

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
FACULTY SENATE
Minutes of the Senate Meeting of January 22, 2008
<http://www.facsenate.utoledo.edu>

Approved @ FS mtg. on 2/19/08

HIGHLIGHTS

President Lloyd Jacobs
Kevin Kucera, Assoc. V.P. for Enrollment Services

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: Arris, Barden, Barlowe, Barnes, Chen, , Edwards (for Baines), Fink, Floyd, Fritz, Funk, Fournier, Greninger, Hefzy, Hamer, Horan, Johanson, Kennedy, Kistner, Le, LeBlanc, Lipscomb, Lundquist, McInerney, Monsos, Moorhead, Olson, Peseckis, Piazza, Piotrowski, Skeens, Stierman, Sundar (for Pope), Teclechaimanot, Thompson-Casado, Ventura, Wedding, Wikander,

Excused absence: Cluse-Tolar, Hottell, Martin, Morrissey, Wolff,

Unexcused absence: Ames (for Bischoff), Beatty-Medina (for Jakobson), Hudson, Lambert, Spongberg, Tierney (for Klein)

II. Approval of Minutes:

Minutes of January 8, 2008 were approved as distributed.

III. Executive Committee Report:

Chair Barbara Floyd:

We will revise the agenda today and I will give my Executive Committee Report after the President speaks to you and answers questions. Bill McMillen will pass out some information regarding the policy website.

V.P. McMillen: The policy website is up and running. There has always been a policy website that contained all of the policies for the University, but the new one is up which allows interactive comments on the policies. The research policies that came up at the last faculty meeting are now on that website. You click on them, read them and make comments on them, it's part of the grid, and it includes others policies that are up for review. You may know that I am chairing a policy committee that is dealing with all policies on campus as well as ones that need to be merged, ones that need to be updated and new ones coming in. The policy committee did not want to paralyze the policy process by introducing the ongoing process by this committee that will have to meet for a year or more. But the new policy website includes the new ones, revised ones, it all will be on this site. It can be a constant review with commentary. Emails have gone out and I prepared these cards that have the website address.

Chair Floyd: Some have asked who the members of the policy committee are, and are there any faculty members on it?

V.P. McMillen: There are not, and we would welcome any additions.

Chair Floyd: If we send you some nominations will you consider some faculty members on your committee?

V.P. McMillen: Yes.

Chair Floyd: Now, our first speaker, President Jacobs.

President Jacobs: Let me just make a comment. The policy committee does not make policies. You make policy, I make policy, the Provost makes policy, the chairs make policy, the Board makes policy. The purpose of this committee is to try to get the numbers right, to update them, and to work on literally thousands of policies that are yet unmerged between the two campuses. This committee is not to make policy but to support this massive undertaking, and, if I may, take even further step backward to conceptualize that undertaking. We are into eighteen months of a new institution, and while we have made a lot of progress, we still have a huge amount of work. What we have at this point is a year or more of reacting to the crisis of the day without creating some of the infrastructure that is required for institutional stability. We have three or four pieces of that institutional stability that the same committee is working on and we are trying to get these policies in order. There isn't one single organizational chart that is up to date. In my office I have seven or so inches of charts and I don't think there is a single page that is correct. I believe that all seven thousand people of this organization deserve to fit in those charts. In addition, institutional committees still are not merged and still not clear about their charge between the two campuses.

All that constitutes in my mind a part of what creates glue that holds this institution together and makes the institution stable. We are going to work hard this year to catch up. This is a huge job and if we get this done in a year, we will be lucky. So the policy committee is not making policy they are working on getting them in order. That was a way of digression and what I want to do is speak to you for just a few minutes and then take questions. But now I wanted to show you a PowerPoint and to point out some history. A very short time after the merger, we got a large group of people together, community members, faculty members, staff members, and others, asking them to begin thinking about a direction for The University of Toledo. In retrospect part of the reason was to begin the process of cultural integration and try and forge a common vision. The Strategic Plan was approved by the Board of Trustees on 3/19/07. I think it's a good document. Once again I want to thank the group of people who emerged as leaders in that process. They took upon themselves to say you can do better than this, and they did. I continue to be indebted to them. We have made progress in many areas outlined in this document and you can print it off the web. But right now I wanted to show you a couple of highlights

- I.2 Develop and implement innovative ways to integrate the knowledge and skills of STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics and Medicine, as defined by federal and state legislature) and related disciplines with liberal arts and broader humanistic traditions.

I think that's a high goal and Charlie Blatz is one of the people that did a tremendous job in the implementation work group.

- I.3 Strengthen the general education curriculum to emphasize university-level skill proficiency and a shared core experience. We will also enhance the relevance of the core to professional, science and technology programs.
- I.4 Implement innovative ways to integrate science and technology literacy throughout the curriculum as a pathway to full societal participation.
- I.5 Strengthen relationships between students and faculty through an increased commitment to student-centeredness.
- I.6 Develop selected degree-completion and certificate programs, both for transfer students and for nontraditional students, based on a careful analysis of regional economic needs and in collaboration with employers and two-year institutions.

- I.8 Employ the principles of engaged adult learning throughout the undergraduate programs.
- I.9 Establish college-specific selective admission standards in all colleges and innovative admission criteria where appropriate. We will establish a portal of entry and an educational process for students and meeting selective admission standards. The University also will support undecided students, those in individualized programs, and students with majors spanning multiple academic units.
- I.15 Expand the utilization of clinical/professional faculty in appropriate undergraduate disciplines focusing on the combination of teaching, applied research and community engagement.
- II.4 Integrate the University and the community to an unprecedented degree by seeking real world experiences and mentorship. Refine and strengthen relationships with regional, national and global institutions to align and strengthen educational objectives and outcomes.
- II.9 Advance the scope and effectiveness of our distance learning and educational information technology. We will develop cutting-edge electronic communities for graduate student learning and research.

I think in many areas of this Strategic Plan we have done very well, and in other areas we have done okay. I specifically call your attention to the areas where we are doing only okay and not moving as quickly as I would like to move. And if you could catch the theme that I chose to put on the screen, I think you will see that we have a common thread of undergraduate curriculum and common methodology in core curriculum. This is the theme I hope to emphasize about the undergraduate experience here at The University of Toledo. I think in the process of creating the Strategic Plan we agreed together between you, between ourselves, the Board of Trustees and the rest of the faculty to move along these specifications as outlined here. If we do not agree to that, this would be a good time to speak about it. I think we agreed and said, this is where we will try to go, and I want to ask you today to help me to move that forward a little more quickly.

We all need each other. We must be in the partnership together if we hope to accomplish a few more things that I intend to extract excerpts from the Strategic Plan. If we hope, therefore, to move along these vectors, we have to talk about working together and talk about partnership. It's important for me to say that I believe that the discussions between the Faculty Senate of this campus and the Faculty Senate of the other campus -- the Faculty Senate that was the original U.T., and the Faculty Senate that was MUO -- the fact that they are struggling and working hard, doing a good job to come together but have not yet, is a distraction to our accomplishment of these things. The fact that the administration and the Senate are not perfectly aligned yet, our interaction with one another not yet perfectly aligned, such as what is delegated to the Faculty Senate and who owns certain decision rights, is a distraction that is slowing us down in the accomplishment of some of these things. Because I want to move these things along, I would like to explore where we are, how we are doing and getting a set of documents that the administration can support, and the Board can approve. I have said to some of you, sometimes publicly and sometimes privately, the important thing is not whether we have one senate or two. I would like to see one senate I think we would be a better institution for it. The important thing is to try to do what we said we were going to do. Therefore, I want to propose to you that we push forward and see if we can find some solutions. We had a meeting with the senior leadership team and the Faculty Senate Executive Committees a few days ago and we begin to outline some approaches to try to break through some of these issues. I would like very much to continue that.

In a number of places, The University of Toledo as it's currently constituted, finds itself in a absolutely unique position. To the best of my knowledge no institution of higher education has ever

before in history, has found itself in a position of having to merge with a free standing health science university. That is absolutely unique. It puts us in a position, in my opinion, to do unique things and to find unique solutions, and to truly do some creative things. I would like to suggest that we turn some of that creativity and thought to figuring out how we can be certain that the discussions between the two Senates and between the administration and the Board does not distract us from going where we want to go.

I will try to summarize what I said:

We agreed in the Strategic Plan on the direction we want to go. If we still want to go there and if you agree with me that we have had some mountains to climb in terms of distractions, we should talk about that and see if we can find some common ground to see if we can move forward.

I understand much of what I talked about is based on trust, and I understand that I am new to many of you and that I am different from many of my predecessors. But after eighteen months, I have the sense that we are beginning to establish some trust between us. If not trust, at least predictability and if that's the case, we should discuss some of these issues to move this whole agenda forward. That is my hope and my desire and if our conversation here in the next few minutes can move this agenda, I should be very pleased. I will stop now and you may ask me questions about anything.

Prof. Andy Jorgensen: Moving forward and merging the two Senates would be a high priority. Let me speak of a sense of frustration I hear on a regular basis from faculty. Just because we have always done it that way is not necessarily the right way, similarly just because we have always done it that way, it's not the wrong way either. We have seen so many policies and individuals over the past eighteen months, that what has been done at the HSC is so much better than what was done on this campus. Whether it has to do with how we account for grants or how we submit maintenance requests. And this also has to do with personnel. The sense of what I'm hearing on this campus is that things were better over there and that the folks have come over here and straightened us out. And that's a terrible frustration and that is keeping us from moving forward in some of these areas. Another thing is the committee structure. We had a committee structure that wasn't perfect, it could have been trimmed down, but the fact is that everyone on this Faculty Senate was elected by the faculty in their respective colleges, and the executive committee was elected by the senators to speak for the faculty. They have certain prerogatives in the areas of curriculum but in other areas as well. We have lost some of that. And the sense of frustration is not helping the institution. It is very real.

President Jacobs: Chauvinism comes in different forms and I have no doubt that it exists on the HSC chauvinism and that has not served us well. Suffice it to say I recognize it and I have been extremely conscious of this phenomenon. You are correct that just because we have done something for so long it isn't necessarily right or wrong. On the other hand, the world is changing dramatically. We had the opportunities to look very carefully and make conscious decisions about whatever we have always done is the right way or the wrong way. Because of that I had to think that we had a unique opportunity and we should at least be open to careful examination of the habits and habit patterns and traditions that we all share. I am committed that we do some self examination of where we are. We do have an opportunity there. I think that comment is rich in connotation.

Senator Barnes: My question is about the undergraduate curriculum specifically. My perception is that's one of the issues standing in the way of the merged senates. I would like to know what is your position on who should be making decisions about the undergraduate curriculum?

President Jacobs: I think it's whether you are speaking of the formal legalistic way or whether you are speaking of every day, work-a-day sets of behaviors. In a formal, legalistic way the Board has responsibility. At this point the Board has delegated it to me and I would like to delegate it to Provost Haggett, to deans and to the Faculty Senate. In that sense this is clear in my mind. In an everyday, work-a-day world this has to come out of a pretty good partnership and cooperation between the main campus and the provost and the main campus Faculty Senate. But we have to

commit to one another that the main campus provost can lead those discussions as the convener, and ultimately what we're talking about is a distinction between input, between colleagues, between partnership and ultimately who holds the decision. If the legislature delegates this to the Board of Trustees, they can undelegate it. The Board of Trustees delegates it to you or me or us, they can undelegate it. So the ownership of the decision seems to sit squarely with the Board of Trustees; and if we were to sit down, you and I, and talk about what to delegate and what not to delegate, I suspect we could get over some of the issues in a hurry. On the other hand, if we take the attitude that the ownership is an ownership by divine right, we're probably never going to get there. So, we have to just make up our mind about how we conceptualize this thing. I would love to sit with Faculty Senate and other groups and talk about what should be delegated to Provost Haggett, or to you. As soon as we show up in the room with HSC chauvinism or a sense that certain curriculum decisions are owned by a divine right, we will never get there. That's the kind of conversation I think we have to get to.

Senator Olson: In years past there used to be a publication that every member of the faculty received that outlined who was on committees and who had the right to appoint people or elect people to those committees. That document has been gone for a few years. With the loss of that document, we have lost an understanding of what committees this university has or needs. It has put the faculty in a position that if they have an issue, they don't know where to take it. What is it going to take to reestablish the committee structure, albeit a different committee structure, that allows this university to function in a normal manner, and when are we going to get to a point about what decision rights rests where?

President Jacobs: Just a few minutes ago I committed to trying to get a list of committees and we will do that. We need to get the policies organized and committees organized, the clear delegations and the organization charts are a total mess. For the most of my time I have been dealing with crisis for the moment and I think this is the year we will be paying attention to those things. In my opinion there are the Faculty Senate committees, and it is entirely my opinion that it is your prerogative to set those. It may not be entirely in your prerogative to establish what it is that they deal with or the decisions that allow them setting them up. You may of course, set up any committee you want to, and as I read the collective bargaining agreement the nominations to committee membership from the Faculty Senate come from the Faculty Senate. However, I believe I have the right to appoint other people who are on the committee but are not necessarily Faculty Senate members. These are the kind of things why we are having these conversations to get these things cleared. So, even if we disagree, we know where we are coming from on some of these issues.

Senator Olson: I am not suggesting that you don't have the right to appoint people; you do have the right. But I also believe there are constituencies that have the right, but right now we just don't have that structure for something as simple as the research council. There are questions who appoints who to it.

President Jacobs: I agree that the documents and the committees and who appoints to them is exactly the work that we will undertake this year.

Senator Kennedy: I'm from the Law School. The greatest issue facing the University in my opinion is the retention of undergraduates. Is that a problem that hits the president's desk? If so, what does the president do with that problem?

President Jacobs: Yes, it is a very important problem that I am aware of that the retention rate from year one to year two is in the range of 68%. A couple of years ago it was higher than that, about 72%. I think this is a major problem. Your Provost is very much aware of the problem and has put together a group of people to try to understand where it is coming from and what can be done about it. I believe it's a significant problem. The first semester to second semester retention this year has improved a little from the previous year. I think that retention whether you use the parameter of first year to second year, or first semester to second semester it depends on a lot of things. It depends on excellence campus wide. It depends on whether or not we are successful in getting some restaurants and retailers along Dorr Street. It's a complex equation and I'm going to ask the Provost to make a comment on retention plans and efforts.

Provost Haggett: There is a small retention group that has been meeting over the semester. That group was charged by me to initially determine what are some of the factors affecting first and second year retention by looking at our own data. And we have learned a lot. This is a cross divisional activity representatives from my office, from Enrollment, Student Affairs, University College and others. We are now at the place where we are ready to start talking about action. We have studied it and now we need to do something about it and are putting together working groups. We will be very happy to have faculty involved in those working groups and we look forward to your participation.

President Jacobs: So is it not true that figures which just came in today or yesterday that retention from first semester to second semester shows some improvement from last year? What percentage of improvement? Do you happen to know?

Provost Haggett: If I'm remembering correctly it went from 86.8% to 87.1% this year. This 87.1% sounds really good but when we go from first year to second year retention, remember it's 68% so there is a lot that happens between first and second semester and first and second year. It has been the number one thing I have been working on since I have been here.

Chair Floyd: Going back to the committees. Has there been someone appointed whose responsibility it is to sort out the committee structure?

President Jacobs: The same group who is going to collate and catalog the policies will collate and catalog the committees. But I want to emphasize that it is not their job to decide what committees work or how those committees are populated. That work is your work and my work. It is their job to support and receive input. I think it's fair to say that they have been struggling with the policies the last couple of months and that they have not gotten very far down the road about how to deal with the committees. You will be a part of that. Bill, is that fair to say?

V.P. McMillen: Yes, the organization charts have somewhat a parallel path with what's working with the policies themselves. We can see some comparisons and how we have to do some merging and updating. The committee structure is somewhat different all the way around. There are some committees that are absolutely essential for persons to do their work, promotions and tenure for example. Other committees did their job and just died. So the committees are a different animal than the organizational charts, like the policies.

President Jacobs: There is some work done in the Provost's Office so maybe it needs to be farmed out at least for starters. It would be a lot easier to farm this out if the Faculty Senates were by now one. Otherwise we have to worry about duplicative structures. But I think it sounds like it's moving. To get that all straightened out, there are four elements of it: organization charts, policies, committees and delegation to the appropriate levels in the organization are essential to making people feel comfortable in an organizational life. I fully recognize and consciously chose that that's not the area that we would emphasize during the first year, and it's now time to turn our attention to it.

Chair Floyd: One area I want to bring up and which we discussed extensively at our last Senate meeting is the proposed changes in policies regarding research. The concern expressed by this Senate was that there is a Research Council representing all colleges and disciplines, where it would seem that those policies would originate from. Instead, what happened was it was top-down. What happens in situations like this is it causes people to think the worst of the administration and if somehow we could avoid future mistakes like this, it would be an advantage to all of us.

President Jacobs: I hear you and appreciate your point, but can't say that I fully agree. I think if we are going to work together and survive in the rapidly changing emotion filled world that we find ourselves in, we need to try to set aside those anxieties. Whether policies come from this campus to that campus or suggestions, if we bound ourselves together to look at the content more necessarily than the origin, does this content serve us? I frankly think we have a better chance of being where we want to be concentrating on those issues of policies and committees. We must survive in what constitutes a very difficult world, from the state level to federal government. Dramatic changes are already happening and without exaggeration suggest that the primacy of the United States in terms of being the educational leadership is seriously threatened in the world. I would implore you and me to try to be sensitive to one another and not be Main Campus chauvinist or the HSC chauvinist, or the

Scott Park Campus chauvinist, and to look at the content as much as we possible can. Never mind, Barb, that I'm sensitive to those policies that were enacted on the other campus before they were enacted here. I would like us to focus on that content and not necessarily how they got in front of you.

Senator Wedding: Focusing on the content, the policy we are talking about was turned down 34:1 by the Senate and one of the issues is not where it came from, but the content. The policy evokes 37CFR Federal Regulation Part 50, and when you read that it actually talks about Health & Human Services and public contracts and grants. Obviously you need such a policy on campus but and if it's labeled like that, you should not try to bring it over and apply it across the entire campus for all disciplines and all contracts. It is a specific policy based on a specific part of a federal code regulation. Also, when you read the policy it looks like they extracted and later added other stuff in there that is not really in the policy. They took the coded federal regulation and brought it and said, we are going to follow that under this contract, that would have been fine. But you have gone a lot further and not identifying the source where it came from other than the citations.

President Jacobs: That's why it's on the web and I appreciate the input. I probably won't remember your citation. Give us that feedback on the web, you all can contribute to that feedback, whether it's coming from regional counsel, senators, individuals, from colleges, from provost's office. To the best of my knowledge every one of those policies will be posted for a commentary for a period of time. I appreciate the input.

Senator Olson: What is the approval process for policies?

President Jacobs: I believe it's fair to say it is still an evolution. One of the problem is this whole issue of delegation. There are hundreds of thousands of them. On the HSC, policies get approved by the medical staff. The policies that get approved by the librarian, by the chief of police, and the approval process on any give policy is part of what this committee and the lawyers are trying to do even as we speak. In general, I can pledge to you that you will certainly be an input on the undergraduate curriculum, core curriculum, admission standards. We are not posting on the web the policy for library fines, for example. It has to rise to a certain level of the institutional interest. We will post all of these and you are more than welcome to comment on the policy fines, or whatever. The short answer to your question is, there is no single approval process.

Senator Olson: On policies where faculty are the stakeholders, other than the web, is there any other review process that insures that the policy has been reviewed by the faculty before implementation?

President Jacobs: They will all go through the Provost. I pretty much commit that no policy and anything to do with faculty will ever be approved without going to the Provost.

Senator Olson: Is there a faculty body that will review this?

Provost Haggett: Every policy has to start somewhere and as the president said, every policy that has to do with faculty will involve the Provost. I will make sure that every policy involving the faculty is brought to the attention of the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee and I have a monthly meeting and I will make sure that the Faculty Senate is well aware of this and that the person, whoever it is, gets brought to the Senate meeting for discussion of policy.

V.P. McMillen: The policies on the website all have a slot saying who is the owner, who is the responsible person. It couldn't get on the website unless it had a responsible person.

Senator Thompson-Casado: I did get on that website and one thing on that website was the policy for Media Relations on the Main Campus and it said that faculty were expected to notify someone in the administration, if they spoke to the media. I am not aware that was our policy before, and it was already listed as passed and approved.

V.P. McMillen: I don't know.

President Jacobs: So give input. If you think that's a good idea, please say so.

Senator Thompson-Casado: It was listed as approved on January 8, 2008.

President Jacobs: They will all be up there for thirty days, whether passed or not passed, for your input and commentary, and whether it's a good policy or bad policy, you are welcome to comment.

Senator Thompson-Casado: I appreciate your willingness for input but I think something like this that deals with the faculty should not be up to the individual faculty to find the time to go on the web and look up these things. These are issues that need to be brought to the faculty.

President Jacobs: This is the web world. Posting policies on the web is what the NIH does, what the federal government does, what the state government does. I know it's comfortable to have them to put it down on paper and cue up for the Faculty Senate to consider. Frankly, that's not how the world operates these days. We are going to have to agree to some amount of interaction at some type of web based level. We are going to get through this. If we didn't do that it is a hopeless undertaking to try to deal with thousands of policies that are already outdated, and we are already behind and not to mention the stack of organizational charts, and committees. We have got to find new ways to expedite these processes and try to give you heads up if you are a specific stakeholder.

Senator Hefzy: First, I have a comment that I would like to share with the President of the University and the Faculty Senate, and then I have a question for the President.

I would like to share a positive experience that is related to the PhD degree in Biomedical Engineering. This is truly a joint degree between the College of Engineering and the College of Medicine. As I have said many times before, when two organizations merge together it is like a marriage. You need to be able to listen to each other and understand why each partner may be acting differently. If you do not do that, both parties will face a lot of frustration. A joint committee composed of faculty from both campuses was formed to administer this degree. My colleagues Dr. Patricia Relue from Engineering and Dr. Michael Bisesi from Health Science Campus continue to provide a positive leadership role on this committee. During the early stages of committee meetings of the joint PhD in Biomedical Engineering there was a lot of frustration. There are one or two PhD programs at the Health Science campus. Consequently their operation is less involved than that of the Main Campus where there are many more PhD programs to monitor. Members of the committee of the Health Science campus kept saying: "This is how we do things," and those of the Main Campus kept responding: "This is also how we do things." It was not until everyone on the committee agreed that the best approach is to first listen to each other and then, understand why each entity is doing things in a different way. Once this was accomplished, it was realized that in order to have a joint program under one umbrella of the College of Graduate Studies, the procedures on the Health Science campus needed to be modified to be more in line with those procedures practiced on the Main Campus. Assigning a specific section number for each mentoring faculty member is one example. So, initially there was a lot of frustration in achieving progress. Once everybody on the committee was willing to listen to each other with an open mind to understand the reasons for different practices, much progress was achieved. This is not easy, but we need to keep working with this frame of mind.

Now my question to the President on behalf of the committee. The administration promised support to provide a specific number of assistantships to be awarded to students joining this joint program in PhD in Biomedical Engineering. When the proposal was submitted to OBOR, the administration committed a specific number of additional teaching assistantships to be provided to those students. We have not yet received any funding for these assistantships and some faculty committee members from the Health Science campus are saying that there is no such commitment from the University.

President Jacobs: I don't know the answer to your question but we will have to focus on it. I am going to ask the Provost to sort out what exactly that is, and maybe I can then get an answer to you. Sorry, but right now I just don't know exactly what's that about at this point.

Senator Piazza: In the past we have had a number of disagreements over these policies and one of the things that the Senate can do, now that there is a website, is track those policies deserving a review or a comment, and for myself, I would like to know how would you like us to comment on this, whether we disagree or endorse what you are proposing. And how do we achieve some sort of resolution of differences, if in fact these policies are going to be available.

President Jacobs: Great question. I think there is space on the website to respond. And if you want to make sure that I personally see it, you are welcome to send me an email. I won't always be able to be on the website to read every comment but I do read every email I get.

Senator Piazza: How do you want the Senate to respond?

President Jacobs: Bill, do you have an answer to that?

V.P. McMillen: I would like to make a comment about that and to clarify. The policy committee was never created to act on a policy. If a vice president sent a policy in and said this is what happened with the research policy, and this is the policy to be introduced as a policy for the institution. The policy committee's job was to find a way to make sure this policy was put in a proper place and if it conflicted with another policy on the campus. By the time it got to the submission of by the vice president, the policy committee was assuming that it had been vetted by the proper channels just as the media policy. We weren't acting as a body that said, "This is a bad policy." We were acting to see if there was a conflicting policy. In other words we did not want to interrupt the flow of being vetted or being analyzed. We are a policy committee to put in place a better system. So your commentary that will end up on the policy website, will be an after the fact commentary. If the policy has gone to the website it had to go through a process of vice presidents, the Provost, etc.

President Jacobs: It's also true that we are committed to take input after they have posted thirty days, and you are welcome to identify yourself as an individual or if speaking for the Faculty Senate and think the policy is stupid or whatever, then suggest that it be changed. That would be entirely appropriate.

V.P. McMillen: What's on the website is still a draft. It came up there through a vetting process of somebody.

President Jacobs: Did we answer your question, Nick?

Senator Piazza: It sounds like if a Senate resolution that voted 35 for it, that could be put on it too.

President Jacobs: I'm not sure I agree with that, but will take that as input and if any constituent body has voted 34:1, that's clearly important input and you can email me that, but I am not sure that I want that necessarily to be a part of the process.

Senator Wedding: My comment going back to the content. You cannot take a policy from one federal agency, like HSHS, NIH, NSF, Department of Defense, and try to make it generic to fit this campus because it will start conflicting with other agencies. Each one of these agencies has its own set of rules and those policies when you put them forth, should have a preamble, this applies to contracts with NSF or NIH. That's where you are making a mistake is when you leave that out and suddenly bring this policy in as a generic policy from a specific source, it's going to cause problems.

President Jacobs: That's a reasonable thought and I wish you would avail yourself to comment on the web or send me an email. I invite that and try to create a mechanism where an adequate input is listened to and where we have less paperwork.

Senator Don Wedding: But you have lawyers. Somebody who is drafting these, legal counsel should know where they get it from and simply put it into a preamble.

President Jacobs: A reasonable point.

Senator Barlowe: One of the issues that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee has been talking about this year is evaluation of deans. In fact, a committee was formed that included Barbara and some other faculty members and administrators to update the instrument for dean evaluation. As you know, there have been some problems with the instrument that the committee put together, but my question is broader. You talked about what you thought administration evaluation should do. How often, and how we might go about that process?

President Jacobs: That 360assessment is a powerful tool for personal growth. I was at a institution where every one, every faculty and administrator had a form of a 360° feedback approach. Some months ago I suggested an outside consultant or even an outside firm to do that. I think the process belongs to me for the Provost and Provost for the deans, and so forth. The process clearly belongs to the line of authority over those people. The process of assessing administrators, again, not to stress the legal side necessarily in ownership but it should be owned by the next person in the

administrative chain of command. Should it be facilitated? Sure. How often? The annual feedback is good for all of us. So those are some of my thoughts on the subject.

Senator Barlowe: So what participation would faculty have in evaluating administrators?

President Jacobs: Depends on how it's set up. The process should be owned and clear of methods and 360° feedback should be established. Some of these methodologies have the same instrument for all four directions. Some of them have a different instrument for all four directions but I think the process should be owned. Let me go in a different direction. We are not going to get where we want to go together and you are not going to achieve the dream and purpose at The University of Toledo, and I am not, unless we lighten up a little bit. You are quick to take umbrage and are hypersensitive to slights, excessively legalistic. When I come to meet with you next year, it is my hope that we will speak of our dreams and goals. I think we made some distance in coming to trust one another and we made some distance in the Strategic Plan and made some dreams for the institution and for one another. We must have a little thicker skin and be a little less offended and little less sensitive to chauvinism that occurs in big institutions, like this one. I acknowledge Andy's comment. We've got to be a little more free and open in our interchanges and less legalistic in our interchanges, or we will never get where we want to go. The fundamental thing I want to say to you today, and I framed it, and said look at the Strategic Plan. It's a great Strategic Plan. It has great ideas in it. Great direction. It constitutes dreams and aspirations for all of us, and then we spent thirty minutes on formulated legalistic kind of stuff. I would like to suggest that all of us, me and you and Rosemary and Bill McMillen, and everyone, try to establish a set of interactions, a little freer, a little more open and more open to criticism, a little less sensitive to umbrage, as I said that would make life a whole lot better for all of us. I want to encourage you to give some thought how one works to create such a sense of interchange of partnership together. So, that's the fundamental message I wanted to deliver today. Let me close by having it restated again and look forward to seeing you again next year or any time during the interval you choose to invite me. Let there be no mistake, I'm dedicated to you and dedicated to the institution and I believe if we all lighten up a little, we all will move a lot more pleasantly. Thank you for inviting me.

Chair Floyd: Thank you Dr. Jacobs. Now I would like to go back to the Executive Committee report, catch up on some items from the last meeting, as well as report on some other issues that have come up. In regards to the research policies, as you know I sent a memo to Doug Wilkerson outlining what our specific concerns are, in what I hope was a constructive manner, and Dr. Wilkerson did thank me for those comments so I'm assuming that those will be taken into account, and hopefully these policies are amended before they are finalized. Does anybody have any comments about the memo that I have sent? I wanted to make sure that we cataloged our concerns and expressed them in a way that would be useful to us.

Secondly, back to the issue of performance reviews of administrators. As you might remember, last time I reported that a task force had been put together consisting of the dean of the College of Business, the vice president for administration, the two chairs of the Faculty Senate, and a faculty member in the College of Business to draft a process by which we could move forward with the evaluation of administrators, particularly deans, as soon as possible. We agreed as a task force that we would go forward this year with the instrument that was developed jointly by faculty and the administration three years ago, and we haven't had an evaluation of deans in three years. Our recommendation was forwarded to the provosts and the provosts have commented on it. One of the suggestions from the provosts that I was concerned about is that the evaluation of administrators would happen only once in their contract, and it would happen at the end of the contract. My concern, as I have expressed to the provost, is that I think that it is important that faculty be able to alert the provost to concerns about certain aspects of a dean's administrative performance, and the assessment really ought to be formative, and we ought to allow ways to provide feedback in a constructive manner that can yield improvements in any particular area in which we see weaknesses. The task force is supposed to meet again, it is supposed to review the Provost's comments, and I'm

going to continue to urge the committee to forward on to the president's our recommendations that this get underway as soon as possible. It has been 3 years since we've had an evaluation of the deans and during that time, they have had extensions on their contract and we have yet to provide any feedback in the past 3 years. Does anyone have any comments on that?

Senator Thompson-Casado: Do you need a resolution from this body?

Chair Floyd: Not at this point, I think that, if you agree, I will go back to the committee and say it is the strong opinion that we really want to go forward with this. I know the Executive Committee feels very strongly about this and I guess we could always do our own evaluation but I would hate for that to be the case. Of course an evaluation that is part of a larger administrative evaluation process has much more credibility with those who are looking at it than if we simply went ahead and did the evaluation ourselves.

Senator Thompson-Casado: What are the primary points of resistance? Because I'm evaluated every semester by my students and I read those evaluations before I plan my syllabi for the next semester so that I can improve my performance.

Chair Floyd: I will let the provost speak to that if you don't mind.

Provost Haggett: I was asked to comment on the proposal and I shared my comments back with Barb based on my own personal experience and what I've known from other institutions and what I know happens nationally. First let me say before I talk about my comments that I totally endorse, as the president said, 360° evaluation and I believe my comments began with that endorsement. Also, I am not at all questioning the need for evaluation of administrators, myself included. I have several comments however on what was proposed, one was on the frequency, I felt that given the intensity of a good evaluation that every other year was not necessary. And yes I did propose, at least once during the contract period. As Barb and I have had subsequent conversations about that, as I've told Barb, this is not a "draw a line in the sand," kind of issue for me. I'm sharing my opinion with you.

I also felt that the instrument could contain some additional questions that looked at other aspects of leadership that I believe are very important, particularly where I would want to see input on the deans who report to me, and I don't remember what those are off the top of my head but there was a handful of them. I suggested we may want to add questions about leadership. I also said, if this is truly going to be a 360° evaluation, we need to include the opportunity for other stakeholders to contribute to this evaluation. Students, external constituents of a college, peer deans, other administrators, and so I suggested that there be an opportunity for others to participate in this evaluation process. And another suggestion that I made from my own personal prior experience is that it would be helpful if we have some sense of the level of interaction that the respondent has with the person that they are evaluating. Is this someone that you interact with on a daily or monthly basis? Do you have personal interaction with this person on a regular basis? And how long have you known this person? That's my opinion.

Chair Floyd: I believe one of the concerns is that this evaluation needs to be a formative evaluation and not something that happens at the end of a contract year to decide whether or not this person continues. By not having this formative assessment, a lot of anger can build up in a college where you could have a vote of "no confidence" rather than an assessment that might produce a better dean. So that was my concern that once every five years was not frequent enough.

Other issues – the attendance policy reminder that went out to faculty – it's not a new policy. For students who have not attended classes for a long time, you need to let the Registrar's Office know so they can contact those students and so that they can understand that it is their responsibility to withdraw from classes. This is the policy approved by this body back in 2006.

Senator Fink: I think it's a fine policy. I just had a student miss a week and a half of classes because he had the flu, but it's unclear to me how many classes they have to miss before reporting.

Chair Floyd: I think what happens is when you report these people to the Registrar's Office, they tell them they need to get in touch with the faculty member or drop the class. That's the intention of having to report these things.

Prof. Jorgensen: It relates to financial aid policy, we don't have an option in this. In the third week you must say who has never attended our class. Never means never. If they have never attended in three weeks, they will have serious financial aid problems. By the ninth week you ask the student to withdraw by the 10th. It actually asks you about a date that they stopped attending. You can put this in the syllabus that if you miss for four weeks, I am going to report you for not attending. You do have to send this in and it's a major consequence with financial aid.

Senator Fink: I'm thrilled to do it. I keep track of attendance and I frequently send my own email asking them if there is anything wrong and if there is anything that I can help with. I think there would be a better response from the faculty if there was some increased clarity concerning how many times a student must miss class to qualify for the "stop attending" category. Some professors are afraid if they do report students as not attending that their financial aid will be taken away. What is your idea, Provost, how many classes they have to miss to be reasonable before reporting them?

Provost Haggett: I am delegating this question to Carol Bresnahan.

Vice Provost Bresnahan: To me it's not the number of classes, because some classes meet three times a week, some twice and some once. What does your enrollment look like on the first day of the third week, that's the deadline financial aid needs and we need an accurate count of our students. Financial aid might be taken away, but that's a federal regulation. If we don't report this accurately, then we get in trouble with the feds. I remember seeing last semester, or maybe a year ago, a letter that the Registrar sent to faculty that they need to report this, and it was pretty clear and we want to make sure it was sent repeatedly.

Chair Floyd: There was an email sent out this morning regarding a new position for a special assistant to the Provost. The email asked people to apply for this position. These are one or two semester appointments to work in the Provost's Office on special projects. The applications are due February 29. If this is something you are interested in doing, I urge you to do so.

Lastly, about the rules and appendices: we have scheduled two open forums for faculty to provide input on the rules and appendices. The rules and appendices do not have to be approved by the entire faculty but only the Faculty Senates, so we want to make sure we offer the opportunity for people outside the Senates to provide us input into the rules and appendices. I will send out an email to all faculty in the morning. The two open forums are:

- Monday, January 28, 2008, 2:00-3:00 pm, SU-2584
- Tuesday, January 29, 2008, 3:00-4:00 pm, SU- 2592

Please let your colleagues know about this.

The minutes of January 8, 2008 were approved as distributed.

Senator Barden: Just a question, how is the Graduate Council merging? It is moving along a parallel track with Faculty Senate?

Chair Floyd: I am not a member of the Graduate Council but I understand that they are trying to construct their bylaws. Max Funk is on the council, can you please update us?

Senator Funk: Last Spring semester both faculties approved a new constitution. I have volunteered to serve on the committee that drafts the new bylaws. We need additional members. So we are a little behind.

Senator Barden: So, do you think it will happen by the end of the semester?

Senator Funk: We are planning to do that.

Senator Barnes: Just a comment, the advice to "lighten up" when we are trying to raise serious issues of deep concern to people, does not come across as being dedicated to us or to this institution. I want to say how really disappointed I was in that.

Chair Floyd: Speaking only as a faculty member we seem to be operating on two tracks: we are trying to go forward in strategic directions while the operational issues of the institution are very much uncertain. That's my personal comment.

Senator Barden: I would like to add that the President's comment implies that our objections to the policy process he is imposing is personal. It's really not personal, it's about the principle of faculty governance at The University of Toledo. To tell us to lighten up is in affect to tell us to stop doing the job we were elected by our colleagues to do. We are obligated to push back when we feel he is bypassing faculty governance. We shouldn't stop doing that. No matter how it's couched, light or heavy, we have an obligation to fight for faculty governance at every turn. We believe in it deeply, and I thought President Jacobs believed in it as well. Now I'm having doubts.

Senator Thompson-Casado: The best way to pass an issue through the Faculty Senate is cooperation between the administration and faculty, and not by trying to ram it down our throats.

Senator Wikander: The expression to "lighten up" trivializes our concern and is disrespectful.

Senator Johanson: As a person who has been called by the press and asked for opinions about four times in the past two months, I think that when we are told that we must check with the higher ups, it smacks a little bit of repression of our freedom of speech, and we should watch out.

Chair Floyd: I think we need to go back and look at that policy.

Tobin Klinger: As one of the authors of that policy it's not at all the intent that there is an expectation that you call me before you talk, I apologize. It's to encourage you to do so, so that we can showcase and build on our expertise.

Senator McInerney: With all due respect, whatever the process of developing and examining policies we have a public pronouncement that they are policy, then we have someone saying the verbiage is wrong, we didn't mean that. It doesn't make a whole lot of sense. If they said exactly what they meant to say, we wouldn't have this discussion.

Tobin Klinger: I will have to read it again.

Senator Thompson-Casado: The point is that it is not just this policy, but rather administrators and faculty who work together to develop these policies so that we don't write something that's objectionable. Why can't we work together to build these?

Senator Barnes: Because we were just told to lighten up.

Chair Floyd: Your comments will be relayed through the minutes of the Faculty Senate and we will make sure the Executive Committee continues this conversation with the Provost and the President.

Provost Haggett: My comment is that I haven't had the opportunity myself to see the policy, and what I would like to do is look at it myself and discuss it with my colleagues in Media Relations, as Tobin said, and I would like for you to give me the opportunity to review it and then report back to you at your next meeting.

Chair Floyd: Sounds good, thank you very much. The next speaker is Kevin Kucera who will talk to us about enrollment and deregistration.

Assoc. V.P. Kucera: Last Spring 2007, our undergraduate FTE count was only one student greater than spring 2006. I am pleased to report today that our spring 2008 undergraduate FTE is 446 (or 3.4%) students greater than last year. In addition, the graduate FTE is up 1.3%. This is our fourth consecutive semester of increased enrollment. It is nice to see the momentum is gaining and moving in the right direction. Our overall headcount for both Main and Health Science Campus is 19,706 compared to 19,265. This represents a 2.3% increase.

To view the PP presentation, click on this icon, or go the Faculty Senate website, www.facsenate.utoledo.edu



fss00cv02.utad.utole

Senator Barden: That was both undergraduate and graduate combined?

Assoc. V.P. Kucera: Yes.

Senator Fink: How does the headcount numbers get used in other kinds of planning activities? Does this go into planning the number of classrooms needed or the total number of parking spots we must have for students to get a spot in a reasonable time frame? I already have a number of students who are very stressed because they have circled and circled looking for parking spaces and have to come to class late. Is there a point where, if the enrollment keeps growing, that the University will invest in more parking garages?

Assoc. V.P. Kucera: The University has a master plan, which outlines opportunities for additional parking. There is a task force co-chaired by Provost Haggett and Vice President Burns that is reviewing our academic and physical plant needs as we move toward our goal of 20,000 undergraduate students.

Senator Fink: If we are successful in changing some of the flow rates and less students leave UT, we have to be ready to provide quality service if we wish to maintain improvement in retention rates. I'm sure you are already thinking of these things.

Assoc. V.P. Kucera: Our enrollment management plan puts equal emphasis on recruitment and retention strategies. Student satisfaction with academic programming, residence hall environment, and extra-curricular programming are all very important elements to our increase in student retention. In addition, changes to our billing practices, including the elimination of deregistration, continue to place the emphasis on student satisfaction.

Unidentified speaker: The increase in enrollment, how much of that can you attribute to increase in first year admission as opposed to better retention?

Assoc. V.P. Kucera: It's a combination of both. Our freshman class this fall was 427 students greater than the previous year. As of today, the second semester return rate for this cohort is 1.1% greater than last year as noted by Provost Haggett. I believe it is quite feasible to see the freshman to sophomore retention percentage increase from 68% to 70%.

Senator Fink: Do you separate retention rates for those people who live on campus from those who live off campus?

Assoc. V.P. Kucera: Yes. We review both on campus and off campus retention rates.

Senator Barden: Are there any correlation between these students' academic profile and background and their first semester success?

Assoc. V.P. Kucera: The academic profile plays a significant factor in the retention rate. Another factor of equal importance is the financial ability of the student/family to afford the education experience. Financial ability to pay and academic preparation are critical elements of retention success.

Senator Peseckis: Since we are having a recession, what impact does that have on enrollment?

Assoc. V. P. Kucera: When the national economy moves toward recession, you tend to see an increase in university enrollment for non-traditional student enrollment. As for traditional students, I believe we have strategically positioned UT to enhance their opportunity to enroll. The zero percent tuition increase, combined with increases in scholarship dollars will continue to make UT a great and affordable option.

Senator Fink: Everything you said about the recession I agree with, but often scholarships are based on how well we do with our investments.

Assoc. V. P. Kucera: The majority of our scholarship funding comes from general revenue as opposed to endowment. An increase in our scholarship budget will be offset by an increase in enrollment.

Senator Barden: You made a financial commitment earlier this year than you have in the past. When do you think we will start to see the results?

Assoc. V.P. Kucera: Merit-based scholarship offers go out the door in the fall, and financial aid offers go out in the early spring, which incorporate FAFSA data into the package. Students and families make decisions upon receipt of these financial aid packages. Thus, we have several months to continue to cultivate the relationship with our applicant pool before we see final results.

Senator Fink: We started the new recruitment program with advertising, and I personally like the ads. In the past, we seem to have very little dollars for advertising. Will there be an increased budget for advertising this year?

Assoc. V.P. Kucera: Thank you, Senator Fink, for your positive comments on our advertising campaign. Our business plan has placed a greater emphasis on advertising throughout the State of Ohio and our new push into Michigan. With the proximity of metropolitan Detroit, we are excited to welcome these Michiganders to UT. I hope all of you will have the opportunity to stop at the Student Union on February 1, to see WJR Detroit morning show host, Paul W. Smith, host his program live from our Union. Thank you for the opportunity to visit with you today.

Chair Floyd: Any old business?

As a reminder, Bill McMillen said if any faculty members would like to serve on the policy committee he is more than happy to have them join the committee, so if any of you are interested, or if your colleagues are interested, I will pass the names along to him.

Any new business? If not, can we have a motion to adjourn?

Motion was made and seconded.

V. *Calendar Questions:*

None

VI. *Other Business:*

Old business:

New business:

VII. *Adjournment:* Meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Alice Skeens
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Kathy Grabel
Faculty Senate Office Admin. Secretary