

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO Approved @11/7/06 FS mtg
FACULTY SENATE
Minutes of the Senate Meeting of October 24, 2006
<http://www.facsenate.utoledo.edu>

HIGHLIGHTS

**President of Student Government
Honors Program
President Lloyd Jacobs**

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, Edwards (Baines), Fink, Floyd, Fridman, Funk, Hamer, Horan, Hudson, Humphrys, Johanson, Kennedy, King, Lambert, Lundquist, McInerney, Monsos, Morrissey, Olson, Ott Rowlands, Peseckis, Poling, Pope, Reid, Ritchie, Schall, Skeens, Spongberg, Stoudt, Teclehaimanot, Templin, Thompson-Casado, Traband, Tramer, Wedding, Wilson, Wolff, Zallocco, (46)

Excused: Cluse-Tolar (1)

Unexcused: Chen, Niamat, Piazza, (3)

A quorum of incumbents was present.

II. Approval of Minutes

Minutes of October 10, 2006 approved as distributed.

III. Executive Committee Report

Report by Chair, Carter Wilson

(copy of Chair Wilson's Executive Committee Report)

FSEC Report
October 24, 2006

My report today will be brief.

Early last week I had circulated what I called my personal response to the so called white paper, aka the draft directions document (or draft document for short), as Dr. Jacobs claims it is not exactly a white paper.

I had been in contact with Mike Caruso, the chair of the Arts and Science Council, as A&S also prepared a paper reacting to the draft document. I would like for the Senate to support the A&S Council.

Friday, October 13, our EC had decided to sponsor an open forum on the so called white paper. We just held the forum earlier this afternoon. Our Executive Committee believed it

would be a good idea for the senate to solicit feedback from faculty members before developing an official position on the draft document and strategic planning.

Monday, October 16, the joint FSECs met with Dr. Lloyd Jacobs. We talked about the issue of shared governance and Dr. Jacobs' presentation before the BOT. Dr. Jacobs again emphasized his view that he wanted the deans to play a greater role in university decision making.

Wednesday, October 18 the Strategic Planning Committee decided to break into three committees and to work on revising the draft document. The discussions centered around the issue of defining UT as a comprehensive university, continuing to emphasis the STEMM area, but not at the expense of the social sciences and humanities and the importance of community engagement. I was encouraged by the discussion. I walked away with the impression that we were committed not to weakening the main campus by severely restricting investment in the humanities and social sciences. Dr. Jacobs was not present during these discussions. The next Strategic Planning meeting is scheduled for tomorrow morning.

Chair Wilson: I would like to commend the EC, especially Barb Floyd for taking the lead and organizing the Open Forum. We just had the forum before this meeting. I thought it was a very successful forum. We received some very good feedback. I thought it was a very good exercise in academic democracy. There were about 55 people, about three Board members, about six deans, three students, a few vice-presidents, and the provost was also there. We had a robust discussion and good feedback from faculty members especially from administrators, as well as students. I was very pleased with the comments and found them very helpful and constructive.

Any questions, or comments? If not, we will move on to the next item on the agenda. Amy Steves, President of the Student Government is delayed, so if there are no objections, we will now ask Dr. Tom Barden to give us his report on the Honors Program.

IV. Reports

Dr. Barden: Thank you, Carter. Hello everybody. I would like to recognize my associate director Dr. Skaidrite Stelzer and my assistant director, Prof. Walt Denk. There is a full written report and Senators can pick up copies available here.

(copy of Dr. Barden's report)

The University of Toledo Honors Program

A Report to the University of Toledo Faculty Senate

October 24, 2006



Overview

Founded in 1963, the University of Toledo Honors Program is a well established and mature entity on campus. There are currently 837 University Honors students.

It has had university-wide participation since 1987, with students from all eight baccalaureate colleges (Arts & Sciences, Business, Education, Engineering, Health Sciences & Human Services, Nursing, Pharmacy, University College) and the Quest Program for undeclared majors (SSC) participating.

It is housed in Sullivan Hall, a beautiful stand-alone facility adjacent to Academic House, which will house an Honors cluster starting in F2007.

It is liberal arts based and student-centered with an emphasis on small class-size, discussion based learning, intensive academic advising, undergraduate research, study abroad, service learning, and peer mentoring.

The Freshman Class of 2006

There are 219 in the new class—ARS 61 [5 transfers from two-year colleges], BUS 25, EDU 8, ENG 66, HHS 15 [new division HSHS-10/NUR-5] PHM 34, and SSC 9

The average freshman ACT score this year is 28 and the average high school GPA is 3.82

Of the 219, 191 self-identified as White, 7 as Oriental, 4 as Black, and 3 as Hispanic. 14 did not identify ethnic origin

Some Program Statistics

194 University Honors students graduated in the fall or spring of the 2005-2006 AY

168 University Honors students had 4.0 GPAs for the fall semester 2005.

137 University Honors students had 4.0 GPAs for the spring semester 2006.

41 University Honors students currently have a cumulative 4.0 GPA.

6 University Honors students received student URAF awards out of twelve awarded for the summer of 2006.

40 University Honors students completed the senior thesis in the 2005-2006 AY.

21 University Honors students presented original research at the National Conference on Undergraduate Research (NCUR). This is the largest representation among Ohio's universities and on a par with the University of Michigan.

30 University Honors student presented their research at Honors "Brown Bag" sessions in the 2005-06 AY. 5 have presented thus far in 2006-07

The David Hoch Scholarship Fund

As of October 23, 2006 the fund holds \$56,540.00. The fund agreement has been signed by the UT Foundation and Julie Hoch. A set of guidelines and an application form have been created and approved by both parties. The first spendable proceeds will be available by January 1, 2007. The purpose defined for the scholarship is to provide assistance to Honors students for learning enhancements such as internships, study abroad, conference fees, travel to conferences and research sites. Typically awards will be given on a one-time basis, although students will be allowed to reapply. For the first year of the scholarship (and as a pilot), the maximum award has been set at \$1000 per student.

Academic Features

The average class size is 15-18 students in such Honors core courses as Readings Conference, the Multicultural Literatures sequence, and the Interdisciplinary Senior Seminars.

Program instructors include UT Outstanding Teachers, Arts & Sciences Master Teachers, department chairs, Distinguished University Professors, other nationally known instructors and researchers, and even a Toledo Municipal Court judge.

Honors students are required to complete theses or projects on topics in the fine arts, humanities, social sciences, natural sciences, business, education, nursing, engineering, and pharmacy.

Honors students are encouraged to do undergraduate research, scholarship, or creative projects. The program sponsors 20 to 25 students every year to present their research at NCUR, the National Conference on Undergraduate Research. Honors student research is funded through scholarships, fellowships, and grants such as the Honors Sullivan Fund, the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, the UT Office of Research student URAFs, and the newly authorized David Hoch Scholarship Fund. Honors students have recently participated in summer research at the Mayo Clinic, Harvard University, The Medical University of South Carolina, The University of Utah, and Carnegie Mellon University. Weekly "Brown Bag" presentations allow students to speak to the university community about their research, internships, and creative projects.

Recent Scholarships and Fellowships Received by Honors Students are the National Science Foundation Graduate Fellowship, the Phi Kappa Phi Graduate Scholarship, the Ohio Board

of Regents Scholarship, the Jack Kent Cooke Scholarship, the James Madison Fellowship, and the Raoul Wallenberg Scholarship.

The program encourages study-abroad and internship programs. Recently, students have studied in Australia, Brazil, the British Isles, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Denmark, Egypt, France, Germany, Japan, Mexico, and Spain. Honors students typically participate in The Washington Center internship opportunities. Other internships include positions in the Washington D.C. Department of Health, the Feminist Majority Foundation, the National Association of Conservation Districts, and in the offices of several members of the U.S. Congress.

Starting this fall, the UT Registrar has agreed to print the Honors Program Student Thesis title on Honors students' official transcripts. This is in addition to University Honors being noted on both the diploma and official transcript.

Some Noteworthy Achievements of UT Honors Students Past and Present

Anita Malley – with Save the Children, on-site in Afghanistan, Iraq, and Darfur in the Sudan; Craig Holden – best-selling author of mystery/thriller novels with Simon & Schuster; Gene Zmuda – Judge of Lucas County Common Pleas Court; Ellen Grachek – Toledo city councilwoman; James LeSage – The Emmett McCoy Endowed Chair in Economics at the University of Texas, San Marcos; Nikko Ronquillo – medical student at the University of Utah's MD/PhD program with full tuition waiver and fellowships totaling over \$30,000.00 per year for up to nine years; current Honors student Amy Steves – president of the University of Toledo Student Government for 2006-07.

The UT Honors Alumni Affiliate

At its August, 2006 meeting the Board of the UT Alumni Association approved the creation of an Honors Affiliate. The group has chosen Judge Gene Zmuda as its leader and three events have been held so far: a social mixer at Manhattan's in May, a reading by Simon & Schuster novelist and UT Honors Alumnus Craig Holden in September, and a UT Homecoming Parade-watching party in October. All were well attended. Other events are scheduled over the remainder of the academic year.

Programmatic and Curricular Matters

When the Honors Program became a university-wide program in 1987, the understanding was that it would be “under the over-all direction of the College of Arts and Sciences.” (James McComas, *State of the University Address*, October 14, 1987) In practice, this led to a double role for the University Honors Director, who also served as A & S Honors Director. Beginning this year, this dual role has been shifted, with A& S appointing its own Honors

director as the other baccalaureate colleges do. The A & S Associate Dean for the Arts and Humanities, Dr. Debra Stoudt, has assumed this position.

A new course is being piloted under the HON alpha code and the 2990 independent study numeric code. It is titled CULTURAL EXPERIENCE CREDIT and is described in a flyer that is appended to this report.

An Interactive CD Honors Brochure

The UT Marketing & Communication Office and the Center for Creative Instruction from the Health Sciences Campus have produced a promotional brochure for the Honors Program in an interactive CD format that will be made available to area high school guidance counselors and Honors-eligible students who have made the decision to attend the University of Toledo but have not chosen the Honors Program.

Goals for the Current AY

To increase the diversity of the program's student population, expanding the population of people of color, transfers, international students and students from under-participating UT professional colleges.

To review the Honors Program liberal arts curriculum. This effort has already begun under the auspices of a committee charged with studying the first-year Readings Conference to determine its efficiency and what changes should be made to this part of the curriculum.

To develop and implement an assessment plan that will track and evaluate the learning outcomes of students during their stay at Honors at the University of Toledo and their satisfaction with the program as they graduate.

To enhance the cultural and intellectual ambience of Sullivan Hall through guest lectures, gallery shows, a sculpture garden, a film series, poetry and fiction readings, etc.

To initiate an Honors Fellows designation for faculty members who teach, advise, and/or direct the research of Honors students. This honorific status will allow Honors-involved faculty members to note this on their ARPAs and thus get suitable recognition for work with the University of Toledo Honors program.



University Honors Program

Frequently Asked Questions Fall 2006

What does it mean to part of the Honors community?

Belonging to the Honors Program provides the chance to meet like-minded students. In small Honors Program classes, students have a greater chance to discuss the subject matter and work on projects together. In addition, members of the community get together for academic, social, and community service functions. The result is that students get to know each other better, including students from other majors and backgrounds.

What credentials do I need to apply for admission to the University Honors Program?

You need to be admitted to UT before we can process your Honors application. Potential Honors students generally have a high school GPA of 3.75 or higher and an ACT composite score of 28 (1260 combined reading and math SAT score) or higher. Students with a 3.5 GPA and a 25 ACT composite (1140 combined reading and math SAT score) are also encouraged to apply. In addition to GPA and test scores, we take into consideration your essay, resume of activities, and involvement in the community.

Does being an Honors student raise my college cost?

No. There is no additional cost for being an Honors student.

Do I have to take every course that is offered as Honors?

No, you don't have to take every course as Honors. Once admitted to Honors, your Honors Advisor will help you select the best courses to take for Honors credit.

How many Honors courses do I have to take?

The total number of Honors hours required to graduate with Honors ranges from 33 to 42 (approximately one-quarter to one-third of your total hours) depending on your college.

How hard are Honors classes?

Many students say that the courses are more interesting and rewarding and provide an opportunity to learn in an environment that supports self-motivation. Honors courses typically develop critical thinking through discussion, reading, and group interaction. You will be given opportunities to refine your writing and verbal skills.

How do I obtain my Honors hours?

You can earn Honors hours by taking University Honors Program courses (Readings Conferences I and II, Multicultural Literatures courses, and Honors Interdisciplinary Seminars). You can also accumulate Honors hours by taking various Honors courses offered by individual departments: e.g., Biology, Mathematics, Psychology, and Theatre. Most of UT's professional colleges also offer

Honors courses for upper class students. In addition, you can “convert” some non-Honors courses to Honors.

How do I “convert” a non-Honors course to an Honors Course?

Typically, the student and instructor should arrange to do a project that will result in an enhanced learning experience. Some possibilities include investigating primary sources and documents, undertaking a project with the results presented to the class, leading a study group composed of other students in the class, doing a term paper or research project on a topic that is more original and challenging than the typical topics in the course. Your Honors Advisor can assist you with the process.

Will Honors accept my Advanced Placement credits?

The University of Toledo accepts certain scores for undergraduate credit as listed at www.undergradadmission.utoledo.edu/pages/advancedplacement.asp. It is not a decision made by Honors. Although AP credit for English does not exempt students from taking Readings Conference I and II, the AP credits will count toward the total number of hours required for graduation.

To graduate with Honors, what requirements must I fulfill?

To graduate with College Honors and to receive the Honors medallion, students must earn at least a 3.3 cumulative GPA, complete an Honors project or thesis, and depending on the college, complete from one-quarter to one-third of their courses as Honors. Honors students take a combination of courses offered by the University Honors Program and their individual colleges.

What GPA is required?

The minimum GPA needed to graduate with Honors is a 3.3; individual majors may have higher requirements. Talk with your Honors Advisor if you have any questions about your individual major and the GPA requirements to remain in Honors.

Can you tell me more about the Honors project or thesis?

Many students begin their work in their third year by selecting a topic in their discipline that they find especially intriguing. Depending on the major, students may spend a couple of semesters working with the guidance of a faculty mentor. This project or thesis often helps students in finding their first job or in gaining admission to a professional or graduate school. Your Honors Advisor, a thesis exploration course, and the thesis "guideline" handbook are available to help you. Completed theses by past Honors students are available in the Honors Office.

What is the Honors Peer Mentorship Program?

Mentoring is a well-established practice for successfully integrating newcomers into a new environment. The program matches interested first-year students with an experienced fellow Honors student. The program works to ease the transition from high school to college. Peer mentors will meet periodically with their students to help them adjust to some of the challenges they will confront during their first year at The University of Toledo.

Can I still have a life?

You'll find that Honors students are some of the most active on campus. They are leaders in student government, athletics, honoraries, and social fraternities and sororities. Many students have jobs, while many others participate in intramural sports, or go to plays and lectures. Honors students seem to realize the value of the many opportunities available to them on campus and in the city of Toledo and take advantage of these opportunities. You can even earn Honors credit while doing so!

Other questions

Contact the University Honors Program at 419.530.6030 or via e-mail at honors@utoledo.edu



University Honors Program Application Process for Fall 2007

Present to January 8, 2007

- Students send in Honors applications and receive acknowledgment of Honors application status (complete or incomplete).
- A completed Honors application consists of the cover sheet, Honors essay, extracurricular resume, high school transcript, college transcript/s if you are taking college courses as a post-secondary options student, and the names of three references. Letters of recommendation are not required.
- Please note that you have to be admitted to UT before we can process your Honors application.

Week of January 8, 2007

- All completed Honors applications received as of January 8, 2007 are forwarded to college committees for a decision.
- Please notify Honors if you change your major after you have submitted your Honors application. Changing your major could mean changing your college; we want to make sure that your Honors application goes to the correct college committee for a decision.
- We accept Honors applications after the January 8, 2007 priority date; however, all admissions to Honors are on a space-available basis.

Early February 2007

- Students who have been admitted to UT and whose completed Honors applications were received by January 8, 2007 will be notified of their Honors application status (admit, wait, deny).
- Students admitted to Honors have until April 13, 2007 to accept the invitation to join Honors (yellow response card).
- Students wait listed to Honors are encouraged to provide additional materials, e.g., letters of recommendation, updated transcripts, and personal narratives. Students who do submit additional materials are usually notified of a change of status by the end of April.
- Students not accepted to Honors may reapply after a semester or two at UT; we keep applications on file for one year.



*Attention Honors Students!!
Starting fall 2006, there is a new way to earn Honors Credit...*

HON 2990: Cultural Experience Credit

You can earn **1 HON Credit Hr.** (per year) for attending sixteen cultural, athletic, artistic, or intellectual events at UT or in the Toledo area during the 2006-07 academic year

Here's how

Attend

Keep a ticket stub or have an authorized person at the event sign your CEC notebook.

Review

Write a short (250 word) description of the event—what kind of event, where, how large a venue, etc.

Critique

Write a short (again, 250 words) response to the experience—did you like the event, were you bored, thrilled, did it change your opinions about anything, etc.

The events may be concerts of the Toledo Symphony Orchestra, lectures by distinguished public intellectual, exhibits at the Toledo Museum of Art, plays at the Toledo Repertoire Theatre or the UT Theatre Department, shows at the Ritter Planetarium, competitions of the new UT equestrian team, or local or national political debates. Half must be from campus and half from town. A list of approved events will be available by the first week of classes, and unlisted events may be approved at Dr. Barden's discretion.

For further details contact:

**Dr. Tom Barden, Director
University Honors Program
1020 Sullivan Hall – University of Toledo
Toledo, Ohio 43606 (419) 530-6033
Thomas.Barden@Utoledo.Edu**

Dr. Barden: Any questions?

Chair Wilson: This goes back to McComas' administration who established a presidential scholars' program, and I was on the committee with David Hoch, and recently we had some discussions about bringing that program back.

Dr. Barden: I think you are thinking of the Founder's Scholarship. If it is, it's still alive and well, and it's administered through the Honors Program.

Senator Skeens: The name was changed. They don't do all the same things.

Dr. Barden: It's a total of four students and they get full tuition and fees plus room and board. We just started the process for this year. Bill Hoover was the chair of the committee last year. January 1st is the deadline for the application process. There is another one, a presidential scholarship, something that President Horton started. He asked the BOT and all his admirers (rather than giving him a Christmas present), to start a scholarship fund. It was called the Presidential Scholarship. And it's different from the current Founders' Scholarship.

I have one more thing. This is the plea to you, as the Senate, I have written a letter and would like it to go in the minutes.

(Dr. Barden's letter)

October 24, 2006

Chair, Executive Committee, and Members
University of Toledo Faculty Senate
The University of Toledo
Toledo, Ohio

Dear Senators:

I am writing to ask the Faculty Senate to use its position as primary voice of the faculty to assert the importance of retaining our Ph.D in history. Responses to President Jacobs' "Straw Paper" from all quarters have stressed the need to preserve the arts, the humanities, and the overall liberal arts milieu as the emphasis on STEMM develops. But I fear such generalized calls may invoke only generalized soothing responses. One specific action that would indicate the administration's support of the non-STEMM disciplines would be maintaining the one humanities discipline that operates at the highest level of learning, discovery, and engagement. We are a comprehensive research university; to me, this means we are committed to maintaining programming at the highest level, the terminal degree, in all the areas of our curriculum, in the four areas of the liberal arts as well as the STEMM and professional areas. To do so, we need the history Ph.D.

The "Straw Paper," in section II, sub-section 3 of the *Vision* portion, calls for phasing out "all non-state funded Ph.D. programs." To my knowledge, there is actually only one such program—history.

So, what this document “envisions” is the termination of the one remaining humanities doctorate. Couching this in the context of state funding gives the impression that (1) this is a financial decision, and (2) decisions of the OBOR should determine the curriculum of the University of Toledo. I think both are wrong. This should be an in-house curricular decision. It should be based on our institutional self-definition as both comprehensive and research-based.

As director of the Honors Program, I have been given stewardship of a program that stands on the shoulders of such past academic leaders as Ernest Gray, Jim Larson, Bill Bischoff, and Dave Hoch. It began with the concept that a truly excellent undergraduate liberal arts education works best when it is situated within a large research university. If we lose our Ph.D. in history, I will not be able to uphold their legacy nor keep our promise to our Honors students that they will get to work with faculty who are engaged at the highest level in their fields. On behalf of our Honors students, and all of us who want the University of Toledo to remain a great university, I ask this body to stand firm to preserve this outstanding and thriving doctoral program.

Yours truly,

Thomas E. Barden
Professor of English & Director,
University Honors Program
University of Toledo

Chair Wilson: Would you forward this letter to me? I would like to share this letter with the Strategic Planning Committee. I share the sentiments with you. Now I would like to invite Amy Steves, the President of Student Government.

A. Steves: Good afternoon. Thank you very much for inviting me. I am a senior graduating in May, with degrees in English and Philosophy. I would like to share a few points with you, things that Camie Corrigan and I have been working on in our administration thus far. One of the major issues that we had to deal with are safety issues on campus and off campus. As such, we have had monthly meetings with the Mayor, the Chief of U.T. Police Department and the City of Toledo Police Dept., in addition to Dr. Kay Patten-Wallace and neighborhood officials to address both, safety issues on campus and in the neighborhood around. We feel we are working to come to a compromise between the City targeting student behavior, and also the safety issues which we feel are predominant such as students being held at gun-point, and things like that that are occurring. The City has agreed to do a tree-trimming project in the neighborhoods. You may have heard about that in The Collegian, and identify some dark areas, where students are known to frequent.

We are also having our freshmen student leaders program starting a petitioning project to locate certain areas both in Bancroft Hills and Secor Gardens neighborhood where there are no street lights. They will be identifying those areas and going through the process of getting petitions together and informing citizens what this will mean to them in terms of taxes. We are really excited for them to go through that learning experience.

We are currently planning a safety walk on campus in conjunction with the residency association and Gary Jankowski, from the UT Safety and Health Dept. We are also planning a Town Hall that will take place before the end of this semester with different City officials addressing neighborhood safety and target enforcement of students around the neighborhood.

Another major area we are addressing is community engagement. There are several student government members that serve on the City of Toledo College Advisory Board that has student members from the University of Toledo, Lourdes College, Owens Community College and other schools in the area. We have set as goals for ourselves this year to increase the number and availability in internships and post graduate jobs in the Toledo area to help find affordable housing for young people in the downtown Toledo area, in the apartments and condos that they are building.

We are planning a Winter Festival in downtown for college students and young professionals.

We are working with our City Affairs Director within the Student Government to incorporate the City Visitor and Convention Bureau into our FYI and Rocket Launch programs. We are very excited about the MUO Foundation's commitment to development around the Dorr Street area and around the campus in general. Some of our Dorr Street development students are working on developing a survey and getting it out to students to get retail ideas.

The ThinkOhio Campaign you may have heard about is still in full force. This summer we all met with students representing various state colleges in Ohio, and we all met in Columbus and we voted to separate ourselves from the Inter-University Council for lobbying purposes. We were worrying about issues involved with lobbying for higher educational purposes being affiliated with the State, so we are a separate body now. We recently met with Dr. Dave Wilson and Dr. Carter Wilson and our VP of Government Affairs to get more ideas of where to go with this project. We are in the midst of hammering out the details of the campaign for the rest of this year and also beyond. We want to make sure this continues long after we've graduated.

Several UT students will be attending a day at the State House on November 15, sponsored by the Ohio Campus Contact.

Some Campus initiatives:

- Our Athletic Affairs Directors have coordinated Rocket volleys during tailgating at home football games with two more planned for two Tuesday games in November.
- Several SU members in conjunction with the Athletic Departments are working on making basketball games particularly attractive to students including offering a \$600.00 scholarship at every home basketball game. Make sure all your students know about this.
- We are working with Dr Tom Kvale, in the Office of Undergraduate Research to put on a research forum in the Spring Semester showcasing research by UT students. We hope to invite Community business leaders to the campus during the event, to foster relationships and perhaps jobs for students.
- We also have been working with the office of Career Services and the Student Alumni Assoc. to try to consolidate the list of internships available to students in one online location. SAA in particular has been working on consolidating and soliciting internships for students around the countries in the areas where our Alumni Chapters are particularly strong. We've had a lot of success in the Chicago and New York City markets. That's another thing to let your students know about.

In terms of entertainment for our students, we have been working with the Office of Residence Life to get DVD rental machines in the Residence Halls and those will be forthcoming.

The White Paper documents obviously have been an issue for students. Several students have taken upon themselves to educate themselves about the process and the work of the Executive Strategic Planning Committee and will be attending our meeting tomorrow morning. I will be planning a forum, in conjunction with some of those students, either within the auspices of the ESPC or a separate forum, specifically for students and different from the Town Hall. We will have a formal

question-answer sessions, or smaller round table discussions with several student discussion leaders. There will be two from the Main Campus and two from the Health Science Campus. This will take place probably in the next few weeks.

And finally, since Camie and I were elected in April, we have lost three members of our student body in sudden and tragic events: Michelle Mielecki and Andrew Brown this summer, and Haris Charalambous two weeks ago. I feel I would remiss if I didn't mention this, as these losses have affected many members of our student body and can give us perspective in the work we do as members of the UT family.

Does anyone have any questions?

A. Jorgensen: What's the relationship with the Health Science Campus students and their student government, what are your plans?

A. Steeves: Actually, I am in the process of trying to get a meeting time scheduled to discuss that very issue. The way our Student Senate works is after the 15th day reports come in on student enrollment, the Senate seats are allotted based on enrollment in the college, so the College of Medicine has seats in our Student Senate and it's just a matter of letting them know about it. I will be meeting with the medical student Council at the HSC and they also have a Graduate Student Council. We will be meeting with our own Graduate Student Assoc. and our Student Government Council to help determine where we're going to go in the future, because a lot of their initiatives and concerns are different from our Student Government as a whole. So we are going to work out the details.

Chair Wilson: I am so impressed with all the things you are doing and all the initiatives. You mentioned a safety walk, when is it?

A. Steeves: Traditionally, this has been done with the President of the University, at least since I have been here. Dr. Johnson did that every Fall where we would walk around the campus in the middle of the night and locate the darker areas where students might feel unsafe. One particular area we are targeting is the flatlands. On the President's Commission on Student-Centeredness, there is a lot of talk about that area in particular, and how dark it can be, and we're hoping that this will be a priority.

Chair Wilson: Is there anything that the Faculty Senate can do for the Student Government?

A. Steeves: I think, especially with all the changes that are going on and with the discussions with the Strategic Planning I think that a lot of us are on the same page with a lot of the issues. And I think with the communication that we have and with the Faculty representative just keeping the communication open. I don't see us at odds on these issues. So if we can have a unified voice, that is the most helpful thing.

(copy of Amy Steeves' report)

Faculty Senate Address

October 24, 2006

I. Safety Issues

1. Meeting monthly w/Mayor, Chiefs of TPD and UTPD, Dr. Patten Wallace, Neighborhood Officials to address both safety concerns and student behavior issues

-Tree trimming in the neighborhoods

- SGFL petitioning project

2. Planning safety walk in conjunction with Resident Student Association and Gary Jankowski from UT's Safety & Health Dept.

3. A Town Hall is being planned that will take place before the end of the semester with city officials regarding neighborhood safety and the target enforcement of students in the area.

II. Community Engagement

1. Several of us serve on the City of Toledo's College Advisory Board that has set as goals for itself:
increasing the number and availability of internships and post-grad jobs, affordable housing for young people in downtown Toledo, and planning a winter

festival downtown for college students and young professionals

2. We are looking to incorporate the City Visitor and Convention Bureau's DoToledo program into our FYI and Rocket Launch programs.
3. We are very excited about the MUO Foundation's focus on retail development around campus, and have two SG directors of Dorr Street Development that are working on developing and putting out a survey to students for business ideas
4. The ThinkOHIO campaign is still in full force. This summer, UT in conjunction with the other state schools in Ohio voted to make ourselves a separate body from the InterUniversity Council for lobbying purposes. We recently met with Dr. David Wilson and Dr. Carter Wilson, and our VP of Governmental Affairs, Bill McMillan, to get more ideas of where to go with this project. We are in the midst of hammering out the details of the campaign for the rest of this year and beyond.

5. Several UT students will be attending a day at the Statehouse sponsored by Ohio Campus Compact on November 15th.

III. Campus Initiatives

1. Our Athletic Affairs directors have coordinated Rocket Rallies during tailgating for the home football games, with two more planned for the two Tuesday games in November.
2. Several SG members in conjunction with the Athletics Department are working on making basketball games more attractive to students, including offering a \$600 scholarship at every home basketball game.
3. We are working with Dr. Tom Kvale in the Office of Undergraduate Research to put on a Research Forum in the spring semester showcasing research by UT students. We hope to invite community business leaders to campus during the event to foster relationships and perhaps jobs for students. We hope to showcase research and creative projects from all areas of the university.

4. We have been working with the Office of Career Services and the Student Alumni Association to try and consolidate the list of internships available to students in one, online location. SAA in particular has been working on consolidating and soliciting internships for students around the country in the areas where our alumni chapters are particularly strong, including New York City and Chicago.
5. In terms of entertainment for students, we have been working with the Office of Residence Life to get DVD rental machines in the residence halls.

IV. Other Issues

1. The “White Paper” document has obviously been an issue for students. Several students have taken it upon themselves to educate themselves about the process and work of the Executive Strategic Planning Committee, and will likely be attending our meeting tomorrow morning.
2. Since Camie and I were elected in April, we have lost three members of our student body to sudden and

tragic events – Michele Mielecki and Andrew Brown
this summer, and Haris Charalambous two weeks ago.
I feel I would be remiss if I didn't mention this
because these losses have affected many members of
our student body, and can give us perspective in the
work we do as members of the UT Family.

Chair Wilson: Ok. Thank you. We have a few minutes before Dr. Jacobs will be joining us and Penny has an announcement about the diversity survey.

Penny Poplin-Gosetti: I want to thank everyone who had participated in the survey over the last week and a half on the diversity assessment. We will now be moving into the focus group phase using some of the data. We've had many people already responding to this email address focusgroupcoordinator@utoledo.edu, but we need many, many more, and we are talking about possibly 40 focus groups. There will be affinity groups, people with similar backgrounds headed by a focus leader with that background. The groups that we have currently scheduled are:

- African-American,
- Latino-Latina,
- Asian-American,
- Arab-American,
- Native American/Alaskan Native,
- Disabled,
- Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender,
- White.

For those groups we have student groups faculty and staff groups. Depending upon the numbers, the more people we get the more groups we will be able to do. People will need to give the demographics of where you would like to participate. They can participate in more than one group if they choose to. I am looking at trying to recruit about 30-40 people. If you will get the word out to participate, these are being conducted by consultants. There are no UT people who will be part of those groups. All data are being reported aggregate not being contributed to any individual. If you have any questions, I will be happy to answer them.

Senator Barnes: What are the groups again? I didn't hear "women" that's why I was checking to make sure.

Poplin-Gosetti: Each group is being broken as much as possible into a male group and a female group. So there isn't just a group of women on those committee groups. There are obviously some of those that won't be able to be split by demographic numbers, but as much as possible we are going to split it out.

The other piece that we are trying to work with is the management and non-management when it comes to staff. I recognize there might be some discomfort, and again, if we can do that, we will try. We are limited contractually to a certain number and we are trying to make this as diverse as possible.

Speaker unidentified: How many responses did you receive?

Poplin-Gosetti: The final numbers are coming in. We did extend it out to student members, around 200-300 just on that one. With the staff our response was over 20% , and faculty was close to that.

Senator Barnes: I don't know if it's possible, is there any way to accomplish socio-economic diversity or any first generation college students?

Poplin-Gosetti: We talked about that also, and we have some challenges. I can target some groups because they fit the demographics and some of the groups will be more difficult to identify. It clearly is the diversity piece I don't know that we will be able to accommodate everyone. If we find that some groups are making it, we might think about trying to address them.

Chair Wilson: Is there a deadline?

Poplin-Gosetti: The focus groups will be November 6-19. I will start sending the invitations out to the people sometime next week. People should respond by Monday, October 30. I am going to be sending emails out and contacting student organizations, residence halls, and different groups as identified demographically and inviting them to participate. Sometimes face-to-face contact serves much better than emails.

Senator Fink: What do you plan to do with the information once collected and do you keep track of response rates for different "diversity" groups.

Poplin-Gosetti: The Marketing & Communication process will determine how we represent ourselves in the media and in printed publications. We will have a report ready to present to the University Commission completed by January 31, 2007 and we will share that information.

Senator Barnes: This is a little unrelated. I want to commend you for your work on the diversity in portraiture project. If you didn't get a chance to attend the event, you might want to check out the portrait, which was donated to the College of law. The portrait is of James M. Ashley, who authored the 13th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. The great, great, grandson of James M. Ashley, Jim Ashley, is currently a faculty member here, and he created the portrait. It was one of the best events I have ever attended here on campus. It was hugely motivating because it was started by students who, with the encouragement of their professors, discovered the connection and created the impetus for the portrait. They also composed music that was played at the event. It was fabulous. And we were all fired up.

Chair Wilson: Thank you.

Senator Bresnahan: UT is one of the nineteen four-year institutions that has been selected to participate in a year long self-evaluation of our First Year Experience for our students through the Foundations of Excellence Program. Starting October 30, there will be a web-based survey asking you to evaluate from your own perspective the first year experience for our students. This survey will take only 10-15 minutes, but please contribute to the survey. It's very important for us to have a broad perspective of how successful our first year experience is and which areas we might improve in. Everything that Penny said about confidentiality for the diversity assessment also applies to this survey. The FYE survey is being run by an outside firm, and no individual responses will be known; everything will be looked at in the aggregate. Please watch for emails to come out soon.

Any questions? Thanks.

Chair Wilson: We still have a few minutes before Dr. Jacobs will join us.

Senator Hudson: I would like to make a comment on Tom Barden's letter regarding the Ph.D. program in History. As many of you know, I spent four years as Graduate Dean at the time when the English Ph.D. and History Ph. D. programs were still producing a fair number of Ph.D.'s. They had been put on notice by the OBOR as part of the previous review, that they were no longer to receive subsidy. They were not phased out. They were not inactivated. They were still on the books, and they remain on the books. At the time I had no objections from the Administration that both of those programs could continue in some form and that we could support their efforts to some degree. It was

regarded as critically important that we continue, in some form, to have Ph.D. programs in Humanities.

Their continuation would come at some expense to the department, but we could certainly have used some assistantship money to support Ph.D. students, as opposed to supporting Master's students. I just want to point out that those programs are not off the books, that is, they had not been phased out. They have only lost subsidy. We can still support them, provided we must deal with the entire cost of doing so without State of Ohio assistance. There is nothing that requires us to continue to not support them in some fashion. During my time in the Graduate School we had a number of discussions with the Dean of Arts & Sciences about whether or not we could continue programs in English and History. History has continued to have students, but not at the same level as before. We need to recognize that if we lose that subsidy, we should be able to support those programs. This is especially so if the faculty are interested and enthusiastic about maintaining Ph. D. programs in the humanities.

Senator Cave: I would like to add a few things. The History Ph.D. program in the past few years has been rather robust. This year alone we probably produced nine Ph.D.'s. We turned out seventy over the existence of the program and a third of those within the last half dozen years. A number of our students have achieved a real distinction. Some of you may have read a review of a book by David Brown which has received national recognition as the most important political book of this year. Brown was the 1995 University of Toledo Ph.D. We have graduates in our program in positions of Deanships, Department Chairmanships and in one case a college president all over the country. So History is alive and well and we hope it will stay alive and well.

Senator Stoudt: In light of the comments by Senator Hudson and Tom Barden earlier, I would suggest that we try to determine what is meant by the language in the White Paper. On p. 15 is the statement that by 2011 we will have "phased out" all non-state funded Ph.D. programs. We have two such Ph.D. programs on the books: in the Department of History and in the Department of English. What does the author of the document mean by "phased out"? Clarification is needed.

Chair Wilson: Ok. At this point I would like to introduce our next speaker, Dr. Lloyd Jacobs.

President Jacobs: Thanks very much. This visit has been on my calendar for several months, and I had no idea it would follow the intense discussion you just engaged in the last couple of hours. So, if you want to pick up on that, that will be fine with me. The issue or discussion point that was asked of me weeks ago to speak of what was my vision of shared governance. We don't have to stay on that subject. Let's establish, if we can, since I am the last speaker, how long do we have?

Chair Wilson: About 45 minutes.

President Jacobs: The subject that you asked me to speak about, has been on my mind. You may recall that I spoke to the Faculty Senate about four and a half months ago, about my view and thoughts about shared governance. I recall speaking about "excellence" and at that point I said that shared governance is essential to retainment of excellence long term, and that sharing governance was an essential issue. You may recall that at that time that I would rather talk more about shared responsibility. Governance and responsibility are, in my mind, on the opposites of the same coin.

And all of us as members of this institution, whatever our role, have a responsibility to this institution's future, to our generations, to our taxpayer, our community, so on and so forth. I would like to keep in mind that what we are really talking about is how each of us understands our roles of responsibility to this institution and see those as part of a high calling, and not just a day-to-day job, which we believe our mission is one that is worthwhile that makes our lives worthwhile. I am reminded of the quotation that says something like this, "if nothing is our fate, let us not live in such a way that we make a just outcome." I believe that to be true of the life of this great University and the life of those that are intertwined with it.

So, I think this is mostly about responsibility. Having said that, what I think is being “shared” when people speak of “shared governance” is what our folks call decision-rights, the right to make certain decisions. Those decision rights have to do with establishment of protocols, promotions, tenure. Decision rights are clearly a part of what it is we are speaking of and it needs to be shared. Similarly prerogatives; and I am not sure where decision rights end and prerogatives begin, but we are speaking of the sharing of making decision rights and prerogatives. Prerogatives to make certain decisions to establishing protocols, hire people and offer retention packages to them.

A whole list of prerogatives that belong to people in leadership or other roles of responsibility. And recognizing that those decision rights or prerogatives are an important part of what makes great institutions work, and are necessary parts, and recognizing further that not everyone in the institution of seven thousand can equally share in those decision-rights and prerogatives. It means that some people will have more prerogatives than others, some people will want more than what they have and some people are satisfied with less than what they have. What is it that we are talking about sharing. We are talking about sharing decision-rights, prerogatives, and for the faculty, I think we are talking about sharing the voice of the faculty. Who speaks for the faculty, who is the glue of the faculty. These are some of the things we are talking about when we speak of shared governance. We have taken at least a small digression at this point and we come at this from a different place.

It is clear to me, and I believe to my core that the faculty is the most important part of this institution. The faculty is the most important part of any institution of higher education. The faculty are what makes a great institution such as this, it is not by chance that diplomas, and that upon recommendation of the faculty the diplomas are given. You may have heard me saying that institutions are not bricks & mortar, not even made of fiber optic cable, or computer boxes. They are made by human beings, at best often imperfectly. Institutions are made of human beings. The subset of human beings that make up an institution, most importantly in my opinion are the faculty. The faculty share the greatest responsibilities. The faculty possess the knowledge and it is our mission to transmit to subsequent generations. The faculty possess the creativity that results in discoveries to improve the human condition. The faculty are central. If anyone suggest to you differently, please tell them they are wrong. The faculty are the core, the heart and the soul of this and any other institution of higher education.

Having said that, there are more than one contender for the voice of the faculty. Among the various potential voices for the faculty there are, at least in this institution and many other institutions three or so contenders for being the voice for the faculty. Three groups or pillars across which there is a distribution of those rights and prerogatives and privileges of which I spoke a minute ago. The faculty is what it’s all about, forgive me if I am being repetitious, all of you teachers, you know, that repetition is important at a time like this, so let me try again, the faculty is the single most important part of the institution. I believe there is an organizing force of the faculty, a voice for the faculty, certain rights and prerogatives that belong to the faculty. So the question arises, “who speaks for the faculty?” Who constitutes that glue that holds the faculty together. There are three contenders in this institution:

- Contender number one is, in no particular order, the chairs and deans and provosts --the hierarchy of this institution.
- Contender number two is the Faculty Senate – this body.
- Number three is the AAUP.

In some institutions there are more contenders. Particularly here we are speaking of three groups, each of which have concerned themselves with the possession of the decision rights, prerogatives, privileges, and so forth. Distribution of those prerogatives and rights, the voice among the deans and

provosts, chairs, the senate and the AAUP is something about which reasonable people can differ. Not every institutions distributes among these three pillars exactly the same. Each person in this room would believe exactly the same about what the proper distribution should be. I would guess that some of you would not believe in distribution and what I believe as ideal is exactly ideal. Perhaps there is no ideal distribution and it's my belief that it is worth looking at distribution of decision rights, prerogatives and voice across those three contenders. I made no conclusion at this point about the exactly best way for that distribution to be, and I am not sure that I know. But I do believe that is something that we need to put on a table and in the spirit of reasonable debate, just as we need to put on the table the relationship between a successful and prosperous society and its teaching of various disciplines in any college or university like ours. I think we need to put it on the table. I am interested in your view and I intend to try to promote and call forth a discussion and a debate about the distribution of rights, prerogatives and privileges across those three groups.

My vision of shared governance, and I am going to try to answer the question posed to me, is that all three of those groups have legitimacy. As it is appropriate to have certain rights provided, it is entirely appropriate that the Faculty Senate have the rights, prerogatives and privileges. The Faculty Senate is a terribly important part of the voice in glue, as I say, that holds the faculty together and that it is as important as provosts, chairs, deans, have some share of those rights and prerogatives. I think that we need to, in the spirit of a reasonable debate and in the spirit of believing the differences of opinions, which strengthens an organization, need to put this issue on the table and have a discussion on it over the next several months.

I know we have a lot going on. We have a lot of debates and discussions, a certain amount of heated discussions, and I suppose it's fair to say that the quicker we engage in discussions, take our time working through them, and we need to engage in them in the next several weeks. So that's where I am on shared governance. I am delighted to take questions on these issues or any other, and engage in a civil dialogue you believe would be constructive for this institution.

Senator Olson: Where do you see the Graduate Council with this shared governance role?

President Jacobs: When I have spoken of the Faculty Senate, you and others, you particularly, have instructed me that I am missing a piece, that is the Graduate Council, and I am working and trying to correct that mistake. I will try to bring the Graduate Council into a shared governance role.

Senator Floyd: Several years ago at the request of the provost a committee was formed to look at the issue of shared governance. It was chaired by Alice Skeens and there were probably about 20-25 people representing various constituencies. The committee in its report outlined the responsibilities of each of the groups who share in governance. Have you seen that report and is it helpful in this discussion? And, secondly, one of the reasons that the committee did that report is that we were hoping to avoid, whenever there was a change in administrations, a change in perception of what the roles of each of these groups were. The report of the committee stated that shared governance is an idea that extends beyond a particular administration. So, I am a little concerned when I hear discussions of a new administration with perhaps new and different views of shared governance. I would like to ask if you have looked at that report and if it's important at all to the current discussions.

President Jacobs: Let me take your questions in order and answer them. Yes, I have the report and have read it carefully. I believe it addresses many of the issues that have been on my mind, and it may be that after some deliberation we might decide that that report is adequate and will follow its recommendations straight away. As best I am able to ascertain not all of its recommendations have been implemented. If that's the case it may be that some of those recommendations are valuable now and that report should be one of the bases of this discussions that I proposed. I'm also sensitive to the idea that the amount of sharing distribution, as I said of decision rights and prerogatives should

change with administrations. I think in the long term it probably shouldn't change with administration. On the other hand, I think it's fair to say, in some corners of the institution, there are sort of pent up feelings that such an examination is a fact. We should take that report and study it very carefully, and I have studied it and we will continue to study it and I think it should be a part of a debate.

Senator Thompson-Casado: Does this mean perhaps that there will be reconsideration with regard to the Fiscal Advisory Committee, because this is the committee in which the faculty and administration worked together and I was an elected member. I was on the Arts & Sciences Budget Advisory Committee for the past two years and was dismayed to see that it was abandoned.

President Jacobs: Whatever else we do, we need to have a dialogue between the faculty and the financiers that builds trust and confidence, and I will commit to you to see that it happens. The CFO, Dan Morissette wanted to create something that was like that, but a little bit different and so I said, that makes sense, let's look at it together. I will commit that we will have more than adequate representation of the faculty with the finance committee.

Senator Thompson-Casado: An elected faculty representation?

President Jacobs: If you want an elected person, sure.

Senator Stoudt: I would like to follow up on my colleague's question and ask the same thing with regard to the Facilities Planning Committee. Members of this committee worked diligently for many years. It was reported at the last meeting by Chuck Lehnert that the committee had been disbanded. It was rather surprising to those of us who have served on the FPC that it will no longer be meeting. What is happening in this regard?

President Jacobs: We have a report from Pat Matting on the other campus and Carol Bresnahan on this campus on Committee on Committees, and I am hoping to implement those recommendations and I think that both of those committees are addressed in there.

Senator Stoudt: If I am not mistaken - someone please correct me - we were told that the FPC and the FAC would no longer be meeting.

President Jacobs: I am not sure that is the final word. What I think we need is a colloquy, a place where the faculty and the financiers and the construction people come together and exchange ideas and create plans, but it's also important to me that we are able to move some of those things quickly. That we have an opportunity to give the new facilities director and the new finance officer some freedom to create something that works for them. I think we are still in the formative stages probably on both of those. In either case, faculty input is very important.

Senator Fink: My name is Larry Fink, I'm in the College of Business in the Department of Management. Right now we have two Senates. There has been some talk of a merger, but no progress so far. I am curious how you see relative to the rights and prerogatives of those two groups?

President Jacobs: When we first got the legislation passed which merged the two institutions, it was my suggestion on the record that we leave the two Faculty Senates as they are for a period of time. Initially I spoke of a year, and I think I also said if it went a couple of years, it wouldn't be a bad thing. As it turns out, however, the leaderships of the Faculty Senates themselves tried to think through what would be the best thing for the institution and they, as you probably know, agreed to merge. I think both Senates passed a resolution to merge.

Chair Wilson: It was just the joint Executive Committee to endorse the concept of merging.

President Jacobs: Carter just corrected me so let me say it correctly, the joint Executive Committees agreed to resolve to support in principle a full merger. From that time until now there has been a lot of discussion to the questions you raised, the prerogatives, the rights, the who speaks for whom, who is the voice for the HSC and for the Main Campus, and so forth.

If Carter would like to speak, or anyone else for that matter I believe the current state is the good people are still trying to figure out what is the best thing to do. Does that answer your question, or did you have a follow up? I think you asked me what is my view, did you not?

My view is, first of all I don't think there is a real hurry but my view is very clear about what the ultimate outcome should be and I think we need one senate. Whether this occurs this month or one year from now I think we can deal with it either way. I do feel very strongly that we need one senate.

A. Jorgensen: Going back to the shared governance and the committee structure, particularly Facilities Planning. You expressed an interest for the university to deal with things quickly and make changes quickly. There is a value to this if done appropriately. I would suggest that the standing committees we had in finances and facilities are exactly the means in which we can do things quickly. For facilities one faculty member rotates off and one rotates on in each year. This provides experience for making some very major decisions. For the Pharmacy Building and the Classroom Building when there is not a standing group of experienced people who can make a plan, which you can say yes to one thing and no to something else. It's shared with faculty and administrators and in some cases the students. This is the means to do it when you have a standing group which can meet regularly and they can move quickly. At the present time we have a vacuum in both Fiscal Planning and Facilities Planning in really key areas. I don't think that is a very good idea.

President Jacobs: Good point. A little bit of solace, there is not much going in either of those areas at the moment. So as we get further engaged in formulation of the OH budget, we understand what the State budget is going to be, we receive a report from the prioritization committee in December. There will be activities so your good counsel is timely.

Senator Fink: You spoke about a couple of different groups that have rights and prerogatives and I appreciate that and have no preset opinion on the matter. I am just curious what is your viewpoint right now, and in terms of the rights and prerogatives you believe should be assigned to each of the three different groups.

President Jacobs: I have not formulated an answer to your question in my own head but I can tell you some perceptions that exist in the institution. Even though I have been here a short time, I think that a perspective on at least some perceptions as I have not been able to learn them enough to ascertain in their truth value. The deans and the chairs do not believe they have adequate share of the prerogatives in decision rights of which I spoke. I believe that's a fact that it is a perception and I think that's part of the reason we have to examine this distribution as I say across these three poles. As far as where I am concerned, I don't know the answer. I am not concerned, frankly, I know some of you may find it hard to believe it from a white guy, a surgeon, and a marine, I am not particularly concerned about my own share of those rights and prerogatives and privileges. I am very concerned to the best of my intellect to analyze it as to how that sharing has an impact on long term viability of the institution. That is my concern.

Senator Pope: At the previous institutions where I was when the faculty voted to organize and join the union the president abolished the faculty senate because he didn't want to deal with faculty at one point and then created the undergraduate council in curriculum. Would you consider this model?

President Jacobs: No, I wouldn't. In the first place let me start with the question of unionization. I believe it is the right of any work group to organize. It is their constitutional right to freedom of speech and the right to assemble. Even though I may have a view on this group or that group, I don't have any intention to prevent anyone from doing that, or any intention of not dealing with such a legitimately formed union. It is clearly a right. I have worked for years in the only major health care institution in the country where the house officers and doctors in training were organized and although it presented special challenges it turned out to be a very good deal. I have no intention to try and not honor the right to organize, or the unions that currently exist.

Secondly, in this institution we have at least three contenders for those rights and privileges of which I spoke, namely, the AAUP, the Senate and the deans, chairs and provost and all three of them have a legitimate position, and a right to some appropriate share. I am not quite sure what the appropriate share is and I have absolutely no intention of abolishing the Faculty Senate or the Graduate Council. Take it to the bank, I will not attempt to do that.

Senator Barrett: You said that there is a perception among the deans that their role in shared governance isn't as robust as they think it should be. Is your perception that the deans feel that the faculty's role is over robust or the central administration's role is over robust?

President Jacobs: It's a very legitimate question that you addressed and I don't take it that you meant it facetiously, did you?

Senator Barrett: No, not at all.

President Jacobs: All right. In fact there are two orthogonal doctrines that go on here: One is the vector that centralizes decentralizes power in an institution, that is up to the president, the provost down to deans, chairs, and so forth. And that vector is in my mind somewhat orthogonal to the other vector of which I spoke, the AAUP, the Faculty, and so forth, and these are separable issues. I believe the deans feel marginalized and want both vectors. They want more decentralization on many prerogatives currently held by the provosts and president and they also feel marginalized against this other vector of which I spoke.

I think it's a good question because we are in a particular place in time at this point and I will just mention to you at least what I believe about where we are. When we are in the middle of an administrative change, and if this is a graphic, I'm going to draw a graphic in the air for you, this is centralization that way on the Y axis and decentralization this way on the Y axis. When new administration comes along let's assume the institution is an equilibrium and new administration comes along and sharp spikes the tendency to centralize initially. We are currently in that phase. You are currently experiencing that. And then, depending on a whole bunch of things such as experience of the administrators, trust, simplicity or complexity of the organization there is a relaxation period currently looking something like this. Can you see my graphic in the air? I want you to understand that we are at this peak now. I am conscious of that phenomenon and what you are seeing from me at this moment is a lot more centralization than you will see in a year. I am a much less centralist than my current behavior would suggest because of this phenomenon. I am actually more of a decentralist than, as I say, than my current behavior would suggest. Does that help?

Senator Barrett: Yes, thank you very much.

Senator Hamer: I'm Lynne Hamer and I'm in Education. I have some uneasiness as someone who teaches quantitative research and talks about the importance of having the length between data and results being transparent. So I sit here and feel a little uneasy and I felt that at other gatherings too where the impression has been given that we have these perceptions and facts and this is what we make of them. But I don't understand the source of the perceptions and what the facts are, and at the gathering last time when people talked about their research, and for a lot of us here research approach and shared governance kind of intercept. I don't know if it's uneasiness or just curiosity.

President Jacobs: I think uneasiness is the right word. If you're uneasy, I am uneasy. This is a new territory for me, this is a complex organization and these are difficult times. There are secular trends that by themselves are more than adequate reasons for you and me to be uneasy such as the recent changes in the state's shared instructions formulations such as the monotonic trend downward in funding from the State of Ohio for higher education. There is plenty going on around us to make us uneasy. On top of that the fact that you don't know me and I don't know you and we have not yet had the time to learn to trust one another. This is a hard time. Can we get past that, can we hold our breath while we develop trust and engage in a debate? I believe so.

I have launched now two major debates and we've tried very hard not to take much of a position on either of them but to let the dialog go forward. The first is about the vision for the university and I understand fully that I was to put pen to paper and in so doing.....position. I have put this on the table and the desire to be frank, open and transparent. And without saying it ought to be 33%, 33%, 33% or something like that, I said, let us have an open debate at least in the next several months about these issues. Let us try to keep in mind the benefits to your children and my grandchildren that might derive from those debates. Let us in those debates work hard to avoid premature closure and work

hard to presume benign intent on the part of people whose views differ from ours. That's what I propose. I propose that these issues I put on the table for the vision of the University, and secondly a re-visitation of the distribution of those things that are distributed are those things that are shared in governance. I think if we put those debates on the table and take our time, look and think through them and keep in mind the fact that my duty and yours is to make this a better place for subsequent generations. Does that make you uneasy? Yes, it makes me uneasy.

T. Barden: I am not a faculty senator this year,

President Jacobs: I will listen to you.

T. Barden: If I could weigh in, this notion of dividing almost numerically is not a good way to think of the division of prerogatives or responsibilities.

President Jacobs: Oh no, I was only joking when I said 33, 33 and 33 %. You can't do that.

T. Barden: There are certain areas specific to the AAUP that deals with finances, the salaries, the raises, the benefits, etc. The Faculty Senate and the Graduate Council dealt with curriculum specific, and then the other hierarchy has to do with promotion tenure. There are things that are assigned there is a lot of concern within Faculty Senate and the Graduate Council about this particular area of curriculum. Would you address that?

President Jacobs: First of all I was joking when I said 33, 33, and 33%. These things to some degree are immeasurable. It is certainly not possible to assign numbers to the degree that these three buckets are filled. Secondly, you are quite right that the relationship of the AAUP is largely a contractual one. Just as I answered to someone before about my attitude toward unionization, I have never, knowingly, plan never, knowingly, to violate a union contract and I don't plan to. Those relationships will have to be negotiated in an appropriate way. Such contracts will have to be negotiated and the relationship between me and the Faculty Senate is quite different from that. Common usage, normal patterns around universities like us throughout the country have more relevance in that arena. However, having said that and if I had my druthers, if I were the czar of the world, we would have a pretty fundamental re-visitation of all that distribution across the three pots.

Senator Tramer: I don't know if this is a fair question in terms of you only having been a president of the entire institution for four month, based on your early perceptions what do you see as the institution's greatest strengths and greatest weaknesses?

President Jacobs: Let me do the strengths. This institution has so much to be proud of and it is so strong. This institution has breadth of intellect. I was out at the Lake Erie Research Center the other night and was astonished by the science that is going on there and also by music that was played. I visited the Art school and it's amazing. Then I went to visit the Department of Mathematics and was blown away by some of the work they are doing there and the teaching in Mathematics. Then I went to a lecture in the Department of Physics on the origins of the universe. I don't know what that means, origins of the universe, and was once again stunned. This is a wonderful institution. Then start down the list of our now nearly ten professional schools. As you can imagine I am proud of the medical school, proud of its entry scores on the licensure examination, the College of Law has done very well and after a period of a little bit of turmoil and transition has settled down very nicely and are moving forward to make us all proud. Anywhere you look around this place, there is much to make me proud.

This is a tremendously strong institution. Where is the repository, if you will, of the strength, where does it reside? That's where I started out. The faculty is where it resides. Make no mistake about it. And it does not reside at the top of the organization either. Most organizations if you stand far enough in the back, see an org chart and the org chart looks something like this, doesn't it. At this point, this part of the organization is not where new ideas and innovations, creativity or even many brains reside. It's down in this area. It's true of governmental organizations, corporate America and certainly true of universities. So this great strength resides in the faculty. My thoughts on shared governance is not about disfranchising the faculty. It's about a little bit of re-thinking about who speaks for the faculty.

Senator Barnes: I am a faculty member in University College and I teach what some might consider remediation, which is developmental education, and I also teach for Women's Studies. My question is about your comments about not rushing to premature judgment and developing a trusting relationship. I can only speak for myself but I am hearing this in Dr. Stoudt's comments as well. I was on a committee last year that I spent a lot of time on and did a lot of work for, and then suddenly found myself not on that committee this year for reasons unbeknownst to me, even though I was invited by the Senate to be on this committee. I'm wondering if you could speak to this issue. How can the Faculty presume benign intent when we find ourselves at the whim of decisions we are not participating in. Can you speak to that and what that does to us?

President Jacobs: I will answer your last question first to perceive yourself, either rightly or wrongly, to perceive yourself at the whim of forces of which you have no control is about the worst possible human experience. I understand that. To the best of my knowledge the only two committees that have not been reorganized, note I did not say deleted or disappeared, I said not yet been reorganized are the facilities and the finance. Forgive me for saying it, I'm ashamed to have to say it, but I didn't even know of the existence of the committees of which you speak.

Senator Barnes: I'm talking about the Student Centeredness Committee. As far as I know, it's still happening. I'm just no longer on it.

President Jacobs: I don't know the answer to that. Let me find out. We have made a new thing called the Commission on Student Centeredness. Would you like to be on that?

Senator Barnes: I would love to.

President Jacobs: Done.

Senator Barnes: But my issue is that if we are assuming some sense of trust, then we should also have a say in those decisions.

President Jacobs: It's true. On the other hand push back a little bit. Carol, can you make sure that Sharon Barnes is on this Commission? Alice is the chair, can you make sure it happens?

Senator Barnes: Really, that's not the point.

President Jacobs: I know that's not the point. Let me get to the point, if I do understand. It's a dialogue. If a committee like that falls off the org chart, what you just did, that's exactly what you have to do. Stand up and say, hey, where is my committee, I want to be a part of this effort. I have this theory that if anyone wants to be a part of something that's good for the university, accept it.

Senator Barnes: I don't think that is my question. If we have a sense of trust and we are communally working toward a great university and good service to the students, the dialogue takes place before the action, in my opinion. So, if somebody asks me, "Is this committee working the way it should?" I am the responsible person who would say, "No, it isn't. It doesn't give fair representation to a certain element." Even if that element is not myself, to have that power taken away and to have to go back and say, "You are stepping on my toes, don't do that," I think that violates the sense of benign trust that we are trying to build. At least that's the way I am perceiving it from where I am sitting.

President Jacobs: Thank you for clarifying the point. Worse than that, I think I disagree with you. I think that there is a need sometimes for the dialogue to occur after the action. I recognize that that is dangerous, at times it can cause the kind of feeling it caused in you. I also believe that trying to create a sense of newness runs that risk and I suspect that from time to time it will be necessary for you to shout out, hey what do you think about this, or that. If we have some time to experience that this doesn't happen too terribly often, maybe we can still learn that sense of trust of which I spoke earlier.

Senator Barnes: Just one more follow up on it. I'm not so concerned about my feelings. Sometimes there is a sense of relief when you are no longer on a committee, but I think it also creates

waste. We have to go through a process of reclaiming and redefining, when perhaps something wasn't broken in the first place. I find it an inefficient model.

President Jacobs: Many times it is inefficient and many times the dialogue before the action is inefficient. I think we need to optimize it. It's terribly important to me that people like you want to make a contribution to Student Centeredness or a contribution to anything that your commitment and talent is not wasted. I will certainly fail in my job if talent like yours is wasted, so truth be told, I don't know what did happen to that committee. I will try to find out, ok? But I appreciate your point, and you are right.

Senator Barnes: It's a point beyond committees; it's a point about leadership.

President Jacobs: I understand it. I got that part now.

Since it's after five, let's make this a last call.

Senator Thompson-Casado: I would like to mention the elephant in the room which is the white paper. Before the Faculty Senate meeting we had a lengthy debate in the Law Auditorium about the merit of the white paper, and there was a discussion about the strengths and weaknesses of that paper. Up to the point that there were several calls to set aside the items contained in the white paper. How open will the dialogue be on this issue?

President Jacobs: First let me push back on a minor semantic point, one that is important to me, to the extent that I understand the phrase, "white paper". White paper signifies a paper that appears without authorship out of nowhere and circulates and plants ideas without attribution. This thing that you are talking about is not a white paper. I have been very clear from the moment of its appearance that I authored it and that I had a little bit of input and that 90% plus, every word is mine, and it is, therefore, in my opinion, not a white paper. You can call it a number of things, but I ask you not to call it that. It's important to me to be able to say, yeah, I put that out there. It's my straw man. And I did it at the request of the Strategic Planning Committee, a committee with a broad group of people who have been charged with hearing a lot of open dialogue, with some of the same points to them that I used a minute ago to avoid premature closure, to assume benign intent, to hear from all parties, the original charge of the Strategic Planning Committee spoke to hearing from all the stakeholders. I reinforced that to them a few days ago and I can only assume that they will be responsible in carrying out that charge. Are you going to change my mind? Is that what you want to know?

Senator Thompson-Casado: No, I wanted to know how open the dialogue was going to be. Frankly, I was disappointed that you weren't there. We had assumed that you were going to be there, so that we could speak to you directly. Many of the issues brought up were extremely valuable.

President Jacobs: Let me ask you again, to assume benign intent.

Senator Thompson-Casado: I don't know what your schedule was, but I think (the issues) were so important that I hope you will get a report or a tape of the things that were said there.

President Jacobs: Two points: One, I would like to ask that this dialogue take place in the context of the Strategic Planning Committee. It's a broad committee, a big committee, and I think it would be better for us all, better for me, if the dialogue and debate took place there, as opposed to a place like this. However, if you feel strongly about it, I am certainly willing to, as I said earlier to claim authorship for this screed and I am perfectly capable of trying to either defend it or walk away from it, or say what I meant by it. If you feel we can do that, I would much rather carry out a debate in the Strategic Planning Committee. That's where I asked it to occur; there is good representation there for us to carry out that debate outside of that group charged with conducting that debate, would diminish them, I believe. Let's carry out the debate out there, but I'm more than happy to meet with you again in the appropriate time and talk about that.

Senator Olson: The open session debate we had today was intentionally without Dr. Jacobs. There were significant members from the Strategic Planning Committee, but it was really designed for us to understand what is the sense of the faculty with respect to this document, and then carry forward those arguments. We just felt it would be too polarizing and the arguments would be defensive and convoluted without us finding what the opinions of the faculty were if Dr. Jacobs had

been there. We had several people from the Strategic Planning Committee speak. I think it was a very beneficial forum. Certainly one of the driving things that came out of this is that a number of faculty would like to see that document withdrawn. That was the definite outcome.

President Jacobs: You can't put the toothpaste back in the tube. It doesn't make any sense to say, withdraw it. In my mind, what makes sense is, let's debate it, let's find out where we agree and disagree. Let's find a place where we will agree, let's keep in mind the long term benefits to the university. If by withdrawing it that signifies that I'm willing to back away from it, what I believe would be a reasonable direction for this university, it will be impacted more by a debate that I hope we will have, then a request to withdraw the paper. There are certain things you can't withdraw. I could name a few of them, but I think I will just stick to the toothpaste and tube metaphor.

Senator Olson: We tried to get the sense of the matter.

President Jacobs: I appreciate that very much, I think that was constructive.

Senator Barnes: Where is the debate going to be? We would like to be a part of it. If the debate happens in the Strategic Planning Executive Committee, who constituted it and how did that committee come to be? Did you name all the members of the committee, Dr. Jacobs? Were they nominated? How did that happen?

President Jacobs: I think they were nominated; there are students, Carter, faculty members, deans, chairs and community members.

Senator Barnes: How were they selected?

President Jacobs: I think the answer to your questions is Penny Poplin Gosetti suggested them to me and I named them. The answer is I don't quite know, but I will find out and let you know. It's a very broad group. If what you're driving at is that that is a hand picked selected group of Philistines which I don't think it is, but that's not the point, let's just say for a moment that that comes to be clear in the next couple of months. And it becomes clear that this group is a hand pick collection of Philistines, then let's do something else. I'm easy. But I'm not going to say don't let us have a debate. That wouldn't be right. If that's the wrong place, fine, let's do something else. I'm easy on that score.

I think we ought to quit and if you want me to come back, I will be delighted. Anytime you invite me, I will come.

V. *Calendar Questions:*

None.

VI. *Other Business*

Old Business: None

New Business: None

VII. *Adjournment:* The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Alice Skeens
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Kathy Grabel
Faculty Senate Office Admin. Secretary

