

**THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO**  
**FACULTY SENATE**  
**Minutes of the Senate Meeting of March 25, 2008**  
**<http://www.facsenate.utoledo.edu>**

Approved @FS mtg. 4/22/08

---

**HIGHLIGHTS**

**Provost Haggett & Bin Ning**  
**Chair of Academic Regulations Committee**  
**President 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 Floyd** called the meeting to order. **Alice Skeens, Executive Secretary** called the roll.

***I. Roll Call –2007-2008 Senators:***

**Present:** Alexander (for Martin), Ames, Ariss, Barlowe, Barden, Barnes, Beatty-Medina (for Jakobson), Chen, Cluse-Tolar, Edwards (for Baines), Fink, Floyd, Funk, Fournier, Fritz (for Humphrys), Greninger, Horan, Hottell, Hudson, Johanson, Kennedy, Kistner, Lambert, LeBlanc, Evans (for Olson), Lundquist, Monsos, McInerney, Morrissey, Piazza, Piotrowski, Relue, Schall, Skeens, Stierman, Tierney (for Klein), Teclehaimanot, Ventura, Wikander, Wolff,

**Excused absence:** Hamer, Hefzy, Moorhead, Thompson-Casado,

**Unexcused absence:** Le (for Zallocco), Lipscomb, Peseckis, Sponberg, Sundar (for Pope), Wedding

***II. Approval of Minutes:***

Approval of minutes of 3/11/08 were delayed.

***III. Executive Committee Report:***

**Chair Floyd:** The minutes of March 11 have been postponed due to the difficulties with the Senate nominating ballots. Some of them had to be revised and re-sent. We have experienced multiple problems with those ballots and I apologize for the delays. As a result, the whole process is being delayed slightly. We've had great difficulty in getting accurate lists of those who are eligible for election to the Senate from each of the colleges. Several colleges have sent us lists of faculty who are no longer in the college.

As a result we've had to reissue the ballots for the College of Medicine, the College of Business, the College of Nursing and HSHS. The nomination ballots were supposed to be turned in this Friday March 28<sup>th</sup>. For those colleges where we've had to redo the ballots we're going to extend the deadline to April 2<sup>nd</sup> to make sure they have had adequate time to receive their ballots, mark their ballots, and get them back in the mail; especially those that are coming from the other campus. The final ballots will go out as soon as we know the results of the nomination ballots and all those people have been contacted to make sure that if they have been nominated they agree to serve if elected.

I've had a lot of questions about what's happening with this election and just as a reminder, this is an election with completely a new senate; none of us will be continuing unless we are formally elected to the new senate. Those from each college who receive the top third of votes will serve a three-year term, the second tier will serve a two-year term, and the third tier will serve a one

year term. If your college only has two representatives, which several of us do, then you will be elected to a three-year and two-year term. After this whole new election happens this year; next year we will begin the traditional staggered three-year term for every election thereafter. Because of the problems that we've had with the nomination ballots, however, our hopes of having the new senate meet on April 22<sup>nd</sup> is not going to work. We are going to have to delay the first meeting of the new senate until April 29<sup>th</sup> so as not to jeopardize a fair election process. That means that the first meeting of the new senate will actually be during exam week, and I apologize for that, but we had this situation last year as well. So mark your calendars, April 29<sup>th</sup> at 4:00 p.m., Scott Park Auditorium, which will be the first meeting of the new senate. I urge you to put that down on your calendar for two reasons. One, if you are elected, it will be very important for you to attend so you can participate in the election of officers. And second, we are actually inviting every faculty member to come to that senate meeting. We think an appropriate way to celebrate our new senate is to have as many people as possible come and participate and observe that new senate meeting. Afterwards, there will be a reception in the Cavern area. Also, parking will be easier at the Scott Park Campus.

As a reminder, the officers are going to be elected at that meeting, and we will elect the new president, a president-elect (which is a new concept for the main campus Senate). We've never had a president-elect, but I think it is a good thing to have someone who is preparing to take over the next year. Also, we will elect an executive secretary, the OBOR faculty advisory committee representative, and two at-large members. The-at large members: one will be for the faculty who report to the main campus provost, and the other for the faculty who report to the HSC provost. Senators will only vote for their own representative, so everybody who is the main campus faculty member will vote for their at-large member, and the Health Science senators will vote for their at-large member. Any questions about that?

**Senator Horan:** I just want to make a small announcement, Allison Spongberg who is the chair of our elections committee isn't going to be able to participate so we have to gather 90 names between two of us for the election ballots for the colleges that will be representing main campus, so I'm looking for volunteers. My name is Mark Horan and you can e-mail me, it's [mark.horan@utoledo](mailto:mark.horan@utoledo) and also, because of the time frame of the process, if any of you who do not want to continue into the new senate but you have been nominated, if you e-mail me that you don't want to be included on the ballot, please do that. Or if you do want to be included on the ballot and are nominated we'll contact you. It's going to be very frustrating to call people who don't answer their e-mails or answer their telephone messages. It's very time consuming because we do start at the top with the most vote getters and work our way down, so if two people on that list don't respond it's going to slow that quite a bit. If you can help us that way that would be great. Thank you.

**Chair Floyd:** Thanks Mark, that's absolutely true, it's a little more difficult this year, even more difficult than usual because we are starting from scratch and there are many, many more people who have to be called. The final ballots will include 28 from Arts and Sciences, 28 from Medicine and the list goes on. That is why we could use a lot of people to try and contact those nominated. So if you are willing to help Mark, please let him know. Mark and Bruce Kennedy are our Election Committee and we also have members from the Health Science Campus senate.

Because we have moved the first meeting of the new Senate to April 29<sup>th</sup> that leaves the questions of whether we should have a meeting April 22<sup>nd</sup>. At this time we have no agenda items for the 22<sup>nd</sup> and we are considering cancelling that meeting. For those of you who are committee chairs, if you want to make a committee report, or you have log items that are out there pending, please let Kathy know so she can put you down on the April 8 agenda. The other speaker that we're trying to arrange for April 8<sup>th</sup> is David Wahr, who is in charge of this new centralized printing and photocopying plan. I'm also trying to get Vern Snyder to come and talk to us about the faculty and staff campaign. The other idea which the Executive Committee thinks would be a good tradition to start is at the end of the year to offer what might be called The State of the Faculty

Senate Address. We have the State of the University Address, State of the college addresses, etc. Why not as a Senate, lay out the issues of this year, what issues we think are still pending, what issues concern us, and that will help set the agenda for the coming year. I think it is especially important this year, with what could be a complete lack of continuity between this body and the new Senate, for us to have an opportunity to lay out what our concerns are and what the next senate might address. The Executive Committee will put together a list of concerns and issues that we would like to see the new senate address. We also hope that this will be an opportunity for you to share with the senate what issues you have and that you see out there that need to be addressed next year.

On another issue of concern, the 10-5-5 budget development process that we've heard a lot about. There was a meeting last week between the chairs, and the deans, the president and the provost and the vice president of finance and administration to discuss with the chairs the process and to answer questions. I attended because I wanted to see what message was conveyed so I can better understand what's going on here. The content of the discussion was similar to what we heard Scott Scarborough talk to us about a couple of weeks ago. I know that some people who are here today were at that meeting. Do any of you have anything you want to add; that you felt new information was conveyed or concerns that you think the senate might want to hear?

**Senator Piazza:** I walked away kind of confused because after listening to it, it sounds to me like there may in fact be two competing budget policies operating in the university. For many months we've been told about this thing called responsibility based budgeting where money was going to go towards revenue generating programs. That is, the more productive the department was, the more cost efficient it was, the better profit expense ratio it had, it could expect money to flow towards them, however, after listening to Scott Scarborough, after listening to what was discussed at the other meeting, one gets the impression that the budget policy is money will follow more strategically-based policy. If you have a program that is a good money making program under a responsibility based budget, that program should get more money. Under a strategic policy based program money would be taken from them and directed towards strategic programming. I would really like to know which budget policy they're trying to follow.

**Chair Floyd:** If you would like I would be happy to forward that message.

**Senator Barden:** I think since the president is coming this afternoon that is a very good question to put out.

**Chair Floyd:** We did send him some questions to address ahead of time, several of them concerning the budget process. So I hope people will have follow up questions and that is a very good one. My concern about this process is that we have heard time and time again that this is supposed to be a conversation that people will participate in, and that faculty will have input into this conversation. I just would like to get a sense of how many of you feel that you have been constructively consulted in this conversation? I have the same feeling, and I was reminded of this this morning when I was looking at the constitution of the new senate. It states under the responsibilities of jurisdiction clause that the Senate is to "participate in a meaningful way in long term strategic planning or prioritization, including budgeting policy and fiscal and facilities planning. I'm not convinced that we have been a part of the conversation in the creative ways in which I think the vice president for finance and administration certainly has in mind. In some colleges it seems that the conversation is occurring between deans and chairs. In some colleges it seems that the conversations was a one way conversation of the dean telling the faculty this is what we will be doing, without any sort of creative thinking that we're all supposed to be participating in. In almost all the colleges it does not appear that whatever proposals are being presented in the budget hearings and what discussion comes out of those budget hearings are being shared with the faculty at this time. This is a concern of the executive committee and I'm sure it's a concern of yours as well. We the executive committee was told about the process that would be used to develop the budget, we knew it would be a difficult process but we'd hoped it would be a

transparent one. So far it seems somewhat lacking in transparency. I hope that when these budget proposals get to a more formal and final stage that deans and chairs will share them with all faculty for some input. I know certainly that is the message we want to convey as the executive committee to the administration. Does anyone have any comments they would like to share?

**Linda Rouillard:** About a month ago, the chair of the Board of Trustees came and talked to the Senate. He promised to get back to you regarding this very same Scott Scarborough budget plan, did he do that?

**Chair Floyd:** No, he did not do that. The executive committee is trying to get a meeting with Mr. Stansley before the end of the semester and we will bring this up with him. I will also forward a message to him tomorrow to let him know you are asking about this. On another matter, as I said, I've been getting some questions about this centralized printing plan that is being implemented right now as we speak. Faculty members have been stopping me, expressing concern about the ability to insure confidentiality of student academic information with centralized printing capabilities. As I said, I've been trying to contact David Wahr to see if he will come and talk to us at the next meeting and explain how this is really going to work and how can we be assured of confidentiality of student information. As a follow up to our two recent senate actions, I forwarded to Carol Bresnahan, who is responsible for academic policies, our motion concerning policy regarding faculty-authored text books, and Carol has, in turn, forwarded that to Bill McMillen who is in charge of the policy committee. I got a call from Bill today asking about the policy so I assume it's being discussed at some level and hopefully we'll be seeing a draft of that formalized policy in the very near future. As for our recommendation for the Research Council concerning changing the membership of the Council to include faculty from all the colleges, I have heard that it has not been favorably received by the Council. It was discussed at the Research Council last week, but there were a few members in attendance. It was not voted on or considered in a informal way.

A couple of announcements: today at 6:00 pm there is a Town Hall meeting in the Field House. If you haven't seen the Field House, you should take the opportunity to see what's happening there. Some of us went on a tour about a week ago and it was really interesting. The purpose of the Town Hall meeting is to talk about alcohol awareness and Nick will be participating in that discussion. That's at 6:00 tonight. On April 2<sup>nd</sup> at 10 a.m. is the president's State of the University address in Doermann Theater. And the topic is Re-Engineering the Undergraduate Experience.

Just on a personal note, I hope you have received your invitation for the opening of the Faculty Authors and Artists Exhibit which is next Tuesday. If you can come please RSVP. It is always good to have faculty turn out for that. If you don't have anything on exhibit, you can see what other faculty colleagues are researching and publishing. Any questions about anything? Our first item for the agenda today is a presentation by Dr. Haggett on gender salary equity.

**Provost Haggett:** I'm going to talk about the gender equity salary study, a presentation that we made to Women's Leadership Forum. The expectation of what this salary study was going to do and what it ultimately did were not the same. There was an initial design that would have been more a comprehensive study including qualitative and quantitative data, but at some point, the study design was simplified.

So I'm acknowledging up front that the study that was done was ultimately not what was envisioned by the Women's Leadership Group. This study was about faculty salaries and it did not include any other group, and it really looked at only gender. . Prior studies were looked at, at other universities as well as other sources. A written report of this study was distributed last Friday when I met with the Women's Leadership Forum,

Salaries are a complicated matter and it's complicated how salaries are set. There are many things that may influence salaries. This is a list of just some of them. Gender and rank and time at rank

but also how long people have been employed, their scholarship, both the area of their scholarship as well as their productivity, what their degree level is and then interactions among these things including gender and college. It was decided at some point in time that only data that were available in The University of Toledo's database, existing database, and existing data would be used in this study. Therefore, the frame of the study became very focused. The procedure was that the data were collected, data were cleaned, and these are clean data. Statistical methods were identified, data were analyzed and interpreted.

Let me point out that this study was started a number of years ago. The salary data available at that time was fiscal year 2005 data, and that is what is analyzed here. Fiscal year 2005 data, so let's note that the data are now old, and they reflect the university as it was in fiscal year 2005, another way to say this is that there is no health science campus data included. It is simply FY 2005. There has been some reference in The Collegian article of using old data, well the data wasn't old when the studies started; they are old now. All of the data was converted to 9 month salaries. Tenure and tenure track were analyzed together, lecturers were analyzed separately, because the factors that affect their salaries are different. Analysis of variance with rank and gender as independent variables were studied. This shows the spread of faculty salaries, again, based on Fall 2005 data. There were 622 salaries at this date. It shows that there was a bell shape, more or less, of salaries at The University of Toledo in 2005. You look at the overall breakdown of women and men by rank; you will see that of the 622 faculty in 2005, there were 180 assistant professors with 54% of them being men, 46% being women; 202 associate professors with 2/3 of them being men and about 1/3 being women; and 240 professors with only 40 of those individuals being women. I believe that is one of the real questions in the data. You look at average salary by rank and gender which gives you the demographics of that average salary and it shows that assistant and associate professors average is almost \$57,000. For associate professors \$64,000 and at the professor level \$90,000. Now when you look at just the averages there is an apparent difference in salary by gender between associate professors and at the professor level. To look at this more closely, the data were further analyzed and the question was asked, is this apparent average difference solely due to gender or do other factors contribute? Again, we only used the data had at the university in the existing database. So rank, college and time at rank were analyzed. The paper talks about the Simpson paradox, a factor of analysis, it says that in certain situations, looking at aggregate data can give you one outcome, but if you disaggregate the data you get a different outcome.

By the way, just today there was an article in Higher Education Today about gender equity nationally.

Yesterday at the AERA meeting, which is American Educational Research Association, an investigator presented data that looked at 8,000 salaries that they collected nationally and looked at many factors, many more factors than we have available to us here. They still identified, after all those factors including research productivity and other things were analyzed, that there was still a 4% difference. It's a really interesting finding and an interesting one when you put our study into context.

That study that Sharon has also mentions the fact that I'll mention next here, that there is a correlation between an average salary and percentage of male faculty in the college. That nationally this is true as well as it is here, that there are more men in colleges that have higher average salaries. What this graph plots is percent male in the college versus average college salary. There is a strong positive correlation between the average college salary and percent of male faculty. In order to say what effect college has on it, the data were further analyzed by subtracting the average college salary from each faculty salary and then each centered salary would then represent how much above or below the college average the individual salary was. These are otherwise known as Z-scores. They are corrected scores for the average. You can now make the

correction on the handout if you can find this slide on the handout. A faculty member paid \$76,000 in the college with an average salary of \$85,000 had a centered score of \$9,000. So if you do the analysis and use the centered scores, what this shows you is that there is no significant difference on the assistant and associate professor level but there continues to be a difference in salary between men and women at the professor level.

The further research question that was asked is that, does time at rank contribute to the significant differences in salaries for full professors. We know that females have been in full rank on the average 8.2 years while males in this data set were at rank for 13.9 years. Men have been at rank, in this data set a longer period time than women and though time at rank interacts with rank, this time at rank can be statistically partialled out to each level independently. After controlling the time at rank, the difference between men and women's salaries is no longer significantly different. That's the data on the tenure, tenure-track faculty.

Lecturers' salaries were looked at separately; the number of female and male lecturers at UT in 2005 was 49 females, 39 males, with the average salaries that you see there, and this difference was not statistically significant.

Using standardized salaries by each college there was no significant difference between men and women and assistant and associate professor levels, although there was a significant difference at the full professor level, but this difference can be accounted for by time at rank.

This is a very narrow study, this is only about the FY 2005 salary data. This is not a generalized statement about equity at this institution. It's not a generalized statement about salaries at this institution today. But we could call it a benchmark to track U.T's progress. It's a narrow study with relatively narrow conclusions that should not be interpreted beyond what the study itself says. We believe in order to have further information, additional studies need to be done in the university we are today. Looking at all the salaries across the entire university. I was asked to talk about this particular study and I am pleased to share it with you today. This is an issue that has been discussed on many campuses. I had a very good meeting with the Women's Leadership Forum on Friday and we talked about how we move forward from here, what are the questions that we need to ask and how do we get our arms around larger questions on equity, not only for men and women but people of racial minority and other groups, how do we get to be the University where there is indeed equity across the university for all our staff, faculty and students. That's the dream that I have and that's the dream shared by many of you. I'm glad this study is concluded and we have this information it only tells us about this particular frame, salaries in 2007 and I'm looking forward to working with Women's Leadership Forum on a monthly basis to have further discussions on how we move forward.

The Power Point presentation can be viewed in it's entirety on the Faculty Senate website: [www.facsenate.utoledo.edu](http://www.facsenate.utoledo.edu) or, click on this icon.



\\  
fss00cv02.utad.utole

Report from the Women's Leadership Council:

DATE: February 27, 2008

TO: Dr. Rosemary Hagggett, Provost, MC  
Dr. Jeff Gold, Provost, HSC

FROM: Women's Leadership Council on behalf of Women's Leadership Forum

RE: Gender Equity Report

Thank you for presenting the results of the Gender Equity Salary Report at the January 18, 2008, meeting of the Women's Leadership Council. We appreciate your efforts to move the process and the report forward in a productive and collaborative manner.

Due to a number of institutional changes, the final stages of the report and, indeed, the final report itself are not what we expected, based on the research protocol established in 2005.

Despite the challenges presented by the alterations in the research protocol and the failure to engage with the research advisory committee, we look forward to partnering with the university in its efforts to address gender discrimination. Moreover, based on the experiential knowledge of women on the main campus, we await a comprehensive gender equity study to determine the extent of that discrimination.

In so much as this letter represents our official response to the report, we feel compelled to outline our concerns about the research and to make recommendations about where we go from here.

First, in reviewing the power-point slides compiled for the presentation, we have identified the following general problems and issues of concern:

1. A power-point presentation is not a study; therefore, there are significant gaps, which render the analysis and results questionable (see below under Specific Problems and Issues of Concern).
2. The report commissioned by the Women's Leadership Forum included Race as a significant factor influencing salary differences; however, Race is absent from the analysis.
3. The report as commissioned was to include both a quantitative analysis (including a Regression Analysis) and a qualitative analysis based on existing institutionalized discrimination and hostile climate research studies, as well as studies conducted at other institutions, because wage discrimination, which can manifest in several forms, requires multiple-context analysis. This study does not include a qualitative, multiple-context analysis.
4. The study should be based on clean, verifiable data.

In addition, we have identified the following specific problems and issues of concern:

1. Slide 4: Under "Factors that may influence salary," eight variables are listed, but not all are included in the analysis; an analysis using all eight variables (and adding Race) could produce significant effects.
2. Slide 9: Under "Average Salary by Rank and Gender," no test statistic or significance levels are provided.

3. Slide 10: Under “Questions that led to further analysis,” only Rank, College, and Time at Rank are used, begging the question, where and what are other potentially operative values (including Race)?
4. Slide 12: Under “Correlation between Average Salary and Percentage of Male Faculty,” the data are being aggregated and COLLEGE has become the unit of analysis (from N=622 to N=9), which is likely to mask differences that might exist.
5. Slide 14: Under “Results,” the unit of analysis has changed; individuals within each rank are used for t-test, but the average of women versus men within each rank is presented. These graphics seem to have been compressed or collapsed.
6. Slide 15: Under “Does time at rank contribute . . . ,” the findings seem to ignore how Time at Rank interacts with Rank; INTERACTIONS need to be explained, and this can be easily done with graphs of significant and nonsignificant interactions/correlations. This information implies that the longer women work at the University of Toledo, the more it costs them.
7. Slide 16: “Analysis of Salary [sic] of Lecturers,” begs the questions: Were there no additional analyses done? What about possible suppression of salaries by variables not included/not presented? Why not extend the analysis to explore factors fully, especially variables unique to Lecturers?
8. Slide 17: Under “Conclusions,” it appears that individual salaries have been subtracted from College averages; division averages or other unit averages might also have been appropriate. Again, presenting significant levels, numbers, and test statistics would have been more thorough and helpful.

Based on the raw data collected on faculty women’s salaries, rank, and promotion and the shared experiences of women found in women’s individual narratives across the main campus, we recommend the following:

1. The University should produce an annual report on salaries and promotion (using clean data) with gender and race as necessary variables.
2. Any future equity studies should be done by an external contractor with extensive experience in university-based studies of promotion, equity, and salaries.
3. In the future, all women within and across Collective Bargaining and employment categories, including women on the Health Science campus, should be included in reports on gender equity.
4. In order to identify challenges to the retention of women faculty and staff, the University should conduct exit interviews with all women who have decided to leave the University within the past five years, similar to the exit interview process used at Cornell University to identify any climate issues that might be affecting retention.
5. In order to increase the number of women full professors, we recommend the creation of a hiring fund with resources for diversity hires and an extensive retention plan in keeping with the University Strategic Plan, the Diversity Assessment, and the Diversity Plan.

Last, we will continue to work with your offices and the Office of the President in aggressive efforts to address the challenges faced by women faculty and staff on the



University campus. We are ready to work with you to fulfill President Jacob's 2006 commitment to increase the number of women full professors from 34 to 100 over five years.

We look forward to working with you on a multiplicity of efforts to recruit, support, and retain an outstanding community of women faculty and staff.

cc: Dr. Bin Ning

**Senator Alexander:** I love statistics because statistics show what's right, but what's presented here is that there is no difference between men and women. Maybe that is true here at this university, but you haven't show that salaries at this university are either too high or too low with respect to the rest of the field. This is a question that most of the faculty want answered.

**Provost Haggett:** That is right, that's another frame that we can put around the study. Any time we do a study we put a frame around it and ask a research question. One study could be how in fact salaries compare to those at peer institutions. Then we identify what those peer institutions are, Northwest Ohio, Ohio, Midwest, or institutions that we see as our inspirational peers. But you are absolutely right, that's how we frame another study.

**Senator Fink:** Matt Dills of HR did a study last year, I don't know where he is with that. Maybe you can ask him.

**Provost Haggett:** Thank you for that, I will certainly find out. I know that Kevin West has quite a bit of salary information. Bin, IR has not done any analysis like that against other peers, have we?

**Bin Ning:** We do provide data to the AAUP survey.

**Senator Moorhead:** I have a question about the statistical design of this study. Does this analysis include independent variables of rank, gender and college as categorical variables along with time and rank as a continuous variable?

**Bin Ning:** Time at rank was tested at the very beginning to see if it can be used as a covariate, the conditions were not met. Thus we didn't use time at rank in the initial analysis at the aggregated level; but at full professor' level, time at rank can be used and was analyzed.

**Senator Hudson:** I believe in the early 90's we and probably many other institutions made a concerted effort to hire the best women and minorities we could recruit. A number of those very high quality recruits have since left The University of Toledo. I can't say whether or not the percentages of women and minorities we were able to recruit sometimes at higher entry salaries that others were among those leaving in higher numbers were among the women leaving in higher numbers. So unless we look at that among other things it's hard to understand some of the salary data in the report. On another matter having started in the 90's we don't move forward very far before you start to look at the issue how long does it take before women and minorities recruited in the 90's begin to populate the higher ranks. It takes about 10-12 years minimally for a new assistant professor to become a full professor. So women and minorities hired in the early 90's and retained are there but for those hired in the late 90's, they are not there even if they were on a fast track. So, my overall point is that considering increased attrition due to women being recruited away by other universities and due to the rate at which women hired in the late 90's can be reasonably expected to attain the higher rank, the overall look of things may not be so bad. That is, we should see more women at full professor over the next several years. My final point is that gender equity salary adjustments have morphed into general equity, such that anyone underpaid – man or woman, may ask for an adjustment. This, in many cases, thwarts difficult decisions made by salary committees in departments. Thus some men that were not given merit adjustments over several years could possibly ask for a salary adjustment. When granted such a decision wiped out difficult decisions made by departmental committees to not regard these individuals with merit increases given a demonstrated unproductive record. When you add that money back what was

withheld by departmental salary committees, you increase salaries for these individuals who arguably don't deserve an equity adjustment and you have less money to make real equity adjustments for women – thus making them look even more underpaid.

**Provost Haggett:** Thank you for your comments. Certainly the points that you raised about how salaries are set that's why I said how salaries are set is a complicated thing that gets influenced by any number of factors, it varies across institutions and all of this has to be taken into account. How salaries were set at W. Virginia University was different than here. They had some of the same factors and complicated weighing factors, equity and compression factors, it all adds up to one number but there can be a lot significant factors behind this one number. Secondly, you mentioned recruitment and certainly we have to be continually vigilant how we are doing our recruiting. We had visitors yesterday from the University of Michigan who came and talked to us about their ADVANCE Grant. ADVANCE Grant is an NSF program that supports the advancement of women in STEMM disciplines but much IS generalizable across the university. So the University of Michigan had ADVANCE funding for quite some time and they came to us to chat with us about how to recruit a diverse population of faculty, and the whole issue about unconscious bias and the frames that we use in this process. I think it's important for us to acknowledge this, to learn more about it, to be aware of it and to share it with our colleagues to ask people to be open to the possibility that we may not think the way we think we do. I would like to share this information with you. I may be able to provide some funding and leadership to talk about it, but it will be all of you who interact in a search process, how we recruit people, what happens when we interview them, the questions we do and don't ask when we recruit faculty into faculty positions. We all need to work on this together. We looked at the number of women faculty we have in the tenure track and where they are, and how many are at the associate professor level. One of the things that the president said when we met with Women's Leadership Forum was that he wanted to see 100 women full professors in five years. So I want to work with you to make that happen. Assuming that we give all our colleagues the support they need in the process, the situation should improve.

**Senator Barlowe:** I want to draw your attention to the other attachment, which is the response by the Women's Leadership Council and Women's Leadership Forum to the Gender Salary Equity Study PowerPoint that we just saw. Our response first discusses the general issues and problems we had with this particular study. One is that a PowerPoint is not a study. Another is that race was taken out as a variable. Also, the study, as it was initiated almost three years ago, was to have both a quantitative and a qualitative analysis that examined structural biases, as Dr. Haggett said, as well as unconscious and conscious biases and attitudes and beliefs about race and gender that are imbedded in institutions, but which institutions have yet to acknowledge. We are told to 'wait and things will get better' as though time itself changes the conditions in which marginalized communities have to exist. I have been waiting 18 years at The University of Toledo; a lot of us are still waiting. I was one of the people recruited in the early 1990's, and I hope I don't die before I get my salary adjustment. I also want to say that we could spend years arguing about the study, but the important question is how we move forward from here. So, we have asked for an annual report done by external contractors, and we asked for all categories of employment across the University to be considered. Retention, as Richard pointed out, is another issue. We know, for example, how many senior women have left in the past two years or are leaving this year. That's one of the most significant issues. We have also asked Dr. Haggett to increase the minority hiring fund.

**Senator Barnes:** You have committed to a total climate study and not just salary study?

**Provost Haggett:** I don't know that I did commit to a total climate study. When we met on Friday I committed to working with you to identify our next steps. And I did say that any study that we do should be done by an external contractor because anything we do internally will be suspect, no matter what the results are. I want to assure everyone in the presence of Bin Ning that this has

nothing to do with my confidence in the office of Institutional Research. I have full confidence in our people in IR, and we will continue to talk about it.

**Senator Fournier:** Where do the funds come from that go along with the cost associated with recruiting faculty members? We are told the resources are very limited.

**Provost Haggett:** The resources come from the college. The University of Michigan people talked about that you need to recruit even before you even start to recruit, that the activity in your discipline should be to invite visitors and to have more diversity you invite diversity into your department. There are proactive things you can do. Maybe it does have to do with finances or other factors. My concern is that we have enough to recruit and I will pursue that further.

**Senator Johanson:** In figuring out the distribution of tenure, tenure-track salaries, the average is just under \$80,000, are administrators, and I assume most of them are faculty at some rank also included in figuring out the average faculty salaries?

**Provost Haggett:** I should have mentioned it, but administrators, like me, are not included in that study. Chairs were included, but their chair stipends were taken out and their salaries adjusted to nine months.

**Senator Lipscomb:** There are two factors important in maintaining equity, one is establishment of a starting salary, the other one is pay raises. What processes does the University have right now to insure there is equity at each of those steps?

**Provost Haggett:** Starting salaries are currently based on what resources are available, again complicated by what the market will bear and complicated with the discipline itself. Here at the University you probably can tell me more about how in the bargaining agreement salaries are set, the increases and merit pays than I can tell you right now. Again, a complicated set of factors that would contribute to the overall salary. That needs to be looked at.

**Chair Floyd:** Thank you Dr. Haggett. Dr. Jacobs agreed to come back and answer a set of questions from the Faculty Senate. We submitted those questions to him, with some relating to the strategic issues and the others to budget issues.

**President Lloyd Jacobs:** Thank you for inviting me again. I will speak of two things: the State's strategic planning effort and the state's budget situation. We are in the first year of the biannual budget. On the 1<sup>st</sup> of July, we will enter the second year of that biannual budget. Our biannual budget is quite favorable, an increase overall of 5% the first year and 8% the second year. This allows us not to be spendthrift organization. My greatest worry is that the State is going to step back from that second year 8% increase. The reason I think that is not because I sense any softening of their commitment, but the State is at least a billion dollars behind on revenue this year. In the next couple of months this will increase to two billion. The chancellor and the governor both said we will not back away from commitment to higher education. This is truly reflective of their value system. But I'm not sure they will be able to keep that promise. However how well their intentions are, certainly other things may happen that will have an impact on us. A budget cut will certainly hurt us as an institution under Medicaid and under the construction budget which has already been cut about \$3.5 million. I think the Governor and the Chancellor are doing everything they can to keep their promise in terms of State's share instruction, but I think we will see the other programs chipped away significantly. I believe, that we will see them forced to back away in the second year of the biennium budgetary commitment. It will have a major impact on us here. I want to be absolutely transparent with you. I want to talk with you today about our own internal budget process. We are having budgetary hearings where we discuss a hypothetical hypothesis that each of us will be cut 10%. But that was to be a hypothetical conversational opener. It is possible that we may be talking about this scenario not as a hypothetical conversation opener, but in real, actual terms of budgetary preparation I hope not. There is a second thing that I said I would speak about the State. Since I'm on budgetary issues, a second major budgetary issue I wanted to call to your attention. Some of you who may have attended the last Board of Trustee meeting heard some of this but now I will recap a little bit for you. Almost all of you have heard or read or have

experienced the subprime meltdown and the tremendous upheaval in the credit market. This is having a major effect on us. It has had an impact in two ways and it will have a greater impact on us as things continue to unravel. We have about \$100 million, \$96 million dollars worth of variable debt issued in 2002 that totaled about \$265 million in debt, which is not a bad thing. We have cash to cover this. The 2002 issuance is variable debt and we borrowed it with our A credit rating, purchase with credit enhancer to AAA enhanced to a lower interest rate. The market is not going to honor our triple A rating, as long as our interest rate will rise to what they would be – which will affect us probably to a couple of million dollars or more. We will be required to reissue that debt. The cost of such transactions will be another million dollars. We're talking about 3 or maybe 4 million dollars and as if that weren't enough we are involved, as you probably know, with a program of guaranteed starting loans to students, and then selling them to a lending agency. That generates for the institution about a million dollars. That million dollars is gone because the borrowing agencies are not allowing us to do that anymore. Again, the spinoff of a subprime debacle - nobody's fault here - but all of this together, you just heard me add up to another \$5 million of budgetary impact over which we have zero control. We could be looking at a pretty hard year ahead of us, and as I say we don't need against that background to create hypothetical scenarios or hypothesis in which to structure budget hearing conversation. We may be looking at it much worse than we expected and I felt that I needed to give you a quick heads up about all that. That is my obligation to you.

The second thing I want to speak of is the state's strategic plan. The Chancellor of the State of Ohio, a little over a year ago, reorganized the Regents of the State of Ohio, reporting directly to the Governor. During that year we've been hearing almost on a monthly basis reports that they are creating a strategic plan; creating a new strategic plan direction and that strategic plan will be announced, ruled out so to speak, next week I think on Wednesday, the 31<sup>st</sup>. This will be a fundamental set of changes. Notwithstanding the fact that the chancellor and the governor have been talking about his for a year, I think these changes go deeper than what is anticipated. What are some of the things that will change, or at least what are some of the things that are in that strategic plan, I'm going to read at least 3 of them for you. First, raise enrollment in colleges and raise graduation rates, keeping colleges affordable against the budget scenarios of which I just spoke. Second, play a major role in job training and the economic development of the State. Third, establish metrics for measuring accountability. Again I am going to read to you the introduction of the strategic plan presents the plan in a single sentence: "The state supports higher education because it contributes directly to the economic prosperity of our residents and the state as a whole." Let me just comment on that. We have had, I think, a legitimate, interesting and occasionally vociferous discussion at The University of Toledo for a year and a half or almost two years, about the relative value of various disciplines, the STEMM disciplines, vis-à-vis the Arts, whether performing or science or other Humanities, and while I have my opinions on that, it's clearly a step beyond where any of us are to that the State supports higher education, because it contributes directly to the State's economic prosperity. It does not say the State supports higher education only because it contributes directly to the economic prosperity, it does not say "only." The State's Strategic Plan goes on to say the responsibility of institution like UT to K-12 education to adult education, the strong statement of importance of connectiveness with a two-year programs, four-year complete degree completion programs, a strong statement of importance of distance learning and throughout this a repeated statement that the new method of implementation, the force of implementation will be budgetary force. These things will be measured and those measurements will be the driving parameters in the State's formulation. So all that adds up to a significant paradigm shift for a lot of you. I, believe in the purpose of higher education, while Max and I might disagree about the relative value of one discipline or another discipline, personal fulfillment a breadth of intellectual undertaking is certainly a part of what it is to be an educated person. We have done a huge amount of work in the area of economic development. The fundamental shift in

some of our beliefs about the purpose of education here in his document is not currently available. It will be available after the 31<sup>st</sup>. If you want this after that time I will be happy to supply it to you. If you want this synopsis that I'm holding, stop by my office. I wanted to mention those things to you to some degree contextualize. You asked me about the budget and I told you that the formulation of the budget at this point is terribly important for a number of reasons. Reason #1 is that this will be the first year it will be truly a budget as a single organization. I left the principles and practices intact so this year for the first time we will try to have a single budget formulation process. Therefore, across all colleges we will try to learn from one another and a good way in doing that is to have budget hearings and discussion of what strength and weaknesses, priorities and past practices are. Many institutions do this. Scott Scarborough will know what weaknesses and priorities in past practices are in all of our units, academic and other, and the way to frame those conversations are fairly common. The way to frame those conversations the way I was involved in for many years was to create a minus 10% scenario to use that as the beginning. I am serious about these discussions. I've said that I believe that the budget is the single most important tool for implementing the Strategic Plan. It is my intention to use every tool at my disposal to implement that Strategic Plan. Therefore, a budget discussion has to be connected to it. One more thing I wanted to share with you and that is the State's budgetary picture. Just last week this took a far greater degree of gravity.

Some of the questions sent to me are:

“What do you see as the role of the graduate education in Arts & Humanities? It is my understanding we don't have very much of that, and in fact we only have one Humanities PhD program, namely, in History. Will U.T. continue to offer PhD programs in these areas. I believe that one of the things imbedded in the Chancellor's strategic plan, if it happens I don't know, that every new program and course will be approved in Columbus, and not our own Board of Trustees. I think it will be awhile before we will staff PhD program in History. The Provost will be in charge and review that as well as other programs to look at the number of graduates, the contribution, the societal, the academics, literature contribution. The Strategic Plan states that the University of Toledo will be a transformative force for the world. What does that statement mean? In my mind this does not imply that we will only have impact on China or India, although we do. We will have an impact on Midwest Ohio and the world. It is our job, our mission to make life better for one another, and we do that. That is what Al Compaan is doing and others as well. I think people in the College of Education are doing. I think Sharon does that when she takes one person's life and changes in the University College. So what I mean by the word *transformative* is that we must carry out our mission on a daily basis in the way that is fundamentally altruistic, fundamentally related to human service, kindness.

**Senator Barnes:** I didn't ask the question, but I had a similar thought in my mind about what that means in the sense that I think there is a push to be stellar in a couple of areas. I primarily teach and I feel like I transform by my interactions with individuals, and maybe the question here is, “What is your vision with regard to that apparent possible contradiction [between overall excellent work and these “stellar areas”]?”

**President Jacobs:** For over thirty years my impact on the world was with a knife and a needle in my hand clearly not a world-wide impact but an impact on one human being. However, if that one human being's life can be made better by my administration or by yours, that changes the world. There are no non-participants in this battle either by hanging back, or by engaging, you still leave your imprint in the world.

**Senator Barnes:** I don't think it addresses that conflict between the programs that you wanted to be global stars and the potential neglect of others. That's my guess about what that person was thinking, because certainly I've had that thought.

**President Jacobs:** I thought initially you framed it, ‘what about those people who serve one human being at a time?’ A different question, ‘what about my constant harping for a couple of

years now on narrower and deeper and focus, and you can't be all things to all people. For an institution like ours to become great is to narrow our view to become great in one narrow area at a time. I'm absolutely convinced of that. So what does that mean for people who don't happen to be in solar energy or in one of those selected areas like microbiology or micro physiology or whatever does that mean that your work is of no value? Absolutely not. To the best of my knowledge I haven't said that. Several areas where we try to invest deeply and broadly I believe that in narrow investment, many people in higher education believe that focus is really important.

**Senator Barnes:** It depends on how you define greatness; if you are defining it in terms of what your community needs and if what they need is a B.A. to move up in the rank for job training there might be a case for high quality general education to be very useful and a great thing.

**President Jacobs:** That's true, we should support programs like that. On the other hand there are huge issues in our society, the war has gotten us very little and it cost us 4,000 lives, or the fact that we are rapidly running out of useable energy. The Wall Street Journal for the first time in over 40 years yesterday spoke of world overpopulation, we could discuss the fact that the economy is softening by the day. There is plenty for us to say what is the greatest most immediate need that the institution needs to serve. I am sure of one thing, and that is not trying to be all to all people, because that's what causes institutions to fail.

**Senator Barnes:** Is there a difference in your mind between trying to be all things to all people and offering a high class university experience for students in a sense that a really great university has to offer all the basics in order to be a world class institution, even if they have specializations where they particularly are outstanding?

**President Jacobs:** When I talk about focus I'm talking about research more than education. I do not think we need to offer every single course in the world. What we do have to do is define what it is that creates people who fulfill contributing altruistic people and try to cover that. My belief is that you can't have a fulfilled life with only one set of metaphor, one set of disciplinary thought frames. We clearly need to have breadth, and we don't need to do every thing.

**Senator Barden:** What do you think about tuition increase? I know we had good success last year with the billboards; it was very good for recruiting. Are we going to be able to do it again this year with the 0% tuition increase?

**President Jacobs:** As you know, we announced the 0% tuition increase and the whole state followed. And they followed it through both years of the biennium, and so unless something changes we will be held next year again to a 0% tuition. But that 0% tuition was predicated on that 8% increase that I thought we might not see. Let's say that 8% increase goes to 6, or 5, or 4 could this hold us to a 0% tuition? I don't know.

Can we do it next year? It would be doubtful. I don't think that we can afford it if the State doesn't keep up with its obligation.

**Senator Barden:** I have been reading indications that student loans will be getting harder to secure because of the sub-prime mortgage crisis as well. That could be a disaster.

**President Jacobs:** They are already harder to get. We processed over a million dollars in loans last year. We give them to students and sell them very reasonably but that program has already shut down.

Another questions, "Do you believe there is a gender equity problem at U.T.?" My answer is, 'Yes,' and we have not made much progress within last year addressing it, and I will try to address it.

**Senator Piazza:** My question is regarding that 10-5-5 budget planning we talked about earlier. In listening to some of the conversations going around can you clear up some of the confusion for me? The budget policies based on responsibility based budgeting meant that departments that were profitable would make money. The conversation going around now sounds more like a Strategic Plan based budget, and we are trying to reallocate resources and direct them to programs that are strategic in nature, how do you reconcile these two things? For departments making money under responsibility based budget approach, can we expect a lot of that money to return to the departments. Under the Strategic Plan approach if you are making money but you are not strategic

then that money will be taken and invested elsewhere in the University. Are we going to abandon the responsibility based approach for a while, or are we going to do a combination of the two?

**President Jacobs:** Yes, they are incompatible and different and in conflict to some degree. however, it is my hope to continue to formulate budget expenses for those colleges this year that don't have any large strategic change, it is my hope to do that next year, Yes, we are trying to do two things at once. Still, this is the year to try to make sure we are not unaligned strategically. We will continue to use the formulary budget. Hopefully we will improve on it.

**Chair Floyd:** Thank you Dr. Jacobs. Mary Ellen Edwards has three log items to report on.

**Senator Edwards:** The first item is Log Item 0708-2, **Student Grievance Council Rights and Responsibilities** and the charge was, "The executive committee asks the Academic Regulations Committee to look into what the rights and responsibilities of the Student Grievance council are, and whether the council can direct that the provost make grade changes as a result of a student grievance investigation." The current policy that governs the academic grievance procedure has been in place since 1999, and this is the very last section of the grievance policy and it says, "The Council's recommendation includes a request for action by faculty member within a 10-day period the faculty member shall inform the Student Grievance Council in writing and the Council shall forward copies of the faculty member's response to each of the persons listed, the chair, the dean of the college and the student. If the faculty member does not implement the recommendation of the Student Grievance Council, the Chair should see the Vice President for Academic Affairs which is the title of the Provost.

However, the Academic Grievance Council and the Provost would like to work with the Faculty Senate.

**Senator Barnes:** Do you know who is on the Grievance Council?

**Senator Edwards:** Right now I'm chairing the Grievance Council and this is my last year. There are five faculty members, four students presidentially appointed and members of almost all the colleges.

**Senator Wolff:** How many cases do you do a year?

**Senator Edwards:** Between one and two cases a year. The process calls for students to go to the faculty member first, then the department chair. If there is no resolution, all the colleges have grievance procedures before they come to the University Student Grievance Council. Most cases are settled at the departmental level.

**Senator Lipscomb:** Is this process different from that of other universities?

**Senator Edwards:** Good questions, but I don't know. Almost all universities have some kind of process like this. Sometimes there is an independent decision made at the Provost's level. The chair of the Grievance Council has no authority to make a decision, it is just a recommendation.

**Provost Haggett:** Change is then recommended?

**Senator Edwards:** That is a possibility. There could be an investigation at the Provost's level.

**Senator Barden:** We couldn't change the language since it's been adopted by the Board of Trustees.

**Senator Edwards:** No, but we could make a recommendation.

**Chair Floyd:** So, you have nothing for us to vote on?

**Senator Edward:** No.

The next Log Item, 0708-3, **Distance Learning Academic Honesty**. In this particular case the breadth is not the issue. Last year the Faculty Senate Executive Committee presented this to the Academic Regulations Committee. At that time last year when I did so, Distance Learning had a different academic honesty policy on its website that governed distance learning classes. They have since changed that. By September they had formed with the regular honesty policy that is in the college catalog. The Academic Regulations Committee that was looking at this at a number of

different schools, brought in a number of different articles written on the issue of academic honesty in distance education courses. They talked about different procedures for insuring testing, security, including test security for online testing and placement testing. This is an issue that a lot of people are looking at and discussing. Since the DL people had changed their policy to conform with the regular policy here at U.T., again the Regulations Committee has recommended that we do not do anything on this issue. However, we do want to recommend that the Center for Teaching and Learning presents something like a workshop for faculty on the issues of academic honesty because there are testing issues, security issues and plagiarism issues came on board in distance learning.

The last issue, Log Item 0708-5, **To address Admission Standards at The University of Toledo**, submitted by Debra Stoudt last May to change. The idea is to establish a minimum admission standards that require an unconditional admission to The University of Toledo for Fall Semester of 2009 of a grade point average (GPA) greater and equal to 2.0 and also an ACT score of 19 or greater. There has been some discussion about this by the committee and one of the things we found out that there was a work group looking at admission standards at The University of Toledo last year, and this work group ran the numbers on admission standards and found out if we put this policy in place if we accepted ACT score of less than 19 and GPA of less than 2.0, we would loose direct from high school 809 students. Basically if we, as of last year's class, 26% of the direct from high school students that would be admitted to The University of Toledo conditionally would not be required to have both, the GPA of 2.0 or greater and an ACT score of 19 or greater. The recommendation from that work group for admission standards was not to implement this decision of last summer 2007. I also spoke to Dennis Lettman about this issue and his concern is also that we should not change this at this time without further discussions on the impact and how the University College would deal with potentially 800-1,000 students who would in fact be sent to Access Programs in the University College. So the Academic Regulations Committee is asking to table this for further discussion and have all of the players involved in discussion of changing the admission standards. I am not sure if anybody here was on that admissions standards working group or not, it was chaired by Chris Habrecht from the College of Arts & Sciences.

**Senator Barden:** Do you need a vote from us to table this?

**Senator Edwards:** Yes.

**Chair Floyd:** So the recommendation is to table it for further discussion and study. All those in favor, please say, "aye." Opposed? None. The recommendation is tabled. Any other business? If not, can we have a motion to adjourn? Motion was made and seconded.

**V. Calendar Questions:**

**VI. Other Business:**

Old business: None

New business: None

**VII. Adjournment:** Meeting was adjourned at 5:00.

Respectfully submitted,

Alice Skeens  
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Kathy Grabel  
Faculty Senate Office Admin. Secretary