

Faculty Senate, Minutes, November 8, 2016

University of Toledo Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: <http://utdr.utoledo.edu/ur-PA-63>

This Meeting Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at The University of Toledo Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Agendas, Minutes, Constitution by an authorized administrator of The University of Toledo Digital Repository. For more information, please see the repository's [About page](#).

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of November 8, 2016
FACULTY SENATE

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

Approved @FS on 1/17/2017

Summary of Senate Business

Anthony Quinn- Co-chair of Strategic Planning Committee

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 Humphrys: I call this meeting to order. Welcome to the sixth Faculty Senate meeting of AY 2016-2017. **Lucy Duhon**, Executive Secretary, called the roll.

I. Roll Call: 2016-2017 Senators:

Present: Atwood, Barnes, Bjorkman, Bouillon, Cappelletty, Compora, Crist, Dowd, Duhon, Edwards, Emonds, Gilchrist, Gruden, Hall, Haughton, Hoy, Humphrys, Jorgensen, Keith, Kippenhan, Krantz, Lanham, Lecka-Czernik, Malhotra, Modyanov, Monsos, Niamat, Nigem, Oberlander, Randolph, Relue, Rouillard, Said, A. Thompson, Thompson-Casado, Van Hoy, Weck-Schwarz, Wedding (substitute for S. Ariss), White, Wittmer

Excused absences: Brickman, Devabhaktuni, Duggan, Giovannucci, Gray, Kovach, Lundquist, McLoughlin, Patrick, Prior, Sheldon, Williams

Unexcused absences: Burnett, Harmych, Jaume, Martin (substitute for G. Thompson), Mohamed, Nathan, Schaefer, Srinivasan, Tian, Willey

III. Approval of Minutes: Minutes are not ready for approval.

President Humphrys: Your Executive Committee has been working on several issues, as well as communicating with the administration concerning plans and decisions for the University.

Among those issues is the potential switch to a 15-week semester, which we will begin discussing today, with the possibility of voting on this change at our next meeting. I am happy to report that both President Gaber and Provost Hsu recognize the role that faculty should play, but up until now have not been given the opportunity to play, in making decisions regarding the academic schedule. As a result, the Senate will need to consider adding an Academic Schedule Committee to its roster of committees. In the interest of time and because of the impending change, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee will assume this responsibility for the current academic year.

The Executive Committee has been working with the administration and an academic department regarding an issue that was brought to our attention and for which we will provide additional information in upcoming meetings. Related to this, I would like to call your attention to the fact that the Faculty Senate website now has a link called "Submit Issue for Faculty Senate Review." It provides information on how to notify the Executive Committee of an issue, problem or idea that the University community would like the Senate to review. Included on this site is a method to submit issues anonymously.

I appreciate the positive comments that I have received from Senators regarding the presentation by Interim Registrar Julie Quinonez providing procedural information regarding the submission of grades. At

your suggestion, I have followed-up with Julie about an interest in further discussing the use of the NR grade and understanding how to use the new feature that allows us to upload grade sheets from, for example, Excel to Banner to facilitate with the submission of grades.

Today we will continue with our theme of discussing UT's budgetary issues. We'll be looking at the topic of contribution margins. I think it's important to point out that focusing on increasing enrollment is just one part of the budgetary story. Other areas such as state subsidy, which we discussed at an earlier meeting, and the University's propensity to provide significant scholarships for a large portion of our student body play a significant role in where we are today.

Lastly, the Senate—via its Academic Regulations Committee—will be very busy this year reviewing existing policies and writing new policies regarding areas of importance that have not been addressed heretofore by official policies. For example, currently the University does not have a policy that specifically defines what constitutes a credit hour. Also, we do not have a formal policy addressing the use of self-authored materials being used in a class. The establishment of policies addressing such issues will set a foundation for future decisions by this body. That completes the Executive Committee Report for today.

Recording Error: Someone asked if anyone remembered whether Jacobs /Scarborough and the Board of Trustees had passed a resolution defining a credit hour. Senator Krantz then responded that this was in the Fall of 2012.

Senator Rouillard: We could ask Joan Stasa for the board minutes related to the topic of the definition of the credit hour.

President Humphrys: Thank you. Our first speaker is Provost Hsu.

Provost Hsu: The first item, we have constituted an ad hoc committee to develop an institutional student learning outcome. This is an area that we've been criticized by the Higher Learning Commission on, not just during the last visit, but during the last two or three visits. We were put on notice and are required to provide interim mid-term reports. We are determined that in the future we are not put on these types of monitoring programs. The ad hoc committee consists of members of the Faculty Senate, Graduate Council, University Assessment Committee, and representatives from the Provost Office. Their goal is to help us develop a set of university-wide learning outcomes for our students and then our plan is to integrate that into our strategic planning process so we can demonstrate this as part of our university-wide initiatives. It will be measured, and it will be assessed, and it will have an impact on future campus-wide decision making. In order to get faculty input on the campus-wide student learning outcome, the committee will develop a faculty survey and it will be sent out electronically to all faculty. I'm hoping to get input as to what our meaningful learning outcomes are for all of our students.

Secondly, you've probably all seen a couple of email messages from me announcing the development of a new leadership institute for our faculty. I am happy to report that we have a very good response from the faculty- 47 applied and we only had 15 spots available. We decided to expand it to 16 positions, so it's going to be a difficult selection process because the majority of the faculty who applied will not get in. Because this is the first year, we are only able to do six months, December till May (six sessions) but the following year we will begin in August, so we will have more sessions and a better prepared and better organized program. So the faculty members who have an interest and cannot get into the program this year, will be able to get into a better program next year.

The last item I want to report, and again, this has something to do with the Higher Learning Commission – HLC just this week approved for our university a status called HLC Notification Program. This is when a university opens up a new site, be it 5 miles from here or 500 miles from here, we need to apply and get approval from HLC. Because of our good performance in the past we have developed a certain trust from HLC. They now say, as long as the new site is within the North Central region we no longer need their prior approval- all we have to do is develop a site and then notify them online. There's a website and all we have to do is upload the document that says we now have a new site at Firelands or whatever site. So this works for us, so we don't have to wait nine months in order to get a new site. So this is very good news that I want to report and thank you again for giving me this opportunity.

President Humphrys: Thank you, Provost Hsu. Are there any questions for Provost Hsu?

Senator Dowd: Have you identified any sites we may be expanding?

Provost Hsu: Well, in fact there is one site that we avoided this approval process, which is Firelands where we are having a new nursing program that is ready to go. All of you know that with nursing, we are limited by the clinical placement sites and in this area we're sort of saturated.

Senator Dowd: That is good news.

President Humphrys: Are there any other questions? Thank you Provost Hsu, we appreciate that. One thing I'll add on to what Provost Hsu just shared with us – the representatives from Faculty Senate who are serving on that assessment committee, the committee that comes up with learning outcomes university-wide – I worked with Connie Shriner and she asked me to suggest faculty who have been involved with the Core Curriculum or the Undergraduate Curriculum Committees in the Senate, so we got Diane Cappelletty, she is one of our reps, Glenn Sheldon is also a rep., and Amy Thompson is also going to be part of that. So those are going to be our three representatives. I think they have a pretty fast turnaround if I remember, I think maybe even by the end of this semester.

Provost Hsu: Right, the reason for the fast turnaround is that we needed that information for our strategic plan; we want to integrate the learning outcomes into our strategic plans.

Senator Rouillard: How are the university-wide learning outcomes going to be different from gen ed. outcomes which will also be university-wide learning outcomes?

Provost Hsu: I think the differences might be subtle, but similar, for example being a local citizen and things like that. I am not on the committee so I don't know what the committee plans are.

Senator Rouillard: Okay.

Provost Hsu: I am hoping that the faculty would help define that. It may very well be very similar, but we need to integrate it into our strategic plan and our assessment process.

Senator Rouillard: Thank you.

President Humphrys: Also, Senator Rouillard in my discussion about this with Connie, she mentioned that they're not entering into this with the belief that every student who leaves will have satisfied every

outcome or even a certain subset- it's mainly just to kind of give a direction and I'm sure we will get some updates from our representative.

All right, speaking of Diane Cappelletty, she is next on the agenda as the chair of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee.

Senator Cappelletty: So again, undergraduate curriculum is meeting and doing actually a lot via email, so thank goodness for email and thank goodness for the curriculum tracking process, it's so far working well for us. So we actually had three new course proposals that went into the system since we last talked that we reviewed. We had eight course modifications that were reviewed, four of them we still want more information from the instructors and the colleges, so they are being deferred for another meeting. Then there are four course modifications that we felt we were okay with to move forward to Faculty Senate for approval.

So the three new courses are at the top: one is Business- it is Sustainable Business Practices, one is in History- Women in Medieval Europe, and the third one is a Criminology course. I keep telling them, every time I see stuff from Mick I want to take his courses because they look like so much fun. But that is criminal forensics and it is supposed to be trial practice, not "trail" practice, so we corrected that slight typo on the form. But, those are the three new course proposals and they do not overlap with any other courses offered in the university. I believe the history course is being cross-listed with the WGST 4980 course; the cross-listing was clarified and it was one of the things we needed information on. I am asking that the three new course proposals be considered as one motion. Does anybody object to that process? Are there any questions or discussion on the new course proposals? All in favor of the new course proposals, say "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? *Motion Passed.*

Moving on to the course modifications, Business: Principles of Marketing has a prerequisite change, they are eliminating Macro Economics 1150. The E-Commerce Business Models & Project Management- that had a name change, they are defining the course a little bit better as well as it had a prerequisite change. Theatre 1010 had a name change in the course description to Creative Process, but the content really didn't change with it. The last one was Digital Systems Design which had a title and description change, again, no major changes in the content.

Senator Niamat: Is the title going to change for the Digital Systems Design, is there going to be a title change?

Senator Cappelletty: I thought the title changed a little bit, not a lot. They had no other changes to prerequisites or co-requisites. But I thought they re-wrote the title a little bit.

Past-President Keith: Well, if Senator Dowd's not going to ask this question, then I am. Did they give you an explanation for why we're removing ECON 1150?

Senator Cappelletty: I think we were just okay with what they gave us, but if you would like to see it then I can pull it up.

Past-President Keith: I guess I am just curious because that is a course out of my department. But also, it seems to me that Business majors have to take Principles of Micro and Macro, so I am just curious if it is a timing issue.

Senator Wittmer: I think it is my understanding that it is a timing issue.

Past-President Keith: All right.

Senator Wittmer: That's my understanding, but I can't assure that 100%.

Past-President Keith: That students want to take that course before they complete their lower core requirements?

Senator Wittmer: Correct.

Past-President Keith: But then I have another question. Is there something on the form that says that for courses that are offered by another department, has the department requesting the prerequisite change notified the other department that it's making those changes?

Senator Cappelletty: It is something that I asked of President Humphrys when I first started with this-- when those changes do occur, is it the committee's responsibility to ask that question or do we work under the assumption that conversations have been had that needed to be had?

President Humphrys: And I think, my response would be that we hope people would talk to each other. But I guess when it comes to this point where we have representatives indicate, unless Senator Dowd knows---

Senator Dowd: No.

President Humphrys: Okay. So, in that case, we probably need to---

Senator Cappelletty: To answer the question specifically, is there something...that says that occurs?

President Humphrys: No.

Senator Cappelletty: There is nothing on the form that indicates that has?

Senator Barnes: When I was chair of the committee we had the same problem. It is one of the reasons that meeting in person really worked for us because you had representatives from every college and if they do their homework ahead of time, they can talk to the people in the department and find out that the conversation occurred and if there were any potential conflicts we should know about. So it really requires a lot of legwork on the committee members' part to check into the implications. Sometimes it's not possible to do it, or you can't anticipate who to even ask, who would know about what that conflict might be.

President Humphrys: Is there a concern to the point that you might---?

Past-President Keith: No, no, I'm just curious. It just seems like an "odd" prerequisite change and I was pretty much just curious about it. I think maybe in the future we need to give some consideration about it, especially when the prerequisite change occurs for a department that is in a different college and there really should be some indication that a conversation was had.

Senator Rouillard: Yes, because it could obviously affect scheduling.

Group of Senators: Right.

Senator Rouillard: Although, in this case what you're saying is that it's not changing the actual program prerequisite, just a particular course, correct?

Senator Dowd: Students would still have to take the course; it's the matter of when.

Senator Rouillard: Right.

Senator Cappelletty: But we can certainly do it as a change to how we work, moving forward. We will ask each one from each college that's represented, find out if conversations were had and bring that to the committees' discussions.

Senator Wittmer: Can I make a suggestion? I am hearing the idea of that being part of the Curriculum Committee's job. I cannot imagine chasing all those different people down. If we go through the curriculum tracking system and the department chairs have signed off on it and deans have signed off on it, I feel that there should be some kind of assurance before it reaches the committee that those discussions had been had rather than it being the responsibility of the committee.

President Humphrys: We might have to, when something like that happens. And again, I think it's a good point, especially if it's in a different college- maybe we could just always ask, "have you notified," in this case, "the chair of the Economics Department about this prerequisite change?" and if they say "no," [then] we can suggest it. I mean, how far should we go? Should we say if they don't talk, we won't consider it?

Senator Wittmer: There are things that are required as part of the submission process, so I don't see why that can't be something. I don't understand why that can't be something that is required in the process before it goes through the committee.

Senator Cappelletty: Right now we still struggle with people filling the forms out correctly.

Senator Barnes: There have been years' worth of talk about changing the curriculum tracking system and this might be a really welcome addition to have an opportunity to add a "potential conflicts, have they been explored?" section, and leave a space for people to explain what they are, so if the committee has questions they can contact the department because that is what often happens; we would call the "affected" department and say, "Did you know; is this okay with you?" And they would say, "Yeah, we talked about it and it is fine; they have our blessing." I think that is what you want to have happen to make it easier.

Senator Kippenhan: I would ask that you add that to your form anytime there's a prerequisite change that you put "I have talked to-" put a name or whatever and "this is okay," so that way, you don't have to check back, it will be there.

President Humphrys: Unfortunately, I believe the form is written in ancient Egypt. I mean, that is how long it's been around, it's like it's on scrolls or something<laughter>. But honestly, to change that form, a few years ago some of the stuff was changed on the form, it was months and it's just amazing how long the process was. We're hoping and I think the provost is hoping also that some new software gets purchased that's been selected and so in that case we can certainly add all these things, but unfortunately

at this point, I think what we will have to do is make it a part of the process rather than the form. What do you think, Senator Cappelletty?

Senator Cappelletty: Right now we are caught up, so the number of proposals is relatively small. It's something that at least right now, I don't think it is all that burdensome to the committee to get done. If we get slammed it's going to slow things down just a little bit more, but right now we are in good shape.

Senator Krantz: I would expand the suggestion, not just between colleges, but within colleges. If you look at some of the larger, more complex colleges like Arts and Letters, it's a lot of departments and they don't necessarily communicate nor necessarily have good working relations.

President Humphrys: Senator Cappelletty, how does that sound, you can just send an email or whatever and say, are you aware of that?

Senator Cappelletty: We can do that.

President Humphrys: Good, that would be great. Thank you. Are there any questions?

Senator Cappelletty: So, is it okay by Senate to consider the four course modifications as a single review of them? All in favor for approval of those four course modifications say "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? *Motion Passed.* I thank you.

[Course Modifications and Proposals](#)

President Humphrys: Great.

Senator Cappelletty: Only other thing, my meeting is tomorrow morning with Marcia King-Blandford and President Humphrys to go through the amnesty documents to find out exactly where we are so we can get moving on all of that.

President Humphrys: Thank you so much. All right, next on our agenda is the Core Curriculum Chair, Holly Monsos.

Senator Monsos: The first item is very simple and you already approved it last time from the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, but since it is a core course we also have to approve it and that is to change the alpha code on AL1130.

The second thing is an existing course, there is no change to the course at all, it is simply putting it forward as appropriate for multicultural and diversity of U.S. culture. We looked at the syllabus and it does meet the description below and the committee recommends approval for both items. Are there any questions? Hearing none. All those in favor, please say "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? *Motion Passed.*

1. Course mod: alpha code change – AL 1130 to UC 1130 Information Literacy for College Research
 - a. Already approved.
2. Course mod: Existing course requesting inclusion in multicultural component, category Diversity of US Culture – PSC 4590 Law, Policy and Politics of Sexuality
 - a. Course description: This course explores law, policymaking, and public attitudes that affect gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered individuals in the U.S. Topics include hate crimes legislation, discrimination law, and same-sex marriage.

President Humphrys: This is a perfect example, well, there are many advantages in having a Library faculty member [we have more than one] on Faculty Senate because Senator Thomas Atwood just looked up and found the Board of Trustees Resolution about what constitutes a credit hour. What year was that from?

Senator Atwood: The Board met on June 18, 2012 and the resolution number is 12-06-05.
“Implementation Guidelines for Credit Hours.”

President Humphrys: Wonderful. We’ve got a scientific mind who remembers things like dates and a person who can reference and research so quickly. So we will look at that and actually Provost Hsu will discuss that and make sure the members of the committee are aware of that too, as they go further into making the policy.

Okay, next on our list is to talk about contribution margins and that’s going to be Past-President Kristen Keith and Senators Mike Dowd and Linda Rouillard.

Past-President Keith: This is a presentation by Linda, Mike and myself. The three of us have been on the Finance and Strategy Committee. The contribution margin was a topic of conversation last year at Finance and Strategy because the faculty members that were part of that committee kept asking people from the Office of Finance when they were going to let us see the contribution margins for at the program level for the current year. They kept telling us that they were working on it. So, what this presentation has is a little bit of background – but really, there’s not much background. I think we were told last time that there’s been some form of a contribution margin/profit margins that have popped up over the years. They did it at the faculty level where they looked at the profitability of each faculty member in terms of how much they teach, what kind of revenue that brings in and how much revenue they bring in in grant revenue. They’ve done it at the program level and they’ve done them at the college level. What we’re doing now because it is now in the Office of Finance, they are doing them at the college level. There were discussions last year about how this would proceed and I wasn’t privy to those discussions, so all I can tell you is what they came up with, and they came up with five different ways of measuring a contribution margin.

Senator Dowd: Past-President Keith, may I jump in?

Past-President Keith: Yes.

Senator Dowd: For context, the contribution margins accounts for tuition and other revenues relative to college costs. The importance of this issue has been discussed at the Strategic Enrollment Planning committee several times and certainly several other times during Strategic Planning committee meetings. Contribution margins will be important for these two committees to go forward with their respective analysis. As mentioned before, the current contribution margins are very different from those constructed in the past.

Past-President Keith: Right. They can’t be used to shut down a program because they contain no information about individual programs. They are just looking at what percent of revenue a college is earning that’s basically above cost. We had aggregated the contribution margins for the whole university

because as I told you last time, the deans had only seen the contribution margins of their colleges, so we can't show you how well Business is doing relative to Engineering or vice versa.

Okay, we are going to bring up the data and revenue and costs. I am calling this academic revenue because the university does have other sources of revenue. Then we are going to talk about the colleges and departmental costs which I broke it down to direct and indirect: Direct are going to be salary and operating expenses. Indirect are our institutional scholarships and our GA waivers. The definitions of the five contribution margins which you'll see in just a minute and then I am going to give you an example. Afterwards, I am going to show you the trend. We've got 2012 to 2015 and these are fiscal years.

The first one is tuition and fees and it is calculated at the student level and Terry Romer is the one who actually came up with this calculation. What I mean by "at the student level" is he takes each student and looks at the courses that students took over the academic year and then attributes tuition to the course college, for example if a person took 12 credit hours- 4 credit hrs. from Natural Science and Mathematics, 4 from Arts and Letters, and 4 from Education, then each of those colleges will get one third of tuition and fees as part of their college revenue. Now, this doesn't really matter for "us" because again, we are showing you it at the university level. Okay, so what are tuition and fees? So he includes tuition, the out-of-state surcharge, general fund fees, and college-specific general fund fees such as upper-division fees. But it doesn't include any non-general fund fees, such as the technology fee, because these fees can be designated for specific items. So it wouldn't include a parking fee, it doesn't include the technology fee and other designated and auxiliary fees. Indirect cost recoveries, it does include grant overhead. The GME transfer, which is funds transferred from UTMC to the College of Medicine and Life Sciences, COMLS. The state share of instruction, this is from the Board of Regents [now Ohio Department of Higher Ed]. Terry really does try to estimate each individual college's share of the state share of instruction based on the new formula, which is 30% of course completion and 50% based on degree completion. Then there's clinical support from the state which is also part of SSI, but it's a separate line item. Are there any questions?

Senator White: The obvious, what is the other twenty percent?

Past-President Keith: It is from the state, it is allocated to PhD programs. The clinical support from the state, for example, will be part of the twenty percent.

President Humphrys: So with your example, let's say that a student takes 4 credit hrs. from "x" college, 4 from "y," 4 from "z" and then 4 from college "a," so there's four different colleges. So, technically we don't get tuition for those extra four credit hrs., right?

Past-President Keith: Well, that is a good question. I think instead of dividing it by three, you would divide it by four. But I will have to find out what he does when we get to the plateau. I think most of us know that we have a plateau – 18 hrs. is the same cost as 12 credit hrs. – I think that's all he does; rather than not getting a college credit from having to generate from tuition and fees, he just divides by the number.

President Humphrys: I think it does because we've always encouraged students to take more hours than fewer, but in reality when it comes to this contribution question, you are actually being "punished" by receiving only 25%.

Past-President Keith: Right, you'd rather be one third of a fixed amount as opposed to twenty-five percent of a fixed amount.

President Humphrys: Right.

Past-President Keith: Is there anybody else? Well, those are revenues and I am calling it academic "revenue" because I want to use that phrase so I don't have to type everything out when I show you how the different contribution margins are measured. So these are what we're using as the college and departmental expenses. The first one is college/departmental expenses, which is salaries, plus operating budgets and non-grant expenses. We were talking beforehand and I don't actually know what those are and I probably should've asked. Does anybody know what a non-grant expense is at a department or college level?

Senator Dowd: Would that not include part-time instructors?

Senator Rouillard: That wouldn't be operating budget?

Provost Hsu: Supply... [*Indecipherable*]

Past-President Keith: All right, thank you very much. Faculty startup funds, not all colleges have faculty startup funds and even colleges that do, do not have them every year, but still that is the direct cost. GA waivers, these are graduate tuition student waivers that are funded by College of Graduate Studies, COGS. Then the last is institutional scholarships, these are not foundation scholarships, these are scholarships that are tuition offsets and none are funded by the Foundation, and Senator Rouillard wants to emphasize that.

Senator Rouillard: Yes, because it has taken me a long time to understand. In these discussions when the topic of tuition discounts would come in, I was not equating that with scholarships. When I heard the word "scholarship" I always thought it only comes from the Foundation. Well, there is a particular group of scholarships that comes from the Foundation, but these are typically not the ones that were being discussed. It has taken me a long time, but I now understand that institutional scholarship is the same thing as the discount. So when we discount the tuition, that's revenue that we no longer get and that means that these scholarships and discounts cost us, they reduce our operating revenue and that's been the huge problem that's been affecting our budgets for the past few years.

Senator Edwards: How are those allocated as an expense?

Senator Rouillard: Doesn't the budget generate the amount of tuition that a student would pay, minus the institutional scholarships in the budget?

Senator Edwards: So it is not like [on a] student-by-student basis?

Senator Rouillard: Right.

Past-President Keith: No, it is. You can have a long conversation about how you should allocate these to a college, right? Should they be allocated to a college of the student major? Should they be allocated based on courses that a student is taking? So from my original example, you have a student taking 12 hrs. – 4 from Arts and Letters, 4 from Natural Science and Math, and 4 from Education- even if that student is

an Engineering major, if you allocated them to the college of the courses then Engineering wouldn't share any of the scholarship expense until the student actually took a class from Engineering, but the other three colleges would, or you can put 100% in Engineering or you can come up with some percentage like 75% per major or 25% per course etc.

Senator Dowd: There is another aspect to this issue. This is not just about where tuition revenues are coming from and where they will be allocated. The tuition discounts Senator Rouillard was talking about must also either be charged against a college's revenues or added to a college's expenses. This too will impact a college's contribution margin.

Past-President Keith: And I think those issues are up in the air in terms of where they would end up, and in terms of how they originally were allocated, and how they are charged back. What this presentation will show you is there's kind of two ways of doing it, but not really because again, we're doing it at a university level- so it doesn't really make any difference how you allocate them to colleges because it's the same amount that the university is spending on institutional scholarships.

Senator White: So the title of the slide has the words "direct" and "indirect," I don't know what that means, but I do see in the slide the topic that we've been discussing. There are two very different kinds of expenses in quotes – one is we actually pay literal money out and the other from money that we don't bring in, are those the "direct" or "indirect?"

Past-President Keith: Yes, those are. That is my terminology because I am an economist and that is how we would define those two types of dollars. So anything that is an out-of-pocket expense is direct money spent. Indirect is money that you are not directly paying out-of-pocket and this is only an expense because we're not getting as much in tuition revenue when we give an institutional scholarship.

Senator White: Right. So the gist of my bringing that up is for any program that's not at its capacity, giving some kind of discount to the students can be thought of. Again, I am not claiming to know the wisdom to any of this, but this can be thought of and many graduate directors are kind-hearted people and believe that it's a win/win situation when we allow students to attend when otherwise they wouldn't be attending, by giving whatever level discount. So it's "direct" and "indirect" and many faculty view those as very different. But I am not sure if they are being treated differently here or not.

Past-President Keith: Okay. Let's come back to the point that you're making because six months ago I would've agreed with you and I still agree with you to some extent, but the problem is that not every student can be the marginal student. I think that we're to the point where we're ignoring the average and we need to start paying attention to the average again.

Senator Jorgensen: The fact of the state share of public instruction, when the students are not paying that tuition, there's still a state share of instruction given on those hours.

Past-President Keith: Only if they complete the course.

Senator Jorgensen: You could be right.

Past-President Keith: Part of the reason I think we're in this mindset where you could bring in a marginal student and there's no cost but there's only revenue is because we are still kind of thinking about

the old formula for subsidy where you got credit for having students in the classroom, that's no longer the case.

Senator White: Let me just emphasize, this is great to look at the big picture, but we don't want to forget that sometimes students actually benefit from this.

Past-President Keith: Absolutely.

Senator Krantz: Past-President Keith, as an example of institutional scholarships, we as faculty and university employees have a tuition waiver, does that fall under that category?

Past-President Keith: I think it does, but I will have to check to make sure.

Senator Krantz: Because there are a number of sibling scholarships; there are five or six in various categories that we're generally not aware of.

Past-President Keith: I will have to make sure, but I think that that's true. But I think the vast majority of that money is coming from the scholarship table where how much scholarship you can get from UT is a function of your high school GPA and your ACT score.

Senator Dowd: The different contribution margins that will be discussed will include a particular variable in one margin and then, perhaps, exclude that variable in calculation of an alternative margin. This is done so we can see the information content of each variable in the calculation of contribution margins.

Past-President Keith: You are leading me into the next slide. Now, just to remind you because I don't want to type all this stuff out, if we are talking academic revenue, we've got tuition and fees, indirect cost and recoveries, the SSI, and the GME transfer which is from the hospital back to the college.

So here's the first contribution margin: It is total academic revenue, minus the college/departmental expenses, minus the startup funds, divided by total academic revenue. So it doesn't include any institutional scholarships and any GA waivers. Margin 2: now this one is just looking at tuition and fees and the indirect cost recoveries and the GME transfer, so it is excluding any support from the state, minus the same things, college/departmental expenses and startup funds, divided by the total academic revenue. Again, I just want to emphasize, it doesn't include any scholarship funds, or GA waivers and it excludes any support from the state.

Senator Dowd: Margin 1 is a base-line measure in that it tells us how we pay for our expenses. The second margin indicates how we would fare if UT had to pay for all of its expenses if we received no financial support from the State of Ohio. In other words, Margin 2 gives us an idea of what our financials would look like if UT were to go our own way -- that is, if we were not part of the state system. Again, each margin has a different interpretation. Do you have anything to add, Senator Rouillard?

Senator Rouillard: And again, we didn't include the scholarships. What we are talking about is if we didn't include the discount rate.

Past-President Keith: Okay, Margins 3 and 4 are the same at the institutional level- the total academic revenue minus the college/department expenses and the startup funds and now we are taking out the

institutional scholarships and the GA waivers. How they differ is that Margin 3 is attributing the scholarship to the student's college. So if you are in a college that has seen enrollment growth in the last few years and if your students are very bright and are receiving a fairly substantial institutional scholarship, you don't look very good in Margin 3. On the other hand, if you're in a college like mine where we teach a lot of gen ed. courses, we're not basically being charged for the students that are taking our gen ed. courses in terms of the scholarship. Margin 4 is now you're charging the scholarships to the student's courses. This goes back to my example about the Engineering student who didn't take anything in Engineering - all of his/her scholarship dollars for that year are being charged to the colleges that teach the courses that are part of his/her course schedule. So gen ed. colleges don't look quite as good under Margin 4 because we are paying for the scholarships that the students in the other colleges are receiving if they are taking our gen ed. courses. Does that make sense?

Senator Dowd: Yes.

Past-President Keith: And then the last one, and I don't know why they decided to do this- they are taking out the institutional scholarships, but including GA waivers as a cost. So it is giving you the total academic revenue, minus the college/departmental expenses, minus the startup funds, minus the GA waivers. So it tells us something about, just looking at graduate students in terms of the tuition waivers, what would that do to a contribution margin? Are there any questions?

Senator Said: Are tuition waivers allocated the same way in each college?

Past-President Keith: I don't know. I think they are allocated by the college based on money that they get from the College of Graduate Studies. I'm sure we have associate deans here that can answer that question. Are there any associate deans here? I don't know, but we can find out. I just know in my college we have an associate dean that figures out how to allocate tuition waivers, but I am not really sure how she does it.

Okay, here is my example and this is for fiscal year 2016. This is what it looks like for all the five contribution margins at the university level: The first one says that if we ignore our institutional scholarships and GA waivers, colleges earn enough revenue in tuition and fees etc. to pay for their expenses and to have 44% leftover. When we throw out the SSI, that drops to about 19%. When we include the SSI and also include the scholarship and the tuition waivers, that increases to 23% from 19% down to 44%. Then when we drop the scholarship and include the GA waivers as an indirect expense, it's back up to 41%. Now, 3 and 4 are the same at the institutional level, again, because we are not trying to figure out how to allocate the institutional scholarship money and the GA waivers.

Here's the trend: So I don't know what you make of this, but this is for 2012-2016. There were a couple of years where the margins were a little higher than in previous years. Last year, fiscal year 2016, our contribution margins fell. Again, that is what it looks like if you have no scholarships, no GA waivers. The next one is what it looks like if you had no state support, plus no scholarships and GA waivers. The third and fourth one includes all academic revenue and all of the expenses including the scholarships and the GA waivers. Then the last one is just like 3 and 4, but we're taking out the scholarships and just including the GA waivers. I personally think 3 and 4 are the relevant ones because I think it is the truer picture of our revenue and our expenses, but you can argue with that. To my knowledge, nobody has decided which is the preferred one, but that one at least shows us to some extent what our institutional

scholarship and our discount is actually doing in terms of these contribution margins. Are there any questions?

Senator White: I have a million<laughter>. This is too complicated. This by the way is a fantastic example of our new quantitative reasoning class because we look at it and say, proportions, that's too easy- but not anymore and that is one of the topics <laughter>. So Margin 2 which includes all of those things, but some of those would be something that's coming in, state support, and some of it is not going out, scholarship waivers, so they balance out. I guess I'm curious to see what happens if you get rid of the state support. Did I hear the words "if we go our own way" like Miami? Nobody's thinking that, right?

Senator Dowd: No, absolutely not. I stated that it was merely a benchmark to give us perspective on UT's financial position if we did not receive state support.

Senator White: Just in case the state changes, not that we can change?

Senator Dowd: Yes --- if you are only referring to the fact that UT does not determine the level of support we receive from the state. No --- if you are trying to infer anything else. We all know we cannot over-interpret the information contained these margins.

Past-President Keith: We are not changing.

Senator Dowd: When some of the Senators in this room began their careers at UT, state support comprised approximately 70% of our annual budget. Now it is down to approximately 22% of our budget. Our financial world has changed and that contribution margin helps us better understand that world.

Past-President Keith: Well, I have a few more slides.

Senator Jorgensen: I agree, Margin 3 and 4 seems to be the most realistic. I've heard it explained that if we look at what students pay in full-time state tuition, the tuition would be about \$9,000, and I've heard it said that our average student typically pays about half. It is not greatly related to this, but clearly it affects these numbers because we are giving away so much "free" tuition.

Past-President Keith: Well, you are leading me into the next set of slides. The next set of slides has to do with scholarshiping. I want to show you two things here. First, I want to show you how we compare to the other Ohio universities. Second, I want to show you what has happened over time. This is based on IPEDS data from fiscal year 2014 and it was calculated by IR. I think I have in the notes how it is calculated, but Ying actually calculated this and he's done it for a couple of years and this is the most recent data that he has. This year we have the highest discount rate of any institution in the state ignoring a couple like Central State; ours is almost 40% - this is our first-year discount rate. So these are the scholarships given to our first-year freshmen. So ours is about 40%, Ohio State is 36.5% and then you start looking at, for example, Bowling Green which is 29.3%, and Miami is 23.3% - we are number one, and maybe that is not a "good" thing.

Senator Krantz: However, in comparison to UT and Ohio State, Ohio State's base tuition is considerably higher than ours.

Unknown Speaker: No.

Senator Krantz: Yes, it is.

Past-President Keith: Yes. Well, I have another slide where I plotted it out. Can you see this? This is slightly different because the tuition revenue minus the discount per student and that discount was based on first-year students- this is the tuition minus the discount for all students, so it is slightly different. So you would expect if a student's tuition is about \$9,000 and they have a 40% discount, it would be \$5,400. Now, it is actually a little higher here, it is about \$7,200. But that again, because it is not the discount rate for first-year students, it is the discount for all of our students. But still, this is what it looks like when you apply discount rates against tuition revenue minus the discount rate for students- you get a sense of what the average student is paying after you take out all of the tuition, minus all of the discounting for scholarships, divided by the number of students- look at where we are. OSU is sort of close, it is our nearest neighbor I guess, but this is Youngstown State. We actually have a lower net tuition per student, at least in fiscal year 2014 than Youngstown State – not by very much, \$50.00 or \$60.00, but, is this who we inspire to be? Do we want to have the highest discount rate and the lowest tuition? This is something to think about. And as Senator White said earlier, we want to do well by our students. We want our students to come here and be able to leave with a good education and not much debt.

Senator White: So we are an urban school?

Past-President Keith: Yes.

Senator White: I guess I would love to see a measure of students' ability to pay. Tied with that, regarding "free lunches," the Pell Grant or whatever it is, it would be interesting to see how these relate. So I would expect us to be near the bottom vertically, lower than BG, Kent, OU and Cleveland, relative to students' ability to pay.

Senator Krantz: I would think that we should cluster with Akron, Cleveland and Youngstown with our demographics.

Senator Jorgensen: Pell Grant is an income, right? We are not paying the discount, the federal government is paying the discount, so I don't think it would be a fair comparison.

Senator Krantz: Correct.

Senator Rouillard: Nobody is paying the discount.

Senator Jorgensen: What's that?

Senator Rouillard: Nobody is paying the discount.

Senator Krantz: It is income to The University of Toledo from the federal government.

Past-President Keith: Right.

Senator White: Is that included in the vertical axis – Pell Grant?

Past-President Keith: I absolutely don't know. It probably is, if it's part of the tuition revenue.

Senator Rouillard: But the discount has nothing to do with the Pell Grant.

Senator Jorgensen: The point is, if a student gets the Pell Grant, it doesn't hurt us on the discount because we're already getting that money in. So a student that can't pay very much, we're already getting money from the federal government for that student. They are paying the difference between the Pell and the face money and then we are discounting it again, but the point is that we're accounting for their inability to pay by them receiving a Pell Grant, which is better than our discount.

Senator Barnes: So what you are saying is that their ability to pay isn't as important as you might think it would be, because of the government Pell Grant?

Senator Jorgensen: Yes.

Senator Krantz: Along that same line, does the state of Ohio anymore have need-based grants?

Senator Rouillard: I think they're called Ohio Opportunity Grants.

Senator Krantz: So that program still exists?

Senator Rouillard: It does, although what I heard at Ohio Faculty Council is that it may be revamped. It might be needs-based still, but it might end up being a matching grant so that the university will have to put in more and then once the university did that, then the business communities and state might match more money. But what I would like to come back to is the idea of discounts and Pell Grants, and as you pointed out, Senator Jorgensen- the discount gets applied and the Pell Grant kicks in and then there's a second discount which has been part of the problem here, because that additional discount often gets added on after the student has accepted coming to UT- this is one of the surprising bits of information that has come out of these discussions. And so as a strategy, we've been using this strategy of discounting, and discounting, and discounting, and what I think you're about to see in the next two slides is that the strategy doesn't work.

Senator Thompson: Well, the analogy is kind of like when you agree to buy a car and then they say, well, we are going to give you even more money off---

Senator Rouillard: Right. Once you sign the contract.

Senator Thompson: Right.

Senator Rouillard: And that's been part of the problem here.

Past-President Keith: So, here's one of the slides she just alluded to. The y-axis on the left shows the amount of institutional scholarships for undergraduate per FTE and the y-axis on the right shows the number of FTEs. So the time series is FTEs, the bars are the total amount that we scholarship, divided by the number of FTEs. So it gives us the sense of per FTE, how much the average scholarship is. The only reason there's a green bar and blue bar is because again, I am an economist so I converted the current dollars into real dollars. But what Senator Rouillard said the trends are, you can see that our undergraduate FTEs have been falling since 2010 and the average amount of institutional scholarships that we're giving per FTE has gone up, so if we're just thinking about this as a recruiting strategy, it doesn't seem to be effective. But again, there are other reasons that we discount besides our recruiting strategy, but if that is what we're trying to do this for, it doesn't seem like it is working.

Senator Dowd: This is mind-numbing. Over the past five or so years, enrollment management became addicted to offering higher and higher tuition discount rates. If you look at the FTE, the blue line — the higher discounts we gave, the fewer students we recruited.

Senator Krantz: That is not necessarily cause and effect, Senator Dowd.

Senator Dowd: No, in one sense it does not. But in another it could be viewed as “cause and no effect.” Data show a complete failure in the previous administration’s policy of trying to increase enrollment through ever-increasing tuition discounts. That policy tool was not effective. This is particularly important because the discussion of discounting is particularly important to strategic and enrollment planning. In my opinion, we cannot cut off discounting “cold turkey” – even if we wanted to. But continuing the current level of tuition discounting indicated in this discussion of contribution margins reduces revenues needed to pay for all of the university’s expenses. If we do not address the gap between revenues and expenses, our financial situation will, of course, only get worse.

Past-President Keith: In 2009 our institutional scholarships were \$38,622,644; in 2016 it was \$65,614,116, so it increased by 70% over that seven-year period- there is a difference of \$27 million over that seven-year period. If you looked at a shorter period, say 2012, it wasn’t as much, but the total amount of institutional scholarships that we give has increased by about twenty-one percent.

Senator Thompson: So my question is, are we still bound to keep our tuition at a certain rate for a number of years right now or are we on a freeze?

Past-President Keith: I think we are on a freeze this year.

Senator Thompson: My second question is, if we mess around with the discount, would that be considered raising tuition? So we can adjust that and that has nothing to do with the freeze on tuition, right? I just want to make sure.

Past-President Keith: Right.

Senator Jorgensen: Should we be saying to students that the tuition is \$9,000, but [they] are really [only] paying \$5,400 and it’s a positive thing, but of course, the student that is paying \$6,500 or \$7,000 and is not getting that discount may not feel very good about it. The second thing, you look at this and the phrase that comes to mind is “somebody fell asleep at the wheel.”

Senator Rouillard: Right.

Senator Gruden: How do we know that it’s not because we are attracting higher quality students?

Past-President Keith: And it could mean that too. We made a commitment to them for four years, so even if we weren’t bringing in “more” students, but are bringing in higher quality students that we award larger scholarships to, then our scholarship expenses will increase.

Senator Krantz: Included in this analysis, the advantage of using scholarship funding as an incentive. So what we already talked about is the incentive to get enrollment, but what was just brought up was the incentive to get good students here, as opposed to just medium students. But then another aspect of incentive is how about incentivizing performing well while you are here, getting a reward for successfully

completing; particularly, the first two semesters are critically important, so if there's a way of motivating and getting students to focus and take it seriously the first two semesters, that would be a very good use of the scholarship funding.

Senator Dowd: Isn't the discount guaranteed for four years?

Senator Kippenhan: No. It depends on your scholarship and how it is written. Many of them have a GPA requirement and I know that for the first two semesters, but I don't know if it's true for all semesters.

Past-President Keith: I just want to say this real quick. I'm now part-time in the Office of Finance. The Office of Finance stated that they are not asking those questions because these are the questions that the Strategic Enrollment Planning Committee should be asking, these are the questions that we should be asking at Faculty Senate, and these are the questions that the university community should be asking. The role of the Office of Finance is to provide data and analysis only.

Senator Edwards: I don't have a question, but I have a comment. One of the other things that separates The University of Toledo from the other urban state universities is that this is the only urban area that doesn't have a local community college which will draw those "underprepared" and "underfinanced" students to them, and we don't have that here at University of Toledo and that's a problem.

Student Government President, Amal: I don't know if I'm a part of this, but I just wanted to give a student input. I am actually one of those students who received a scholarship and was already coming here, but got something in the mail that said you're approved for a scholarship. I thought it was really odd because no other school that I had applied to had done that. I don't want to seem irrational, but I appreciate it and I am happy that I got that <laughter>. The second thing I want to say is, I am from Toledo and I noticed that a lot of students from Toledo who came here, everyone got \$2,000 or \$800 or whatever, but all of those students would've come to University of Toledo no matter what, including myself whether on a scholarship or not because at the end of the day, it was cheap tuition and it was ten minutes away from my home so I am not paying for housing. But I also know students who may have come from Columbus and Cleveland who received larger scholarships here and said they didn't go to OSU or Miami because Toledo gave me too good of a scholarship to turn down. So it might be beneficial to look at those higher quality scholarships, specifically for students who are not from Toledo because they are paying extra for housing most of the time. This is just a suggestion from my perspective.

Past-President Keith: Thank you. I think I should probably finish up, right <laughter>?

President Humphrys: I was impressed by your PowerPoint swiggles. Thank you for the presentation.

Senator White: I have one last comment. Some of that increase we can attribute to the economy coming back, so I just want to say that I'm encouraged.

Past-President Keith: Yes. There's just one more slide and that is just for graduate students because these scholarships are correlated with increases in FTEs until 2014 and decreases after that.

President Humphrys: Thank you so much, Past-President Keith- it was very informative. We are going to go on to Dr. Anthony Quinn who has been patiently waiting for us, but you are used to Senate because you've been a senator, right? <laughter>.

Co-chair of the Strategic Planning Committee, Dr. Anthony Quinn: Yes.

President Humphrys: Right now our next item on the agenda is an update on the Strategic Planning Committee and the strategic planning process by the co-chair of the committee, Dr. Anthony Quinn, Tony.

Co-chair of the Strategic Planning Committee, Dr. Anthony Quinn: Thank you for allowing me to speak this afternoon or this evening, now that it's getting kind of close to evening. I will keep this short. I am mostly here to answer questions and bring you into our strategic planning process. Some of these slides some of you may have seen in some of our last discussions/listening sessions, so for those of you who have seen this, please bear with me. We discussed the idea to show you what we talked about during our discussions, sessions and meetings. One of the questions is, why are we doing strategic planning now? Well, because it seems like this is the right time. As you all know, Dr. Gaber assumed the presidency last Summer, July 2015 and Provost Hsu was appointed in July 2016. So it just seems like the right time since we have key leadership positions filled and now we can start to talk about going forward. What is the strategic planning process going to look like? Well, when the committee was launched, one of the things that Dr. Gaber stressed was that she wanted a grass-roots, bottom-up type of approach. I remember in the first conversation someone said, what do you envision the strategic plan looking like? She said, I don't want to tell you what the strategic plan is supposed to look like; I want you to tell me what you think should be in it. I don't want to sway you, I want this to be an organic process. She insisted that there would be feedback groups, so there are multiple opportunities for the community to have input into this strategic planning process. And again, it is supposed to be comprehensive and institution-wide.

Laurie Dinnebeil and I serve as co-chairs for the planning committee. The other members of the planning committee represent a number of individuals across the university including members of the Board of Trustees, administrators, faculty, staff, students and the community. There are just a few that are listed here, there are 25 of us on the committee. Again, there's a broad array of individuals from different backgrounds and different constituencies. Dr. Gaber laid out a pretty aggressive timeline and when Laurie and I met with her to accept the position of being co-chairs, she had two directives- one is, I don't want this beautiful book that is [just] going to sit on a shelf somewhere. I want a strategic plan that has realistic goals; it's all right to be ambitious, but I want realistic goals for five years and I want something small- we discussed 20-25 pages long. She wanted this all done by May of 2017. This is just an outline of some of the strategic points: In October we started our discussion sessions with the UT committee asking the question about what do you think are the strengths at UT and what are the areas that you think we can improve or strengthen, or things we should focus on. Again, you can see that there are places where we're going to refine the document and on multiple occasions we're going to revisit back to different constituencies in the community. The sharing sessions begin in March and April and again, the goal is to present something to the Board of Trustees by May. She wants this thing done before school is out in May; so before everybody leaves for the Summer, she wants this document completed and the process finished. Here is just outlining where we started off with our discussion sessions last month. We had seven discussion sessions- three on this campus and four on the Main Campus. We also allowed people to

chime in online by an online survey. The question was, what the strengths at The University of Toledo are and the second question was, what areas we could improve, strengthen or focus on- so in all, there were 432 respondents to the online survey and during the discussion sessions, 271 collectively between both campuses. There is also a survey for the Board of Trustees, Alumni Association, and for the Foundation Board. Again, they were all given the same questions.

Senator Dowd: Can you explain the 140%?

Dr. Quinn: Well, Sharon McDade is our consultant who is assisting us in this process and she likes adding this in. I think what happened is there were a couple of people that clicked twice. One Board member admitted that he wasn't sure that it went through so he decided to do it again. They were very enthusiastic about getting their opinions recognized. The main point is that we received input from across campus from students, faculty, and staff. So that brings us to November, which is where we are now, and our goal is to dive in to some of the things. You can imagine, we started off with looking at things like the SWOT analysis to the teaching planning committee and then we started asking questions to the community, therefore crunching all of that data down is quite a challenge. What's become remarkable to those of us on the coordinating committee is the overlap that you'll see, whether it's faculty, staff and even the Board of Trustees- the same issues keep coming up and the same ideas and things that keep rising. So we sort of percolated those things into ten topics here, and one was Reputation and Visibility, the other was Reputation and Research. If I can just expand on Reputation and Visibility- this one was really important because it was coming from students, faculty and staff. They've said that this is a great place to be, but we're not telling our story very good and our perception of ourselves seems to be very poor. A number of students stated, "well, UT was not my first choice" which I reported to the committee, when we talked to the students, you don't hear them saying "I am getting a bad education, this is such an easy program, it is just like high [school]." No one hears that in the hallways, at least I don't. So what I think you get is students may have thought that until they arrive here at the university.

One other topic that came up is research: There's student success, graduate professional students, fundraising, fiscal health and finances, community engagement, the comprehensive nature of the UT curriculum in department which means, and having someone from outside the university contribute to discussions- I think this one has been really critical, it opened our eyes to some things, at least some of us. Even this term "comprehensive-" she kind of drilled down the discussion, what do you mean when you say comprehensive because that can be interpreted in a number of ways? We use it a lot, such as "you're a comprehensive university," but on the flip side, does that mean that you're not focused and you haven't committed yourselves to excellent and acute areas as opposed to trying to be everything to everyone? Athletics was also one of the topics, and "Working at The University of Toledo." So we've identified these ten topics that we're working on now, and as we decided to dive into these ten topics, we decided to expand the committee temporarily just a bit. Like I said, we have 25 committee members with representation across the campus and now we've added another group of individuals which we call Invited Experts, and these are members of the UT community that have expertise in these ten specific areas for which we would need input for the development of the initial topics for the strategic process. So this morning we had a meeting which included about 50 people that contributed their expertise in one of these ten areas. So that is where we are now, we are at the stage of brainstorming these ten topics, getting input from these additional individuals and developing some goals for those ten topics.

I would like to report that one of the things that struck me is the positive nature of all of these discussions, whether they were on this campus or the other campus. It's been remarkable how positive people have been. It is also this conscious effort to "not look back." I can say, across the board, there's a general feeling that this is a very good institution and we just have to do a better job with marketing ourselves. I should report that when we had one of the meetings on this campus, staff were the ones who showed up in the larger numbers. One of the things that staff said here [at HSC] was, we want more communication with the Main Campus; we want to interact more with the Main Campus. So as being someone who was here when the merger took place, I think the "ice wall" that was there is starting to melt and we are at a key point where we are ready to play as "one house" and accentuate all our attributes. So again, I think this is really positive and I am excited about going forward. Are there any questions?

President Humphrys: Are there any questions for Tony?

Senator Barnes: Dr. Quinn, on your list of ten topics, are those topics that you anticipate developing initiatives and devoting resources to, and if so, are those universally things that we're already doing well and we want to continue to do better?

Dr. Quinn: To answer your question, yes. Now, the idea is that probably the goal is going to be to come down to about six topics and some of these are going to overlap, for instance, the comprehensive nature of the university- that is going to spill into everything. So again, some of these things are going to overlap as we tease them apart and deal with the specifics. And yes, I think most of the things are items that we do, it's just that we don't do them "well" and my contention is that, for many of them it's that it's not that we don't do them "well," we just don't do them well uniformly. So my favorite example which I shared with the committee is when we start talking about academic performance or data about how well you should perform, I said right away that our athletes have high GPA's and they won the highest GPA in the MAC for several years – and why do I know that? I never looked it up and I never actively sought to see how our athletes were performing, but I know that fact point, right? It's because the Athletic Department has done something very well to get that point across to me, so then why don't we do that in our academic programs also? We have to figure out how does the Athletic Department get that across the fact point when you're not seeking it.

President Humphrys: Thank you very much. Well, I put too many important items on the agenda today. I was thinking about this and Provost Hsu and I had a discussion about the time limitations that we have on the 15-weeks semester discussion. If we talk about it in depth at our next Senate meeting, I will make sure to reserve a good use of the time. Then if it's acceptable to vote on it even at the December meeting, it will still be before the Board of Trustees meeting, which is the ultimate goal for making a decision on the 15-weeks before their December meeting. So rather than just spending time on that, I will just reserve that for the next meeting. So, we will move from the 15-weeks discussion to welcoming the Student Government President, Amal Mohamed, who is just going to give us an update on some of the things going on in Student Government.

Student Government President, Amal Mohamed: I actually don't have much to report on because the first half of the semester we have been recruiting for the Student Government because we were really low on members at the beginning of the semester. Right now we almost have a full senate. The two things that I wanted to discuss is we recruited to two ad hoc committees – the first is a sustainability ad hoc committee and that is going to work with the student green fund to get more projects for the different

types of students because although the money is there for the student green fund...but I do want to say that sustainability is something that we find incredibly important for a lot of our students, which is what causes grievances [for the] ad hoc [committee]. The second thing that Student Government will be working on this semester is the sustainability specialist position which was a full-time position on campus. I don't know if administration is currently looking at making it a part-time position or getting rid of the role completely, but that is something that Student Government doesn't want to see happen. In the future we will have legislation to state the student body supports a full-time position. Also the LEC ad hoc committee [has found that student] retention [is] is proven [if you] log more hours, [it leads to] higher GPAs. We will be meeting with the LEC to get more information. Also [we are working on a resolution for an] Office of Health Equity and Diversity; UT doesn't have such an office, but U of M has.

President Humphrys: Thank you, Amal. Are there any items from the floor? Then may I have a motion to adjourn? Meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

V. Meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:
Lucy Duhon

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard
Faculty Senate Office Administrative Secretary.

Faculty Senate Executive Secretary