

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
FACULTY SENATE
Minutes of the Senate Meeting of October 10, 2006
<http://www.facsenate.utoledo.edu>

Approved @ FS mtg. 10/24/06

HIGHLIGHTS

Facilities Planning
Update on Committee Revisions
Core Curriculum Committee

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

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

I. Roll Call –2006-2007 Senators

Present: Ariss, Barlowe, Barnes, Barrett (Klein), Bischoff, Bopp, Bresnahan, Byers, Cave, Cluse-Tolar, Edwards (Baines), Fink, Floyd, Funk, Hamer, Horan, Hudson, Humphrys, Johanson, Kennedy, Lambert, Monsos, Morrissey, Niamat, Ott Rowlands, Peseckis, Piazza, Poling, Pope, Ritchie, Skeens, Spongberg, Stoudt, Traband, Tramer, Wedding, Wilson, Wolff, Zallocco (39)

Excused: Fridman, King, McInerney, Olson, Reid, Schall, Teclehaimanot, (7)

Unexcused: Chen, Lundquist, Templin, Thompson-Casado, (4)
A quorum of incumbents was present.

II. Approval of Minutes

Minutes of September 26, 2006 approved as distributed.

III. Executive Committee Report
Report by Chair, Carter Wilson

We have a set agenda for the upcoming meetings:

- October 24th meeting Dr. Lloyd Jacobs will be addressing us, and Tom Barden is going to talk about the honors program.
- November 7th Bill Logie and Dan Morissette will speak on Administrative Affairs and budgeting.
- November 28th we will have an update from the Prioritization Committee.
- I would like to announce that according to the Princeton Review, the University of Toledo College of Engineering Graduate Programs were ranked in the top 20 in the nation and ranked above Michigan.

Last week Andy Jorgensen and I attended the HSC Faculty Senate meeting and we became a part of the merging of the two Senates discussion.

- I pointed out how similar the two Senates are as well as their Constitutions and By-laws. They pointed out their recent revisions of their Constitution and By-laws using our model.
- We talked about similarities and differences with undergraduate issues related to curriculum, academic regulations and core curriculum.
- They talked about their past experience with self-contained graduate programs. Also, about numerous questions such as how the collective bargaining impacts the Senate.

- The two Senate Executive Committees met and discussed the importance of a Senate being a strong voice for the faculty and the need for senates to appoint faculty to key university committees.
- We met with Dr. Jacobs and I asked that four issues be put on the agenda:
 - Scheduling regular meetings with Jacobs and FSEC
 - Committee appointments
 - Faculty governance
 - The white paper

Dr. Jacobs was reluctant but then agreed and we will have monthly meetings with him.

Committees:

- Dr. Jacobs claimed that many committees were a waste of time.
- Some of the more critical committees:
 - Fiscal Advisory Council
 - Research Council
 - Facilities and Planning
- We expect to continue to have FS representation on University committees.

Faculty Governance:

- Dr. Jacobs insisted that Senate needed to devolve curriculum responsibilities to the Colleges.
- I agreed that Senate should not be involved in reviewing the substance of courses, but need to be involved with curriculum and academic regulations issues that cut across colleges.
- Dr. Jacobs backed away from the rule of senate involvement in college cross cutting issues.
- Senate has developed a number of academic regulations precisely to protect the welfare of students, such as the missed class policy designed to protect athlete students who miss classes to attend games across the country.
- Communication is continuing over this issue.

White Paper

- It emerged out of the Strategic Planning Committee, with initially a subcommittee to draft a **straw paper** for committee members to react to.
- It was suggested that I send out a mass email reassuring faculty members that the document was not engraved in stone, but to solicit comments and would be subject to revision.
- I prepared a rather extensive response to it pointing out some major flaws and will email my response to the Faculty Senate after this meeting.
- I outlined mega trends that impact the university in areas of Social Sciences and Humanities
 - Increased needs in Criminal Justice (particularly post 9/11),
 - Anti terror policy,
 - Foreign language
 - Global diversity
 - Impact of aging baby boomer population on social programs
 - The need in area of social work
 - Policy analysis
 - Economic development is not exclusively supply-side involving the transfer of technology, but a large part is demand side involving the raising the quality of life in the community and the quality of education in the community and the role of the social sciences and humanities in this rejuvenation.
 - I provided ten recommendations for revising the white paper.

Chair Wilson's reaction to the white paper

- The white paper entitled "Directions: The University of Toledo" is the beginning of a dialogue about the future of UT
- It restates the University's mission and core values
- Notes four guiding principles for developing the strategic plan
- Lists eight societal mega trends and several local realities
- It connects the mega trends and local realities to new directions and goals for the future of UT
- It suffers from a number of fundamental problems.

This completes my Executive Committee report.

Charles Lehnert, Assoc. VP for Facilities & Construction will give us his report.

Charles Lehnert: I would like to give you a brief overview of the projects that we will be doing on both campuses:

- Orthopedic Center - on the HSC - 23,000 sq. feet outpatient orthopedic care and it will go on top of the Dowling Hall Building on the western edge of the HSC, and it was awarded to Speaker, General Contractor. Opening date is set for September 1, 2007.
- Carlson Library Information Commons – project is in final design, bids will go out on 10/19/06, the goal is to award it within four-five weeks of the bids; by end of November we should start the renovation and it will continue through the winter months.
- Project First Class – every fiscal year as we start to prepare for the fiscal budget year, the State asks us to review for any leftover dollars from previous State funded projects and on the main campus we were able to scrape together a little less than a million dollars. We convinced Dr. Jacobs to allow us to upgrade classrooms on the main campus and we asked the Deans to identify 50 classrooms in the worse condition. We completed the upgrade in ST-120, our test room, in about a week and a half. The upgrade of classrooms will continue.
- College of Pharmacy – on the HSC this project is still in design phase and with major involvement from Dr. Early and Wayne Haas and the rest of the staff. We selected an architect but have not signed a contract with them yet, as this has to go to the Board for approval. If the Board approves we will move forward. It includes 17,000 sq. foot research laboratory space and a 450 seat auditorium.
- Savage Hall – two \$15 million dollar projects which will be broken up into two projects so that we can cycle it through the basketball season and get a piece of it done next summer and re-engage for the following summer. One of the original plans was the indoor practice arena but this will not be part of this project. Phase One of this project will be clean up, shine-up and bringing the building up to code, and do some energy management things, and the second phase will be loggia halfway up the court in the arena.
- Gillham Hall – project has been under way and phase one will be completed December 19th, then we will move the folks and start on phase two.
- Signage project – the money for this project is State funds which have been sitting in Columbus since the year 2000, there has been a lot of committee activity on this through the Campus Facilities Committee. These are the final design options for signage on the HSC main entrance on Glendale Rd., Scott Park, and the main campus on Bancroft in front of U. Hall. Also, major marquees on the main campus.
- Center for Business Engagement – Monger & Monger are the architects. They have done many projects here and we have it pretty much in the schematic design.
- Core Lab Upgrade – Phase 1 on the HSC – we will re-engineer how we do research on the HSC, it will have open lab concept with all glass walls so you can see some of the research going on there. In addition, there will be four core research laboratories:
 - Imaging core lab - couple of electronic microscopes; those will be in the basement

- The first floor will have pro.....(sp?) and genomics (sp?) core labs (not audible)
- Second Floor will have psytometry (sp?) lab (not audible)
- Third Floor will have tissue culture

We modeled this after the University of Wisconsin. They do this very well where they have core laboratories, for example if you want DNA testing done, you would take it to a Core Lab, or if you want imaging you would take it to a director who is over that center so you get the best results from your specimen. This project will be done in about five or six phases.

The next images we are presenting are Facilities & Construction Key Performance Indicators.

On this campus we are looking at work orders over 30 days. We are tracking our targets, work orders over 30 days are 90% completed. This graph shows that we are above that curve line.

This is the HSC response time - by the time you call it in to the time it's closed.

This is the Main Campus response time – our target is 14 days, we are about 17.5 days on the average.

These are work orders generated in April, May and June and now July, August, September. These work orders are put in the system.

This next graph is square footage – tracking all the square footage. The big rise is the addition to the HSC – 1.8 million on the HSC.

The last chart is the utility usage. The maroon graphs are heating degree days in the fiscal year, the blue are cooling degree days, one standard deviation from the set point of 65 degrees. If the average temperature of the day was 70, it would be five cooling degree days on that particular day. That's why you see these numbers so large as far as heating/cooling per days. The yellow line represents our cost per square foot. Our square footage is 7.8 million and our cost per square footage is \$2.25 per all utilities – that's \$14 million utility cost.

This concluded my report. Any questions?

Senator Wedding: Are you going to focus on improving seating in classrooms for the student?

C. Lehnert: Absolutely, this is part of the **Project First Class**. You have to be careful of some of the renovations; if we improve seating sometime you lose capacity. There is a delicate balance you have to walk through. Whatever we can, we will try to improve.

Senator Stoudt: I noticed that your presentation didn't include the Classroom Building.

C. Lehnert: Yes, that's because we don't have any ready art work. The selection committee is going to pick an architect on October 26th. We will ask the Board for approval of this project, as well as the Pharmacy project and Savage Hall. I am getting ahead of the curve by getting the selections done. So when the Board gives us the green lights, we will be ready for some design work.

Senator Stoudt: Can you speak to faculty input with regard to the design of the Classroom Building?

C. Lehnert: The classroom building has not been decided yet, more likely it will be in the Field House Project. I do have members who are on the selection committee.

Senator Stoudt: Will input be solicited from the departments to be housed in the Classroom Building?

C. Lehnert: Absolutely.

A. Jorgensen: In general how are you going to have faculty input for these various projects? In the past we had Facilities Planning Council which decided various priorities and recommendations to the President, but it was a means for the regular, non-administrative faculty members to contribute their expertise.

C. Lehnert: The direction in which the president is going with the committees, I am not certain how we are going to get that input. I have challenged my staff to make sure, what I call purposeful engagement, so that if there are people who are involved in projects we will try to bring them in.

A. Jorgensen: In the past we had ongoing committees and we would try to bring people in with expertise and get their input. Now to dismiss them, and go off in this particular way is not effective consultation.

C. Lehnert: I understand it.

Senator Barrett: Based on conversations with some of my colleagues, it seems to me right now we are over-cooled in the summer and over-heated in the winter. I know that's a different budget, it's an energy cost issue which is an ongoing **expense**. Has anybody looked at the amount of money we might be able to save **if** we change the temperature by two or three degrees in each season, and whether it would be worth doing that, and whether this would make people more comfortable?

C. Lehnert: That's an excellent question and an excellent observation. I can tell you that on the HSC campus we have adopted Jimmy Carter philosophy - 66 & 75 temperature range. In some research settings and in some hospital rooms there are limitations where you can apply that. In the new Facilities & Construction staff we have a certified energy manager Harvey **Bershamm (sp?)**, and we will be working very hard on energy management issues. Does this answer your question?

Senator Barrett: Other than the economic effect of it, yes.

C. Lehnert: We are definitely aware of the economics of this and that's the whole reason of having an energy manager on staff. So it's more than just changing the set points, it's technology we can bring to a classroom setting like this one, or air handler or chiller plant or boiler plant, you will see some of these things rolled out.

Senator Floyd: Could you tell us where the funding for these various projects is coming from? Is it from State capital funds?

C. Lehnert: Yes. Most of it is coming from the State Capital Fund, some of it is coming from bonds. So there will be a mixture of both State and bond funding, and there is some outside funding coming in, too. In the case of Savage Hall, you know there is a big donor there, the College of Business there is a big donor there, so the funds are coming from several different venues.

Student Representative: Before the merger there were going to be some plans for renovations funded with student facilities fees, in particular the Information Commons and the new Classroom Bldg. Post merger what are the plans for that?

C. Lehnert: I couldn't say how the funds from the student fees will be used, I can only speak for Facilities & Construction. Due to some reorganization we have given 2 percent tax back to the projects, so I can only tell you what we contribute back to the University.

Senator Stoudt: With regard to the Information Commons project, you mentioned that the work will continue through the winter months. Can you tell us how this will impact the students and faculty who will be using the library?

C. Lehnert: Hopefully it won't impact them too much. The space is vacant now and we are going to take great caution to make sure that it won't impact anybody too much.

Senator Stoudt: Doesn't this include the Circulation Desk and the present Reference Desk?

C. Lehnert: There is a large portion there, and it is my understanding that it is vacant now.

Senator Stoudt: Not when I was there last night.

C. Lehnert: I guess we are going to be moving, not people, but things, to create that vacancy.

Senator Stoudt: Can you clarify whether the Writing Center is a part of this project?

C. Lehnert: Rob was asked to look at that, and the Writing Center as an alternate. The budget is very, very tight. We are also going to put the Carlson Library.....(?) (not audible), on the Fifth Floor as an alternate. If we get very good bids, then we will be able to do a couple of these things. If we don't get good bids, it is what it is. I understand the construction in Toledo is starting to slow down a little so we should be getting some impressive bids.

A. Jorgensen: The State has not appropriated any money for the Pharmacy Building - the \$15-20 million, the money is not in the bank to do that, is it?

C. Lehnert: No, the money is not in the bank yet.

A. Jorgensen: But we are hiring an architect?

C. Lehnert: No, we are not hiring an architect until the funding is lined up. We have selected an architect that we will use once the Board tells us to go forward. As a part of the ORC we have due diligent process that we have to go through to select an architect. It's a fairly lengthy process. We have to advertise, get their selection, we have to short list them, grade them, rank them and we are trying to get that work done, so when the Board says, go ahead and go forward, then we go forward.

A. Jorgensen: Is the Board going to make their decision before knowing the money is there? We are not going to know Monday.

C. Lehnert: I think they will. I think Dan Morissette is prepared to tell them Monday how we plan on funding these projects.

Senator Stoudt: Can you clarify the chronology of the Pharmacy Building and the Classroom Building? Which is supposed to be constructed first?

C. Lehnert: I think all of those are going to run concurrent. We have a selection made for the Pharmacy, if it goes forward. This month we will select an architect for the classroom project, if it goes forward, and I don't think the Board is going to give us approval until November. I will be at the Board meeting Monday to present a recommendation to the Board for these two projects.

Senator Fink: Do you have the ability to use the money saved on improved energy savings to finance future projects?

C. Lehnert: When I spoke to the reallocation of the money we got for the classroom that some institutions refer to them as table scrapping. We refer to them as leftover. We have 83 projects going on right now on both campuses that have an open status.

So, as we close out those projects, if we do our jobs well, there may be some money left over.

Senator Fink: I am talking about what will be done with the money saved through your energy savings produced by your remodeling.

C. Lehnert: That's our goal - energy efficient projects.

Senator Fink: So then part of your focus is to save future money for the school through savings achieved by energy efficiency and then to use these savings, in part, for future improvements.

C. Lehnert: Exactly.

Senator Wolff: Who decides these projects and who prioritizes them?

C. Lehnert: Most of these projects have been decided by the Facilities Planning Council Executives, we have not changed any course here.

Senator Wolff: If there is no more Facilities Planning Council, what's going to happen? How are projects going to be decided on?

C. Lehnert: That's a good question that I can't answer. I work with the Provost.

All these projects that we are doing now, have been approved prior.

Senator Stoudt: Since I was on the Facilities Planning Council before it was put on hiatus, I would like to clarify. The FPC did not give the Pharmacy Building priority over the Classroom Building. The Classroom Building was always our number one priority; the Pharmacy Building just cropped up. The Main Campus is in dire need of the Classroom Building and has been for years, hence my question about the timeline of these two buildings. The Classroom Building will be of value to all undergraduates on the Main Campus; the Pharmacy Building will be of value primarily to students in one specific college.

C. Lehnert: One does not have a higher priority over the other, but strategically, the Classroom project will probably have a higher priority. Strategically they are very important to the whole. Because, if Pharmacy moves to the HSC it will take classroom space with it and that will strategically change the overall master plan. So they are interlocked. Classrooms are very important to both campuses. I don't want to minimize the issue of the Classroom Bldg. but they are interlocked. If something happens with the Pharmacy, it will impact laboratory space and classroom space. It's a master plan, and not an election process.

Senator Stoudt: The Pharmacy Building was not in the Master Plan that was vetted by the Facilities Planning Committee, the University Committee designed specifically for the purpose of reviewing such plans. The FPC did in fact review the plan very carefully, as Andy already pointed out. Many of us invested years of service on the committee and had a good understanding of how and why the plan was put together as it was. From the perspective of many of us on the committee, it is unfortunate that there was no carry-through of the plan agreed upon. The changes were not discussed with the faculty.

C. Lehnert: You have to look at what is strategically best for the students. I think the issue arose around that the Pharmacy would best be suited on the HSC setting. If Pharmacy moves, the Board hasn't approved it yet, what does it do to classroom space and the research space. It will impact what is going on. Fortunately a lot of the work that is going on is from years before the merger. In light of the merger the best place for the Pharmacy students would be on the HSC where the hospital can give them overall direction.

Senator Wedding: Is there anything being done about the low quality seating, broken and uncomfortable chairs? Can this be addressed architecturally?

C. Lehnert: Yes. Architecturally there will be some challenges. Once we start messing with the floor space, to comply with Americans with Disabilities Act, we will try our very best to address those issues.

Senator Niamat: Are there any plans in the future to move the Engineering Technology Building from Scott Park Campus?

C. Lehnert: There are no immediate plants to do that. There might be some space we will look at but we don't have any analysis on that yet.

Senator Hudson: This relates to priorities. At one point there were priorities on the medical campus and priorities here. But now we are one group. In the past each campus always anticipated a certain amount of funding from the State for new construction. So, looking at priorities on the two campuses, can we anticipate that we will essentially get an added sum, or at least as many dollars as we got before, then I can see that priorities are being changed a little, without hurting anyone.

R. Sheehan: We have made a specific request which has been accepted by the Chancellor that in all calculations we would receive the larger of the two options that you have focused:

- Either the added sum,
- Or recalculation based upon the two institutions.

We will, indeed, have as many dollars or more as we would have in the past if one wanted to make very clear, because one campus is on an earnings basis upon space, and for certain calculations the other campus is on an earning basis upon certain credit hour generation. We believe we have an agreement that whichever maximizes the earnings of this campus that approach would be taken into consideration by the Board.

Senator Hudson: This is a related question; we are submitting one list now and not two lists.

C. Lehnert: At the State board level there were two capital plans submitted for pre-merger, so the next funds that get released they were actually released in November they are not going to be because it's an election year. It will be held over until the next Governor takes over. Those funds could be released sometime in the Spring – April or May. They are still two separate buckets as of FY 07/08. I believe very firmly that the HSC capital budget requested for 07/08 is separate.

Senator Kennedy: After the merger how is the Master Plan developed?

C. Lehnert: The Master Plan was just finished from the work of those that were involved on this campus, and then we did strategic Master space plan on the other campus. One of the things that Dr. Jacobs asked us to do pre-merger is lay side by side and see how they fit. How does Health & Human Services fit, how does Nursing fit, how does Pharmacy fit and we think we came up with a pretty good summary of what we believe has been done and should be done as far as the Master Plan. If you would like to see that, it's available, that's a public document.

Senator Hudson: So we are currently operating on the hybrid of pre-merger of Master Plan of both campuses?

C. Lehnert: Yes.

Senator Hudson: Who actually did the hybridization?

C. Lehnert: We took both Master Plans and it was an internal work group: Harry Wyatt was on it, Rob was on it, Dan Morissette was on it Dr. Jacobs would come ad hoc from time to time, Patsy Komuniecki was on it and many other folks were on it.

Any other questions? Thank you very much. I am extending this invitation that any of you who have staff meetings and you would like me to present this material, I will be glad to do it.

Chair Wilson: Dr. Carol Bresnahan will present her report as a co-chair of Committee on Committees.

Senator Bresnahan: All Senate members should be receiving copies of the committee report and at the end I will take questions or comments that you might have.

(copy of Dr. Bresnahan's report)



Report of the Executive Strategic Planning Committee
Sub-committee on Committees

October 3, 2006

Members:

Carol Bresnahan (MC), co-chair

Patricia Metting (HSC), co-chair

Christopher Bork (HSC)

Barbara Floyd (MC)

John Gaboury (MC)

Jeri Milstead (HSC)

(with significant input from **Doug Wilkerson** and **Frank Calzonetti**, related to areas that they oversee)

Introduction

The Committee on Committees offers the following recommendations for the standing committee structure on both the Main (MC) and Health Science (HSC) campuses. As detailed below, the recommendations have been classified into six different categories. In constituting the committee memberships, traditional practices, including consulting the various senates for nominations and/or elections of members, should be followed in order to ensure broad representation with faculty and students, an appropriate balance between faculty and administrators, etc. Note that some campus committees have already taken the initiative to add members from the other campus. The Committee on Committees did not address those

committees that have been created since the merger (such as the Strategic Planning Committee) whose membership and functions already serve the new UT.

Recommendations

The Committee makes the following recommendations for consideration by the President and the Strategic Planning Committee:

1. Combine or reconfigure those committees that exist on each campus and significantly duplicate each other's functions (listed alphabetically).

- Academic Computing Advisory Committees (MC and HSC) become the Academic Computing Advisory Committee
- Academic Honors Committee (MC) and Honorary Degree Committee (HSC) become the Academic Honors Committee (advises president on honorary degrees and Distinguished University Professors)
- Commencement Committee (MC) and Graduation Committee (HSC) become the Commencement Committee
- Human Subjects Research Committee (MC) and the Institutional Review Board (HSC) become the two separate Institutional Review Boards (IRB) that are research-related, not campus-related: the Biomedical IRB and the Behavioral/Social/Educational Science IRB
- Institutional Biosafety Committees (MC and HSC) become the Institutional Biosafety Committee

Report of the Sub-committee on Committees
October 3, 2006

1. Combined or reconfigure committees that exist on each campus, continued

- Library Advisory Committee (MC) and Library Committee (HSC) become the Library Advisory Committee
- Misconduct Committee (HSC) and Research Council (MC; some functions) to be combined, but to cover, perhaps as two separate committees, both scientific research and other academic misconduct, such as plagiarism
- Patent Committees (MC and HSC), the Technology Commercialization Oversight Committee (HSC) and the University Technology Committee (MC) become the Life and Biomedical Sciences Committee and the Engineering/Physical Science Committee (each will be chaired by the Director of Intellectual Property; recommendation from the Tech Transfer/Research Commercialization Work Group)
- Student Health Advisory Committees (MC and HSC) become the Student Health Advisory Committee

2. Expand existing committees that serve an important function on one campus to include the other campus, with added representation from that campus. Each committee should be empowered to seek additional membership from the other campus in an appropriate proportion.

- Academic Technology Committee (MC)

- ADA Advisory Committee (HSC)
- African American Student Enrichment Advisory Committee (MC)
- Beautification Committee (MC)
- Bookstore Advisory Committee (MC)
- Commission on Engagement (MC)
- Distance Learning Advisory Committee (MC)
- Distinguished Lecturers Committee (HSC)
- Emergency Preparedness Committee (MC)
- Executive Enrollment Management Committee (MC)
- Facilities Planning Council (MC)
- First-Year Experience Steering Committee (MC)
- Fiscal Advisory Committee (MC)
- Honors Advisory Committee (MC)
- Inter-College Advising Steering Committee (MC)
- International Students Committee (MC)
- Latino Initiatives Advisory Committee (MC)
- Martin Luther King Scholarship Committee (MC)
- President's Commission on Diversity (MC)
- Professional Staff Association (MC)
- Program for Academic Excellence Awards Committee (MC)
- Research Council (MC)
- Service Learning Steering Committee (MC)
- Service Recognition Committee (MC)
- Student Issues Resource Group (MC)
- University Assessment Committee (MC)

Report of the Sub-committee on Committees
October 3, 2006

3. Leave existing committees mandated by the Collective Bargaining Agreements intact.

- College personnel committees
- Department personnel committees
- University Committee on Academic Personnel
- University Committee on Sabbaticals (MC)
- Any other contract-mandated committees

4. Leave existing committees of the two faculty senates intact, and encourage the two bodies to combine committees as the senates themselves merge.

- All senate committees

5. Leave intact separate committees, even if apparent duplication exists, in order to meet the specific needs of individual campuses or the requirements of external regulatory agencies.

- Athletic Advisory Committee (MC)
- Awards Committees for recognition of outstanding teaching, advising and research, unless otherwise noted (MC and HSC)
- Conflict of Interest Review Committee (HSC) (After further evaluation and submission of a report to the NIH in response to their recent site visit to HSC, a second Conflict of Interest Committee will be added on main campus or the HSC committee will be expanded to university-wide.)
- Institutional Animal Care and Use Committees (MC and HSC)
- Multicultural Affairs Advisory Committee (HSC, but with focus on HSC needs)
- Parking Appeals Committee (MC)
- Parking Committee (HSC)
- Radiation and Radioisotope Committee (HSC)
- Radiation Safety Committee (MC)
- Student grievance and appeals committees (MC and HSC)
- Student Life Assessment Committee (MC)
- Superannuate Grievance Committee (MC)
- Student Activities Committee (MC)
- Student Life Advisory Committee (HSC) and Advisory Committee for Student Life (MC)

6. Discontinue committees whose functions are no longer needed.

- Academic Chemical Hazards Committee (HSC; functions will be handled by Office of Safety and Health)

Senator Bresnahan; These are the Committee recommendations. This report was forwarded to the co-chairs of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee, Tom Gutteridge and Jeff Gold as well as President Jacobs. Any questions or comments?

Senator Stoudt: When was it forwarded?

Senator Bresnahan: It was initially forwarded on Friday, September 29. Barb Floyd pointed out one error, that the Sabbaticals Committee had been put in the wrong category. This committee is of course mandated by the union contract so that change was made and Pat Metting forwarded it on October 3rd.

Senator Stoudt: Have you received any official feedback?

Senator Bresnahan; I've had no feedback and I don't know that anybody on the Committee has. The Strategic Planning Committee meeting was cancelled so that the President could discuss the White Paper with a sub-group. I assume this report would have been discussed at the meeting that was canceled. There is a meeting of Committees tomorrow morning (10/11/06) and I don't know if this will come up on the agenda.

Senator Stoudt: Carter, a question about your EC report: you said that President Jacobs considered some committees a "waste of time." Could you expand upon that statement, namely explain why Dr. Jacobs has this opinion of committees?

Chair Wilson: You want me to explain why President Jacobs would say the committees were a waste of time?

Senator Stoudt: I would like you to confirm that those were his words, and if he said more and you could fill us in, that is what I would like to hear. If he didn't, then you are not obligated to create an explanation.

Chair Wilson: I don't know if I can. You are asking me to call a meeting with Dr. Jacobs? I did take notes at the meeting and this was the impression I got, and I don't know if I can add much more to it. Unless some of the members of the EC who were there can help me out in this.

A. Jorgensen: It was evident that in Dr. Jacobs' view of committees in running the institution was that Standing Committees don't have much of a place. If something needs to be done, he will set up a Task Force but other regular means are not something he desires. The EC vigorously disagreed with that. The Fiscal Advisory and Facilities Planning need continuous faculty input and a certain number of votes in particular areas. I wouldn't say we didn't make any progress on it at all. I think that's basically his decision and I think in the future it will need to be shown how wrong he is. We will have to keep speaking up on it, because our opinion will be asked for on the Task Force as he is planning something, but forget about it in other areas. It's a major shift for how this university is run with faculty input. I think it's a grave mistake.

Senator Floyd: I would like to add that the HSC Faculty Senate Executive Committee very strongly argued as well that standing committees had been playing an important role in running the institution. They were very articulate expressing their desire to maintain standing committees.

Senator Edwards: Where does this leave the committees now? Facilities Planning Committee does not exist anymore, does the Student Grievance still exist? What are we supposed to do with this?

Senator Bresnahan: You will notice that this is our recommendation and as with any committee report the person commissioning it can accept in toto, accept in part or not accept any of it. But you will notice that on the list of committees we recommend to continue are Facilities Planning and Fiscal Advisory.

Senator Stoudt: The previous discussion we had with Mr. Lehnert brought to the fore the fact that we had a Facilities Planning Council that provided continuity and had as its members individuals engaged in the review process. I can appreciate the value of the Task Force, but to create an ad hoc group to deal with an issue and then dissolve the group after it has submitted its report does not involve the same kind of effort, institutional memory, and long-term commitment to important issues such as facilities planning, fiscal planning, and research. I appreciate the hard work that your committee did and hope that the FSEC and others can lobby to create a better understanding of the nature of our academic institution.

Senator Bresnahan: If you look at the list of committees you will find a lot more noted as Main Campus (MC in parenthesis afterwards). That is a very clear sign of the kind of culture we have on this campus and it's very clear to me that the mode of governance employed here has evolved committees to accomplish tasks that are ongoing. The HSC is a different place, with a governance structure that involves presidentially appointed commissions, task forces, and ad hoc committees which address certain problems; then the committees go away. These are two different types of governance and it's not easy to figure out how they will be applied to the new UT.

Any other questions? Thank you.

Chair Wilson: Professor Marcia King-Blandford, Chair of Core Curriculum, is next and will report on the Core Curriculum

Prof. King-Blandford: This is to add a one hour Kinesiology 2460 lab to the Core in Natural Sciences. We already have the Kinesiology Class, Anatomy and Physiology in the core and we neglected to include the lab, so this will correct our mistake. The other class we are bringing forward to you is also an oversight on our part. It's a Chem 1120. This is Chemistry for Health Sciences, a four credit hour course. When the course went through originally and was accepted into the curriculum, we neglected to include it in the core as was requested of us. The syllabuses for both

classes meet the core requirements and the FS Core Curriculum Committee supports both of these classes to make amendments to the Core and correct the errors that were made previously.

(copy of Prof. King-Blandford's report)

FS Committee supports the addition of the following to the Core:

A&S CHEM 1120 4 cr. Hours

Previously in core; oversight, it was removed; returning to core. Natural Sciences core.

HSBS KINE2460 1 cr. Hour

Corresponding course is in core; this is lab which is needed for students to meet core in Natural Sciences.

A. Jorgensen: The Chemistry class is my omission, not yours.

Prof. King-Blandford: Both of them were existing course modifications and oversights that we are trying to correct as the core and transfer module move forward. Can I get a motion to approve this?

All those in favor, please say "aye",

Chair Wilson: Opposed same sign.

Senator Barlowe: Carter, I have a question about your EC report. You indicated that you have written a response to the white paper. I would like you to clarify the purpose of your response and if it is coming directly from you or representing the EC, or the whole Senate. Also, will the Senate discuss the white paper and will we have an opportunity to put forth a resolution, recommendation, or response?

Chair Wilson: I just finished writing it today, and I will email it to every Senator and hopefully this will generate some feedback and discussion and take it from there.

Senator Edwards: The white paper itself, has it been distributed?

Chair Wilson: I will email to all Senators a copy of the white paper and a copy of my response.

Senator Skeens: It is a draft, a project in progress.

Chair Wilson: Yes.

Question from the floor: Will it be on the agenda for next meeting?

Chair Wilson: We have a full agenda, but it should be on the next agenda.

Senator Floyd: I think it should generate a response.

Senator Hamer: If it's a draft, when is it appropriate to have an official input?

Senator Skeens: He told us that it was a draft work in progress and that he was still working on it and then it would go to the Strategic Planning Committee for their feedback, and from there I don't know where it's going.

Senator Barrett: Do people understand the history and scope of how this came about and how it was created? I don't know if the Senate has that sense.

Chair Wilson: Let me back up and give you a quick synopsis. The white paper emerged out of the Strategic Planning Committee. It was decided by the Strategic Planning Committee that a small sub-committee be put together to create a so called "white paper" for the Strategic Planning Committee to

respond to. So our understanding is that this was to be a “straw document” to generate discussion within the Strategic Planning Committee.

Senator Cave: I don’t know if that has already gone to the BOT or not, but it seems like a strange thing to have a notion that this is still a work in progress. Can you shed any light on that?

Senator Skeens: That’s not my understanding. I don’t think it has gone anywhere.

Senator Bopp: Rick Stansley was on the distribution list

Chair Wilson: He is on the Strategic Planning Committee.

R. Sheehan: I can tell you that there are three or four BOT members who are on the Strategic Planning Committee. They haven’t received a copy yet. I can also tell you that the portion of the white paper was presented verbally to the Academic Affairs Committee of the BOT last Friday or week ago Friday. So, there is at least some circulation of these concepts.

- The document that went to the members of BOT is indeed a document marked DRAFT, and the entire Strategic Planning Committee was asked to consider the document a draft which opens doors for suggestion.
- Second is that Dr. Jacobs has said the venue he is seeking is the University wide discussion which is the Strategic Planning Committee and that he himself is not particularly interested in dealing with individual comments regarding that plan, and all comments are to go to the Committee and he would like to have a discussion.
- Walt Olson provided a detailed response early Monday morning and his comments which you might find helpful, were also forwarded to the Strategic Planning Committee.

Senator Stoudt: Can you clarify how many faculty are on this Strategic Planning Committee and how many faculty are on the subcommittee that put together the draft?

R. Sheehan: Let me answer your second question first. I don’t think the subcommittee should be described as putting together the draft. The subcommittee was offered an opportunity to react to various portions of the draft and suggest some edits. The draft itself was to the best of my knowledge put together by President Jacobs. On the subcommittee looking backwards, Carter was a member on that subcommittee.

Chair Wilson: No, I wasn’t.

R. Sheehan: Sue Ott Rowlands was, but was not able to attend that retreat. Larry Elmer was, there were two faculty from the main campus.

Senator Ott Rowlands: It was Tom Gutteridge, Jeff Gold, Rick Stansley and Joe Shapiro

R. Sheehan: Penny Poplin Gosetti filled in for you, so there was no faculty input or reaction to that draft. On a larger Strategic Planning Committee if you consider both campuses I think there are 4-6 faculty who do not have administrative appointments.

Senator Ott Rowlands: It’s important to reiterate that the white paper is very much Dr. Jacobs’ work. The sub-committee had an opportunity to give feedback. Much of that feedback Dr. Jacobs chose not to include in the final draft.

R. Sheehan: The feedback went to Penny Poplin Gosetti and it was incorporated with Dr. Jacobs’, which is the document dated October 6th.

A. Jorgensen: I gave advice to Carter that we handle the response to this in a very careful way. We can start shooting from the hip by some of the things suggested for anybody looking at it that this is not a good idea, it’s inconsistent, it doesn’t make sense but I think our approach should be from a very high level. We can look at this as a professional idea that somebody is putting out there and we want to respond in a professional way, sorting things out, this is what we are considering, here is the past. I think the document reflects a lack of knowledge of not only the University of Toledo but other four-year major universities and I think we have to handle it in a very careful way, an educational way, a firmly worded sense of what the university brings to the community, what this university brings to this community.

So I suggest the members of the Senate send your comments to Carter, and other members on the Strategic Planning Committee. John, you are on it, Carol, Max Funk, and Sue, but particularly if you are a Senator make sure that Carter is in the loop. Carter has given to the EC a four-page draft, his first draft to the response to this. We will look it over and give comments to him and he will share that with you as well. We want to do this carefully, otherwise we can be dismissed as reactionary, and not wanting to make changes.

Senator Hudson: When you get something thoughtful that is clear and unambiguous and doesn't have DRAFT written on it, that's when you respond. I just read the document and I find parts of it coherent and parts of it that are completely incoherent, bumbling language. I feel it's necessary for the author of the document an opportunity to make it clear. If he wants the Strategic Planning Committee to go back and forth and discuss things in order to create a document that is worth responding to, they have to be given a chance. My view is that it is exceedingly premature for the Senate to respond to this document in its current form. It's just not worth my time or the Senate's time responding to something that is so unclear in many respects.

Senator Stoudt: Most of us are not involved with the Strategic Planning Committee and it has very little faculty representation, but this is our only opportunity to weigh in. This may be our only chance to do so, whether or not the document is considered a draft by some. It was crafted by the President of this institution and disseminated as a public document. I would encourage all of you to voice your opinion on this matter now. To wait and to hope that we will have another opportunity or to wait and see a final version is folly.

Senator Barrett: First off, in fairness to the drafting of the white paper and what Dr. Jacobs has done, the Strategic Planning Committee through a majority vote, **asked** him to draft a white paper with **the** co-chairs of the committee. He didn't cram this down anybody's throat. Certain people on the Strategic Planning Committee didn't think things were going quite quickly enough and they felt **that** having a smaller group come up with something to react to would create greater efficiencies. I'm not going to speak **to** the wisdom of that . . . decision **nor the** vote taken. But that is how this arose. We have not had a meeting since then, we cancelled the last meeting, our next meeting is tomorrow and we're going to learn a lot tomorrow **about** how this **will play** out. Hopefully feedback will be given, hopefully this is **will be an** open discussion **where** there is room to change and react to **what has been drafted. If anyone has any comments,** the more information anybody on the committee has, **the better, and** it should be brought forward. Carter, who has given this a lot of thought already, **might be a good person to give your comments to.**

Senator Bresnahan: As John said, the committee took a vote at one session - I voted against this - and asked the President to form the first draft. That's what we have in the form of this white paper. As a historian I believe writing the document is a tremendously powerful tool because you force people to react to what you've written. But the committee by a majority vote asked the President to do this, and make no mistake, this was the President's document, although he did get feedback from a small group. I also hope there will be more than one opportunity to respond to this, but I want to second Senator Barrett's words and ask the Senate to please contact your colleagues on the Strategic Planning Committee with the feedback that you have.

Senator Cave: I hear a lot of talk and speculation about what the President wants and the direction he is going to lead us in, and it seems to me that perhaps the President needs to know what we want, and what our vision is at this university. This great university has not been dependent on the vision of one man. There has to be an exchange of views with respect for the faculty, or you might as well fold this university.

Chair Wilson: Absolutely.

Senator Hamer: Can we put together a couple of comments by responding with our thoughts but prefacing our response and that we are seeing this as the first draft attempt?

Chair Wilson: Sure.

V. *Calendar Questions:*

None.

VI. *Other Business*

Old Business: None

New Business: None

VII. *Adjournment:* Chair Wilson adjourned the meeting at 4:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Alice Skeens
FS Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Kathy Grabel
Faculty Senate Office Admin. Secretary