleges in Ohio, the K-12 districts and so on. What is happening now is that all these proposals that have been submitted to the Ohio Board of Regents, the Ohio Board of Regents is going to write a white paper that they are going to share with the legislators here in Ohio and I'm hearing that they could have a vote on this legislation as early as January or

February in 2014 and they are planning to have discussions about this legislation process in November and in December. So again, the important thing is that it is a state program being mandated and what they are trying to do is combine dual-enrollment, post-secondary enrollment, tech prep, and other dual credit options that are currently in existence in Ohio.

Some of the important concepts and guided principles that the state wants to accomplish is create predictable and adequate funding because right now what is happening is the K-12 school districts are shopping around and they are negotiating deals with community colleges and four-year schools and they are trying to find the lowest expense option and that's what they are promoting to send their students and it might not be what's best for students. We want to make sure that the students are taking relevant courses that count towards degrees and they are not just taking any old course. The state is contemplating whether to have an aggressive communication campaign where they will communicate. I envision it will have direct mail being sent from the state to families. I envision posters to high schools and maybe even TV commercials, and billboards. Again, program participation will be mandatory and I think the state is making sure we have good data to attract outcomes and how many are participating and that sort of thing. One of the things we have to keep in mind is how the revenue works, and what is new and different about House Bill 59 compared to other programs, is that four-year schools will benefit not only from the tuition that is paid but also we will get SSI and that's new. In the past we got a fraction of the tuition revenue and now the state is telling us that we will be able to benefit from some SSI. Another thing that is important to know is that our revenue is maximized when the courses are taught on our campus or online. There is less revenue we would receive if the courses are taught on a high school campus and further, our revenue is maximized when our faculty teach. When high school faculty teach on the high school campus and then online then we get less revenue. So it behooves us to make sure our faculty are intimately involved in the development and the way courses are instructed.

Past-President Dowd: Dr. Cruickshank, just for clarification, I've read House Bill 59 and I don't recall seeing "online" anywhere in that Bill. Perhaps you would indicate where it is mentioned in that Bill.

Dr. Cruickshank: So, how are we going to deal with this? What's the proposed strategy for UT to be upfront? So I purposely chose this image. I specifically chose this image of a chess board and chess pieces and there's one chess piece that is out in front, and that is where we want to be. We want to be proactive and in front and not reactive and catch-up later on. We don't want other institutions to beat us to the punch. There's an institution down the road and others throughout the state that are going to have an answer to this and we want to be one of those institutions that has a proactive strategy. And our strategy that is being proposed is to have a selection of high-quality general education courses that's going to be offered in a blended and online format. These courses will be Ohio Transfer Module compliant which is a requirement of House Bill 59 so we can get fully funded for those. It would be great to have hundreds of high school students from high schools throughout Northwest Ohio to participate in these programs. We will have students come to campus and be exposed to our excellent faculty and to our high-quality courses and to really whet their appetite...about the possibility of coming to UT. We will brand it and call it the UT World College Credit Plus Program and we will market it and promote it. We will market it and promote it by adding billboards here in the Toledo area. We already have access to the names of tens of thousands of students who have taken the SAT and the ACT, we can send a nice high quality mail piece and tell them about our opportunities here. We will meet with high school principals and guidance counselors and share these opportunities with them and their schools. The courses will be a mix of science

and math courses, some art, lab courses, and social sciences and our original 15 courses that are being proposed with placeholder names. Our courses might not match those names exactly, but part of the intent here is to be able to offer courses from many of our academic colleges here at UT and expose students to a whole bunch of different opportunities within the different academic colleges and expose them to different curricula and disciplines. There is some interesting data. These data are the top 15 new credit courses that were taken by students in 2013. If you would compare the list of courses that we are proposing with these that have been taken by students, there's a lot of overlapping and similarity between what's being proposed and what students have taken. We may wish to offer these courses in three different pedagogies, three different manners. These three images represent the three different possibilities we are contemplating and I will take just a minute to go over each one of those three.

The first is a blended model with a combination of interactive video and online material. The interactive video will have synchronous real-time interaction between faculty on the UT Campus and students that would be distributed at high school campuses throughout Northwest Ohio and maybe even the world. We would be able to have student-instructor interaction and student-to-student interaction. And the online activities would include some of the typical online activities that exist in well-designed online courses, things like video and reading assignments, writing discussions, group assignments with peers, among other things. We had a meeting with the... Superintendent of TPS back in the late Spring and there was definitely an interest exhibited at TPS at that time to be able to offer in this manner because each TPS high school has one of these interactive video classrooms.

The second potential way that we can offer courses is in my opinion, my preferred method for delivering these courses, and that is blended, where students would come on campus and have some things online. Again, there will be synchronous on-campus activities and synchronous online content delivery. Students will come to campus either weekly, bi-weekly, twice a week, or monthly. We don't know how it would work out because that would depend on the discipline and how the course was designed. They would come and do things like utilize the Planetarium go to the Simulation Center on the Health Science Campus, or maybe you could take them down to the museum downtown etc. If I can just take a minute to tell you how those would articulate. Let's say we have a course in Astronomy, we have some world-class astronomers here at UT and we invite students to enroll in a blended-learning astronomy course. We get 300-400 students from throughout Northwest Ohio. We would bring them on campus and when we bring them on campus we would all meet in a beautifully renovated Doermann Theatre. One of our rock star faculty who is a world expert on astronomy would talk about constellations or the formation of the universe or whatever the content is that day, and then we would break that large group of students up in a bunch of smaller groups; some might go to the planetarium and some might go to a lab and some might go to an active learning session, but we would give students a rich experience where they would learn content independently and then come to campus and demonstrate their knowledge of that content.

The third and final option we contemplated is 100% online. There are some school districts, mostly rural and ...schools that aren't close to UT and they have high-ability students that are juniors and seniors and they don't have faculty to instruct these students. The ability test that students take for online courses is a really good option for them. Managing Scale: We will have common learning objectives; I spoke earlier about a concept of a course. We would use a course development team, which would develop these courses. I am proposing that we have a delivery team approach where we would have a lead instructor of record and others would be helpers and guides on the sides, and additional faculty team-teach (whatever

moniker we want to place on it), it would be other folks to help teach that course. Back to the idea of the Astronomy course, if there were 200 students enrolled in a course and if the ideal pedagogical model for the students is small group sessions with 40 students in a session in a group- we have one lead instructor that could teach 40 students in a small group. We have 160 students left; therefore we would need four helpers: four lecturers, four teaching assistants, four whatever the department comes up with that would help instruct that course -- that's how the team-teaching model we're proposing would work.

The potential differentiators, why would someone choose The University of Toledo's College Credit Plus Dual Enrollment Program over someone else's? We have some unique things that we might be able to differentiate. The first is the possibility of our virtual labs and simulations. I already referred to the benefit we have of the inter-professional Simulation Center, that is something students aren't going to get exposure to in those places and we can leverage that asset that we have. We are also building simulations in the One World Schoolhouse that was described earlier by President Rouillard through building by Bill McCreary and there are also available virtual labs. One might ask, Cam, how do you do a Biology course online and how do you do Physics online. There are simulations available where you can do labs online that we can look at.

We also had a very interesting iPad project this summer. You might have heard people talking about the Apple project where some courses were developed for the Honors program, it was a phenomenal success. We identified faculty who wanted to be part of the program. The institution provided help for them and gave them some iPads and gave some instruction and professional development. We launched some courses that will be very well received both by students and very positive feedback by faculty. We could continue to leverage that use of iPads. We don't have the financial resources to give every student an iPad so we would have to get some grant money or something, but there's some interesting opportunities to distribute iPads with course content. We could eliminate the need for textbooks. We could have educational apps, it could be some good stuff there. Finally, we could continue to leverage our relationship and our interest in some of the Khan Academy principles. I've come to understand that faculty here at UT have been using a flipped classroom for a decade or longer which is a long time. It is not a new phenomenon, but there's been a lot of attention paid to those types of things lately. Another benefit here at UT... competency-based education, the opportunity for peer instruction, and we've already gotten permission from the Khan Academy to use the One World Schoolhouse as inspired by the Khan Academy, and that is a branding differentiated opportunity that we may wish to take advantage of. So, that's the last of my slides. I will now take any or all questions that you may have about World Campus or the College Credit Plus Program.

Past-President Dowd: When you met the Senate's Executive Committee you did not have answers to a number of questions we asked you. At that time you, quite reasonably, indicated that you would consult with the Provost to determine the answers to those questions. During that meeting you said that your office would conduct marketing research to suggest the number of Distance Learning sections of courses to be taught in a particular semester. I then asked what would happen if the number of DL sections your office "suggests" differed from the number of DL sections that a department chair preferred to schedule? The example I gave during that meeting was to suppose that both your office and a department chair wants three sections of a course to be scheduled in a semester. However, your office wants those three sections to be DL and the chair wants only one to be DL. This difference is due to the department chair's responsibility of managing the overall "health" of enrollment in department courses – both DL sections

and face-to-face sections of courses. At that meeting I noted that every department chair recognizes the very delicate balance that must be maintained when scheduling both DL and face-to-face sections of the same course. Too many sections of one option puts in jeopardy the enrollment and, hence, the offering of the other option. At that time I asked you who would have the final authority over the number of DL sections to be scheduled – your office or the department chair. So, I'm sure you have consulted with Provost Scarborough by now. Who has the final authority to schedule classes and make teaching assignments?

Dr. Cruickshank: I would be happy to respond to that question. First, I would like to say that we would hope that it wouldn't get to that. What this is all about, Dr. Dowd, is being able to make sure we are offering enough course sessions to meet the demand of what our students need. So, we would not be making unreasonable requests to request a certain number of course sessions just because "we want more course sessions." We would make requests for course sessions because there's a demand from the students that they want those courses. So, we would make those requests. If the department says they can't honor those requests, the first thing I would do is ask our vice provost of our online education, Dr. Barbara Kopp-Miller to go visit with you to try to understand the nature of the problem to see if there's a resolution that can be worked out. We would then follow the process, the process that is in place with the way the collective bargaining agreement works and the way that faculty governance works. I would then take the problem to my supervisor, the provost, and tell the provost that we have a little bit of a conflict here; the student demand is requiring us to offer three or four sessions of a specific course and Dr. Dowd only wants to offer one, what should we do about that? And it is my understanding based on the way that governance works right now, the number of course sessions that's offered is an administrative purview, it's an administrative prerogative on how many course sessions are offered.

Past- President Dowd: What does that mean? I do not understand why you are muddying the question by raising the issue of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Dr. Cruickshank: That means that the administration can overrule the department. You as the department head are part of administration and the administration of the provost/president's office would be able to determine how many course sessions are offered, that is my understanding of it.

Past-President Dowd: Absolutely everyone in this room already knows that the provost can overrule a chair on all such issues. So please clarify the change in operations. Will department chairs lose the operational authority of scheduling courses they currently have at this time?

Dr. Cruickshank: It is my understanding that the department chair at this time does not have that authority and if this conflict ever happens, right now the way the rules are written the provost can overrule that. My colleague, Vice Provost Barrett, is raising his hand and he wants to say something.

Vice Provost Barrett: Dr. Dowd, it is the position of the Provost's Office and if Provost Scarborough wants to comment because he is sitting here he can. That is already within our discretion. We cancel course sessions all the time if there's not sufficient enrollment and if there's a need for more sessions we are going to ask you to schedule more; obviously, we have to make the resources available to do that if we are asking for more and you don't have the personnel etc., but that is already considered within our purview. I actually talked to some people in the AAUP and that is what they told me as well. So I don't know if there's anything here to be taken or contemplated to be taken. But the assignment of the faculty

member is the chair's prerogative and the preliminary scheduling, but the final say resides in the Provost's Office.

Past-President Dowd: Again, everybody already knows the provost has the final say on scheduling. But you have raised the other half of my question: who will choose the instructor for each of these DL courses? Dr. Cruickshank, when you met with the Senate's Executive Committee, you indicated that you have people "on the bench waiting" to be called on to teach courses. The very specific example you gave was that you might have some individual in North Dakota sitting on that bench willing to teach courses for UT in within and across departments. Will the selection of the instructor come from your office, the Provost's Office, or an academic department?

Dr. Cruickshank: You are referring to the proposed optional service of faculty services?

Past-President Dowd: I am not being that specific. For the four-year degree programs included in your online proposal, you indicated that you would recruit individuals that can "sit on the bench" and when necessary you would call them in to teach a course for UT. Question #1: again, who specifically will select the individual to teach a course? Regarding the Astronomy course you mentioned earlier, will the selection of the course instructor be purview of your office or the purview of the Chair of the Department of Physics and Astronomy? Question #2: who will be responsible for vetting candidates for that instructor position – to verify they are actually qualified to teach each course your office will be scheduling? Again, with regard to the Astronomy course you mentioned earlier, who specifically will verify whether a candidate actually has at least a Master's Degree in Astronomy so that they are qualified to teach a Bachelor's course in Astronomy? Will that verification be conducted in your office?

Dr. Cruickshank: No, what we talked about is that Learning Ventures could create this faculty service department that provides this optional service to help departments identify and select and train faculty to teach online, that's an optional thing that we could develop. My understanding of the way things work right now is that the department head decides who teaches the courses and the department head is the one responsible for vetting who's qualified to teach and who is not.

Past-President Dowd: Well, it is good to hear you state that department chairs will determine teaching assignments. Will department chairs continue to determine the choice of qualified instructors?

Dr. Cruickshank: I can't speak on what would continue. This is a Faculty Senate meeting and we are talking about proposed organizational structures. You might be starting to get into some AAUP issues and that is not for me to decide.

Past-President Dowd: I am not discussing organizational structures and I am not talking about any AAUP issues. I am trying to discuss the academic integrity of courses that we are talking about. The vetting of candidates for an instructor position in a particular department is an academic decision reserved for faculty members with academic standing in that particular department.

Dr. Cruickshank: If that is what you are hearing me say then that is correct. Learning Ventures and Cam Cruickshank, we have no interest in taking over any academic curriculum or content. What our interest is is to provide enough learning opportunities for students that want them, that's it; not to take over anyone's curriculum or anything like that or determine who teaches the class. All we want to make sure is that there are enough course sessions available for the students who want to take courses, that's it.

Past-President Dowd: But when talking about having enough course sections, all of your statements indicate that your focus is on DL enrollment only. Take the example mentioned earlier. I, as a chair, may want to schedule three sections of a course and only one of those sections to be a DL section. But you decide that three DL sections of that course must be scheduled. Yet you do not talk about the impact of your decision on the face-to-face sections of that course. Put aside the obvious fact that the provost can order the creation or cancellation of courses – because no one questions that authority. Instead, I am making the distinction that department chairs look at the overall enrollment picture of their department and chairs recognize that delicate balance I mentioned above. For example, scheduling too many DL sections may cannibalize enrollment in the face-to-face sections. In turn, this may endanger the offering of face-to-face sections and, hence, disserve students who wish to take such courses. You are the VP for Enrollment Management, but I have yet to hear you express any concern about enrollment in face-to-face courses.

Dr. Cruickshank: Well, actually, Dr. Dowd, my role is Vice President of Enrollment Management and Online Education, so I would have a similar level of advocacy to offer enough face-to-face sessions for students here at Toledo or at some other site we might offer in the future. I really don't care whether it's online or offered face-to-face. If we need enough course sessions to meet the student's demand then that is what we need and that is what it goes down to; it is not about online. It's about meeting student demand and giving them the courses they need to fulfill their educational goals.

Senator Hamer: I applaud your commitment to high-quality courses for hundreds of students. I think we can do that both online and face-to-face, but I'm seeing a gap and actually the slide you have up there, where is the place for hiring more tenure-track professors in order to be able to develop and deliver those? There's a huge gap that I think really harms UT's credibility if instead having trained, educated professionals, we have a pool of part-time instructors and I don't understand that gap so maybe you can explain why there aren't any.

Dr. Cruickshank: Sure. Well, I think the best way to respond to that question as it relates to the development of new degree programs that are 100% online is this concept of a feasibility study. If we had a new degree program that we wanted to launch we would look at potential enrollments, account driven, we would look at the department as it currently existed, how many full-time faculty we have and come up with a plan and say, "If we are going to create a program and enroll 300-400 students, how many more full-time faculty would we need to make that happen?"

Senator Hamer: Could you write that into the plan?

Dr. Cruickshank: Could I write what into the plan?

Senator Hamer: Hiring full-time faculty to support these...

Dr. Cruickshank: It's right here at the bottom bullet, "helps determine the mix and number of part-time and full-time faculty."

Senator Hamer: It would help if it shows up on the other slides as well.

Dr. Cruickshank: Okay. Thank you.

Dr. Anderson-Huang: My question is pretty much the same, but I also wanted to use this as a general forum for the administration- this is going to require a lot more flexibility with workload issues than is presently available. Right now we have to work out these liberal contracts that say faculty here are assigned to teach things. We are starting to develop more and more students coming in and more and more sessions if that happens, but still there has to be some way that the workload issue is flexibly assigned and we are not constrained to teach exactly what we signed up for.

Vice Provost Barrett: Dr. Anderson-Huang, I just want to say that I am one of those people that work on the workload team. If any chair needs to adjust an individual faculty workload they are welcome to submit a revised workload at any time. We will review it and approve it if it's appropriate based on the data you submit. It happens all the time in our office. Don't feel "handcuffed" to what is turned in eight months ago if it's no longer appropriate for what you are doing. We are here to make sure we are doing the right thing at the right time and that requires flexibility and adjustments, so I completely agree.

Senator Edinger: You talked about moving the state's expectation of dual enrollment and PSO [postsecondary option], and the online things. You mentioned three strategies, none of which include regular classroom teaching. I was wondering will we play a role still with dual enrollment and PSO, or will everything have an online performance?

Dr. Cruickshank: That is a great question. I am glad you asked that.

Senator Edinger: And that is why I am here <laughter>.

Dr. Cruickshank: Thank you. We will continue to offer courses to students that study 100% face-to-face. We have approximately 450 (I think) that are taking dual enrollment or PSO right now. Many of those are students enrolled in T.E.C.H.S. So, if about 200 of those 400 are in T.E.C.H.S. then we've got about 200 other students that are taking some courses face-to-face. We will continue to offer those and in fact, the publication that we are preparing includes that fourth option. These are the "new" options, but that one will still be present. Thank you for asking that.

Senator Lundquist: You said there will "probably" be new faculty hired if online programs are..., is that correct? The College Credit Plus Plan if I understand correctly, seems to be...is that correct?

Dr. Cruickshank: The College Credit Plus Plan is anticipated to go through a...process to be voted on in January or February and be effective Fall of 2014, yes.

Senator Lundquist: So, if it turns out that more faculty are required to teach that to create these new courses and so forth, will our new faculty plan for that as well?

Dr. Cruickshank: I can't answer that. At this point we are really early in the budget process and I'm personally not involved with faculty hiring. I would anticipate though if there was a huge spike in demand for courses and we needed additional full-time faculty that is a reasonable request that the provost and the president will consider. I am not in a position to promise there's going to be more full-time faculty.

Senator Lundquist: It just seems to me that the timing on this is very, very fast. It's not even approved by the state legislature yet and yet we are proposing to create new courses in three different delivery modes and have people in place to teach them by next Fall, is that correct?

Dr. Cruickshank: That is correct.

Senator Lundquist: If I understand correctly, it is not part of the state's mandate that they should be offered in three different delivery modes.

Dr. Cruickshank: That is correct. But it is also noteworthy though that these programs already exist as independent standalone programs. There's a dual enrollment program that exists within the state. There is a post-secondary enrollment option program that exists. There is a tech-prep program that exists, plus there is one other one. And the state is trying to bring all of these together under one umbrella and call it the College Credit Plus Program. As I just mentioned, we already have over 500 students that are participating in this and it would be our hope that we could increase that to much more than 500 students; have more students on campus benefitting from the high quality instruction that our high faculty give and be able to expose them to UT earlier in hopes that these high-ability students would enroll at UT.

Senator Lundquist: For instance, currently, we are offering face-to-face and DL courses in English Composition; it seems to me if we want to offer these to more students next Fall we should just go ahead and do it. Why do we need to create the new kind of DL course, a new kind of face-to-face course and have it in place by next Fall? You are right, these things are already in place. What is the rush about creating a different kind of product than we already have which is a high quality...as it is?

Dr. Cruickshank: You are right. What I am hearing you say, we have potentially four modes for delivering these courses: both 100% face-to-face and online, blended interactive video, and blended face-to-face. What I am hearing you say is we are going to have two of them, why do we need the other ones?

Senator Lundquist: I am not saying that we don't need them. I am saying, what's the hurry? It seems to me that the role is planned out already with the courses that we already have.

Dr. Cruickshank: I think the hurry is that we want to provide the types of courses our constituents are asking for; the courses that our high school partners, the K-12 school districts, and the students want. When Vice Provost Barrett, myself and Provost Scarborough had lunch with the TPS superintendent in the Spring, he asked for courses that can be delivered in an interactive video. TPS is a big school district. They are not the only school district we serve, but if there's a potential partner that wants us to help them by delivering these high quality courses, then that's what we are going to do.

President Rouillard: Provost Scarborough, did you say that TPS has pulled out of this arrangement and that they are no longer interested?

Provost Scarborough: No. Actually, we were trying to submit a grant to the straight-A convenient with TPS and that's what they pulled out of.

President Rouillard: Okay.

Provost Scarborough: But, on this dual enrollment, they are very interested in moving forward. The only thing that Cam left out of his answer and it is kind of an important part. What they said was, "And if you are not able to do it, the University of Akron has already assured us they are." So really, there were already plans for it, so we will be ready. But we can't afford the University of Akron coming in to our

primary service market and capturing a pipeline for these students and...so that is part of the hurry, just to try to prevent and to protect our primary service market.

President Rouillard: Well, that would be 100% online with face-to-face and a video.

Provost Scarborough: Right. What we are trying to do is be in a position to say we deliver four different modalities of high-quality, distinctive, really outstanding courses for our students that satisfy their ability to transfer to any university within the state of Ohio and this satisfies the requirements for a high school student. We want to create that opportunity to be a leader of those courses so that when they are ready to... a greater relationship with us and they choose to come to The University of Toledo.

President Rouillard: If the constituents have already indicated their interest, do we know how many students are involved or faculty we need to hire?

Provost Scarborough: We don't know that yet. What we hope to have is a brochure ready by January 1, 2014 that lists all the courses and the delivery options that we can begin calling...in our area as many as we can and as fast as we can to get a sense of what opportunity is there. This is a pretty straightforward way of growing our way out of these challenges that we are experiencing. This is our primary service market, we just can't afford to give up these students to other universities. We will know more when we have the material.

Senator Lundquist: So, these courses that are being created for high school students will only have high school students enrolled in them?

Dr. Cruickshank: UT students will also be able to sign up for these courses. What you don't want to have is a class of 400 fifteen- and sixteen-year-olds, we want to have a mix of college and high school students.

Senator Hoblet: I think that everybody's interested in what you are proposing... in learning, what I hear is some skepticism about can we roll this out as quickly as you have it on that ...Legwork, do we have a very good sense in all the colleges about what we currently have as far as online and in-class combined if every one of these course areas we need to....And then, really, pulling the faculty in using the college, particularly the department chairs to work with their faculty to see what else can be constructed in an appropriate timeframe. Because the department chairs are going to know what the resources are. I heard it from Senator Lundquist and Senator Dowd about what the resources are as far as focus faculty on these endeavors. So, I think we need to have faculty brought into this team as quickly as possible to see what the feasibility is for this, I think that's a huge concern. Then I would also incorporate the recommendations that Senator Hamer had as far as moving that up and making sure you have the projections of increased faculty need along with increased enrollment, that should be planned right up front. How much of an enrollment ascension curve should we be looking at before we click for each additional faculty line, okay and what that should look like? And then second-of-all, the recommendation not only the "A, B, C," model but also the "A, B, C, and D" model offering that face-to-face. Thank you.

Senator Barnes: I just wanted to ask some of my colleagues in education about the mix of high school and college students. We don't have sixteen and seventeen year olds; we have fourteen-and fifteen-year olds in our classes, and we are having a really interesting problem with the material we are trying to deliver to our students in terms of their capacity to learn. So one question is, is there any research about

how this large program is working around the country where they are doing it? And also, I have the same question about online learning because I appreciate what you are saying about “our customers want it” and we want to deliver it, but my student also want A’s, but they don’t all get A’s, right? There is something that happens in the process that makes them not earn that A. And sometimes a student will tell me, “I took an online version because it was easier.” I have heard that many, many, many times over the years since online education started happening. A “good” student for online learning is both a “good” student, and a mature student who is capable of learning independently in an online environment. Is there research that is assuring us that we are not giving away the farm to make a dollar here?

Prof. David Nemeth: Dr. Scarborough, in your brochure, do you have the names of the star faculty?

Provost Scarborough: That is a good question, let me look. I do not, but there is a place where they are photographed.

Prof. David Nemeth: The reason why I asked is that you have previously, many times and Dr. Cruickshank today mentioned star faculty and why students would want to come to our university instead of the university down the road, Eastern Michigan, or comparable colleges. And if star faculty are so important, are they interchangeable or are they expendable? I mean you expect that star faculty can just be hired. I’ve seen a lot of star faculty leave in the last six years, so our best faculty as far as I am concerned are gone. We have to ask ourselves, why has that happened and whether we have our priorities in the right place here. I think students will come to the university that has the best faculty not the university that has the chess piece out in the front for a program that hasn’t even been developed or approved by the state yet. We have to invest in star faculty or we have to develop star faculty out of what we’ve got here already. That takes a lot of money, but since this is the Faculty Senate we really should be thinking about the investment of the university right now in star faculty because I think that’s the game changer that if we have that then they will come to us rather than the others. There’s other stuff, even if we are first, they will catch up with us within a year or six months, and all these plans the other schools will adopt if they work. But star faculty is a long term investment and I don’t see any investment in that right now because we are not hiring.

[Applause]

Senator Lundquist: This is just a follow-up to that. I think one of the reasons why there are no pictures on that brochure is because the people who have been contacted who are generally star faculty have a real problem with this course development agreement and I would think that an institution that wants buy-in from faculty will not produce a document that is so lawyered-up that anybody who signs it will probably need legal advice before they sign it. It seems to me that if you are thinking of your star faculty faces that’s going to bring in students, we shouldn’t refer to them in one document as “rock stars” and in another document as “content providers.” I really don’t like that content. I don’t understand this agreement. I find it really kind of baffling and kind of insulting. I think that I would be interested in some ways in creating a...that would be a real intellectual challenge and real treat for high school students. But I don’t think I could ever sign an agreement that is like this and I wouldn’t recommend anybody do it.

Vice Provost Barrett: I was kind of hoping, well, “hoping” may be a strong word, but I wanted this comment to come up today, because I wanted to make a few comments about it. First off, the document may appear lawyerly because it was drafted by someone who is a lawyer, me. This was not drafted by the

administration. It was not drafted by anyone at the top. I created it because they wanted a document that would work and function for flipped and hybrid classes and it is now being used for other things. I want to say a couple of things about this document because it is getting a lot of pushback. There's a lot of rumor, and there's a hell-of-a-lot of inaccuracy. With that being said, if you don't like my draft then I apologize. First, the document was substantially built on the merging of the two documents that have been used for a number of years for DL course development. It was not created from a blank slate, it was significantly borrowed. There were some changes, and I want to comment on a few of those, but the basic structure and provisions came from these existing documents, such as the description of certain things to be developed and included like appendixes. One of the things that has been getting a lot of pushback is the claimed loss of your intellectual property rights. However, that is already provided in the Collective Bargaining Agreement when the university hires you to develop something. It is also something that has been in the course development agreement for years. This is not something new. We follow a traditional university model in regard to intellectual property development that was actually modified a little from the business world. In the business world if you use your employer's time or equipment it owns the intellectual property. If you are at our university, like most universities, if you write a textbook or if you write an article even though you used the university's computer and do it on work hours, we let you own that. But if we hire you specifically to develop a course by getting release time or additional compensation, we own it and we have done this in the past. It is in the Collective Bargaining Agreement February 2014 version and there is no change here. That is the first thing. The second thing is that there is no usurping of the scheduling from the department to some other group. I admit, and this is entirely on me, nobody else, the document could be clearer in this area. It talks about the employer scheduling the class. It could say a department or something more specific. It was not made intentionally to move anything or to change anything - it is just a little vague. The department chairs are a part of administration, so when they act, it is the employer who is scheduling. After a discussion with Dr. Cruikshank, I think Dr. Cruikshank would be happy to modify that language slightly if there is a concern of a particular individual or a department chair in agreeing to have their faculty develop a course in this area. The only major change in this contract that I did "beef-up" are the expectation requirements by creating some timelines and things for getting things done, so that is on me; but that did not seem like an inappropriate expectation; we are paying you to get something done and having a timeline for doing it doesn't seem out of line to me. But the only major change to me that is really different from the prior documents is that I removed the right of first refusal for teaching DL courses. The document talks about it not being governed by the Collective Bargaining Agreement and the reason that this language is in there is solely to remove the right of first refusal that is in the Collective Bargaining Agreement for DL courses. Why did I do that, you may ask? Because of the nature of what I was asked to construct, I didn't think it fit the bill for there to be a right of first refusal. The whole point is we are trying to create course material that can be used by multiple faculty across a department. The notion was to create videotaped lectures and other materials, apps and things like, that multiple people could use where we would pay one person to develop it as a high-quality product that is really good for the entire department in that program. Once it's developed, the whole idea is for it to be adopted by as many faculty as freely choose to use it in that department, and that doesn't really fit with the right of first refusal. So that's really the only significant change. I am happy to answer any questions about why I drafted it the way I did. I am happy to discuss changes with Dr. Cruikshank if he wants them. I have a meeting with Dr. Heberle. She is getting some faculty together to talk about this and they are meeting with me at 9 o'clock tomorrow morning. I am not trying to hide anything here so I wanted to stand up and say "This is my work product, although it has

been modified somewhat for College Credit Plus compared to what I drafted for Apple and the other ones.” But it is really on me and there is nothing sneaky or really different that’s going on here, so I just wanted to have a little clarity. I am sorry that I went on so long.

President Rouillard: That is okay.

Dr. Jorgensen: I was looking at it from a different direction. It is prudent to be attempting educational experiments from different directions, that’s just part of what we want to do; but when you carry on an experiment you don’t want to lose any data from the previous experiments. We had some interesting ones in the university that have not had the greatest past. You talk about the Apple U in glowing terms. First, the jury is still out on it because the first semester is not even finished yet. I understand maybe not all the classes that were to be developed have been developed just yet and there are some other issues. Like I just said, the reports are not as glowing as you are suggesting from other reports, so I would suggest that you look very carefully at what we’ve learned from that, what will work and what might not work. If we are going in a very strong direction, we would like to make sure the data is there behind us.

Senator Hoblet: I looked at the agreement and I appreciate where you are coming from, Vice Provost Barrett, on the whole agreement. But one of the things that I was a little disappointed in is agreeing to any excessive revenue that comes in as it relates to these courses or these programs. There is nothing in there about revenue sharing of any kind- back to the department and back to the college and I was just a little disappointed because that shows me, at least as a faculty member, not only do you value that contribution that we make, but it goes exactly to what we are worth, and coming back to the college to help us develop sort of the “goose that is going to lay the golden egg;” gives us the resources that we need to develop faculty so we have a sustainable excellent faculty model.

Vice Provost Barrett: Can I please respond to that?

President Rouillard: Yes.

Vice Provost Barrett: I would say a couple of things. First, under the agreement, as I understand it, faculty are getting considerable more compensation or at least a decent bump-up from historically what we paid for a normal DL course. It is an attempt to underscore that this is a bigger commitment and the outcome will hopefully be a better product so it deserves to be paid more. In terms of revenue sharing, if it’s used within a department by various faculty within a department, we don’t share revenue based on how many students we each teach, we don’t allocate that way. I do think you may have a point if it is sold to some third party, but when I was involved in preparing this, that was never one of the things that was being considered. I haven’t really heard about any intent to sell to a third party.

Senator Hoblet: But, it does not include them and there’s no language that would exclude it. So either we structure it so that doesn’t occur or if that should ever occur then that comes back for consideration and I think that is an appropriate business model.

Dr. Cruikshank: I have an update for the group. We had distributed that course developing agreement a few days ago and we heard several questions and concerns. So, earlier today I asked Barb to distribute a message to the department chairs and the deans of the folks that are involved in the College Credit Plus Program, receiving some input on some of the points of the course agreement that were problematic. We’re going to collect all that feedback and then I am going to sit down with Vice Provost Barrett to see

if we can make some tweaks to that course development agreement so it might be more appropriate and more in line with what our mutual expectations are. So, that is one update that I want to give. There's a starting point and if there are problems with it then we can make tweaks to the document. The second thing, I want to speak to Senator Hoblet's comments about revenue sharing; I am not speaking about individual courses, but to talk about revenue sharing possibilities as it pertains to the new 100% online degree programs. One of my primary functions is to help grow enrollment, and to grow enrollment as the sales guy, I need more degree programs to sell. So we need to partner between Learning Ventures and the academic departments to create more degree programs that are available 100% online so we can enroll more students.

President Rouillard: But that needs to come to Faculty Senate.

Dr. Cruikshank: It absolutely does. But the point is, there is a revenue sharing document that is being considered and I am hopeful that we can get that finalized so that in some point in the future when they are developed, the revenue can be shared among the university, the college from which the new online degree program came, and then the other internal departments that helped support those learners.

Prof. Patrick Lawrence: Vice Provost Barrett, would you be willing to share the DL contract that you referred to? I developed a number of DL courses just as faculty in my department. Including back in the day when Rhoda ran the DL and it was faculty development when we created those courses. None of my faculty, my former chair, or my current chair has ever seen your signs of contracts that included language over intellectual property rights regarding content so I would like to see the agreement because I've never seen one and personally as department chair I never signed one. My current course was developed four years ago so specifically on the course description on DL reserves the copyright for myself and my colleagues when developing the course...the content... so I would really like to see the basis for the agreement you referred to, the DL agreement, I've never seen one. The second question, why are these agreements necessary? I have faculty in my department over the last couple of years who have developed blended courses and DL courses and a number of initiatives within our program not for hire, but to participate and work on initiatives like this program because of great opportunities for the university and is not required in a contract. We develop a course very successfully. We have great instructors and content for these courses. I have faculty that really can teach the courses under this program, but none of them will sign that agreement. I was just wondering, what is the necessity for having payment, this contract for hire. Why don't we reach out to department chairs and faculty and have a dialogue about what our programs offer. What courses we already offered that can easily be built in, because there's already a blended, DL, face-to-face, or what course faculty would be willing to develop as part of the workloads as part of the regular duties for these programs.

Senator Wedding: Under Article 4 of our contract and under state law, I hate to tell you, but The University of Toledo has management rights. And under those management rights there are a lot of things including the number of sections that they want signed. But the bottom line is The University of Toledo owns our courses. Now, listen very carefully what I am going to say here- they own the courses, but they don't own the material. That is our copyrighted material. Our contract, Collective Bargaining Agreement, both of them, lecturers and the tenure track Article 17 of the tenure-track agreement clearly says that we own the content of our courses including books etc. etc. It's in there. All you have to do is read it. Now, on the other hand, if you decide to sell it then you have sold the material inside that course to

administration, nonetheless, you still retain revenue-sharing with the contract. It is already there and it is generous compared to what is going on at other universities, because of the time we are putting in there, we look at other universities. So I hear all this information that is just not correct, both on the administration side and what the faculty is saying. It is absolutely “bunk.” I’ve heard nothing about this contract that you so generously fell on the sword for; I thought that was very nice of you. And it is a tough contract. I wasn’t aware of the earlier contract that people were signing for their DL courses and I’ve never seen one, but I can imagine what they look like. The point is if you sign one of these contracts you don’t give away your intellectual property. They cannot override our contract, our contract stays. On the other hand, they did set forth parameters for you to perform to get your \$5K , our contract says \$3500 of the \$5K, but you only get 30% up front, so you get \$1500 to start with and after that you have to go through a whole maze of performance criteria which is quite complicated and if in the end if they don’t like it they can get their money back. That is something they can do outside the contract. If you sign this thing, then “yes,” you give it up, but you still retain a share of the revenue stream. And if they try to change it at the bargaining table we will fight them like we fight them on everything else. So, we got it and I don’t know why we have these discussions. As far as intellectual property is concerned, the Ohio Revised Code 3345.14 says, “The University owns all inventions and discoveries on this campus used with university facilities...” that summarizes it for faculty, students, and staff. The university has agreed, however to share revenue on anything that happens if you create it on campus. There is a revenue sharing provision that applies to the discoveries.

Senator Humphrys: I think to kind of echo some of the things that were just said, my department used to be -- at least last year -- responsible for about 25% of that gravy train show of the credit hours that are generated. I can’t say I will sign anything. I teach 200 students online every semester and vaguely remember when Rhoda was here. I remember receiving something that said you will get paid “X” amount of dollars if they can’t picture you off within a year from the time you began and that was it. Quickly, what I think this particular document says is, “we don’t trust you” at least that is what it says to me. The other thing, just as a suggestion, I think the concept of having new online programs is really good, but I hope we can find a way to not go down the same road that we have. The history always is important. If somebody comes up with an idea for a new online program and you can guarantee, I don’t care if it’s the hottest career in the world, you are not going to get an abundance of students right-off-the-bat. And we have these absurd rules historically about you have to have 15-22 students or that class won’t run. I am guaranteed you will never get a new program off the ground if you don’t allow for growth for sections for the first year or two of a particular program. So that is just my suggestion, we can’t hold to these minimum “whatever” because they are unrealistic types of programs. Thank you.

President Rouillard: I hate to cut this short, but Dr. Lawrence Anderson-Huang informed me that he has some reports that are time-sensitive. So, I would like to thank Dr. Cruickshank for coming today. Perhaps, we can invite you again to give us an update at a later time.

[Applause]

Dr. Cruickshank: That would be great. Thank you.

Dr. Anderson-Huang: The Senate Committee on Academic Programs is recommending the approval of the following course modifications that were sent out to you:

One from Mechanical Engineering, one from the Bachelors of Science in Nursing, four from the Environmental Sciences Department, and one from Criminal Justice and Social Work and one from Kinesiology.

I would like to put those forward for approval and ask for a vote or questions. All in favor? Any opposed? Any abstentions? ***Motion Passed.***

The other thing that I would like to discuss is this letter that would be coming from the University Academic Programs with Ray Marchionni and our committee. It is asking for colleges and departments to look very seriously to associate programs. If you have an associate program please work very hard to make them articulate very properly into Bachelors programs so the credits are not lost. The information is in the letter. Are there any questions?

Senator Keith: Did we ever get the information out about what associate degrees are actually viable? Is that included in the letter?

Dr. Anderson-Huang: No, it is not in the letter.

President Rouillard: I think that information is being requested.

Dr. Anderson-Huang: Yes, it is being requested from the colleges.

Senator Keith: It is important to have that information.

Dr. Anderson-Huang: Right. Another question that we want to look very carefully at is how many students are actually dropping out of school after 60 credit hrs.

President Rouillard: Thank you, Dr. Anderson-Huang and thank you to your committee. Thank you as well, Ray Marchionni, for working on the issue of the two-year programs.

Dr. Marchionni: I was reminded today by Karen Bell that I have to report back to the University Council about these programs. At least I can see at this point I am not going to have any definite answers as much as I would with a progress report. Perhaps I am sure that letter Dr. Anderson-Huang mentioned about the University Council as well as some other places. November 15th, Dr. Anderson-Huang, we need to report back.

Dr. Anderson-Huang: Okay, we can change the date on it.

President Rouillard: And thank you, Dr. Marchionni, for working on that. And Senator Molitor, you had an announcement that you wanted to make about Apple Tree.

Senator Molitor: I would like to thank President Rouillard and my fellow Senators for granting me a few minutes to discuss Apple Tree. In addition to serving as a Senator from the College of Engineering, I also serve as President of the Apple Tree Nursery School Board of Trustees. On behalf of my colleagues that serve as board members for Apple Tree, I wish to inform the Senate of the sad news that Apple Tree will be ending its long-standing relationship with The University of Toledo effective December 31st, 2013.

Apple Tree was incorporated as a non-profit organization in 1974 to create a child care co-operative for children of families affiliated with The University of Toledo. By the mid-1980's, Apple Tree was

contracted by the University to provide child care for students, staff and faculty and was granted the use of a facility on the Scott Park Campus. With strong encouragement from the University Women's Council, the University constructed a building adjacent to the Dorr Street entrance of Main Campus dedicated to housing child care services. Apple Tree moved into this facility in the mid-1990's and has remained there to this day.

Apple Tree has been long recognized as providing the highest quality of care and education for children six weeks to six years of age, and we were one of the few centers in this area to receive the highest three-star rating from the State of Ohio's Step Up to Quality program. Apple Tree's reputation extends well beyond The University of Toledo community and throughout the state of Ohio. When enrolling my children in Sylvania Schools, parents and teachers would tell us how fortunate we were to send our children to Apple Tree. The reason for this excellence is a teaching and administrative staff that to this day continues to provide a level of care, education and love for our children that is unsurpassed.

Eleven years ago, when my wife and I were enrolling my oldest child, Apple Tree was a thriving institution that provided high-quality care for the building's capacity of 24 infants, 24 toddlers and 90 preschoolers with waiting lists for these three age ranges. The University was providing Apple Tree over \$100k annually to subsidize the cost of providing high quality care to children of students enrolled at the University.

Unfortunately, we have faced numerous financial challenges since this time. First, our subsidy from the University has been withdrawn, and for the past seven years we have been paying the University around \$130k annually in utility and maintenance costs for operation of the child care facility. Next, our enrollment has declined by approximately one-third below the building capacity. Although I do not have the data to support this claim, I personally believe that the aging of our university community resulting from reduced hiring has reduced the number of faculty and staff with young families, resulting in a decrease in enrollment. Finally, economic challenges have meant that a larger percentage of families that remain receive care subsidized by the state of Ohio, which reimburses us at a much lower rate than families that pay for their own child care.

Although the University approved changes in building maintenance last year that allowed us to substantially reduce our payments for building operations, we have been unable to overcome these financial challenges and can no longer continue our operations. Recent discussions with the University to provide additional support could not be resolved in a manner that would allow Apple Tree to maintain operational control and retain our authority to make decisions regarding the staffing of the child care center and the quality of care provided for our children. Effective January 1st 2014, the University will enter into a contract with another vendor with the goal of maintaining a high quality and fiscally viable child care program on Main Campus.

Apple Tree's failure comes despite the inordinate amount of time, effort and expertise that my colleagues on the Apple Tree Board of Trustees have willingly provided to maintain our operations. I am very proud to have served with this wonderful group of individuals. Despite the sadness and anger we feel about our inability to maintain Apple Tree's viability, we would like to extend to the University our sincerest wish for their future success in maintaining a high quality child care program on Main Campus. And I would

like to conclude by conveying to my Senate colleagues and to the University administration the high stakes in failing to do so.

Although we do not believe it is possible to find elsewhere the quality of child care provided by Apple Tree's staff, many Apple Tree families are fortunate to have the financial means to obtain high quality care for our children, whether it is here on Main Campus or elsewhere. But there is a group of children at Apple Tree that do not have this luxury. These are the children of our ever-increasing population of low-income families. Many of these low-income families are headed by parents enrolled as students at this University. Because of their socioeconomic backgrounds, their children face the greatest obstacles in their future educational careers, and are dependent upon high-quality preschool programs to boost their future chances of educational success.

Of greatest distress to me and my fellow board members is what happens if we fail to provide high-quality care for the children of these low-income families. It is not an exaggeration to state that the quality of care typically available to these children is abysmal. Given the financial challenges that face the University, we understand the need for a financially viable child care operation. However, we urge the University administration *not to fail these children by placing an undue emphasis on financial viability*. High-quality child care is expensive; the families that need it the most cannot afford it. The cost of failing to provide high-quality care to these families is much, much greater than failing to have a balanced budget for child care operations. Thank you for your time.

[Applause]

Senator Relue: Do we know who the vendor is going to be?

Senator Molitor: I have not heard yet, but perhaps Provost Scarborough can answer that for you.

Provost Scarborough: We've been knowing about this particular issue for three weeks. We went to the Executive Committee of Faculty Senate to alert them that all that Senator Molitor has tried is in fact a sad chapter. We began working over that during the three weeks to develop a number of proposals that are still in the process of being developed. We are obviously reaching out to a number of high-quality providers. The worst-case scenario, the plan is to be developed at the university in the name of our One World Schoolhouse cooperating with the College of Education and functioning as a last school would seem to hire the employees that are currently working for Apple Tree for some type of a transitional or perhaps long-term plan, so that alternative is also being explored or developed at this time. We are working diligently and we know the clock is ticking. We know how important these children are and our commitment is to try to find a solution. The one thing we are fully committed to is to make sure there is a day care that continues on the Main Campus and it is high quality. There's no question about it, it is unfortunate that as a university we find ourselves in a difficult position. As we discussed many times, we try to find a budget that works for the university in a sustainable manner; we are not in the position at the moment to simply walk in with a check. And although everything that Senator Molitor said was true, the university does continue to subsidize Apple Tree in a form of friend...that are way.

Senator Wedding: I think this is a very important topic primarily for single women who come here looking for an education. It is a very important topic. I am sorry that we are doing it at 5:45 p.m. at night. Going back to something I said earlier, I really think that this is really more important than some of the stuff we got into earlier; I'm sorry but that is how I feel. This is really an important topic.

Senator Molitor: Thank you. We appreciate that.

Senator Humphrys: Have Apple Tree always had to pay for keeping the lights on?

Senator Molitor: No. Like I said, that changed from several years ago. Before, we were actually getting direct payments from the university so we could provide this high-quality care to our students at a reduced cost.

Senator Humphrys: What was given as your explanation as to why we had to starve payment?

Senator Molitor: There was no explanation.

Senator Unknown: Did that decision come from the UT Board or only from administration?

Senator Molitor: I do not know the detail. The money that Provost Scarborough was referring to comes out of student fees for funding the building. So we were told by the vice provost of Student Affairs and that is who our contract is through.

Senator Relue: I would just like to say as a colleague here who has struggled to take care of my children and do everything that is asked of me as a professor that Apple Tree was a life saver for me. It was close to my office and I could go over there at lunch time and nurse my daughter and son. To have to go across town and be disconnected from my family would be difficult. Apple Tree was such a wonderful experience for my family. The teacher loved my kids as much as I love my kids. To be able to be five minutes away from them and spend a couple minutes with them at lunch time and go back and get them at the end of the day took so much stress from my day-to-day activities and it improved my productivity so much and I don't know what it would be like during those years if I didn't have Apple Tree. I am about ready to cry about this because this is horrific. I look back here and I see some of my teachers that my kids had. I mean, I still talk about the Apple Tree teacher and my kids are eight and ten now. I just think this is awful.

President Rouillard: Thank you. May I call the meeting to adjourn?

Meeting adjourned at 6:14 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

