

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
FACULTY SENATE
Minutes of the Senate Meeting of March 27, 2007
<http://www.facsenate.utoledo.edu>

Approved @ FS mtg. 4/24/07

HIGHLIGHTS

Chair of Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
Mentoring plans
9% Fall semester tuition increase & budget projections update
Classroom Building & Information Commons update

Note: The remarks of the Senators and others are summarized and not verbatim. The taped recording of this meeting is available in the Faculty Senate office or in the University Archives.

Chair Wilson called the meeting to order. **Alice Skeens, Executive Secretary** called the roll.

I. Roll Call –2006-2007 Senators

Present: Barnes, Bischoff, Bopp, Bresnahan, Byers, Chen, Cluse-Tolar, Edwards (for Baines), Fink, Floyd, Funk, Hamer, Horan, Hudson, Humphrys, Kennedy, King, Klein, Lambert, Lundquist, McInerney, Monsos, Niamat, Olson, Peseckis, Ott Rowlands, Peseckis, Piazza, Poling, Pope, Randolph (for Friedman), Reid, Skeens, Spongberg, Stoudt, Teclehaimanot, Templin, Thompson-Casado, Traband, Tramer, Wedding, Wilson, Wolff, Zallocco (44)

Excused: Barlowe, Moorhead (for Morrissey), Ritchie, Schall (4)

Unexcused: Ariss, Johanson, (2)

A quorum of incumbents was present.

II. Approval of Minutes

Minutes of March 13, 2007 approved as distributed.

III. Executive Committee Report

Report by Chair, Carter Wilson

Faculty Senate Executive Committee Report

March 27, 2007

Approval of the minutes

Before I do anything, I need to take care of the minutes. Any comments on the minutes, if not, could we entertain a motion to approve the minutes.

Tribute To Patrick McGuire

I need to begin my executive committee report with a few words of farewell and a tribute to a good friend and colleague, Patrick McGuire, who departed from us about a week and a day ago, March 18.

Patrick McGuire, devoted father and husband, is from up state New York. I heard him talk about his home in nostalgic, picturesque and poetic language. He spoke of enjoying the rolling green hills and clear waters and fly fishing. This past year he spoke of returning home.

Patrick McGuire joined the faculty at The University of Toledo about 20 years ago. He served as chair of the Faculty Senate about ten years ago. I served on his executive committee. Therefore it is fitting and it is an honor for me to say a few words of tribute to my friend and colleague.

Patrick McGuire was a prolific scholar, having published countless articles and several books. He had a background in political philosophy. In fact we had connected immediately when we discovered that we both had a background in political philosophy. Patrick had conducted considerable research on electric utility companies and community activism and engagement. In 1994 he earned the distinguished scholarly achievement award from the American Sociology Association for his book, *From the Left Bank to the Mainstream; Historical Debates and Contemporary Research in Marxist Sociology*.

His work on electric utilities led to two major books, *The Control of Power: The Political Economy of Electric Development in the United States, 1870-1930* and his most recent publication, *The Social Construction of Industry; Human Agency in the Development, Diffusion and Institutionalization of Early Electric Utility Industry*.

Patrick was the director of the Urban Affairs Center from 1999 up to 2005. Not only did he bring money into the Center, he brought faculty members together on collaborative research projects. He brought me and other faculty members including a few members of this Senate into a number of projects, particularly on urban education, predatory lending, neighborhood development, citizen action, and many others. He empathized with the downtrodden, the poor, the elderly and the homeless. Patrick believed in empowering people and he was committed to principles of social justice.

I remember several years ago saying to Patrick, after he had suffered disfiguring surgery and painful chemotherapy, "you have more courage than anyone I know." Patrick said to me that this was not courage. He said that he was just doing what he needed to do to survive. As I look back in retrospect and when I learned that Patrick had driven himself to the hospital the night he died, I know that Patrick was too modest. He indeed had more courage and more strength than anyone I had even known.

I will never forget the first time I heard Patrick McGuire speak up at a Senate meeting. Frank Horton was the president of the university at that time. Frank had just addressed the Senate and asked for questions. Patrick, sitting in the back, was the first to raise a hand. Patrick said, "There is an old Gaelic saying, 'It is hard for me to look a man in the eye who has his foot on my throat.'" Patrick was a passionate defender of the faculty. He believed that universities ran best with strong faculty input and with a strong faculty voice at the university level. He insisted that the concentration of power in a university president was a form of oppression. He believed that making radical changes in the university without effectively consulting with the faculty was oppressive, demoralizing to the faculty and destructive to the university. And when I see faculty members standing up and challenging unlimited presidential powers, I quietly say to myself that Patrick's spirit is still alive.

About two months ago, Patrick emailed me and expressed his concerns about the new administration. He wrote to me saying that he will not be around much longer, but if there is anything he could do to help to just let him know.

Patrick asked if we are going to be ok. My reply is that I don't know. It depends on our ability to persuade others of the importance of a strong faculty voice at the university level, our ability to make both administrators and board members understand that faculty

involvement at the university level is essential for a healthy and well-functioning university and our ability ourselves to stand up for our principles and values.

When I remember Patrick I remember his support for a strong faculty senate, his general belief in empowering people. I remember his strong commitment to principle social justice. But what I remember most is his courage, his strength, his determination and his passion.

In a eulogy of a civil rights activist about 40 years ago, Ossie Davis spoke these words:

Consigning these mortal remains to earth, the common mother of all, secure in the knowledge that what we place in the ground is no more now a man—but a seed---which, after the winter of our discontent, will come forth again to meet us.

I salute Patrick McGuire: my good friend, this distinguished scholar, this committed activist, this defender of the faculty, and this most noble person. I bid farewell to your body. May your spirit remain with us.

Constitutional and Merger Issues

Last week, Tuesday, March 20, the joint FSEC approved a list of principles to include in a new constitution. We had been looking at the two senate constitutions since October of last year and we had been working on developing these principles for several months. These principles were derived from our current constitution, from our views of shared governance and from our commitment to preserving and strengthening the senate, as we merge the two campuses. The first draft was developed back in November. The two senate executive committees had met December 1 to approve the principles. We met March 20 to refine them and firmly commit to them. They were distributed to the president, deans and board members.

Last week, Thursday, March 22, we had our second summit on shared governance. At the meeting, we argued about the points we had agreed on at the last summit. Four board members were present. There was considerable discussion of board powers. The second half of the summit focused on our document, which I need to get to you. Every bullet point on our list of principles was challenged.

Responsibility and Jurisdiction

- The Faculty Senate shall be the voice of the faculty.
- The Faculty Senate shall carry out the mission of the university.
- The Faculty Senate shall be responsible for the academic affairs of the institution, including university-wide undergraduate academic rules, regulations, policies, programs, and standards; the granting of degrees, honors, awards; and the oversight of student progression.
- The Faculty Senate shall have the power to consider any subject pertaining to the interests of the university and to act in the name of the university faculty in making recommendations to the university administration on these matters.

- The Faculty Senate shall have a role in long range strategic planning, including policy, fiscal, and facility planning.
- The Faculty Senate shall conduct bi-annual formative assessments of the provosts, vice provost(s), and deans to ensure accountability and improve administrative performance.
- The Faculty Senate shall have a role in the appointments of university-wide administrators, being an active participant in the search process.
- Nonmembers of the university faculty and faculty non-senators have the right to attend meetings and have the privilege to speak in regard to matters before the senate subject to the rules of the senate.
- The provosts of the main campus and health sciences campus shall serve as ex-officio, non-voting members of the Faculty Senate.

Deans insisted that they spoke for the faculty; that they should have permanent, appointed seats on the Senate; that the senate was not the exclusive voice of the faculty. They objected to the Senate assuming responsibility for carrying out the mission of the institution. They insisted that they rather than the senate should appoint members to university committees.

President Jacobs suggested that he put a committee together to start writing our constitution and to work out our time-table for merging the two senates. We told him that that would not work. It will not happen. As I have said many times, we are listening to board members, to deans, to vice-presidents, and to the president. We are talking openly and honestly about issues and problems of shared governance. We are committed to resolving whatever Senate problems are identified. We have been working on proposals to resolve problems and to respond to the concerns and needs of board members, deans, and other administrators. We have toned down our demands.

We went back and looked at our original constitution and noticed that as it is written, it responds to most of their concerns. Our constitution acknowledges board powers. It suggests that the Faculty Senate is not the exclusive voice of the faculty. College council will speak for the college faculty. The senate, as the elected representatives, is the voice of the university faculty.

The Senate Executive Committee met afterwards. Yesterday, Barb and I met with Larry Elmer and Kris Brickman to discuss our next steps. We have another summit scheduled. In the meantime, there are issues we need to work out among ourselves. We need your advice on two issues:

- 1) Whether the senate or the faculty should elect the senate chair, vice-chair and executive committee. Our senate elects its officers, much like the parliamentary system. On the HSC side, their faculty elects the officers of their senate separately, much like our federal system of government.
- 2) The two EC decided to allow senators to serve for two three year terms

The other issue is that we would like to move forward on our constitution. If we are to change our constitution and merge the two senates, we need to do it before the term ends or we will have to wait until the fall. If we do it this term, we will need to be able to send you a

copy of the constitution and call a special meeting. We are thinking about the possibility of April 17. This gives us April 10 to have further discussions of constitutional issues. Are there any comments from other Executive Committee members that were there?

Senator Bopp: It's important to mention that we will have a constitution shortly.

Chair Wilson: We will continue to work on our own constitution. We have two senate meetings in April and we would like to ask you, members of the FS, to be prepared, as for the April 10th Faculty Senate meeting we will send you some material and would like to have open conversations about constitutional issues. We would like for all of you to reserve April 17th at 3:00 pm and have some conversations with A&S Council and talk about the issues and plan for a special FS meeting.

Any other comments on the shared governance summit?

Senator Floyd: Whatever constitution comes out of the Executive Committees, it must go to this body for approval and ultimately must go for approval by the entire faculty of both campuses.

Senator Edwards: Are the timelines for the HSC faculty similar to those proposed for us here on Main Campus?

Chair Wilson: Let me add another announcement so that you are informed on what's going on. Barb and I met with the President and Vice-President of the HSC Faculty Senate so that we can strategize and so this is not something we are doing by ourselves, and so that this is something the faculty on both sides want to do. Also, let me add that they, too, are committed to the faculty senate as the strong voice for the faculty. We are united on that point.

Senator Olson: One thing that the HSC has an advantage in is that they do work 12 months a year, and we don't. So we must conclude our activities by the first of May, they would be working beyond that. I hope they will have their ratification done by June. It will not be an identical schedule to ours simply because they have more time.

Chair Wilson: Let me add one other thing that the discussions of shared governance is one thing. Us, the two senates merging and developing its own constitution is quite another thing. When we talk about shared governance we talk about the powers and responsibilities and prerogatives of the Board and administration and the role of the faculty. We talk about issues of appointing people to University wide committees. When we talk about the FS constitution, we talk about issues of proportional representation. In our system we have more of a parliamentary system where we elect members to the faculty senate, and the faculty senate elects the officers and the executive committee. However, on the HSC campus their faculty elect members to the faculty senate, however that faculty, not the members of the faculty senate, elect their president, vice president and the officers. I need some advice from you on that.

Another issue, and this came up at the shared governance summit, some of the board members said. things like the members of the faculty senate are always the same people. I explained to them, how can that be when members of our faculty senate are elected for three years, then you get off the senate, and every year one-third of the senate are different people. They also said that the leaders of the executive committee are members of the humanities. I pointed out at the board meeting that today in our executive committee there are no representatives from the humanities. In fact, most of them are from the STEMM area. Then I went on to introduce Bernie Bopp from Astronomy & Physics, Andy Jorgensen in Chemistry, Steve Peseckis in Pharmacy, Walt Olson from Engineering. So there are a lot of misconceptions about us that we will have to work to dispel and we have the responsibility to educate the board members. I would prefer for us to continue to have a system where we serve for three years, then we step off for a year, and then get elected after that. Over at the HSC they can be elected for two consecutive three year terms. I feel it's better to have more circulation of faculty members of the senate and I think we can go back and tell the members of the BOT we want a constitution where we can only serve for three years then we have to get off, not explaining to them that's always been in our constitution.

Senator Piazza: I think that's a valid point, we are not just writing a new constitution, but we are merging two different cultures. Two ways of doing business, two different ways of governance. There are things in the way we do business have been attractive to the folks over at the HSC. There are also things that they hold dear and don't want to let go of, and I guess I could say the same thing about us. We have things dear to us that we don't want to let go. What we have been doing in trying to put this thing together is preserve the voice of the faculty, that the faculty gets to speak with one voice, that we all don't become fractured and that there is the possibility that we would have multiple bodies of faculty that are essentially contrary to one another, that we have one strong faculty senate. It might not be exactly what you recognize, it may not look like what you have now, by necessity it may have to be different. A long time ago I had the misfortune of having to change high schools at the end of my junior year and go to another high school for my senior year. This was devastating to me. I wanted to finish high school with my friends. Then someone gave me a good piece of advise at that time and said, there are two things in life you never want to do, compare your new girlfriend to your old girlfriend, and compare your new school to your old school. As much as we might cherish the way we do things, we are a new school. We may have to do things a little differently to make sure that we preserve that unified faculty voice, even though it may not look entirely the way we would like it to look, or familiar with the way it looks, that we would at least preserve a single faculty voice and much stronger because it includes hundreds of faculty from the HSC.

Chair Wilson: I still would like to get your feedback on those two issues. The first issue is the election of officers whether members of the senate should elect officers or whether the faculty should elect the officers separately.

Unidentified speaker: Are the officers in addition to the senators elected?

Chair Wilson: In our system the members of the executive committee are elected to the senate first, and are members of the senate. In their system I believe Larry Elmer was not a member of their senate but a president elect. So in their system you can be elected a president, or president elect and not be a member of the senate. In our system you have to be a member of the faculty senate.

Senator Stoudt: We elect all new senators first, then they are invited to the final senate meeting of the academic year. New leadership is elected at this meeting, so that the leaders are in place for the following year. Elections need to be completed before the end of the semester since the full faculty is involved and most have 9-month appointments. I don't think changes can be implemented yet this academic year.

Chair Wilson: To me that's a very important concern.

Senator Olson: The fact is that faculty within our colleges don't know faculty in other colleges, whereas the faculty in the Faculty Senate do. We are meeting throughout the year, the president cannot be a first year member, so you learn who the people are before you elect them. Consequently I do like our method better.

Senator Fink: Can you tell me what the president and the deans are saying about UCAP?

Chair Wilson: How are the president and the deans talking about UCAP, can someone help me out on this?

Senator Floyd: UCAP isn't a Senate committee, so it's not part of this discussion.

Chair Wilson: Faculty members elect members to their faculty senate, and faculty members elect the officers to the faculty senate separately, however when it comes to representation on their faculty senate they have a proportionate representation system that is somewhat similar to our proportionate representation system. It's a separate ballot, and I'm not sure whether they have two rounds of ballots. The impression that I get is that they just have one ballot. The more I think about that, I see more and more problems with that.

Senator Hamer: I wonder if that doesn't turn out to be a big campaign. I don't have a lot of experience in the faculty senate, but I see a good continuity and you can elect people who already know the issues.

Chair Wilson: Thanks for your feedback. Next on the agenda is Steve Peseckis.

Senator Peseckis: This has to do with update on the curriculum and you should have received by email a list of course proposed here today for your approval. As we negotiate in forming the new constitution, more items are being affected in the curriculum and how to handle it. We want to move toward something called a consent agenda which we're still trying to define. Pre-distributing the courses that are up for approval that members of the Faculty Senate could have input directly to the committee or the committee chair and the issue would be resolved. This way we wouldn't need to discuss them on the Senate floor. It would be streamlined. The other goal is to process courses within 30 days through the Faculty Senate. So that's why even though we processed a large number of courses last month, we have more now and will have more by the end of the year to keep things moving quickly through the system. Please look at the courses proposed today, one from A&S and three from the College of Business, five from Engineering and eight from HSHS. I move that these courses on the list be approved. Any questions in what is being proposed today?

Senator Stoudt: The CI course is listed under the College of Arts & Sciences. Isn't it in the College of Education?

Senator Peseckis: Yes, sorry. Thank you for correcting that. I will check that again. If nothing else, all those in favor please say "aye". Opposed, same sign.

Motion passes.

Course Modifications and New Courses Approved by the Faculty Senate on March 27, 2007

College of Business

Course Modification

EFSB 3500 Introduction to Entrepreneurship 3 ch
Change course title to "Introduction to Entrepreneurship for Non-business Students"
Update catalog description

MKTG 3880 Marketing Research and Data-based Management 3 ch
Change pre-requisites from "BUAD 3010" to "BUAD 2070 and BUAD 3010"

PSLS 3440 Professional Sales Group [SIS]/ Sales [catalog]
Change title to "Professional Sales"

College of Education

Course Modification

CI 4450 Creativity and Language Arts 3 ch
Update catalog description

College of Engineering

Course Modification

EECS 2100 COMPUTER ORGANIZATION AND ASSEMBLY LANGUAGE 4 ch

Change pre-requisites from “EECS 1100, EITHER 1500 OR 1530” to “EECS 1100; EECS 1530 OR EECS 1560”

EECS 2550 OPERATING SYSTEMS AND SYSTEMS PROGRAMMING 3 ch
Change pre-requisites from “EECS 1530 OR 1550, 2100” to “EECS 1530 OR EECS 1580, 2100”

EECS 3200 SIGNALS AND SYSTEMS 4 ch
Change pre-requisites from “EECS 1530, 2300; MATH 2890, 3860” to “EECS 1530 OR 1560; EECS 2300; MATH 2890, 3860”

EECS 3500 AUTOMATA AND LANGUAGE TRANSLATION SYSTEMS 3 ch
Change pre-requisites from “EECS 1550” to “EECS 1550 OR EECS 1590”

EECS 3550 SOFTWARE ENGINEERING 3 ch
Change pre-requisites from “EECS 1510 OR EECS 1550; ENGL 2950 OR ENGL 2960” to “EECS 1550 OR EECS 1580; ENGL 2950 OR ENGL 2960”

College of Health Sciences and Human Services

Course Modification

COUN-3140 SUBSTANCE ABUSE PREVENTION AND COMMUNITY PROGRAMMI 3 ch
Change pre-requisites from “PERMISSION OF INSTRUCTOR” to “None”

HIM 3220 AMBULATORY CLINICAL CLASSIFICATION SYS AND SVSC 3ch
Change pre-requisites from “HEAL 2210 AND HIM 3210” to “HEAL 1800”

HIM 3230 HEALTHCARE DOCUMENTATION REQUIREMENTS 3 ch
Change pre-requisites from “HIM 2210” to “HEAL 1800”

HIM 3240 HEALTH INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION PRACTICES 4 ch
Change pre-requisites from “BUAD 1020 AND HIM 3200” to “JUNIOR STANDING”

HIM 4200 REIMBURSEMENT METHODOLOGIES AND COMPLIANCE 2 ch
Change pre-requisites from “HIM 3220 AND HIM 3240” to “PRE-/CO-REQUISITE OF HIM 3210 AND HIM 3220”

HIM 4210 HEALTHCARE STATISTICS, REGISTRIES, AND RESEARCH 3 ch
Change pre-requisites from “MATH 2600, HIM 3220” to “PRE-/CO-REQUISITE OF MATH 2600”

HIM 4260 LEGAL AND ETHICAL ISSUES IN HEALTHCARE SERVICES 3 ch
Change pre-requisites from “HIM 3200” to “JUNIOR STANDING”

RCRT 3940 RECREATION APPLICATION EXPERIENCE 3 ch

Change pre-requisites from “RCRT 1300, 1310, 2300, 3310, 3710 or permission of instructor” to “RCRT 1300, 1310, 2300, 3310 or permission of instructor”

Chair Wilson: Thank you, Bernie Bopp is next.

Senator Bopp: Carol Bresnahan, Rob Sheehan and I had met to discuss issues of faculty mentoring. We were charged to devise a program of mentoring new, tenure-track faculty. This is a well-studied area and there is quite a bit of literature on this, including at least a couple of books I have in the Center for Teaching and Learning. Probably the best is Bob Boyce’s book called *The New Faculty Member*. He was the faculty developer at SUNY Stony Brook and his specialization was in psychology. From his extensive work on mentoring he found that new faculty often feel lonely, isolated and had time management issues. If Jennifer Rockwood were here she could describe another group of individuals new to campus that have this same kind of problem, and that’s the new freshmen that come on campus. In hindsight it shouldn’t surprise us the same issues so important to our freshmen are indeed equally as important to new faculty. But Boyce’s very important conclusion is that without guidance and mentoring new faculty take a long time to get up to speed as far as being able to function as a full-fledged faculty member. His research indicates that most new faculty members take four to five years to bring their research productivity and their teaching effectiveness to a level that meets or exceeds institutional standards. That’s a very long time and I think that we can do better than that. Boyce’s work indicated that with proper mentoring new faculty members can get up to speed on a time-scale of two to three years, instead of four to five years. So a mentoring program for new tenure-track faculty is a very important thing. We tried something like this a few years ago.

There is no formal mentoring program at U.T. right now, although I certainly can recall very positive mentoring experiences that I had as the mentor to new faculty. In fact the two faculty members I mentored, Alison Spongberg and Linda Rouillard, are both in the room. Notice that the mentoring was by a faculty member in the Physics and Astronomy Department, far removed from their research interests! One of the things that Boyce found is that while having mentors within departments is important - those are the people that can comment and assist with research and scholarship - it’s also very helpful to have an external mentor from outside the department. The external mentor admittedly lacks expertise in scholarship but has no access baggage, no ax to grind, no issues of “Is this person going to be voting for my tenure promotion?” That’s simply not an issue anymore.

We did have a mentoring program in academic year 2000-2001. I remember working with Linda at that time, and Alison earlier than that. Such programs can certainly work, but we allowed this formal process of mentoring to lapse. There is certainly informal mentoring happening in departments. Perhaps there are specifically assigned mentors within departments, but all too often we believe that effective mentoring is happening at the department level, but it is not. Casual hallway conversations that we may see do not make a mentoring program. We need to be more systematic than that. What did Carol Bresnahan and I find from the research here at U.T? In November Carol brought together focus groups of newly tenured faculty, hired either in 2000 or 2001. We spent several hours talking to these individuals, and there were some interesting and some disturbing things that we learned. We found, not unexpectedly, that the amount and quality of mentoring within the departments is highly variable. There were some newly-tenured faculty that talked very positively of their mentoring experiences and their mentors within the departments. Other new faculty said nothing ever happened. They either never got a mentor or were assigned a mentor that hardly ever spoke to them. The newly tenured faculty admitted that the tenure and promotion process was very transparent. I think the dossier preparation and the procedures that have been put together by the AAUP and the

administration has produced a very transparent process but the criteria are still mysterious. The newly-tenured faculty still weren't exactly sure what those tenure criteria really mean.

The newly-tenured faculty told stories that I personally found very hard to believe but I suspected were urban legends. Nevertheless, the faculty on the tenure-track believed it. Another thing we were criticized for is that there are votes about tenure and promotion issues that come back to faculty and no one really explains what the votes meant. If there is an 8-2 vote what does that really mean? Should the faculty member up for tenure be deeply concerned about two negative votes, or is that something not of any consequence?

One issue that came up in our discussion with the newly-tenured faculty was surprising and disturbing to Carol and me. When we talked to the newly-tenured faculty about their future plans there was a disturbing fraction that were not sure they would seek promotion to full-professor. Perhaps some of this was due to "tenure-exhaustion" - they just went through the process of putting together a large dossier and perhaps didn't look forward to doing it again for a *long* time. But the newly-tenured faculty also found the written expectations for promotion to full professor to be very unclear. Urban legends were numerous! Others in the group expressed an interest in becoming a department chair, rather than striving to be promoted to full professor. Nobody seemed to be asking the associate professors what they wanted to do.

The provost's office and the CTL have plans for the mentoring program - there will be a mentoring program established starting this fall. Colleges and departments would be given responsibility to assign a mentor from a home department. I hope that a second, external mentor from a different department or college might be designated as well. I found such a system to work very well, and I think that Professors Spongberg and Rouillard would agree. There should be training and organization and thought given to this and CTL can certainly help to provide mentor training and follow-up meetings in that regard. Lastly, I'm organizing a program at the CTL which will highlight particular offerings which will be targeted towards new first year faculty. Carol will give us a little more details.

Senator Bresnahan:

Recommendations.

The University of Toledo will institute a faculty mentoring program in all departments and colleges.

1. Because of the need to mentor "from day one," and the adjustment that all new faculty make in becoming full-time departmental citizens at UT, we propose an enhanced early mentorship program, the UT First Faculty Year. This program will seek to address, through effective mentoring, challenges that faculty typically face as they adjust to full-time teaching and research at UT. In particular, we propose the recommendations below.

2. Although mentoring does, and will continue to, take place informally, a successful mentoring program must be formal, organized, and systematic. To set up such a mentoring system, the provost must empower deans, who, in turn, must empower department heads or chairs to take "ownership" of mentoring. The campus must create a climate where mentoring is valued, assessed, supported, and rewarded. Deans and chairs must, as Prof. Stewart observed, monitor and assess mentoring carefully.

3. Each department shall create, and provide to the dean by June 1, a written plan to mentor tenure-track faculty. Departments and colleges should be given the resources and,

consequently, held accountable, for successful mentoring of all their faculty, especially of untenured women and underrepresented groups. Chairs and heads shall provide annually to deans, and deans annually to the provost, lists of new faculty and their mentors, and should include mindful assessments of their mentoring programs as part of their annual reports. While quotas are to be avoided, departments that have had trouble hiring and retaining women should expect to demonstrate improvement over time as they create or improve their mentoring systems. Deans should collect department plans and forward a comprehensive college plan, along with the individual department plans, to the provost by July 1.

4. As a rule, mentoring must be clearly separated from evaluation. Faculty must be secure in the knowledge that questions or conversations concerning their professional or personal concerns be kept confidential and apart from tenure or other professional reviews. The mentor should not introduce anything into a tenure committee's discussion that cannot be gleaned from the dossier, though it is possible that he or she may provide a context that will help a tenure committee understand the accomplishments of the mentored faculty member.

5. Each mentored faculty member should be formally assigned at least two mentors. It is strongly recommended that mentored women and people of color have at least one senior mentor who is female or of color. One mentor should be knowledgeable about the faculty member's area of research, while the other should come from outside the mentored faculty member's department. Departments may develop a written or web-based application form for mentored faculty and mentors.

6. Mentoring and programmatic mentoring events must be made with sensitivity to the isolation that many women and persons of color can feel in departments populated mostly by white males. Developing mentoring relationships for women in a college or department with little diversity may mean looking beyond the women's academic homes.

7. Mentoring should focus on the full professional development of the mentored faculty. During the first year, such mentorship should include teaching. After the first year, the greater need for the majority will likely be in areas of research, grant writing, performance, or other appropriate peer-reviewed professional activities.

8. A "best-practices" mentoring system supports the professional development not only of untenured faculty, but of associate professors toward promotion to the rank of professor. The mentoring system should continue to support all faculty as they seek full professorships. Senior colleagues should emphasize the importance of full rank as a goal. We strongly recommend that deans and chairs create a voluntary (but strongly recommended) third-year review for associate professors, analyzing the progress they have made toward promotion to professor, may establish guidelines for such promotion, set up formal mentoring partnerships between professors and associate professors.

9. The provost (or president) shall provide resources for an annual mentorship social event, occasional guest presentations and training sessions on successful mentoring. Each fall, the provost shall sponsor a mentorship social event for all mentors, mentored faculty, chairs, and deans. If mentoring, and its expected results, represent a university priority, then the

university must signal this priority by supporting mentoring. Mentors need training and mentoring relationships deserve recognition. The provost might consider creating a “Mentor of the Year” award to spotlight mentoring’s importance. The provost, working with deans, can also encourage the creation of self-help/self-mentoring groups like those described by Ellen Daniell’s *Every Other Thursday*, in which women scientists in the Bay area met biweekly for personal and professional support.

10. The provost shall continue to sponsor, at least every other year, faculty focus groups for both tenure-track and recently tenured faculty. These groups provide valuable and current information about their experiences at the university and also will offer a way of assessing the success of mentoring.

11. The Center for Teaching and Learning will provide, both at the new faculty orientation and at other occasions, including through its own lunchtime events, programming aimed specifically at support of tenure-track faculty and at development of good mentorship.

Senator Fink: There are very few rewards for becoming a full-professor. It takes many years and after many years of work you only get a couple thousand dollar raise. It is easier for people to consult and make much more than that each year. Many people I talked to say it is easier to consult and make up more than the difference from not being a full-professor.

Senator Pope: I can see two things happening. One is somebody comes up for renewal or tenure and that person failed to take the whole mentoring process, or that person might say, ‘I did everything I could, but I could not find my mentor. I’m not sure how to prevent this kind of thing from happening.

Senator Fink: This whole mentoring system is a good idea but you need people in the person’s college or department as well as across colleges.

Senator Stoudt: Just for clarification, this is going to come out of the provost’s office to the deans?

Senator Bresnahan: I believe so.

Senator Stoudt: Is this only going to involve brand new people?

Senator Bopp: Yes, that’s the plan.

Senator Stoudt: We actually discussed this topic at a recent Arts & Sciences Master Teacher luncheon. It was noted that mentorship of tenured associate professors interested in applying for promotion to the rank of full professor might be useful as well.

Senator Bischoff: Will this be a part of the orientation program, because there are a lot of pieces there that could be very effective.

Senator Bresnahan: We will use the orientation as part of this program.

Senator Chen: I’m not sure if this is in the book, do you know what percentage of faculty didn’t get tenured?

Senator Bresnahan: I do not, but the great majority are successful. A few leave UT before the tenure year.

Senator Chen: This is related to my second question, what is the purpose of mentoring because it was not clear about mentors’ responsibilities, i.e., a clear charge is needed. It would improve the quality of research education, not simply just help them get tenured. I’m struggling with what do I tell the junior faculty.

Senator Bopp: A mentoring program can help faculty members be successful sooner. Beyond just achieving tenure, a mentoring program helps to produce successful new faculty members a lot sooner.

Chair Wilson: Next on the agenda is Dan Morissette, Sr. VP for Finance & Strategy.

VP Morissette: Thank you for having me today. I'm going to speak to the budget process and where we are right now. I will quickly flip through a few of these slides.

To view the entire PowerPoint presentation, click on this icon:



\\
fss00cv02.utad.utole

Also available on the Faculty Senate website: www.facsenate.utoledo.edu

We are facing what is normal at this time of the year and that is the expenditure requests exceed the projected revenue. The current projected budget deficit is nothing but a reflection of the known expenditure increases such as the faculty hiring plan and a few other known expenditure changes compared to what we project as revenue. The expenditures do exceed the revenue by about \$5 million. There are some caveats that are very important. I would also like to update the FS on the governor's proposal which could have a dramatic impact. This fiscal year we will be fine. We are a little short on the main campus, we had a good year on the HSC, and overall we should be fine for the fiscal year on June 30.

These are objectives that we have discussed and agreed upon with the Board and the leadership group. These are very similar to what I have presented here previously. We are hoping to grow enrollment on the main campus for the upcoming year, and the hospital activity has been up this year and we are hoping to grow that as well. Those two things are our largest drivers of money flows that allow all of us to succeed here at the University of Toledo. We are going to have a balanced budget overall and cash flow positive does not have a lot of relevance to what we are talking about today. We also do want to begin the implementation of the strategic direction document and are working with the sixteen (16) or so implementation work groups for the strategic plan.

The budget process is underway for all the programs that we have started, and we have started the new FAC. We have one FS member in that group now. I will ask Carter to give me a second person, the next meeting is this Friday (March 30). We will be meeting every two weeks and as we get the budget crunch type stuff we might meet more often than that.

We are all aware of the 0% tuition increase this Fall. What the Governor is proposing, and if it's accepted by all the legislators, all state universities may be capped to 0% for the entire year, University of Toledo included. At the time this decision was made to offer this in the Fall term, the prevailing wisdom was that there would be either a 0% cap for the undergraduates instate or at the most a 2% cap, so as not to predict things that are not necessarily good fiscally but it does appear that that in deed will be the case. We may or may not be able to increase the general fee. We have some major pieces missing. The expenditure process of current projection revenue of \$5 million has one very important piece missing to that. We have estimated that our new enrollment from the direct from high school enrollment initiatives dollar wise equal our scholarships. If that actually occurs, we are in trouble. That's not what we are expecting to occur. We have a number of folks working on this and we expect in a day or two to have the actual hard data. I have been told, but have not seen the data right now, that the statistical model for direct from high school enrollment if it holds, would call for about six hundred and change new direct from high school student increase over the current year, and that the net revenue from those students would approximate about \$1.8 million dollars. I have asked for the schedules and we are working with our Institutional Research Department, the Budget Office and the Provost's Office.

The sheet of paper I have received from the Board of Regents would actually help the University of Toledo for the upcoming year. That sheet of paper shows that we would receive about \$6.8 million in additional state share of instruction support and so it would more than offset the requirement to have the 0% undergraduate tuition increase. The downside of that is that a lot of larger institutions such as Ohio State do not fare as well. So the more practical part of me says what is the likely outcome of the University of Toledo receiving a modest but reasonable increase in state share instruction, and almost every other institution including Ohio State receiving much less than that. It may be accepted to have a 0% increase in tuition, but the legislators might say the funding is not available and you must live within your current funding mechanism.

So the current budget shortfall doesn't scare me. I have already reflected the fact that the enrollment number, and the new revenue from the increased enrollment is not in these numbers right now. There are a number of other major items that we are working through and there are expenditures that we know about like the faculty hiring plan and the minority hiring plan.

As far as the main campus general fund, in our current model we have an increase in revenue of about \$9 million and an increase in expenditures of about \$13 million and some changes to our non-operating expenses that's where you get the \$5 million number. In about a week we will have clearly better numbers as we will be about 80% of the way through the process stuff and right now 30-40% through some of the big picture things like the direct from high school enrollment and enrollment projections but obviously they are all coming together and they will be relatively complete within the next two weeks.

The auxiliary fund is just simply a placeholder for the Board's understanding that those need to be balanced. I mentioned the tuition and the scholarship number where I also show \$7 million, these numbers do reflect one positive for us and that would be if we couldn't raise tuition this spring. Our commitment before the Governor's proposal, was to raise to the cap in the spring. If we go with the state funding formula, it would pay for it on a recurring basis if you do not raise tuition up to the cap. So we and any other state institution could conclude this fiscal year going up to the cap of the tuition increase.

We do work with the deans and the people in the colleges and go through some of the assumptions of tuition rate increases such as in the graduate school 5%, in the Law School and MBA program of 6%. General fee increase, which may need to be removed, is in these numbers and we do have the direct from high school enrollment. I did put in an increase of greater than 7% and as I said we are very optimistic right now and cautiously optimistic that it will have a positive effect on the overall budget for the upcoming year when the direct from high school numbers are well vetted.

We are committed to the faculty hiring plan and minority hiring plan discussed previously by the prior administration and there are some new positions in 2007 that are not in a budget totaling about \$5,000. We are working through very carefully with some benefits numbers and very large increases in health care cost. Employer health care cost is about 10%, we have gone through with what we expected with utilities and scholarships to give you a picture of what some of the various items cost, from the fiscal stand point, each 1% salary increase across the University including the pension benefit is about \$1.4 million, each 1% increase in undergraduate net tuition, should we be able to do that would be \$450,000 per semester, each 1% increase or change in the state share instruction is about \$800,000 for the main campus. More information available in the PowerPoint. In the health system we do have our 1,800 member union contract wages negotiated for the FY '08 and '09, and those are included here with 2% increases each year. And we have other inflation factors built in.

The Governor's proposal. If the state share of instruction sent to us from the Board of Regents holds, we would receive about \$3 million in additional state share instruction that was not in those numbers I

showed previously. There could be some offsets like we could not raise the general fee. This would help to the tune of at least \$2 million. This proposal has some other caveats to it like the requirement that Universities find 1% of “efficiencies” in FY 08 and additional 3% in FY 09. If that’s defined correctly, it’s not an issue, if that’s defined as your total cost is right now \$300 million, and it needs to come down by 3% that would be a big problem for us and other institutions. That is a part of the “pact” with the State of Ohio.

Yesterday I had the opportunity with Rob Sheehan to speak with the Law School accreditation people and the question was how we are going to balance the budget. If we are successful in getting a reasonable increase in state support, we will still have a small projected budget deficit of a couple million dollars. On a \$300 million base, I believe we can find a way to close that gap. If, on the other hand, the State says you may not raise tuition and your state share of instruction is not going to go up, then we are going to have a very similar issue probably on both campuses to what both campuses experienced for the past few years. So we are cautiously optimistic. We have some different options. Dr. Sheehan and I and some other people met with some of the deans the other day about some opportunities to increase enrollment on both graduate and undergraduate levels to impact the Fall numbers. We have completed our new student scholarship model, as well as the retention issue. We are evaluating some carry-over stuff. Administratively we are looking at some vacancies in this budget that we’re not planning on filling anyway which would be the preferred way if we could use that to balance this. The University of Toledo retirement incentive plan which is for faculty only, we do have to cost that out in terms of what impact that will have in this next fiscal year, and I believe we will have a small but positive budget balance. At least that’s the model I got from the Provost’s office.

We have begun a small margin improvement project. We have Dr. Sheehan, myself, Bill Logie and Mark Chastang, look at some things that we could do, we run an in-service bookstore at the HSC and Barnes & Noble on this campus and a lot of the stuff is things that really are major things that haven’t yet been addressed and this group is trying to address this. And, we are looking for new opportunities as well.

Any questions?

Senator Pope: With the University being self insured, faculty and staff who use the UT Medical facilities should result in a cash flow ‘wash.’ How much has this been happening?

VP Morissette: I believe since the merger as of the end of February we have had ten admissions of defined main campus people at the HSC, and the year before we had seven. There has not been a lot of movement in that direction. At some point in the right forum, I would like to speak to why most universities who have health systems do have preference for their own health system and what the value of that is. The simplistic fiscal piece is no different why we provide employee education assistance at U.T. and not at BGSU or some other university. That’s because the marginal cost of providing no services when you have already the cost base in place, are somewhat less than what you would be paying if you were paying, sort of like what you would pay retail vs. wholesale. So right now I wouldn’t consider it to be a major migration. Since you brought up healthcare I will mention the cost of healthcare on this campus and the average age on this campus is seven years older than the average age on the HSC. The cost of healthcare on this campus is around 40-50% at least, higher per employee.

There are specific programs that have been presented to myself or Dr. Sheehan and we have addressed the question of what resources are needed to accomplish this and how are we going to get there. So we have been doing this across the institution with the College of Business, College of Engineering and Graduate Dean. There are individual opportunities so part of it is about if the money that we can confront would help grow enrollment. The direct from high school target that has been

stated is that we want to grow our base from about 3,000 Ohio residents this last year to at least 3,500 this upcoming year. That is one piece of the puzzle. The benefits of that and the scholarship model is very important because we have no intention of just adding 500 students and fully scholarship that back out because there are some costs and with some programs very high costs to teaching those additional students. We expect to have three benefits from that fiscally.

- New net revenue. I am told that the current projection would be that about \$1.8 million increase in net revenue in the first year incoming class compared to the year we just had and that would be a positive development
- We do receive our state share instruction for each and every student. Sometimes you don't see it in new money but if you didn't have the student you would lose the money. On the average we get about \$4,000 per undergraduate student. The more we have it will equate over time to about \$4,000 per FTE, the filling of the resident meal plans. Our residence halls this past year were at 87% occupancy. Most universities these days are packed. When the Ottawa House was built it was projected to be packed and enrollment came down, competition went up, and we have not been full.

So a movement of about 1% in resident housing occupancy is worth about \$250,000 per year. So if we could move the needle from 87% to even 91%, notwithstanding it's on the auxiliary side, nonetheless, if you look at the model you will see that there are passes back and forth. There is the indirect cost charged to the auxiliary units and then they service debt and they support general fees and those kinds of things. It still helps the total institutional picture.

These are the benefits. The strategy is one piece. The second piece, under Dr. Sheehan direction is retention. The retention rates have been better the last couple of years. We did tell the deans that should the retention rates this spring, that we are in right now, end up to be higher on the percentage basis than it was last year, in other words the institution's coffers are more than what was projected because there were more students retained, that we would return that money, dollar for dollar, back to the colleges. We do plan on honoring that. The strategy is to grow the programs where there are opportunities for growth, to grow the direct from high school and we are reaching out more on distant education as well as adult learners.

On the health care activity we have signed a number of new payer contracts so a University of Toledo person who told me they could not go to our hospital without a referral, and I told them that was not true. From Frontpath that is not true, which is the largest carrier on this campus. We would like more of our own to use the health care system for two reasons. One reason is retail vs. wholesale. The other one, if you don't have confidence in your own health care system how do you expect the community to have confidence. So we have added a new payer contract with Aetna and United HealthCare and as you know many people are driven entirely toward the in panel providers. We want a minimum of 3% inpatient growth and about 6% outpatient growth.

Senator Thompson-Casado: What is the target increase for revenue on the HSC, and what is the percentage of that target increase?

VP Morissette: The enrollment folks who have been working with the adult learners have additional encouragement and resources that have been put into accomplishing those objectives. And we are trying to reach out to the community.

Senator Stoudt: Can you comment on what the plan is for carryovers at the College and departmental levels?

VP Morissette: The colleges right now do get 100% of carryovers. A proposal that I put out there was that we would have that carryover at 75% on the academic units and 25% on the administrative units. That is not as dramatic as you would think if you knew what I was talking about switching money wise, because we have a bunch of stuff such as the visitors that we don't have in the budget at all. So we want to put it in the budget and reflect it differently. But the basic current proposal would be 75% and 25% on the administrative departments.

Chair Wilson: Thank you Dan. Next is Dean John Gaboury.

Dean Gaboury: I will talk to you about the Information Commons update.

To view the PowerPoint presentation on Information Commons, click on this icon



\\
fss00cv02.utad.utole

Also available on the Faculty Senate website: www.facsenate.utoledo.edu

We are about 6 weeks behind schedule in terms of the timeframe. Our goal is to be at 60% by June, and completed by the first week in October. What I wanted to share with you is the concept from the architects, a presentation that they used. For orientation purposes, the top of the screen is Bancroft Street and the ROTC Building is near the bottom.

The Field House Classroom project will create 20, 30, 40 seat classrooms. An assessment of the 10 year classroom need showed that we were short 18 of each category of classrooms. This proposal picks up all of the required classrooms. In addition to that and in the past few weeks there were some developments to bring forward a very large lecture hall to be located in this area (lower left on the drawing) on the first floor. To the right hand side of the PowerPoint is the open mall area, the bus stop, the turnaround area at the Student Union, this will be the main entrance. We are looking at three floors, two of which would be completed and after that we still had additional space for a loft area which is undesignated as of yet. We are proposing that this loft area could be used for additional office and group meeting areas. You can also have access to the loft area from the very front part of the building. The gymnasium is here. The concept would be a Town Hall approach. Also a spiral staircase that goes up to the second floor, then you would go up to the loft area. This is the corridor that comes in from the east side of the building and you would move to the left, where there is a design for a historical wall.

Senator Lundquist: One of the architects talked about the state of the art lighting. It will not look like a corporate-like facility.

Chair Wilson: Thank you John. A motion was made to adjourn and it was seconded.

V. *Calendar Questions*

None

VI. *Other Business*

Old Business: None

New Business: None

VII. *Adjournment:* meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Alice Skeens
FS Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Kathy Grabel
Faculty Senate Office Admin. Secretary

