

## FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

September 7, 2010  
2:30 p.m.

Assembly Room  
McFall Center

**(A Faculty Senate Reception was held in the McFall Gallery from 2:00 - 2:30 to welcome new Senators.)**

### CALL TO ORDER

Chair Kristine Blair called the meeting to order and asked the secretary to call the roll.

### ROLL CALL

Secretary Terry Herman called the roll.

**Absent:** DeBard, Shields (Brad Clark, Substitute), and Thompson.

The Secretary announced that there was a quorum.

**Guests:** Dr. Neal Jesse, Dr. Deborah Wooldridge, and Dr. Paul Moore of the Connecting the Undergraduate Experience (CUE) Committee

### COMMUNICATIONS

#### Chair of the Faculty Senate

Chair Kristine Blair offered the following report to Faculty Senate.

Welcome back everyone and a special welcome to our newest faculty senators. We ended the last academic year with several ongoing pieces of business. First, the Misconduct Policy that has been returned to the Faculty Welfare Committee for review of the appeals section of the document before it will return to the floor of the Senate. We also considered the Flexible Tenure Policy, which required clarification on the amount of actual time allowed for tenure delay. This policy has also been returned to the Faculty Welfare Committee for review and there has been some consultation with the Provost's office over the summer as well. Returning senators will also recall the presentation at the May Faculty Senate meeting on behalf of the Parking Advisory Committee leading to the need for clarification about whether a change in funding structures was in the proposal or the policy stage. Based on this presentation there has since been discussion between the Senate leadership and the FSBC as well as with staff of the Parking Unit, and the Parking Advisory Committee, as well as Vice President Stoll. Overall a very productive discussion from which we hope to see a formalized proposal for review by the Senate in the spirit of shared governance.

Certainly in the light of discussions of collective bargaining there have been questions about the continuing role of the Faculty Senate in fostering shared governance and strategic planning and of the Academic Charter in articulating the rights and responsibilities of all members of the University community. Yet the success of the Faculty Senate rests not only with the Senate leadership and with Senate committees but also with all of us in working collectively and cooperatively to expedite business in ways that allow for substantive consultation and feedback.

When that process slows down, and admittedly it does, it's easy to look to the Senate as the broken link in the communication chain when perhaps there are other external variables. These variables can include the timetable for Senate review, curriculum or policies arriving at the Senate too late in the academic year, or the admitted need to re-familiarize ourselves with the necessary steps as outlined in the Academic Charter for reviewing, approving, and implementing a range of policies impacting faculty, staff, and students. In this way, rather than viewing the Senate as an obstacle to change or as a mere symbol of shared governance we should remember its vital role as an advocacy group for all faculty and its role as a key constituency for dialog about such issues as enrollment management, academic reconfiguration, program review, the Presidential search, and overall faculty welfare.

To that end, the Senate in its position of neutrality on the issue of collective bargaining will convene a forum on Tuesday, 9/21/2010, at 2:30 p.m. tentatively scheduled to be held in room 228 of the Bowen Thompson Student Union. At this point representatives of the administration and the BGSU-FA have agreed to participate in a moderated discussion about issues related to unionization. An invitation has also been extended to the AAI. More details about the format for this event and the participants involved are in development.

Today our major agenda item is the final report of the Senate ad hoc committee on Connecting the Undergraduate Experience or CUE which is aligned with strategy number 1 of the BGSU's overall Strategic plan: "Create distinctive coherent undergraduate learning experiences that integrate curricular and co-curricular programs." After the presentation there should be plenty of time for questions about CUE's implementation phase.

2010 is our Centennial Year and as we chart the future of Bowling Green State University it is important that we remember it's past. I say this with sadness that I note the death on August 23<sup>rd</sup> of Emeritus faculty member Beth Casey, Director of General Education at BGSU from 1978 to 2002, and whom I'm hopeful we'll be able to honor more appropriately at our October meeting. It is through the legacy of individuals like Dr. Casey, and all of us, that we are able to embark on curricular initiatives that advance the mission of the institution into the 21<sup>st</sup> century. With that goal in mind the Senate remains committed to working collegially with all constituencies. And, I thank you all in advance for your service this year. Continuing on with communications, President Cartwright...

### **President**

President Cartwright offered the following report to Faculty Senate.

Good afternoon and welcome to the first Faculty Senate meeting of the new academic year. I've said this before but it bears repeating that the privilege of being a part of a university community is enhanced each new year with the arrival of new students, faculty and staff and the enthusiastic return of others. The energy and excitement is palpable and adds to our momentum.

We have important agendas before us this year, but I want to focus my remarks today on a single subject—enrollment.

At the opening meeting of Faculty Senate for the 2008-09 academic year, I recall discussion about enrollment. Concerns were expressed that we were investing in a consultant. At that time, I expressed support for this investment. In particular, the consultants helped us review our financial aid practices to be more strategic, and we have benefited from that work.

As a result of our concern about declining enrollment patterns, we invested in new senior-level leadership and were able to recruit an accomplished professional to lead us forward. Albert Colom arrived to begin this important work in January of 2009. He has built a team and a strategic approach that demonstrates without a doubt that our investments are making a significant difference. When you consider the data about what we did and what we achieved for this fall, the only reasonable conclusion is that we have made wise investments and we have clearly jump-started enrollment.

Albert instituted the “Ten for Ten in 2010” plan with his team. This was his way of getting the team focused on the fundamentals—the basic building blocks—of improving enrollment. He was looking for ten percent improvement in ten areas to increase enrollment for 2010. And, the team went way beyond expectations. For example,

**10 for 10 in 2010**  
**Final Day 1 Results**  
*26-Aug-10*

		<b>Fall 2009</b>	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Fall 2010</b>				
Fall Freshmen Prospects	<b>55,422</b>	<b>35,135</b>	<b>20,287</b>	<b>57.74%</b>
Fiscal Year Campus Visitors	<b>17,145</b>	<b>13,713</b>	<b>3,432</b>	<b>25.03%</b>
Fall Freshmen Applications	<b>13,996</b>	<b>10,418</b>	<b>3,578</b>	<b>34.34%</b>
Fall Freshmen Admitted	<b>11,211</b>	<b>9,253</b>	<b>1,958</b>	<b>21.16%</b>
Fall Freshmen Enrolled	<b>3,871</b>	<b>3,166</b>	<b>705</b>	<b>22.27%</b>
Fall Freshmen Students of Color	<b>802</b>	<b>542</b>	<b>260</b>	<b>47.97%</b>
Fall Freshmen out-of-state	<b>560</b>	<b>393</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>42.49%</b>
Fall Transfer Applications	<b>1,867</b>	<b>1,352</b>	<b>515</b>	<b>38.09%</b>
Fall Transfer Enrolled	<b>704</b>	<b>559</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>25.94%</b>
Annual Off Campus Programs	<b>1,388</b>	<b>671</b>	<b>717</b>	<b>106.86%</b>

One important set of enrollment data is sent to the Ohio Board of Regents after the 15<sup>th</sup> day of the semester, which was yesterday. The key points in the 15<sup>th</sup> day report are: at the BG campus, undergraduate headcount is up 2.7%, at Firelands, it's up 4% and overall, we are up 2.2% in headcount. Overall, we are up 2.6% in student credit hours.

The University's approved budget for this year (FY11) included an assumption of 550 additional full time, new freshmen, 50 additional transfer students and flat enrollments for junior, seniors, and graduate students compared to the prior year.

The actual enrollment of new freshmen and transfer students exceeded our expectations. Our new freshmen class is the second largest in our history, with 3,871 new freshmen as of the first day of classes and 3,841 on the 15<sup>th</sup> day. If new freshmen who started in the summer are included, the new class is 3904 strong.

Transfer students are also up over our projections (second highest ever). We have a number of historic "high's" in this new class: highest ever number of students from under-represented groups; highest ever number of transfer students and out-of-state students; and highest ever number of applications (20.73% more than our previous high). It is also worth noting that we accomplished these results without an overall decrease in academic quality and without the deep, across-the-board tuition discounting that was used in prior years. In other words, these outcomes were secured the old-fashioned way—by going out and telling the story of the value of the BGSU educational experience—one student at a time, one family at a time.

That is all good news! However, there is more to the story. Our enrollment of full-time continuing juniors and seniors declined over last year—and we had flat enrollment in our budget projections. In addition, graduate enrollment continues to decline. When all of these data are considered together, from the perspective of the budget, we expect our tuition revenues for the year to be slightly below, or at best flat, compared to what we projected in the approved budget.

The improvements in freshman and transfer student enrollments would not have been possible without the important investments of almost \$2.9 million we made in enrollment-focused initiatives during FY2010. Those improvements coupled with the upper division and graduate challenges we've experienced also underscore the need for continued investment as reflected by the planned investments of more than \$3.0 million in enrollment and retention-focused initiatives for FY2011. The Faculty Senate Budget Committee (FSBC) has been an active partner in discussions about enrollment and supported these investments.

The active and committed participation of all members of the university community also made a difference. Our engagement going forward will be very important to future success. One year doesn't make a new trend. We'll need to continue with these initiatives.

President Cartwright opened the floor to questions from Faculty Senate.

Midden: Last year's enrollment increases were funded by the furloughs, I think.

President Cartwright: In part. There were about 800,000 dollars generated by that program which added to the dollars we had already set aside.

Midden: Where will the money come from this year?

President Cartwright: Already in the budget. In order to do the things we did in this year's budget we had to cut elsewhere. The priority for last year was enrollment and faculty salaries if enrollment increased beyond expectations. That didn't happen last year. This year we already had enrollment and faculty increases as the top priorities and fully funded, cuts were made elsewhere to make that happen. If we're off a little bit with the numbers this year, at best flat, maybe a little down, we'll have to review those cuts to adjust but the changes won't be significant. I didn't want people to think – whew! A 22% increase in the incoming freshman class. Look at what that generates. Because of course it does generate significant tuition revenue and eventually SSI, which lags, it's a trailing average that is factored into SSI. It's the overall enrollment that has to be factored in when thinking about the budget.

Terry-Fritsch: I have a concern about a statistic Dean Morgan Russell shared with us in regard to quality of incoming freshman students and standardized test scores. On average, the honor student population is coming in with a 29 out of 30 but he also pointed out a great discrepancy in other students with the lowest score being a 7.

President Cartwright: I have the data and I can certainly go back. I have not seen everything broken out. I have seen some early indicators about the number of students above 3.5 for example or the number of valedictorians that we recruited. The overall quality index is a tenth of a point difference. It's been running between 21.9 and 22 since 2004. And, we're at 21.9 this year for the overall class.

Weinsier: If I understood you correctly, you commented about the incoming freshman and transfer students. It sounded like a lot of new students coming in. But then you mentioned that the overall budget is relatively flat because of the decline in juniors, seniors, and graduate students? Does that mean that junior and seniors are leaving in the spring? There is a discrepancy in revenue because of them.

President Cartwright: No these were the smaller classes. Thank you for asking the question to allow me to address that issue. Those are the smaller classes that were admitted in the last few years and are now moving through the pipeline.

Weinsier: I'm confused though how that translates into a flat budget if there are so many incoming new students.

President Cartwright: We project what kind of increases we will have in order to put the budget together. We projected 550 new freshmen and we had more than that. We projected 50 more than the normal flow of transfer students. And, we had more than that. But, we also projected that the juniors, seniors, and graduate students would be the same as last year but they were down.

Weinsier: That's my point. There must be a lot of juniors and seniors leaving to make up the difference in all the new freshman and transfer students.

President Cartwright: Well, in part, the seniors leave when they graduate but the others are simply the effect of admitting smaller freshmen classes in previous years and they are moving through the pipeline.

Weinsier: If I had to put a question on it you aren't concerned about the retention rate between the freshman to sophomore, sophomore to junior, and junior to senior levels?

President Cartwright: We are. We think we can do better. But, we do have a 2.3% improvement in the rate from last year's rate to this year's rate. We are clearly moving in the right direction.

It's 76.8% this year and the prior year was 74.5%. We'd like to get it at about 80%. We want to keep building that.

Edminster: Is there any information available on what quantitative measures were used to establish a clear, causal relationship between our recruitment efforts and our enrollment increases? Were there surveys done? Focus groups? Interviews?

President Cartwright: The recruitment professionals know what works. There is a lot of historic data about the bigger your prospect pool; the more likely you are to have more applications. The more applications you have the more likely you are to have more admits and so forth.

Edminster: Is there any data specific to our institution's efforts?

President Cartwright: Certainly the enrollment staff has a lot of evidence, but not in a causal sense. Edminster: Is that data available? President Cartwright: Sure. Yes, we can see that data day by day, week-by-week, sometimes they follow it hour-by-hour what students have shown an interest. We have a lot of anecdotal data about students who come here, how they were treated, very often about excellent interactions they had with faculty members, for instance. Albert, am I misstating anything here?

Vice President Colom: We looked at 15 years of data, purchased the names of students who are likely to enroll at BGSU. We followed best practices of this campus and others. We already have well over 1,400 applications for Fall 2011.

### **Vice President for Academic Affairs**

Provost Kenneth Borland presented the following report to Faculty Senate.

#### **Fall 2010 Strategic Plan Initiatives**

You have already heard about the progress faculty, staff, and others made possible in regard to enrollment, the second strategy in BGSU's strategic plan, *Charting Our Future*. Throughout this fall, efforts to recruit, support, and retain traditional and other undergraduates and graduate students will continue, and require everyone's high-level thinking and engagement. Your engagement with and encouragement of others to participate this fall in all strategic initiatives will be much appreciated. Each fall initiative I will mention has been highlighted for my attention by many people throughout BGSU and is anchored in *Charting Our Future*.

1) **Undergraduate Learning**--The new undergraduate program resulting from the Senate's CUE Committee work will be discussed within and beyond our established academic committees. Dr. Messer-Kruse, Dr. Jesse, and *ad hoc* committees are assisting me in the processes to address issues, and to refine, approve, and implement the new curriculum which is open to all disciplines. They will tell you more, including receipt of an outstanding external validation.

2) **Graduate Education**--Dr. Messer-Kruse will also lead university-wide dialog to generate a graduate education strategic plan. As dean of the college (which remains intact), he remains responsible for all, every one of its aspects: transactional, enrollment, linkage to research-creativity, and academics. The competitive support and development of graduate assistants, achievable recruitment and retention, strategic expansion of graduate program delivery, and sustained development of academic quality are all important facets of this dialog.

**3) Research-Creativity**--Dr. Ogawa is inviting our entire faculty to engage in conversation to generate a strategic plan for improved internal capacity and then the next level of results for BGSU-wide research, creativity, and scholarship of all kinds. This plan will address the scholarly agenda of all individuals and collaborations, the Centers of Excellence, and how BGSU's academic research-creativity can be a broader basis for economic development.

**4) Inclusion and Diversity**--

a) We must make progress beyond understanding that we value diversity. We need to act out that value with the resultant verb, include. To be sure everyone at BGSU is safe, supported, and able to be successful as empowered university members; we need to improve our inclusion of persons who are diverse. So, I am assembling an *ad hoc* Inclusion & Diversity Network. It will inform the BGSU community about inclusion, bring individuals and organizations together to enhance inclusion, and undertake leadership development for inclusion.

b) **Further**, with the supportive resolutions provided by the Faculty Senate and Administrative Staff Council, and the vote of the Health Wellness and Insurance Committee, at the October 1 Board of Trustees meeting, *Domestic Partner Benefits* will be presented for review and action.

**5) Assessing performance and realigning resources to support academic priorities**--

a) With the elimination of compacts and the use of department strategic plans, an improved academic program review process will be returned. Department strategic plans will link your own best thinking to the college and the university strategic plans and better inform the FSBC-UBC resource request, budget proposal, and allocation results.

b) Program reviews will give you the opportunity to measure performance against your desired curricular, teaching, and student learning outcomes within your academic units and within the context of your external peers. The process will be less burdensome, supported by IR, linked to strategic planning, and can be accomplished as part of disciplinary accreditation. The plan, developed by the deans and in draft form, has been shared with chairs, directors, and CAA for their input.

**6) Faculty Development**--

a) The tenure clock policy is once again ready for your improvement and consideration, and I encourage Faculty Senate to engage me with any remaining concerns.

b) \$100,000 for CUE-related faculty development has been allocated: Be listening for how it might support faculty and curricular preparation for this important undergraduate learning strategy.

Provost Borland opened the floor to questions from the Faculty Senate.

**Graduate Student Senate Representative**

Met for the first time last Friday, 9/3/2010. The group has been busy with organizational matters.

The GSS is looking forward to working with Dean Messer-Kruse. Specific initiatives will be reported at the next Faculty Senate meeting.

### **Undergraduate Student Government Representative**

It's good to be back. Thank you to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for their help and guidance and thank you to all for your support.

### **Retiree Representative**

Representative Harold Lunde shared that the retiree's group is still alive and well. The organization is very strong but he had no statistics to report at this time. The group has regular monthly luncheons and social events. They are also very watchful of the retirement benefits of STRS and OPERS. Overall they are an active and growing group who are having lots of fun.

## **REPORTS FROM SENATE COMMITTEES**

### **Committee on Academic Affairs**

David Border, Chair of the Committee on Academic Affairs (CAA) offered the following report to Faculty Senate.

CAA's principle work for the late spring and summer concerned CUE.

- 1) CAA had requested a report from CUE to examine by June 1.
- 2) At the invitation of Chair Stephen Langendorfer, CAA representatives met with BG Perspective (the Gen Ed committee) at a June 10<sup>th</sup> retreat
- 3) CAA did receive a report from CUE and began the process of reviewing the report.
- 4) CAA held a meeting on June 15<sup>th</sup> to consider response to the CUE report.
- 5) On June 23<sup>rd</sup> CAA submitted a 5 page response to CUE (recipient Cathi Cardwell)

During its September 1<sup>st</sup> meeting, CAA devoted the bulk of its meeting to CUE discussions, with guests, Neal Jesse and Tim Messer-Kruse.

CAA's next meeting is September 15<sup>th</sup>.

### **Amendments and Bylaws Committee**

Erin Labbie, Chair of Amendments and Bylaws Committee (ABC), provided this report.

The first meeting will be held next Tuesday, 9/14/2010 at noon. The ABC will be reviewing the Flexible Tenure Policy, and other policies.

### **Committee on Committees**

Chair Daniel Williams presented the following report. The Committee on Committees is preparing for their first meeting in the coming week. They currently have a vacancy for one Senator. Anyone interested in serving on Committee on Committees should contact Chair Williams or the Faculty Senate office.

### **Faculty Senate Budget Committee**

The first meeting of the Faculty Senate Budget Committee will be held Thursday, 9/9/2010 from 2:30 – 4:30 in the Chart Room.

### **Faculty Personnel and Conciliation Committee**

No Report



## **Faculty Welfare Committee**

No Report

## **Committee on Professional Affairs**

Geoff Howes, Chair of the Committee on Professional Affairs offered the following report.

On May 13, 2010, representatives of the university, recruited by the Committee on Professional Affairs, made a visit to the Ohio State House to convey BGSU's message to legislators. David Robinson of the Montrose Group, our lobbyist in Columbus, organized the trip. Participants were: students Joe Edens, Connor Nemitz, and Jordan Rupert; faculty and staff Scott Magelssen, Penny Nemitz, Hassan Rajaei, Mike Zickar, and Geoff Howes; and General Counsel Sean FitzGerald. Another visit is planned for after the elections in November.

Legislators whose offices we visited:

- Representative Barbara Sears (R-Sylvania)
- Representative Edna Brown (D-Toledo)
- Representative Cliff Hite (R-Findlay)
- Representative Matt Huffman (R-Lima)
- Representative Jeff Wagner (R-Sycamore)
- Representative Jeff McClain (R-Upper Sandusky).
- Senator Kevin Coughlin (R-Cuyahoga Falls)
- Senator Steve Buehrer (R-Delta)
- Senator Teresa Fedor (D-Toledo)

As soon as we can establish a time, we will schedule a September meeting of the committee. We are still working on a time for our first meeting of this semester.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

None

## **NEW BUSINESS**

Connecting the Undergraduate Experience (CUE) Committee Final Report

Dr. Neal Jesse, Dr. Deborah Wooldridge, and Dr. Paul Moore presented the final CUE report on behalf of the CUE Committee.

As a committee we have really evolved in our thinking. The journey of moving from what is to what can be was exciting and intellectually stimulating. Three documents were developed as part of the committee process including the final report. All three documents can be found on the Connecting the Undergraduate Experience website at <http://www.bgsu.edu/cue/page83887.html>.

The team presented their report using a PowerPoint presentation. Carol Geary Schneider, President, AAC&U made the following statement in regard to the BGSU CUE process:

*“The plan is bold and visionary, and has the potential to be pace-setting. If BGSU approves and implements this plan, I am confident that there will be wide interest in it, across all parts of higher education.”*

If we can achieve the implementation of this plan we will become a model for many Universities. We'll begin a series of workshops for instructional and curricular development working with Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) primarily in order to do this. The projected rollout for the CUE initiative is Fall 2011.

The CUE presentation team opened the floor to questions from Faculty Senate.

Brodke: In your problem solving and inquiry sequence I noticed that the social sciences and sciences in general were mentioned specifically. Do you see a role for the College of Business for example contributing to the course pool?

Moore: We feel every College and department can participate. One of the benefits of this model is that it broadens the expanse of general education across the campus. Right now most of our general education courses are in Arts and Sciences. We want to break that model so all Colleges can participate in general education.

Edminster: Will these be new courses or enhanced courses? What level will they be?

Moore: We haven't worked out the details yet but for the most part the inquiry courses will likely be 1000 level; junior capstone, 3000 level; and the capstone experience at the 4000 level... but we haven't worked out the details yet.

Another Senator asked if CUE is going to fit into a 4-year graduation schedule or what we have now – like a 5 or 6-year schedule? We had practical questions like that and concerns about CUE. Are these initiatives being developed in a vacuum?

Jesse: Let me take some pieces of that. Any sample schedules we come up with will look like no one's major and everyone will have problems with it. The students don't have to take any course at any specific time other than the junior experience sometime between sophomore and senior year and senior capstone. Students would take their inquiry courses later if their program were front loaded with major specific courses, such as in Physics. They would take the inquiry and problem solving sequence of courses later than other students. But, in other majors students can jump right in and begin fulfilling these general education requirements. We looked at many departments and programs, not all of them. We weren't able to do a complete environmental scan of every major and how they would fit in here. It will vary by department but it is flexible enough to accommodate every major. During implementation we'll have to identify some wiggle room. Many different scenarios are possible. With a little bit of hard work, it all looks doable. That sample schedule is just one possibility; there are lots of possibilities. The Senator wondered if the inquiry courses could fall in any specific order? Jesse: The inquiry series have to be taken before the problem solving sequence. We hope students take the classes as soon as possible and the model is designed to have them take the classes as soon as possible but we know not every major fits that.

As a quick follow up to that question, will any of our existing general education courses work?

Moore: We'll leave that up to the major to decide. If the courses satisfy the learning outcomes, we'll be fine. Everything is driven by outcomes.

Murnen: In education, the inquiry courses look like Arts & Sciences inquiry courses. This looks like an Arts & Sciences driven general education model. Are you envisioning something like a

social sciences inquiry course grounded in principles of research in education? Would this give students the foundation to go out and do research in their junior and senior level?

Moore: That model is exactly what we're talking about as it cuts across the disciplines.

Wooldridge: Think creatively and any discipline should fit in here. We do hope you'll think creatively.

Weinsier: I was under the assumption that Firelands was one of the seven Colleges of the University. I notice Firelands does not have a banner at the front of the room. What do you mean by Firelands being categorized as other? But that's not really my question actually. Of the courses up there, I wondered what percentage of the courses would be new courses? And thereby what is the impact on faculty? Will there be load changes? Will new courses have to be offered? Will faculty have to be realigned so they can teach these courses and the old courses go away?

Jesse: Firelands is special because of their Associates Degrees. We will need to work with Firelands very closely. One of the things about the general education provision that we're making is that it has to be acceptable at the state level, has to meet the state transfer model. That's why they are separated out. I have no idea why Firelands doesn't have a banner at the front of the room. In regards to the courses, you might be able to tell from the presentation that the Foundations of Creative and Critical thinking is a re-tooled and re-imagined version of BGX 1000. It will be a modified course. The inquiry courses will be new courses but will not supersede existing general education courses. They will be taking the place of some current general education courses but they won't be erasing those courses from the catalog. We're trying to get the data together. That data will go forward to the implementation committee. We're trying to find out how many sections will be needed. How many faculty will be needed? What will have to be moved to accommodate this change? How soon will we need them? What will be displaced because of it? How do we work with departments so that they participate in the model? We will need to figure out that exact configuration. It's a big undertaking. That's what we'll be working on next.

**NOTE:** The College banners at the front of the Assembly Room are in place for admissions activities. Firelands admissions activities take place on the Firelands campus.

Terry-Fritsch: This is a follow-up to the last two questions, partially answered by Neal Jesse. So this is not going to be self-identified within the division or department that a particular course could be applicable as an inquiry course or a particular course can be considered a problem-solving course? Or will we be abandoning current courses to create new ones? So within each department and each division will there be a self-identification process? Or will the two dozen or so faculty and staff make that determination? They'll tell us what counts as an inquiry course, what counts as a problem-solving course.

Moore: It can be both ways. The process will not be so different than the process we have now. We will review the courses and determine if we have a course that will need some re-tooling and it will work – or we need a new course. Here's a new course we'll generate. We'll go out to the department and ask if they can help us develop this course. The implementation process will look at the course level with departments.

Jesse: We will incorporate BG Perspective (BGP) as much as possible into assessing courses. Doing what it is doing now. It is the faculty body that is reviewing what is going on with general

education and we want them to remain in place and work with the departments and schools in order to move this along.

Fan: Fundamental question – can you please clarify for example why you have chosen what is the theoretical or practical ground for the Committee saying three courses rather than two? Do you have statistics on this? How did you make that decision for the number of the courses in each category?

Moore: State compliance. We want students to apply their knowledge gained in the inquiry series across all the disciplines across campus. Historically we can look at major disciplines on campus, three seem to fit with what we have on this campus and the transfer model... a lot of factors that go into this decision, some intellectual and some practical.

Fan: What happens if we deviate from this specific plan? More for the implementation process.

Jesse: If I understand you correctly, why is three the magic number? Originally we did debate a number of distributions. We looked at a lot of research and nothing said this is what you must have or must do. What does the research say needs to be in a general education model? What are we doing well? What are we currently doing? We came up with a good 12-credit hour distribution because that seemed to make sense for BGSU and the transfer model of Ohio. We need to allow students to accommodate general education in the transfer in and transfer out process. If, as the implementation goes forward, and we begin to implement and assess what's going on, the Implementation Committee decides they think four inquiry courses would be better than three we would adopt four in the future, move slightly one direction or another.

A Senator asked if approval of CUE courses depend solely on syllabi and course descriptions or will it depend on the assessment of student achievement and outcomes?

Moore: Both. A plan for continuous review would be in place. Unlike the current model, a course will have a life span. We want to be sure the courses are current.

Lunde: I want to compliment the CUE Committee for the hard work you're doing. One of the most difficult areas to handle and to work together. Great job. Have you taken into account the differential background of students appearing here as freshmen? Some are better prepared; some are not very well prepared. How are you handling remedial learning? How does that affect the cost to the University?

Moore: What we haven't talked about today is assessment and we haven't talked about faculty advisors so that students are steered toward the appropriate remedial work. Others may go beyond that standard level – assessment and feedback. Academic advisors are key elements of this process.

Jesse: Transfer students enter at different levels and ranges of experiences will be addressed. We are addressing this – and you'll find it in the reports.

Laird: I have two questions. You alluded briefly to transfer in from other institutions. What is the mechanism to ensure that our courses will match the transfer assurance guide to other institutions? Could you please comment on the timeline given the fact that the Fall schedule goes up in February? This seems very ambitious to say the least.

Jesse: Cardwell and Langendorfer are working to be sure we fit the transfer model. We're working with the state to be sure our courses fit the transfer model. As we talk about TAG there is a lot of complexity involved. As we move forward this will be one of the hardest pieces we put

in place. We're hoping that for Fall 2011 we have a foundation for critical thinking course – 140 sections, to accommodate every freshman. Worst case Spring 2012. Dozens of the inquiry sequence should also be in place but will depend on how many faculty can be recruited. What type of professional development money can be put towards recruiting faculty to create courses that interest them? We want to accommodate every freshman in Fall 2011 and then keep ramping up after that. The quantitative literacy/math course is already being delivered. The two General Studies Writing (GSW) courses are already being delivered. Those will be put up as well because they're already there. Many take a math course already through their majors. We don't have to add too many of those. Those pieces should be done by Fall 2011. We'll achieve this by working with all Colleges, key departments and schools, and getting faculty interested. And yes, this is very ambitious. We have a lot of hard work in front of us. The implementation committee has a very long three months ahead of them. We want to follow all the steps in the process for curriculum improvement and be sure they are put into the catalog as appropriate. That's why we're working with Faculty Senate right from the start. And, we'll continue to work with Faculty Senate. Moore: This is not our first model. The state weighed in to make sure it fit.

Chair Kristine Blair noted the vast amounts of work of the CUE Committee and thanked them for their dedication and valuable service. The Faculty Senate looks forward to being a part of the implementation phase. Future reports will provide updates as needed.

### **ISSUES AND CONCERNS**

Steve Dinda, President of Graduate Student Senate, reminded Faculty Senate that representative Randy Gardner will be on campus Wednesday, from 12 – 1:00 p.m. in Olscamp, Room 101. Please join us for this important discussion.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Terry Lee Herman  
Secretary, Faculty Senate