

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

II.

of as a clinical experience at the undergraduate level and we should take that into account – that's the idea.

Professor Ekelman stated that she is sure that Nursing would have issues. She said that her question has to apply to what's done at an associate degree level. How would that impact our undergraduate programs?

traditional lecturer types of classes, whether it is an Associate or Bachelor's. He added that we do apply that at all levels basically. We do treat seminars differently from traditional lecture courses even though that is still meeting physically in a classroom. Certainly you can do that. UCC has seen proposals recently where looking of Business analytic proposals coming out of the College of Business and they want to offer some courses at evening sessions which just means they will meet for twice as long per week over eight weeks. He noted that in his Economics Department they have an alternate schedule like that as well for a couple of their courses because that's what works best for the timing of the material for their Master's program. However, the minimum number of minutes and hours and contact time still are met.

Dr. Goodell asked Professor Goodman to restate his proposed amendment. Professor Goodman moved that Senate amend this proposal to exempt graduate level professional programs from these standards.

Dr. Goodell inquired if this applies to the supervision of clinical laboratory experiences or all of these standards. Professor Goodman replied that he can live with lab hours and lecture hours but we can't live with the definitions under practicum and field work in clinical experiences.

Dr. Goodell then stated that Professor Goodman moved that the graduate level professional programs should be exempt or may be exempt or would be exempt.

Senator Robert Krebs raised a broader question. He said that he would assume that in this room, very few of us have had the opportunity to read this document nor do we think we needed to because once some sort of an exception or real problem arises, it sort of highlights the problem for most departments. Those programs need to look at these more carefully than he is sure that we have done. He is concerned about trying to vote and pass a document now that we are trying to make up little tweaks on the fly here as if this is going to cover everything. He added that he is sorry. There have simply been too many demands on all of us to read every document that comes across the table. Now this one seems to have some serious problems to it that we need to look at more carefully rather than to try to vote on today.

Dr. Goodell asked Professor Robert Krebs if he was proposing to table the document until the next meeting. Professor Krebs said, "Yes." Dr. Goodell then asked for a second to the motion. Professor Beth Ekelman seconded the motion. Dr. Goodell then asked for a vote. The motion to table the UCC proposal to adhere to OBOR's

MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF

PAGE

apply the guidelines.” She stated that she also thinks that last year everybody was rushed so we probably were not getting the best work of everybody just because of the timeline. She added that she appreciates the suggestions on how to improve things.

Dr. Goodell stated that this proposal will be discussed at the next Steering Committee meeting depending on the feedback Bill Kosteas has received; we will decide at the next Steering meeting whether the proposal will appear at Senate or whether we put it off until the next year.

B. Recommendations on the following items: (Report No. 65, 2013-2014)

Professor Kosteas reported that these next items are just recommendations of items that the UCC felt we need to give more attention to in the future.

- 1. Ongoing review of General Education Courses**
- 2. Core requirement for syllabi**
- 3. Clear guidelines for course numbering**
- 4. Standardize the undergraduate and graduate catalog descriptions**
- 5.**

syllabi submitted. Faculty making comments like, “office hours, if you can find me.” He stated that in another course there may be a statement on their syllabus that they reserve the right to change anything in the course at any time. He stated that the vast majority of us understand that things like this are not appropriate but there are those occasions when certain things are missing. It would help if we just had a certain standard basic format of what is required to be on the syllabus along with maybe a set of guidelines as to those things you should not put on your syllabus. He noted that along those same lines, we really should standardize the catalog and it really should be written in one voice in some degree of uniformity. There is also some concern that when you look at the catalog, the catalog should be have a simple c

Dr. Goodell stated that the Provost will hopefully give us an update on where the program prioritization process stands, and how the completion of certain rating and

she fears that some people may have ignored it for that reason. She noted that she in fact thought it was a test but it wasn't, it was the real thing. Faculty should receive the paper-based Committee Preference Sheet by internal mail as last year. She noted that last year, there was a problem with some departments, her own department in particular, because Committee Preference Sheets did not get distributed for some inexplicable reason. So, we thought we would try and cover our bases this year and send the Committee Preference Sheet out by email as well as by paper. She stated that she emailed Tommie Barclay of IS&T and next year we will hopefully work through those procedures to change the process with the support of IS&T or Maribeth Kralik, who does the Graduate faculty election procedures so we can use the same method. She asked everyone to please complete their Committee Preference sheet, whether on paper or electronically, and to encourage their colleagues to complete theirs as well, and return them to Violet Lunder in the Senate Office as soon as possible, but not later than April 18, 2014. Dr. Goodell then noted that the open committee positions are listed on page 3 of today's Agenda. Dr. Goodell stated that our last Faculty Senate meeting of the year includes elections. She asked faculty to please talk to their colleagues and encourage them to volunteer because we generally have strong faculty governance when people are involved.

Senator Linda Wolf reported that she has three openings on the University Electronic Learning Committee and they are not listed on the upcoming Senate Elections. Dr. Goodell pointed out that members of the E-Learning Committee are appointed by the Academic Steering Committee and that is why that committee is not listed on the upcoming Senate Elections.

V. Report of the Provost and Chief Academic Officer

Provost Deirdre Mageean first announced that President Ronald Berkman was unable to attend Senate today because he is on the road

happen again. She noted that they did actually have a first meeting of a number of parties including IS&T to talk about helping better to do this kind of thing when we buy software. Better to test it, make sure people know what's going on, make sure that IS&T people know about it, make sure that the support is going to be there and that the users can get a chance to look at this software. She noted that there are plenty of lessons from the past to make sure we do this kind of thing better. The full range of software can be of use to us if it is adopted and it's used well. There is no shortage of these things and Lord knows we need plenty of help as we move forward.

Provost Mageean noted that Professor Goodell mentioned Master Planning. Professor Rachel Carnell is going to talk about this but she has requests from some of us and Rachel is the representative who has volunteered for that. The Provost appreciates her doing this. She reported that some additional meetings have been added to the schedule, namely, a focus group with some faculty from 10:30 to 11:30 AM on Thursday, April 24, 2014 and open meetings for faculty from 12:00 Noon to 1:00 PM on that same day. The first meeting will be in MC 105 and the second meeting will be in the MC Auditorium. She noted that this is then followed up with a meeting on Friday, April 25, 2014 from 10:30 to 11:30 AM which is a focus group of department chairs, program directors and associate deans. W

request of Dr. Duffy, she brought along and distributed to the entire team a set of metrics that we were going to use. First, they contextualized this a little bit as she did with the Faculty Senate Steering Committee. She thinks we all know that as Dr. Goodell said, we are all under scrutiny and accountability. We certainly live in a very different budgetary environment than we did in the good old days. In the State of Ohio as in many other states we have seen a serious decline. She mentioned this to her colleagues in New England, and she referred to ourselves transcending from state universities, to state supported universities, to state assisted universities, and now they are really state located universities. We are fortunate in Ohio to retain the percentage that we have and how the Governor has continued to support higher education. Nevertheless, there are interes

other large tasks like the 4 to

no money from Heaven, there is nothing coming to us. SGA President Allyson Dumski, wanted to let Senate know that this is an exercise not confined to the academic side of the University. The President has made it quite clear and said that this has been something that has been expected of all sides of the house. Units in all silos have got to be reviewed. What are they doing, how are they are spending their money, are there any efficiencies. We hope to get this back to the deans, very, very shortly. She believes that the discussion has to take place in the colleges. Frankly, we are running against certain deadlines that are coming up very quickly. She commented that you can say to somebody, I have been working for twelve months only for so long. She noted that she has encouraged the deans to conduct at least two open forums with the faculty when they get this information back so there is some opportunity for discussion.

Provost Mageean said that on a somewhat parallel track is the request for new faculty positions and we will be hearing from the deans on April 24th, 25th or 23rd going forth on that. Clearly, some faculty positions have to be allocated. She stated that she thinks we understand all of this. We may not be able to resolve this completely in the next month but we can at least do some first quarter things and deal with them, i.e., faculty positions and there will be some delay in getting some of the others through.

Provost Mageean noted that this is where we are with the process thus far and, as she said, she is happy to make those metrics available. Finally, she said that at the

discussed. However

Before, the formula was based upon either a two or a five-year average of data whichever was better and that's what the institution got. So, this whole redo of the formula kind of cleaned up a lot of the things that were not only troublesome but were inconsistent and it will take a little bit of time. Even if we have a poor course completion year because of the three-year average or a poor graduation in numbers, it's important to know that the graduation performance in the formula is not the graduation rate but is the number of graduates that we produce in undergraduate and graduate courses. All of that now is based on a three-year average that started in FY 14, the current year we are in, and it will continue on in FY 15. He noted that the other variable, the big one, is that it is a fixed pot that the legislature allocates for SSI funding all over the State. So, we are dependent upon what the other institutions do with respect to their outcome performance. It is not, we did better, therefore there is new money and we will get more because we did better. It is a zero sum gain. We expect that our allocation will remain about flat, about 69.5%, \$70 million range. When we get to 16-17, there are going to be some more tweaks to the funding model that we are going to discuss over next year. We are going to clean up some of the things tha.2 0 0 50 0 0Tm /TT1 1 Tf () Tj ETo162 514.he

at Senate knows anyone on their college Faculty Affairs Committees, please make sure that they get their additional questions to the UFAC for their college specific instrument. He reported that UFAC has heard from three or four colleges.

A. Revised Harassment Policies (Report No. 68, 2013-2014)

Dr. Karem reported that the only action item he has today from UFAC is the revised Harassment Policies. As he indicated at the last Senate meeting, these are in a way a kind of fait accompli so it is already done. Because of Federal compliance, these had to be passed by this year and UFAC had just only two weeks. It is still vital to have Faculty Senate vote on this to show our support of this policy and our stand against harassment and discrimination and things of that nature. Dr. Karem stated that the Office of Compliance has been extremely helpful in working with UFAC taking feedback from the different groups here. UFAC has approved this policy as it has been amended in response to feedback and it was available for an open comment period as well. Dr. Karem reported that he is not the originator of the policy but we do have a representative from the Office of Institutional Equity at Senate today. He added that he is happy to answer questions from the UFAC standpoint and for other questions, perhaps he can invite Equity up here. He then asked if there were any questions.

Senator Vera Vogelsang-Coombs inquired if there will be a dissemination plan that will go with the policy because just having the policy in place doesn't mean people will abide by it. If they don't know about it then you can't do much.

Ms. Rachel King, Chief Compliance Officer, Office of General Counsel, responded that this is actually a very timely question. She noted that they are in discussion right now. They certainly are undertaking a pretty daunting task. Because of the compliance issues that Dr. Karem mentioned, they need to train all employees – faculty and students – on the new policy. The Office is currently in the process of working with a vendor to do training for students both incoming first-year students, transfers and graduate students. They are working with Human Resources to make sure that that's addressed. With new employees, it currently already is but they are also making sure that this new policy is disseminated that way. They also are considering to make this issue, this topic, part of new faculty training this year so that plan is in the works right now absolutely, but it is not finalized at this time.

Dr. Goodell stated that the University Faculty Affairs Committee has proposed endorsement of the Revised Harassment Policies and asked for a vote. The UFAC's proposed endorsement of the Revised Harassment Policies was approved unanimously by voice vote.

B. Workload Amendment – House Bill 484 (Report No. 69, 2013-2014)

Dr. Karem stated that the only thing he has for the moment with respect to the workload is some people may be aware that last year, imbedded in the budget bill, was a provision of increasing faculty workload by ten percent. It is interesting because we

don't like across-the-board things when it comes to workload. He noted that everybody is going to teach an additional course beyond their present workload. In addition to teaching an additional course the following year, which is the extent of his mathematical expertise. Our view is that it is inconsistent and it is a mess and it is not strategic. Dr. Karem stated that recently a new provision crept in. In the document he distributed, he noted that this is an amended version

Provost Mageean stated that Jesse Drucker is r

Professor Robinson May stated that the article seemed to say that there were two phases of the training and one seemed to be more of informational and then some kind of immersive experience.

Ms. King responded that she certainly doesn't know that immersive experience would be included. It's an application. Actually she sat through the module and she thinks it's very engaged and interactive, much more so than just a PowerPoint presentation. She added that there are scenarios and there are different things that students have to do to show they actually are engaged with it. For example, slides will come up and students

Professor Rachel Carnell stated that she was asked to be the faculty representative to the Master Planning Group but she has no prior knowledge of master planning and she was also told before she attended the first meeting that the Master Plan would be completed by the end of June 2014. She said she understands from people who work in this business that this is extremely unusual. It is more usual that there should be a one or two year timeline. She noted that she doesn't know why this process needs to be completed by the end of June and perhaps the Provost can enlighten us about the urgency of what we are doing. She added that she doesn't know where the deadline has come from but it is making the process accelerated to

MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF

PAGE

forums after the semester ends and that I should be the one to be a conduit to encourage faculty to participate. They also asked me to report back to them what you said when I came to you at this meeting. I can report back by email to any of these people at the Smith Group. You can tell me which group of faculty you would like included at the select group of faculty meeting that is scheduled for the morning of Thursday, April 24th which will be followed by a noon open forum for faculty on Thursday, the 24th and I will have this sent through Joanne to you.

Professor Karem thanked Professor Carnell for reporting to Senate. He said that he had just a bit of feedback to the consultants since there is another faculty forum coming up. He wonders if there is a delicate way to suggest to them that they actually need another forum because the first was very informative but it was an hour straight of PowerPoint slides. This meeting was not engaging or interactive and we had little time for comments and felt very rushed.

Professor Carnell replied that she was actually going to tell them that they needed to allow faculty to speak.

Senator Elizabeth Lehfeltdt stated that unless she missed it, which is entirely possible, could these dates be publicized to the faculty on the campus forum via email and as many ways as possible because the last forum, the first she heard about it was at the last Faculty Senate meeting when there was only a week to spare. Now she is hearing about another round of meetings with only a week to spare and she thinks her faculty

people haven't noticed, is the

appointed by Dr. Goodell or the Senate Vice President or the Senate Secretary to represent our concerns with this?"

Professor Carnell commented that she is gathering from Senate that people do not believe that timeframe is reasonable but she is hoping for as many people as can attend and she will be sure that they (planning committee) say less and listen more. She is gathering that this committee may not want to have a selected faculty by this group. If Senate does, then faculty should let Joanne Goodell know that they would like to do that. She noted that there are two separate meetings and faculty should let Joanne know if they would like to do that.

Dr. Goodell asked if there was any new business. There being no new business, Senate President Goodell asked for a motion to adjourn. It was moved, seconded and the meeting adjourned at 4:55 P.M.

Stephen F. Duffy
Faculty Senate Secretary

/vel