

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of April 12, 2011
FACULTY SENATE
<http://www.utoledo.edu/facsenate>

Approved @ FS mtg. on 4/26/2011

HIGHLIGHTS

Dr. Alice Skeens/Dr. Celia Regimbal: Recognition of WNIT Championship
Dr. Celia Regimbal: Faculty Senate Academic Programs Committee Report
Dr. Bruce Kennedy/Dr. Scott Molitor: Faculty Senate Constitution & Rules Report
Professor Barbara Floyd: Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee Report
Dr. Steve Peseckis: Faculty Senate Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Report
Provost William McMillen: Legislation Pertaining to Higher Education in Ohio's Budget Bill
Dr. Penny Poplin Gosetti and Dr. Thea Sawicki: HLC Update

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 Mary Powers called the meeting to order, **Karen Hoblet**, Executive Secretary, called the roll.

I. Roll Call: 2010-2011 Senators:

Present: Anderson, Atwood, Barnes, Baumgartner, Caruso, Chiarelott, Cluse-Tolar, Dowd, Duhon, Eisler, Fink, Franchetti, Funk, Hamer, Hammersley, Heberle, Hoblet, Hornbeck, Hottell, Humphrys, Jorgensen, Kennedy, Kistner, LeBlanc, Lee, Lundquist, Malhotra, Molitor, Moore, Nandkeolyar, Ohlinger, Piazza, Powers, Randolph, Regimbal, Rouillard, Sawicki, Sheldon, Solocha, Stepkowski, Teclehaimanot, Thompson-Casado, Tinkel, Wedding, Weldy, Wilson,

Excused absences: Batten, Benjamin, Brickman, Eastop, Olson, Shriner, Yonker

Unexcused absences: Barlowe, Crist, Dismukes, Fournier, Gardner, Giovannucci, Laux, Moynihan Patrick, Rooney, Skeel

II. Approval of Minutes: Minutes from March 15th and March 29th were ready for approval.

III. Executive Committee Report:

President Powers: I am calling the meeting to order. Welcome all to the fourteenth Faculty Senate meeting of the academic year 2010-2011. I apologize; my voice is a little weak today.

To start the meeting, I request Secretary Hoblet to call the roll.

Minutes from the March 15th meeting were sent for your review two weeks ago and inadvertently, I did not ask for approval of the minutes at our last meeting. May I have a motion for approval of the minutes from the March 15th meeting? Second. All in favor? Any opposed. Minutes from the March 29th meeting were sent yesterday for your review. May I have a motion for approval of the minutes from the March 29th meeting. Second. All in favor? Any opposed. Please let the record show the minutes from the March 15th and March 29th meetings have been approved.

As the Executive Committee reported at the March 29th Faculty Senate meeting, President Jacobs asked a subset of the Executive Committee to specify some alternatives to the BOT draft resolution that would increase teaching workload to 15 credit hours per semester. Since our last meeting, the group requested a

meeting with Provost McMillen for some guidance and met with Provost McMillen on Monday last week.

The next update is about the work of the FY12 Budget Formulation and Reengineering Task Force. The group met once since the last Faculty Senate meeting; however, President Jacobs was not present at the meeting. At the meeting it was announced that a public records request was received for the list of **Recommendations from UT Internal Stakeholders** and the list of recommendations is now posted on the task force website <http://www.utoledo.edu/2012reengineering/>.

The Executive Committee received a log item from College of Languages, Literature, and Social Sciences Council about the proposal from the Faculty Senate Core Curriculum Committee. The log item included nine questions and the Executive Committee assigned the Faculty Senate Core Curriculum Committee to address the nine questions and provide a presentation to the Executive Committee at the April 22nd Executive Committee meeting before the Senate votes on the Core Curriculum Proposal.

Before concluding the Executive Committee report, I will be happy to take any questions.

Lastly, the Executive Committee considered a resolution that was drafted by Dr. Celia Regimbal honoring the University of Toledo Women's Basketball Team and whole-heartedly recommends the Senate to pass the resolution.

I now ask University of Toledo's faculty athletics representative, Dr. Regimbal to come forward and read the resolution. Dr. Regimbal.

Senator Regimbal: Members to the Faculty Senate this is a resolution honoring The University of Toledo's women's basketball team and our coach, Tricia Cullop.

Whereas, The University of Toledo women's basketball team defeated Colonial Athletic Association member Delaware 58 - 55, March 16, in the 1st round of the Women's National Invitation Tournament Championship (WNIT); and

Whereas, The University of Toledo women's basketball team defeated SEC member Auburn 67 - 52, March 19, in the 2nd round of the WNIT; and

Whereas, The University of Toledo women's basketball team defeated SEC member Alabama 74 - 59, March 22, in the 3rd round of the WNIT; and

Whereas, The University of Toledo women's basketball team defeated Big East member Syracuse 71 - 68 in overtime, March 27, in the 4th round of the WNIT; and

Whereas, The University of Toledo women's basketball team defeated Atlantic 10 member Charlotte 83 - 60, March 30, in the 5th round of the WNIT; and

Whereas, The University of Toledo women's basketball team's historic postseason run was capped off by a 76 - 68 triumph over USC in the championship game before a school and conference women's basketball record 7,301 fans; and

Whereas, The University of Toledo women's basketball team captured the first postseason tournament crown in Rocket history;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, The University of Toledo Faculty Senate congratulates and conveys our sincere gratitude and appreciation for the dedicated, selfless work of the University of Toledo women's basketball team and Coach Cullop; their poise under pressure; and the great excitement they brought to our University, city and community.

President Powers: This motion comes from the Executive Committee so there is no need for a second, all in favor? Any opposed? *Motion Passed.* Thank you very much. Now, I ask Dean Alice Skeens, to introduce Coach Cullop.

Dr. Skeens: I have the privilege of introducing someone who really does not need an introduction: right? This lady has a 29- record, the first NIC championship for the University. She has a 72- 30 record. The Rocket's have 29 wins this year, which is the school record. We have two sold out crowds, we never had that before. What I really want to say is that it is not the statistics, Coach Cullop is one of the most outstanding women that I know and her Lady Rocket's are awesome. I give you Tricia Cullop.

[Standing Ovation]

Coach Cullop: Coach Cullop: I tell you that I should be the one that is applauding you because being a part of The University of Toledo means that you are surrounded by good people. Every day I am excited for our players to go to class and to learn what they are learning from you. I know that they are in great hands when they are in your hands. So, I can't thank you enough for everything that you do for them and also for your support of our program. The student body including the faculty coming out to support our last game meant more than anything. Everybody is claiming to be that 7,301'st person; my sister claims it was her. It was so excited to look up into the rafters at a women's game to see the turnout. We see that often times at a men's event, but it was heartwarming to see that for a women's event.

But more importantly, you will laugh if I tell you this story. I promise it's not going to be long. We were playing Eastern Michigan at the conference tournament and as sometimes young people do, their minds were somewhere else. We had a game that we should have won and we really wanted to go to the NCAA tournament. I came back and found out where their minds were somewhere else; I know sometimes you see the same thing in your classrooms. I basically said to them that "We do not have to go to the WNIT tournament. We've been invited, but that doesn't mean that we have to except it." Then I said, "Unless you're heads are in the right place, I am not going to except it." They looked at me stunned. Then I said "It takes a lot of effort for a university to except something like this and unless you are going to full heartedly do this thing, I am going to go upstairs right now and tell them we are not going." You should have seen their faces. Then I thought to myself "What am I saying? We worked really hard for this." But I meant it. Because unless they were going to give everything that they had, it would have been too much for them. I was extremely proud every step of the way because not only were they in it, but they were in it together. The teams that we were playing were taller and faster. The last team that we played had six All-American high school kids on their team. Their starting point-guard had started out at the University of Connecticut. So, we were continuing to face unbelievable players the whole way, but what we found out is it is not about individuals it is about team. I was just so overwhelmed and I don't know if it has sunk in yet. I was hearing you say all of the names of the teams that we defeated and still to this day it has not sunk in all the way because you and I both know that some of the budgets to those schools far exceed everything we can touch, and yet we won. I couldn't have been more proud of the players because they did it with such class; they did it with effort, they did it with saying "Hey, if I am going to go up against the tallest player I am going to help my team and go down, I am going to "box-out" until it hurts because my opponent is 7ft tall." There were times that we handed them the staffing report to our USC game and the starting lineup was 6 ft 1in, 6 ft, 2 in, 6ft 3in, 6 ft 4in, and 6 ft 5 in, my point-guard turned to me and said "Where's the point-guard?" I said "She's the 6'1 ft girl." That is a great story of life and they learned a great lesson. It is not about your name across the front of your jersey, it's not about how tall you are and

how fast you are, but it is about what you have inside. That is the one thing that I absolutely love about this place, we are constantly surrounded by all beautiful people. They learned a great lesson. They reminded me after the fact that I almost didn't let them play in this game. I couldn't be more proud of this group and as you well know, you don't do this all by yourself. I got invited over here, but I wish that I could have brought my whole program with me because all of us pulling together did this. Please note, my staff had a lot to do with it and my players had everything to do with it.

Did anyone get an e-mail that stated the telephone lines were down? The funny thing was that they were trying to track down the guys who take care of the phone lines so people can purchase tickets and when they finally got a hold of them they asked "Where are you?" It's funny because they were in the lines too trying to purchase tickets. The director had to promise them tickets in order for them to get out of the line to fix the phone lines. Thank you.

President Powers: Thank you very much. Next, Dr. Regimbal, could you please come to the podium to provide a report from the Academic Programs Committee?

Senator Regimbal: This may not be equally as exciting, but it is as important. You were sent a report from the Academic Program Committee today; I do apologize for the lateness. We have three items on the consent agenda. One is from Engineering and two are from Language Literature and Social Sciences. Are there any questions? If there are no questions, I ask for your vote. All in favor? Any opposed?

Motion Granted.

Academic Programs Committee Report

April 12, 2011

All new programs and program modifications are held in the Faculty Senate office and can be viewed there until voted on by Faculty Senate. The Academic Program Committee reviewed the following documents on-line. Discussion of the program requests and voting was also done on-line; the following requests have been approved:

Engineering

The Department of Electrical Engineering Technology proposes the following:

- Add CHEM 1230, General Chemistry I to the EET curriculum
- Add EET 3150, C Programming to the EET curriculum
- Delete CSET 110, Introduction to Computer Science & Engineering Technology
- Reduce the Professional Development credit hrs. from 8 credits to 3 credits
- Change the focus of EET 4250, Microcomputer Architecture to Microcontrollers

The net change in credit hrs. is zero – 128 semester hrs. required for graduation

Languages, Literature and Social Sciences

Request program revisions in both the major and minor in Africana studies:

Changes to requirements for major

- Drop AFST 2400 Social Policy and the Black Community
- Make AFST 1200 Intro to the African Experience optional with AFST 2100 Foundations of Black Intellectual History
- Make AFST 3500 Environmental Inequalities & Opportunities optional with AFST 3600 Entrepreneurship in the Black Community

Changes to requirements for minor

- Drop AFST 4900 Senior Seminar
- Add AFST 2300 Black Community Research Methods
- Make AFST 1200 Intro to the African Experience optional with AFST 2100 Foundations of Black Intellectual History
- Require 9 hrs of electives along with 9 hrs of core

Rationale: changes to major and minor allow for more flexibility

Request the following change in the Communications minor:

- To earn a Minor in the Communication Department, a student must complete 21 hours of coursework. Two classes required of all students pursuing the Communication Minor are:
 - Communications 2000 Mass Communication and Society
 - Communication 2400 Information Analysis and Synthesis
- Students desiring to complete the Communication minor must achieve a grade of "C" or above in COMM 2000 and COMM 2400

Rationale: to align grade achievement expectations for students taking the Communication minor with grade achievement expectations associated with students taking the major.

President Powers: Thank you Dr. Regimbal. Next, Dr. Bruce Kennedy and Dr. Scott Molitor have a report from the Faculty Senate Constitution and Rules Committee.

Senator Molitor: We have been doing a little work taking a look at changes that needed to be made to the Constitution. One of these changes came about change of title; the provost at the Health Science Campus took the Chancellor position. So because of that change we decided to take a look at other issues that we can clean up in the Constitution. We have talked about amending it for a while. The last time we amended it was when we merged together in 2006 or 2007. I just want to go through the documents that are being circulated. I believe the proposal is for you to take a look at the ones that's been circulated. It has all of the changes marked, the Constitution and the By-laws. Then we will take a vote in two weeks if there's no further discussion. I wanted to let you know what to expect when you take a look at the changes.

For Article I, Scope and Article II, Jurisdiction, we were asked by the Board of Trustees to include language that affirms our commitment to student centeredness as well as our commitment to maintaining an open dialogue between the Senate, Administration, and the Board of Trustees. In fact, we added a little provision into section A that I believe we have honored to this point, it is when a Board of Trustee member is more than welcome to address the Senate and seek our input at Faculty Senate meetings as needed; so we decided to formally encode that in the Constitution.

Article III has one of the bigger changes. We extended our definition of faculty to make sure that if you have multiple appointments that you are only allowed to represent the college of your primary appointment in the Faculty Senate. Again, this is a policy that we have already adhered to, but it just didn't appear in the Constitution. We excluded administrators, deans or a higher level, which is something that's been our policy that we followed, but it was not formally put into the Constitution. We defined colleges as having full time faculty with primary appointments in that college. There may be colleges that are created that have faculty with adjunct appointments but not primary appointments. So, the college itself has no primary full time faculty and that college will not be eligible for Senate representation. In addition, that relates to the idea of making sure that faculty only represent their primary college that they are appointed to.

Also in Article III, we changed something about the makeup of the Faculty Senate in terms of the election. This input came from the Elections Committee; Mike Caruso attended our meetings while we were discussing this issue. The issue that came up was if there is a college with less than ten faculty, having a minimum of two Senators, for example if you have four or five full-time faculty members in that college, having two Senators can create an inordinate burden on the faculty and inordinate representation for that college. So, the provision of the minimum of two Senators has been changed to a minimum of one if the college has less than ten full-time faculty with their primary appointment in that college, and anybody above that threshold of ten will have two Senators based on the apportionment. Also, Mike Caruso pointed out to us that sometimes when you're trying to get to a target of sixty-four and if you have that exact number of Senators you can run into issues with rounding. For example, you might find that one college gets 5.7 Senators and another college gets 4.6, you will be faced with rounding one up and rounding one down which can create an imbalance of the apportionment. Rather than having that as the apportionment strategy if it came to that situation, we thought it might be better and fair to all colleges involved to round both up. In that case we need to increase the membership Senate to sixty-five. So the idea was to add a clause that sets sixty-four is a soft target the elections committee would shoot for, but due to the nature of rounding if they needed to go up or down one or two Senators from that

number the Faculty Senate can vote to approve on that number before the ballots went out. So, that request came from the Elections Committee.

Also in this Article, there is a provision that actually defines the provost and the chancellor on both campuses as the highest ranking academic officers. You will see language throughout the Constitution where John Barrett edited to indicate that we are referring to the provost and the chancellor now, but if those titles change we are then referring to the highest academic officers on both campuses. Again that will prevent issues of need to amend the Constitution in the future if titles should change. John Barrett cleaned up a little language on the elections right now that's related to the Senate President. Where you have President-Elect, President, and Past President on a three year cycle; there was a phrase in there that said something about "other officers" in fact, the phrase should just say "Past President;" because that is the only officer in the Senate that will be in this position. All of the other officers only have one year terms.

I believe this is something that the Senate has adhered to by consent with regards to amending the Constitution. If there is a clause in the Constitution that is ambiguous and the Senate votes on how to resolve that issue, the results from the other vote will be added to an addendum section to record the results of that vote. Then the last Article in the Constitution related to the transition with the merger a few years ago has been removed and replaced with a future reorganization provision. It basically says this is the process that will proceed if colleges are reorganized and the number of faculty changes in various colleges due to the reorganization, if colleges are added or colleges are removed. So that is the result of the language that is in that Article which is based on the language that is followed from the transition.

A few other points, these are in the Appendix and the By-laws section of the Constitution. On the Faculty Senate elections, so we thought that we should put a provision in there to allow for electronic voting rather than mailed ballots. The Elections Committee felt that it would be a lot easier for the Elections Committee to go forth with electronic voting vs. mailed ballots. The provision basically says that once the process has been agreed upon that this will be the default provision unless voted otherwise by the Senate. If that procedure is not approved by the Senate then it will default to the old mail ballot system that we are currently following. The UCAP and the UCS compositions were specified in the Appendix of the Constitution when in fact, right now they are defined in the collective bargaining agreement and that should supersede what's in the Senate document. So we basically put a provision in there that states the composition of UCAP and UCS are defined by the collective bargaining agreement and if not, then the composition of UCAP and UCS will be as follows.

Senator Kennedy: Concerning this particular revision Mike Caruso tells me that a further technical amendment is needed here. If you look at, Appendix II D2 L2 (draft page 7) the draft text reads "...Elections ballots to UCAP shall be distributed to Faculty Senate members by interoffice mail." The reference to "UCAP" should read "UCS."

Senator Molitor: The election of UCS and UCAP will also follow the electronic election process once it is approved and that would be the default process unless the Senate votes otherwise. The Rules Committee will basically formalize that Senate meetings are held on Tuesday afternoons and that we formalize rule that we have been following that the ballots for Senate officers can only be cast by people who will be members of the Senate in the following Fall semester. Again, that is something the Senate had been following, it just never had been formally laid out in the Constitution. Thanks to Mike Caruso from the Elections Committee. This has been circulated and we would like for everybody to review it and we are going to vote on it two weeks from today. Are there any questions?

4/12/11

Articles I and II

- Article I Scope – add a statement about commitment to student centeredness
- Article II Jurisdiction – affirm commitment to open communication and shared governance with administration and BOT
- Article IIA – BOT members may attend and speak to solicit input from FS

Article III – Membership

- Faculty with multiple appointments are only eligible to represent college of primary appointment
- Exclude administrators at dean level or higher
- Define colleges as having full-time faculty with primary appointments in said college

Article III – Membership

- Minimum representation dropped from two senators to one senator for colleges with less than 10 FT faculty
- Committee on Elections can propose to add or remove 1-2 senators from target of 64 if needed for equitable reapportionment
- Define MC provost and HSC chancellor as highest ranking academic officer for this and subsequent sections

Articles V, XII and XIV

- Article V Executive Committee – cleanup language for Past President election cycle
- Article XII Interpretation – results of FS vote to clarify ambiguity in Constitution will be recorded in a Addendum section
- Article XIV Transitional Provision – replace specific MC/HSC merger provisions with process for future college reorganization

Appendix ID – Elections

- FS elections will be electronic using process agreed upon by FSEC and Committee on Elections unless FS votes to contrary
- Current interoffice mail process is used if electronic process is not used

Rules

- Article I section 1 – meetings are held on Tuesdays 4-6 pm unless changed by vote

Article VI section 1 – ballots for officer election may only be cast by members of FS for the following Fall

Constitution and By-Laws Committee

- John Barrett (chair)
- Leigh Chiarelott
- Bruce Kennedy
- Michael Kistner
- Scott Molitor
- Glenn Sheldon
- Stan Stepkowski
- Donald Wedding
- Michael Caruso (chair of Elections Committee)

Senator Thompson-Casado: Who will be providing electronic voting?

Senator Molitor: That will be up to the Elections Committee, I assume. The process is not yet agreed upon yet. Once that process is agreed upon and after that is the default process.

Senator Dowd: Thank you for all of the work you done on this issue.

Senator Molitor: I should acknowledge that the lion's share of this work was done by John Barrett. He went through it and really looked close at it, and he really did a great job.

President Powers: Thank you Dr. Molitor and Dr. Kennedy. Next, Professor Barbara Floyd has a brief update from the Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee.

Professor Floyd: I am here to give you a progress report on the Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Programs. Before I tell you what we have been doing, I'm going to tell you what we are not doing. There were a couple of recommendations that came out from the Re-Engineering Task Force. That seemed to imply that our committee was involved in things that we are really not doing. So I want to make perfectly clear what it is that our committee is doing and what it is that our committee is not doing. One of these recommendations is: "It is expected that sun-setting will be included within the scope of the strategic plan reorganization team being led by the Faculty Senate. In addition, Penny Poplin Gosetti is currently conducting program review in an attempt to improve curriculum quality and identify sun-setting opportunities. While it is very premature to speculate on which programs will be sun-set, some of the commonly referred to programs would likely result in a \$2.5 million opportunity."

I am not sure where this came from, I am not sure where the \$ 2.5 million dollars came from, and I am not sure what these “commonly referred to” programs are. This is not the activity of our committee. We have never discussed sun-setting programs and we have no idea what these commonly referred to programs are.

Senator Barnes: Does “sun-setting” mean cutting?

Professor Floyd: Yes, I am assuming so.

Senator Barnes: Thank you.

Professor Floyd: Again, I do not know where the \$2.5 million figure came from.

Senator Barnes: An “opportunity” means funds taken from those cut programs?

Professor Floyd: I believe that will be the case. It is an odd view of opportunity. Next, one of the other recommendations of the task force is: “I also expect that opportunities to reduce/eliminate tenure will be within the scope of the strategic plan re-organization team led by the Faculty Senate...” I can assure you that this is not a goal of our committee. We will not be recommending the elimination of faculty, tenured or not, in any academic program. Again, I do not know where those recommendations came from and I am not sure how they got into that document, but I am here to make it clear that those are not within the charge of our committee nor will we be doing that.

This is what we are going to be doing: it is a process that we worked out with Penny Poplin Gosetti and I want to thank her and Heather Huntley for all of the work they have done to try to coordinate this effort. I think we finally have come to a decision about what we are going to be doing and how we are going to be doing it. First of all, the committee members will review program review documents that have been prepared by chairs from the undergraduate programs. An analysis will be done according to an instrument (yet to be developed) that addresses the quality issues in the program review documents. Those programs that appear most vulnerable will have a financial viability and sustainability analysis conducted based upon program-level data to be developed at our request. We hope to work with the Graduate Council’s program review committee for those programs with graduate components; but that is yet to be worked out and I will keep you informed. The programs which appear to have viability and sustainability issues will be candidates for the first round of complete program review that will be conducted in 2012. Our committee will recommend the process for complete program review, which will include viability and sustainability components. So, we are going to be looking at the bench-marked program review documents and then we hope to develop a process for a complete program review. We hope to see this process normalized across the institution in the future, and include review at the undergraduate and graduate levels; but again that is something that is in purview of the graduate council at the graduate level. But, we certainly hope we can coordinate this because it doesn’t make much sense to have one method of program review at the undergraduate level and a different method of program review at the graduate level. Our committee will not be recommending any specific actions for any program, but simply providing analysis to the appropriate parties. Lastly, one very important component of our work is to identify how we improve the data required for viability and sustainability analysis and develop an accepted method for such analysis. One of the problems that we discovered was that data needed for this kind of analysis doesn’t seem to exist or is not good data. So, a lot of what we are going to be doing is recommending data sets that will allow this kind of analysis to be done in the future. So that is where we are and I will be happy to answer any questions.

PowerPoint Slide

Progress Report:

Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Programs

Recommendations from the Re-Engineering Task Force

- "It is expected that sun-setting will be included within the scope of the strategic plan reorganization team being led by the Faculty Senate. In addition, Penny Poplin Gosetti is currently conducting program review in an attempt to improve curriculum quality and identify sun-setting opportunities. While it is very premature to speculate on which programs will be sun-set, some of the commonly referred to programs would likely result in a \$2.5 million opportunity."
 - This is NOT an activity of Ad Hoc Committee, nor have we discussed any likely programs for "sun-setting"
 - Do not know where the \$2.5 million figure came from
- "I also expect that opportunities to reduce/eliminate tenure will be within the scope of the strategic plan re-organization team led by the Faculty Senate..."
 - This is NOT a goal of the Ad Hoc Committee. We will NOT be recommending the elimination of faculty, tenured or not,

in any academic program

Process Developed by Ad Hoc Committee for Future Work

- Committee members will review program review documents that have been prepared by chairs for undergraduate programs
- Analysis will be done according to an instrument (yet to be developed) that addresses the quality issues in the program review documents
- Those programs that appear most vulnerable will have a financial viability and sustainability analysis conducted based upon program-level data to be developed at our request
- We hope to work with the Graduate Council's program review committee for those programs with graduate components
- Programs which appear to have viability and sustainability issues will be candidates for the first round of complete program review that will be conducted in 2012
- Our committee will recommend the process for complete program review, which will include viability and sustainability components
- We hope to see this process normalized across the institution in the future, and include review at the undergraduate and graduate levels
- Our committee will not be recommending any specific actions for any program, but simply providing analysis to the appropriate parties
- One important component of our work is to identify how to improve the data required for viability and sustainability analysis and develop an accepted method for such analysis

Senator Heberle: I have two questions to ask you. First, you mentioned first quotations; I am just wondering what documents are they in.

Professor Floyd: That document is something called The Recommendations of the Re-Engineering Task Force. It is available on the Web and it has many, many recommendations. These are probably that two of most concern.

Senator Heberle: Secondly, the program reviews that was requested from some of us, it was requested with a time line for yesterday so they are really radically incomplete; I am just wondering will that be taken into account because the program review process itself has to be developed.

Professor Floyd: We understand that these reviews that are being done right now are simply bench mark reviews, but it will allow us to begin to identify the process for complete reviews. It will also begin to allow us to identify any vulnerable programs that we might be able to try out a financial viability and sustainability formula on. Whatever those programs are, those will be the programs that will be in the first round of the full program review process in 2012. One of the things that I talked about is once we develop this instrument to analyze these benchmark documents we will give them back to the department to make sure when they look at the instrument that their program reviews are going to be judged against that they have enough data and information for that analysis to be done.

Senator Heberle: I just want to follow up on your comment. There are a lot of programs within our departments and I just hope that that will also be taken into account.

Professor Floyd: Yes it will. There are one hundred and eleven programs that are not necessarily departments. That is one of the problems; data does not exist at the program level. Dr. Poplin Gosetti, is there anything that you would like to add?

Dr. Poplin Gosetti: I know that program review unlike Graduate Council, but it is a part of Graduate Council, it is not in Faculty Senate Constitution, but I appreciate the opportunity to work together as we move forward because I think that it will strengthen the process that we do. So, I will be looking forward to working with this committee to develop a process. The thing with these bench mark program review is how we do this in a sustainable way in a period of time. I appreciate what people have done so far and we are going to try to take it to the next level.

Senator Hottell: I am just curious and it kind of goes along with Senator Heberle's question. The slides that came from the Re-Engineering site, I assume that the Faculty Senate will give us that information. Secondly, normally with these types of sites things are written in the third person or even the first person, plural. This is the first time that I have seen one in first person, singular.

Professor Floyd: The "I" I believe is referred to is David Cutri. If you read the document, I believe that's who the person is that is speaking in that voice. That is one of the concerns; David does serve on our committee to provide assistance from the finance department. So, that is why it is very important to clarify that those two recommendations are not something that our committee is doing. I am not sure where that came from. I requested that the Web site should be corrected, to remove us from that discussion. Are there any other questions? Thank you very much.

Senator Ankle: Thank you.

President Powers: Thank you Professor Floyd. Next, Dr. Steve Peseckis has a report from the Faculty Senate Undergraduate Curriculum Committee.

Dr. Peseckis: This was sent out yesterday for review. All in favor? Any opposed? *Motion Granted.*

New Course and Course Modification Proposals Approved by the Faculty Senate on April 12, 2011

College of Languages, Literature and Social Sciences

New Courses

AFST 3500 Environmental Inequalities and Opportunities 3 Chr

Lec 3, 35 students/semester; 35/section; Semester Offered: Spring, Every Year.

Grading: Normal; Prerequisite: None

Catalog Description: "Explores environmental inequality along racial, ethnic, class and national lines. Applies diverse perspectives on the environment to explain, predict and correct environmental inequality in America and throughout the world."

AFST 3600 Entrepreneurship in the Black Community 3 Chr

Lec 3, 35 students/semester; 35/section; Semester Offered: Fall, Every Year.

Grading: Normal; Prerequisite: 3 hours Social Science or 3 hours AFST

Catalog Description: "Explores the gap between the entrepreneurial aspirations and the actual entrepreneurial enterprises in the black community. Examines the subject in a socio-Historica' context. Diverse sociological perspectives, methodologies, and analyses are employed.

AFST 3700 African Women and the Environment 3 Chr

Lec 3, 35 students/semester; 35/section; Semester Offered: Fall, Every Year.

Grading: Normal; Prerequisite: 3 hours Social Science or 3 hours AFST

Catalog Description: "Overview of empirical evidence and interpretive models of African women with reference to environment. Specific topics: African women managing natural resources; implications of climate change in African ecology and feminism.

CALL (College of Adult Life-long Learning)

Course Modifications

UC 1000 Orientation 1 Chr

Change alpha code to AL (so name is AL 1000 Orientation)

Change grading from "A,B, C, NC" to "A, B, C, D, F"

Reason: Grade change to motivate student to persist in class and to conform to state changes.

UC 1200 Applications of Thinking Critically 1 Chr

Change alpha code to AL (so name is AL 1200 Applications of Critical Thinking)

Prerequisite: Required of incoming students with High School GPA 2.5 or less and an ACT of 18 or less.

Reason: Students with HS GPA 2.5 and ACT score of 18 or less need critical thinking skills to be successful and it is one of the targeted competency.

UC 4940 Field Experiences/Internship 1-8 Chr

Change alpha code from UC to AL (so new name is AL 4940 Field Experiences/Internship)

FYI

ALS 2500 Interdisciplinary Approaches to Research

Use ALS 2500 as requirement for ALS and eliminate ALS 1900. ALS 2500 will be required of new and transfer ALS students.

College of Business and Innovation

Course Modifications

ACTG 1200 Accounting Software

Change title to "QuickBooks"

Change code to CMPT 1200 (to better reflect the software application nature of this course)

Delete prerequisite of "ACTG 1040 or BUAD 2040". Change to "None"

Change course description to: "This course will introduce students to QuickBooks software. Students will record financial transactions for fictional companies. Topics include creating a chart of accounts, recording customer and vendor transactions, processing payroll, and printing receipts."

ACTG 2150 Intermediate Accounting II

Change prerequisite from "ACTG 2100" to "ACTG 1040 or BUAD 2040"

ACTG 2400 Fundamentals of Taxation

Delete prerequisite of "ACTG 1040 or BUAD 2040"

ACTG 2450 Advanced Tax Accounting

Change title to "Tax Accounting II"

ACTG 2500 Auditing and Internal Control

Change prerequisite from "ACTG 1060" to "ACTG 1040 or BUAD 2040"

ACTG 2990 Independent Study in Accounting

Delete prerequisite of "Permission of Instructor." Change to "None"

ADOT 1010 PC Keyboarding I

Change course description to: "Provides instruction via software and the Internet for building keyboarding and document processing skills. Learn formatting standards for business letters, reports and tables."

ADOT 2990 Independent Study

Delete prerequisite of "Permission of Instructor"

BMGT 1010 Business Principles

Change course description to: "An introduction to the world of business focusing on an overview of business operations with special emphasis on management, marketing, accounting and finance."

BMGT 2020 Human Resource Development

Change course description to: "Explores the functions of Human Resources that focus on training and employee development with special emphasis on improving the quality of work life."

BMGT 2990 Independent Study

Delete prerequisite of "Permission of Instructor"

CMPT 1100 Computer Information Applications

Change title to "Microsoft Office Applications"

Change course description to: "Concepts and techniques of the application of Microsoft Word, Excel, Access and PowerPoint in the workplace."

CMPT 1120 Application Programming

Title change to "Visual Basic Programming"

CMPT 1320 Internet and the World Wide Web

Change course description to: "Topics include history of the Internet, IP addressing, World Wide Web, HTML, XHTML and CSS. Students will learn the history and functionality of the Internet and create a two-page website using XHTML and CSS."

CMPT 1400 Introduction to Web Page Development

Change course description to: "Students will learn the basics of creating websites using Dreamweaver. In this course we will be learning web designs skills, CSS, tables, forms, graphics and interactive features. Plan, write and format web pages for workplace applications."

CMPT 1500 Flash Web Animation

Change course description to: "Students will learn entry-level web animation using Adobe Flash. Students will learn to create an animated business card, websites, actions script special effects, movies, buttons and navigation."

CMPT 1510 Digital Imaging

Delete prerequisite of CMPT 1100. Change to "None"

CMPT 1600 Internet Design and Publishing

Change course description to: "This course offers a broad overview and extensive practical experience in the design and production of websites. Students learn current web design technology and create web pages using Microsoft Expression Web."

CMPT 1700 Podcasting, Vodcasting, and Blogging

Change title to "Blogging and Social Networking"

Change course description to: "Students will be introduced to the latest tools and receive extensive practical experience in this new and ever-expanding media. Cloud computing will be explored, as well as blogging, design and development of online audio and video presentations."

CMPT 2030 C Family Programming

Change title change to "C Sharp Programming"

Change course description to: "This course explores the C Sharp programming language. Students will design and compose business applications."

CMPT 2110 Advanced Concepts in Programming

Change title to "Web Application Programming"

Change course description to: "The course covers advanced programming techniques and the concepts of object-oriented programming using a currently popular programming language."

CMPT 2410 Adobe InDesign Desktop Publishing

Title change to "Adobe InDesign"

CMPT 2420 Advanced Adobe InDesign Desktop Publishing

Title change to "Advanced Adobe InDesign"

CMPT 2510 Intermediate Adobe Illustrator

Title change to "Advanced Adobe Illustrator"

Change course description to: "Advanced hands-on exploration of Adobe Illustrator for professional illustration creation and manipulation. Students will incorporate typography, image compositing, painting and image-correction techniques."

CMPT 2530 Intermediate Adobe Photoshop

Title change to "Advanced Adobe Photoshop"

Change course description to: "Advanced hands-on exploration of Adobe Photoshop for digital imaging. Students capture, create, manipulate and edit images for high-end output."

CMPT 2620 Web Site Maintenance

Title change to "Website Redesign"

Change course description to: "Students will learn to keep a website fresh. Students will develop and enhance HTML, CSS and visual design skills and learn about the web design environment and the principles of sound web design and redesign. Previous course work or experience in creating web sites helpful."

CMPT 2990 Independent Study

Delete prerequisite of "Permission of Instructor." Change to "None"

CNET 2200 Network Technologies

Change code to CNET 2000

Change credit hours from 4 to 3

CNET 2300 Network Operating Systems II

Change title to "Linux Operating Systems"

Delete prerequisite of CNET 2100. Change to "None"

Change course description to: "This course offers an in-depth study of a contemporary network operating system. Topics include operating system installation and upgrade, configuration, management and troubleshooting."

CNET 2400 Network Operating System Support

Change title to "Microsoft Directory Services"
Delete prerequisite of CNET 2200. Change to "None"

CNET 2410 Network Services and Infrastructures
Delete prerequisite of CNET 2400. Change to "None"

CNET 2940 Network Capstone Project
Delete prerequisites of "CNET 2200 and CNET 2400" Change to "None"

College of Engineering

New Course

EET 3150 C Programming 4 Chr

- Lec 3, Regular Lab, 1; 20 students/semester, 20/section; Semester offered: Fall, Spring, Every Year
- Prerequisite: Permission of Instructor.
- Normal Grade Only (A-F, PR, I)
- Catalog Description: "This course emphasizes C programming. Design of a microcontroller system including hardware, interface and programming using C is implemented. Lab exercises cover the areas of interrupts, structures and other programming concepts."
- Fit: Junior Level

Course Modification

BIOE 4640 Medical Imaging 3 Chr

- Change prerequisite from "BIOE 3300" to "BIOE 4300, MATH 3860, PHYS 2140"
- Update catalog description from "An introduction to the physical principles, design and function of medical diagnostic imaging systems." to "Mathematics and physics underlying major medical imaging modalities including X-ray radiography and computerized tomography (CT), magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), nuclear medicine imaging, and ultrasound imaging."

CIVE 3310 Structural Analysis

- Change prerequisites from "CIVE 1160; EECS 1050; MATH 1890 or 2890" to "CIVE 1160, MATH 1890 or 2890" So EECS 1050 is deleted.

EET 4250 Microcomputer Architecture 3 Chr

- Change credit hours to "4"
- Course description should read: "This course covers the different types of microcontrollers, their architecture and programming and lab testing and troubleshooting. Topics include: Basic Structure, Programming Fundamentals, Algorithms, I/O Interfacing, Interrupts, Communications and Development Tools."

Reason: Faculty committee decided to reverse an earlier change to credit hours. Originally the course was 4 credits. Due to other changes we decided to change to 3 credits. On the advice of the Industrial Advisory Committee, decided to modify those changes and that eliminated the need to change the credits of EET 4250.

President Powers: Thank you Dr. Peseckis. Next, Provost McMillen will provide a report on Legislation Pertaining to Higher Education in Ohio's Budget Bill.

Provost McMillen: Thank you Mary, I have a rather disjointed presentation today because I had two full days of budgets; I was actually looking forward to coming to Faculty Senate. Things are happening in Columbus and I will briefly review them and will be happy to answer any questions. First, these arrived at my office. I wanted to mention them as a resource. These are *The U.S. Congress Directory* and the *Ohio Legislature*. If you need names, addresses, you might be interested in it. If for nothing else, it makes for interesting reading.

Starting out with a piece of good news, I have a press release through one of our Washington associations. The press release is from the US Senate Committee on Appropriations, which is interesting to read because it reviews the continuing resolution that was passed by the Senate and one of the things that is mentioned, and it says, "...The final legislation does not contain 15% cut to the maximum Pell Grant that would jeopardize millions of students to receive a higher education." That's been a pretty big deal because the Pell Grant was up for debate. Cutting the scholarships that we have in place cut 15%, will just added to our budget woes to say the least. I can give this document to Dr. Powers if anybody would like to look at it; it's a review of what is and isn't in the Bill. Both are from an education point of view, social programs and so on. It is also some information in there about NIH and other grants as well.

Moving on to the State budget Bill; Budget Bill number 153 is having hearings right now and it contains everything, including the kitchen sink; it contains six or seven different provisions that have to do with higher education. I'm sure most of you know these; I actually have a document pertaining to higher education in Ohio Budget Bill. Among the higher education issues that are in the budget includes faculty workload, and most of you know this already that legislation adds a class to every faculty member once every two years on top of the current workload. Other issues include charter universities and Choose Ohio First Scholarships. Another one that has been discussed is three year degrees. Let me comment on the three year degrees a little bit. It's a proposal that actually set deadlines and it states that 40% of all our students will have to graduate in three years by 2014, so I guess we should get going. The legislation says that we can't count summer school classes, which is beyond me. Basically, the point of it is a little more insidious, we have to start doing education in high schools. The idea of it is that students would actually come to college with a year of college from high school. Now some of that of course is okay. We have a wonderful school at Scott Park where students do come in with almost a full year and maybe a little more. But of course, to reach the numbers that they are talking about in here is about impossible. Duo enrollment has been one of the policies that we've heard about regarding our linking with high schools. Duo enrollment means that we have to provide the education, we have to train the teachers (we are obligated to do that) by the Regent's rules. The students only pay a little tuition and we are not allowed to collect State subsidy on them. So it's a pretty good deal for everyone except us. The teachers are gaining degrees because we have to go out and mentor them and teach them. We only have a few such arrangements. We do not have an arrangement with TPS. This was pushed by the last chancellor as much as it is being pushed by the current chancellor.

Today Aaron Baker works with Government Relations and was in Columbus attending the Presidents meeting which meets once every six weeks. In fact, the meeting was visited by Randy Gardner our legislature from Bowling Green and Jim Petro, the new Chancellor. There is some good news; the faculty work load issue is likely to be removed from the budget bill appropriately. Although the issue of faculty productivity is still on the table. Ironically, the legislator and the Chancellor mentioned that there would be exceptions if there is excellence in teaching and research. Also, the whole issue of the three-year undergraduate degree may be debated. Randy is predicting the bill will come out in about three weeks from the House and then it will go to the Senate. So it will not be simply rubber stamping; there will be some debate. The Republicans are feeling some pressure from the citizens and some of the moderate Republicans are deciding that some things have gone a little too far. There is some talk about some additional tuition flexibility beyond what is in the Bill right now which is a 3.5% cap. And the charter university idea is being proposed may also come out. Now remember the chancellor and the legislators were talking before fourteen university presidents, so they may have said things that the university president wants to hear. There is also talk that there may be a Capital Bill. As you may know the budget for Ohio for the month of March which we always heard about (usually ten days after the month is over) is another \$100 million and over revenues. It was \$158 million over budget, which brings to date in FY11 the budget, is out \$627 million over projections, which is a lot of money and April is a huge revenue month because of taxes. So, it's looking more and more likely that we will get the 12th payment that we had to take a cut with six months ago and may even be that we will get a little capital money, even if it's maintenance. Both the last payment and any capital money will not be known to us until the final bill and before another bill is introduced.

Senator Dowd: Time wise, how does that line up with the budget process at U.T.?

Provost McMillen: Well, that's a perennial problem about how the two line up. How long can we wait? Dr. Jacobs has said that he will take at least a preliminary budget to the Board on April 18th, next Monday, so we will see. State budgets and university's budgets can be amended as we go along. It doesn't match up and it is very difficult and it never has.

Senator Dowd: Thank you.

Provost McMillen: You try to do the best that you can to try to balance stuff and hope that the State comes through. Four years ago with Strickland's first budget we knew right away because it came out early and every person in the legislation voted for it which is, of course, unheard-of. That was right after Strickland was elected. But two year ago, it was a much different story. If you remember that, the State budget was not approved until the third week in July, which is after the drop dead deadline. So it could go either way. What we think with the Republicans nomination that they will pass the budget quickly, but like I said, there are breaks in the Republicans ranks and it can be very nasty. The President of the Senate disciplined one of the Republicans, Bill Seitz, because he had voted against Senate Bill 5. He was one of the five Republicans that voted against it, and he disciplined him by taking away his chairmanship and so Seitz was unhappy. Are there any other questions before I move on to the final?

Senator Cluse-Tolar: Is there an "or else" if the university does not have "x%" of their programs transferred in to a three year module by a time limit?

Provost McMillen: It is so vague. It all depends on what the chancellor's does. If it survives the budget, then the chancellor as a cabinet member would assign "the right to rules" that will carry out intent of the law. Who knows? But you always need to have deadlines put on it.

Senator Cluse-Tolar: It's my concern that since we are going to put greater focus on Lifelong Learning and being able to get credit for life experience that there's going to be a lot of pressure to that and we are going to be graduating people who really aren't academically sound.

Provost McMillen: It's Prior Learning Assessment (PLA) and in fact, Dennis Lettman is having a well-known speaker here tomorrow to give a presentation on that very issue. Dennis and I were in a meeting together yesterday and he said "Literally no one comes into the adult learning program without prior learning." So, that may be practical to have a three-year program for his students. I had lunch with students about two weeks ago and I brought up some of these issues just to hear what they would say and some of them started laughing and said "We can't even graduate in four years, how are we going to graduate in three year?"

Senator Hammersley: There are some special projects that the campus has been involved with i.e. solar, wind and others that seemed to have slid in popularity at the State level. What kind of impact is there on the University for Global Funding in those areas that we are trying to really push for the entire Northwest Ohio? Is that a budget chunk that we can't forecast?

Provost McMillen: That's a huge issue because of Third Frontier funding. The governor is moving the Third Frontier funding out of the Department of Development and setting a separate corporation to run it. Then he brought a man from California, who is an entrepreneur and is taking a salary of one dollar. He is essentially replacing the Director of Development, but then he realized that he couldn't because he couldn't move from California. He then moved to a special assistant to the governor category and then on Saturday afternoon he was out doing motor cross and was injured. He is scheduled to be here for graduation, but I don't know if he's coming. Going back to your question is that the Third Frontier right now has been in sort of a position of funding left over money. We have not received any of it. It sort of depends on how it gets funded, if it gets funded through the budget bill, or if it is gets funded privately. It's going to have a big impact on us.

Senator Fink: I don't want to put you into an awkward position, but obviously we are facing severe budget cuts and faculty members often come to me and say, "what is going on in terms of what cuts might be made?" I don't know if you are in a position to comment on that, but if so, could you?

Provost McMillen: I can make some comments if it's all right because most of you have already been involved in this discussion with your deans and department chairs anyway. Essentially what have happened is that we have had previous budget hearings and then we had budget hearings and all of the deans were given a 20% figure cut of what they have. So, for a smaller department that may mean a few thousand dollars, but for a larger department that may mean two million or more and they were asked to prioritize cuts. Most of the deans offered not just cuts but also revenue enhancement and they ultimately were not asked to do that. They also offered up a number of cuts to their colleges, that was the first phase. The second phase was when all of the deans, the chancellor, the Provost's finance person, Brenda Grant, and myself went before the finance people to present their presentations. Those deans just concluded those budget meetings. The finance people went in and reacted to those and now they are asking for a number of college programs to come back. So that is where we stand. The president is supposed to be involved with the meetings on Thursday and Friday; this will be the third budget meeting for some people and there will be discussions and he will put things together for presentations. This month is a committee meeting for the Board.

Senator Wedding: What is the total deficit that we are looking at and professing to be using?

Provost McMillen: The total deficit is \$35,464,000 dollars.

Senator Wedding: That's the number that I have seen, but to get to that number they added in \$6 million dollars extra to the appreciation, \$6.5 million dollars to go back to the special reserve fund and about \$2.8 million to the Athletic Department. So they are basically doubting the real deficit and now they are going back to the colleges and asking for more cuts so we start cutting academics or appreciation. Last year it was \$30 million then they upped it \$6 million, I do not know how they got to that. Then they are going to turn around and replenish and in the mean time we are going to cut anything that we can in the academic area. It makes a lot of sense.

Provost McMillen: I think what you said is exactly accurate. That is why I have been working hard to defend the academic enterprise.

Senator Dowd: At the Finance and Strategy Committee meeting it was stated that depreciation last year was set at \$30 million. Someone at the meeting asked for clarification, whether that meant \$30 million was spent for renovations last year. The answer was "no" --- only \$14 million was spent on renovations. Provost McMillen, this is not directed at you because I know you didn't determine the amount set aside for depreciation. But the administration under spent that amount they allocated for renovations last year. What did they do with the remaining \$16 million last year? This year the Finance office has set depreciation at \$36 million. If the amount spent on renovations is maintained at \$14 million, what is the administration going to do with the remaining \$22 million? That \$22 million could be used to reduce the \$25 million budget gap to only \$3 million. Our colleagues are asking these questions. Additional information about this issue would be very helpful so we could explain to our colleagues whether the \$25 million in budget cuts are justifiable.

Provost McMillen: I am struggling with the concept myself regarding depreciation. I understand that is no help to anybody. One of the reasons that have been said was the lack of the capital bill. The capital bill is a good bill to support because it's not just us saying we need a capital bill, but it's all of the contractors and people out in the community who are telling their representatives that we need public spending on instruction. So, if we have \$2 million, \$3 million, or \$4 million it can dramatically reduce that number.

Senator Barnes: What kind of response have you received from the individuals in Columbus when you tell them what we are telling you about how this proposed increase in workload is going to affect the quality of education that we are able to deliver? Would they simply not believe you? Will they say there is nothing we can do? Or is it just a plot, like Senate Bill 5 to totally mess with anyone that has a good wage and a good job?

Provost McMillen: I think the serious answer is that it is a bad situation and everybody has to suffer. I think the worst answer is that we take the stimulus money and now we have to suffer the consequence; that is what Gov. Kasich has said in his State of the state speech. Another answer is that I heard, legislators believe that there is this tremendous middle management that every university has and it should be cut.

Senator Barnes: Who is middle management? Do you know?

Provost McMillen: I heard a few people state faculty is the middle management. Truthfully, I never heard anyone say cut faculty.

Senator Wedding: Senator Barnes I think you misunderstood because what we are talking about here is another \$15 million being added over and above what Columbus is going to dock us. We are talking about things like appreciation, a rainy day fund, and \$2.8 million to the Athletic Department that is being added to what the State is going to dock us. So, the question is why is this other money being added? We have to accept what the State does, but do we have also to internally spare ourselves?

Provost McMillen: Some of this stuff is understandable, for example “inflation vs. supplies.”

Senator Jorgensen: Provost McMillen you mentioned in your Senate State budget report the “Choose Ohio First” Program. We have a fair number of students that are funded by that through scholarships. I understand that that’s okay for next year.

Provost McMillen: Yes, that is my understanding of it.

Senator Anderson: That’s the existing programs. Do you know anything about the new round of soliciting programs?

Provost McMillen: I really don’t, however I will find out. I have just one more thing to mention. I mentioned an article from Gongwer; it is the electronic news letter that comes out every week day from the State Capital. It’s a private organization. The reporters are going out and collecting information that’s usually most helpful. The Capital Scene is where they talk about things that are going on around the capital square. It states “...Matthew Forney has been named Managing Director Government...of the Ohio affairs of Congress. In his new role Mr. Forney will direct the chamber legislature teams daily operations and the chambers... program. He said Linda Woggn has been appointed to the new Executive Vice President position at the chambers. Mrs. Wagn who has been with the group since 1996 will assist with the government affairs program and campaign for jobs etc. My Forney graduated from the University of Toledo and served as an aid to two State lawmakers whose legislature for the liaison for the Ohio consumer...similar position at another law firm.” I just wanted you to inform you about Matthew Forney. Thank you everyone.

President Powers: Thank you Provost McMillen. Next, Dr. Sawicki has an announcement and update about the HLC preparations.

Senator Sawicki: The HLC self-study is going to be uploading the first draft of the entire self-study on April 15th on the self study website at www.utoledo.edu/accreditation. It will be posted until the end of May. This is the second opportunity for all constituents at UT to read what has been drafted for the full self study report and to send in their comments, additions and any other examples that they feel are important to make the point of how well UT is meeting the HLC criteria. We really appreciate the help we received the last time and especially from those responding to the letters that went out. The self-study criterion teams got some wonderful additional evidence and feedback. So, I thank you and I encourage you all to read it. Thank you very much.

President Powers: At this time, I would like ask Dr. Nick Piazza to provide a brief update from the Ohio Faculty Council of the Ohio Board of Regents.

Senator Dowd: President Powers may I ask that we return to the previous issue? Is there going to be an update from Dr. Poplin Gosetti?

President Powers: Dr. Poplin Gosetti do you have any other updates? I recently received a message from Heather Huntley that only Senator Sawicki would provide the HLC update today.

Dr. Poplin Gosetti: No

Senator Dowd: I apologize for the interruption. I thought Dr. Poplin Gosetti was going to give a report today. The semester is winding down, Dr. Poplin Gosetti, and I know that your work to prepare us for the HLC visit will continue over the summer months. Are there ways in which the Faculty Senate can assist you during the summer?

Senator Sawicki: Thank you very much for that idea. I will work with Dr. Poplin Gosetti to identify areas where the self study and the senate can collaborate this summer. We will let you know. Thank you.

Senator Dowd: President Powers, I again apologize for that interruption.

President Powers: Thank you. Dr. Piazza.

Senator Piazza: The Ohio Faculty Council met on April 8th. There were a number of items of business which all involves a rather lengthy discussion.

First, Chancellor Petro was unable to meet with the OFC this month and has rescheduled for next month.

Second, the OFC chose not to pursue a Freedom of Information Act request for those University System of Ohio Presidents in the Inter-University Council to disclose their positions on SB5. Instead, the OFC decided to invite IUC CEO, Bruce Johnson, to discuss the IUC's position without having to go through a process that might be perceived as adversarial. The option to pursue an FOIA request at a later date was left open pending the level of cooperation the OFC receives from the IUC.

Third, we discussed planned efforts for a referendum to reverse SB5. All of the various unions in Ohio have agreed to pool their resources to raise \$20 million for a referendum campaign. The Ohio chapter of AAUP has pledged \$200,000 as our share.

Finally, we discussed Gov. Kasich's proposed budget. There are two items in the budget that have direct bearing on higher education.

There is a proposal for all Ohio universities to convert all or most of their four year degree programs into three year degree programs or to at least offer a three year alternative.

The budget also contains a provision that would require that all faculty teach one extra course every biennium.

The Provost at The Ohio State University has testified against these provisions in the bill and there is some optimism that legislators will remove these provisions from the budget bill to give them further consideration. Provost Alutto's testimony is available at <http://oaa.osu.edu/alutto-testimony-house-April-2011.html>.

President Powers: Thank you, Dr. Piazza. That concludes the executive business for this meeting. Is there any other business from the floor?

We now have time for general questions and concerns that the Senate should address. If there are no questions, may I have a motion for adjournment?

Senator Barnes: I would like to move that we sunset this meeting.

President Powers: All in favor? Meeting adjourned.

IV. The meeting is adjourned at 5:21 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Hoblet
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard
Faculty Senate Office Administrative
Secretary