

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
FACULTY SENATE
Minutes of the Senate Meeting of February 19, 2008
<http://www.facsenate.utoledo.edu>

Approved @FS mtg. 3/11/08

HIGHLIGHTS

President of Board of Trustees
Chair of Faculty Affairs Committee
Chair of University Affairs Committee

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

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

I. Roll Call –2007-2008 Senators:

Present: Ames (for Bischoff), Barden, Barlowe, Barnes, Beatty-Medina (for Jakobson), Chen, Cluse-Tolar, Edwards (for Baines), Fink, Floyd, Funk, Fournier, Horan, Hottell, Johanson, Kennedy, LeBlanc, Lipscomb, Lundquist, Martin, McInerney, Monsos, Morrissey, Olson, Peseckis, Piazza, Piotrowski, Relue, Rouillard (for Kistner), Schall, Skeens, Spongberg, Stierman, Sundar (for Pope), Teclehaimanot, Tierney (for Klein), Thompson-Casado, Ventura, Wedding, Wikander, Wolff,

Excused absence: Fritz, Greninger, Hefzy, Lambert, Moorhead,

Unexcused absence: Arris, Hamer, Hudson, Le,

II. Approval of Minutes:

Minutes of January 22, 2008 and February 5, 2008 approved as distributed

III. Executive Committee Report:

Chair Barbara Floyd:

Faculty Senate Executive Committee Report
February 19, 2008

As you know, there was another tragic and senseless killing on a university campus last week, this time at Northern Illinois University. Student Government has organized a vigil for this Thursday at noon in the Ingman Room of the Student Union to honor those students who lost their lives. I would urge any of you who are available at that time to attend. Such tragedies as those that happened at Virginia Tech University last year and NIU last week are not just the tragedies of those campuses, but they affect all of us who believe that universities should be places of freedom and not fear. I urge you to attend and show the students that we, as faculty, understand that the loss of student lives to such violence is our burden and our sorrow as well

At this time I would like to introduce Rick Stansley, Chair of the Board of Trustees.

Richard B. Stansley, Jr.
Board of Trustees Chairman
Comments at Faculty Senate Meeting
February 19, 2008

I want you all to know that it is truly a great pleasure for me to be here with you today. I always look forward to the all too infrequent opportunities that I have to discuss Board activities with members of the faculty in a forum that allows for a healthy dialogue. But before we start our dialogue, I would ask that you bear with me for a few minute so that I might briefly summarize my observations of the significant changes that have occurred at our University over the course of the last 10 years, and to share with you my hope for our Institution in the years to come.

I was appointed to the University of Toledo's Board of Trustees in February of 1999. As a new trustee I was excited to serve one of the great institutions of our community not just because of the opportunity to provide public service but also for what I could learn by being involved and interacting with people that I knew to be much smarter than myself. I would like you all to know I have not regretted one moment since. My service and time spent here at the university or on university business has been and is to this day very fulfilling and meaningful. Many times it is hard to recognize significant beneficial change as it is happening. It is in reflection when we look at where we were... and are able to compare that to where we are today... that we understand with clarity the importance and the purpose for the process of change. It is within that context that I share with you my observations.

It was shortly after my initial trustee orientation that I realized that service to the University would not be a walk in the park -- and that would be putting it mildly. My numerous requests for a copy of our strategic plan went unanswered. It was later explained that the strategic plan had been developed some seven years before and it had been "completed"; therefore, I shouldn't need a copy of it. Not only was I surprised by the lack of an active strategic plan, I was shocked by the statement and the concept that a strategic plan could ever be "completed" but nevertheless I pushed forward trying to take in as much as I could concerning the intricacies of the institution. It was reported to me that our financial condition was marginal, at best; the University as described by the CFO at the time was "spending itself into oblivion." I was provided a series of charts and graphs to demonstrate what was so simply stated with the caveat that he was glad to be retiring because he wasn't sure what could be done to help the situation that we were in. In those first couple years, financial exigency was discussed on more than one occasion. As a matter of fact, if my memory serves me correctly, I believe our SB 6 ratio was the second worst of all State institutions. What was more disturbing than the current financial condition was the lack of an articulated plan to address the problem. The Board was presented meeting after meeting with cost cutting measures and one-time savings to fill the never ending budget gaps. And that ladies and gentleman was clearly not the worst of the issues confronting us. I learned that the University was in the final stages of an early retirement buyout program that when offered to our faculty in conjunction with controversial administrative leadership at the time stripped the institution of two very valuable assets. First and foremost our most experienced professors were leaving in mass, and secondly a more subtle but very

important asset our “institutional knowledge” was leaving with them. At one point I was told that we were short on qualified instructors to teach required curriculum courses and that some classes may even need to be cancelled. I quickly learned that our Faculty along with various other stakeholder groups and the community in general were disenfranchised from the institution. Moral was at an all time low and the institution was faced with a constant barrage of criticism from both internal and external forces. The significant issues that the Board dealt with at the time had nothing to do with the future of the University but more to do with the emergency of the day. It could be accurately said that we were dealing with our immediate survival. In reflection, I would say a sad state of affairs for an institution that should have been a cornerstone of our community.

Few realized at the time what was possible, when a group of committed individuals representing every stakeholder group within our institution put their collective minds together for the purpose of solving the university’s problems. These people worked together tirelessly and at times jeopardizing their careers for the sake of improving this University not for a self serving reason but for the benefit of our students and our community. Many of you were part of that effort and your sacrifices and commitment did not go unnoticed and to this day are often talked about during reflective conversations with past and present Board members.

Now, let’s fast forward to today. We are now the third largest University in our state, with a breadth of professional programs that few other universities in the country offer. We are truly an institution that strives to put our students first. It is clear that our faculty and staff are committed to excellence in education, research and service. This is consistent with our institutional plan to be recognized nationally and internationally for our areas of expertise.

The University has always been a great place with great people and today we are experiencing a revitalization of sorts, a continued transformation to an institution with the ability to quickly adapt in a rapidly changing world. We are doing this with deliberate focus on our core principles.

As members of our faculty you have demonstrated a balanced commitment to teaching, research, and scholarship. The faculty’s commitment to undergraduate education runs deep. Our educational principles are based on the commitment to a strong liberal arts education complimented by the opportunities afforded by a broad set of excellent professional degree programs. This mixture is an important part of The University of Toledo’s very core today.

Equally as important, The University Toledo has made a commitment to become a residential university in a metropolitan environment. Today, almost 4000 students or over 24% of our student population live on campus and experience an expanding residential campus community. We are committed to a continued effort to improve the campus quality of life. One of many examples is the “Gateway Project” at the corner of Dorr and Secor. This mix of commercial, retail and residential will be a exciting gateway to our campus community and will provide the amenities that our students have long been asking for. The University of Toledo is no longer the commuter school of the past. We attract students from across the country and around the world. We had over 10,000 submitted applications to our University last year, of those

10,000 we enrolled 3,570 incoming students to our freshman class, and as has been widely publicized, we have enjoyed increases in enrollment two years running.

We are committed to our community through service programs, social and cultural initiatives and economic development programs. We have worked diligently on community service and engagement re-emphasizing the importance of the University community relationship. This has been done through academic and public service programs that are too numerous to mention. We are a cultural community icon, as the city is integral to the fabric in which we live, work, and learn.

The impact of the University goes far beyond its sphere of regional influence. The University of Toledo is a world leader in a multitude of our research programs and institutes. We are well positioned to play an important leadership role in education and discovery as the world continues to advance toward full global connectivity.

With a renewed focus on research we now are performing over \$60 million of sponsored research per year. The growth of research at The University of Toledo in the last few years has been nothing short of remarkable and is a reflection of the commitment and dedication to long term strategic initiatives here at this institution.

All of these activities—education, research, and public service—are indicative of a great student-centered metropolitan research university. Getting this message out should be one of our primary objectives. The University of Toledo is a great university, and the fact is that it can be much better in the future.

This brings me to my hope for The University of Toledo. I hope The University of Toledo will be one of the greatest student-centered, metropolitan, research universities in the country. Our university should be known for its commitment to our students, to our faculty and to our other stakeholders for the purpose of providing the best value we can in education. We must devote our efforts to having our campus recognized as a place where we learn and live together in the context of the city and the world; where we produce important knowledge and educate the next cohort of young people to help shape the world in the 21st century for the purpose of improving the human condition.

How do we find our path to success? The Board firmly believes our success lies in the implementation of our strategic plan. We simply have to dedicate ourselves to achieving the objectives identified in the Strategic Plan with a commitment to quality in everything we undertake, whether it be our educational programs, our interdisciplinary research efforts, or the essential activities of hiring and promoting faculty.

One thing that I have learned in my tenure as a University trustee is that the quality of the faculty DEFINES the quality of a university. As Dr. Jacobs often says The University of Toledo is not just a collection of bricks and mortar, the university is its faculty. We all share responsibility for the quality and future of the institution, but the heavy lifting will fall on our faculty to be truly successful, The University of Toledo must effectively recruit faculty while competing against other universities with more money and, as some may be perceived, with

more prestige. We must abide by a policy that uses the highest standards for the promotion of faculty members, while respecting our tradition of balancing outstanding research and scholarship with teaching and with service to the University.

The composition of our student body is equally as important as the quality of our faculty. We, as you all know, have made progress in this area and today we are attracting a remarkable student body from across the country. We must balance this objective by providing opportunity and accessibility and welcoming to students of all races and socio-economic backgrounds.

Over a number of decades, The University of Toledo has grown from a city-based, commuter university to a major state university. In the ten years that I have been involved I have watched an organization carefully deploy the revenues generated by tuition, fees and research for the purpose of improving our campus and strengthening and expanding our educational and research programs. We must continue to refine this process with a deliberate emphasis in areas that promote the objectives that are identified in our strategic plan.

The questions that face our Board today are very different from the emergency of the day 10 years ago. They are more meaningful and include things such as: How do we move the University forward? What will UT look like in a decade? How do we implement our strategic plan within the context of our vision for this institution? These are questions for all of us that deserve focused attention. The best chance of succeeding in our endeavors to continue to make this institution a better place requires that our roles in answering these questions be clearly defined. As I have said to all of you before, management of this organization is a task delegated by the Board to the President -- it is our only means of organizational accountability that exists. We do, however, have a clear obligation to seek input from all of our stakeholders. The most important group of course is our faculty. We have and will continue to work with the leadership of the faculty senate and other representatives of the faculty body to develop a meaningful process that will promote open discussions and debates for the purpose of fulfilling our commitment to our students, our institution and to each other.

Our strategic plan, a document whose beauty lies in its simplicity, is now in place. The hard work, of course, is in its implementation. Achieving our defined objectives will involve difficult choices, and at times, significant departure from past practices. I do not stand here before you for the purpose of creating false hope or providing assurance that everyone will be happy with the subsequent outcome of our efforts, but as Chairman of this Board I am committed to do our best to communicate to and seek input from all of our stakeholders and from our community throughout the process as we measure our progress against our goals.

There is much work to do if our University is going to continue the wonderful progress it has made over the past decade. Our success will be a strong function of our commitment to the task, of our commitment to achieving the highest quality in everything we do, and of the support that we can muster from our alumni, friends and our community. I am excited by the opportunities in front of us and by the opportunity to work with a wonderful group of people toward advancing the University of Toledo. And, finally, I am proud to be a part of this great institution and I am thankful for the respect and patience you have afforded me over the past ten years. I will be happy to take any questions.

Senator Barlowe: Given that shared governance is one of the most important responsibilities of faculty at this University, would you share with us some of your ideas about shared governance including what you think are the most effective and appropriate functions of various constituencies.

Trustee Stansley: There has never been a clear role of what shared governance should be. Not even the stakeholders have been defined. As a result, it created a problem and a reaction. A reaction causes a lot of anxiety in heated debates and discussions and ultimately what has happened in the past has never been fixed. The problem was just ignored. I believe in shared governance there can be clearly defined roles. It's clear from the Ohio Revised Code that the final authority in decision lies with the Board. The Board can delegate the authority to the President, the Board has an obligation and responsibility to seek input from all the stakeholder, the faculty being the most important. The process, no one really understood what that meant. The once every other month Board meeting where we hear the report from Barbara is not meaningful input. What we have attempted to do is start to lay the foundation where we can establish the ground rules for shared governance, what input and how it's received at each level. It is important for the Board and for the administration to receive that input. The Board and the administration want the Faculty Senate inserted into the organizational structure of the institution. You can't do that. There is no single point of accountability. We have come to understand that there are bodies that set above the organization. These bodies talk in ways where decisions aren't made but there are discussions and debates. We can talk about the issues at hand and more meaningful solutions than what has been presented. That interaction when clearly defined, will serve to provide that platform for meaningful discussion, debates, interactions and provide meaningful input.

My personal thought is that at some level the Board and the Faculty Senate should be at a table talking. Typically the Board delegates responsibility and authority to me, and I tell the President. In this case it is a little different. We have instructed Dr. Jacobs some months ago to do certain things related to shared governance. And recently we asked where we were with this. If it goes on too long it develops a certain level of distrust and anxiety. I'm aware of that. I would like something to be done before summer so we have some clear idea of what these rules will be and how we are going to do it. We are still talking about it and how that's going to happen.

Senator Barden: The calculus of this is complicated by the merger. We had two Faculty Senates, and while there is pressure from the Board to the President to do certain things there is also the faculty who are working together to make one institution out of two, and yet we want everything done by the summer. And that's tough.

Trustee Stansley: There is no deadline. The Board may not be clearly explaining what their expectations are. They are not interested in details on how things are working or what you are going to do. There is a certain reason why we want that to happen. We are looking for a single body of Faculty Senate representation. If not, how many stakeholders are there, how do you weigh in input. It would be difficult. We believe that the faculty are in the best position to make determinations about the curriculum. I think Dr. Jacobs will agree with that. We believe the faculty has to have input. Those are the things we want to talk about. But we can't get there yet, and those things are frustrating.

Senator Olson: You mentioned that faculty has an important role in supporting the Strategic Plan and that there will be difficult choices and that you need to get input from stakeholders, and you have indicated that the faculty are the stakeholders, and you also indicated that the faculty are in the best position to make decisions on curriculum. However, we heard about a plan on Thursday and it was sent to deans on Friday and it hit my department level on Monday about the 10-5-5 Plan. This plan requires the deans to report a budget based upon last year's budget of a 10% reduction, 5% will be made available to deans to reinvest in their own programs where they see their strategic opportunities. And an additional 5% will be withdrawn to the University level and reinvested according to prerogatives at the University level. What is interesting about the plan is that there are two review bodies but faculty have no input at all, and yet this is going to change programs and curriculum on this campus. There is no faculty sitting in on the peer review board and have no input in budget decisions. This plan may possibly eliminate programs and certainly change the curriculum of this University. I also believe, while it's necessary to

reallocate funds to support the Strategic Plan, that this plan may cause severe hurt on this campus. An academic department is mostly manpower, very little support. So, if you put faculty's name on that 10% cut, is it going to be tenured faculty or untenured. But if your name is on there, you have just been told you are no longer important to this department. It's easier to eliminate untenured faculty than tenured, destroying the lifeblood of this University for the future. That really concerns me because there will be a lot of hurt on this campus from this plan. Have you heard about this plan and has anyone thought of the problems it will create on this campus as we attempt to reallocate according to this plan.

Trustee Stansley: I appreciate your input. I have heard of the plan. It was introduced at the last Board meeting. The answer is no, people have not thought through what the implications will be. Scott Scarborough has been here for two months. This is Scott's plan. He laid it out at the last Board meeting and the question was, what do these numbers mean? He said, those numbers he pulled out of the air because they seemed reasonable.

Senator Olson: Those were the same words that were used with us last Thursday, but on Monday, these were cast in stone. There was no longer any doubt what the numbers were.

Trustee Stansley: I'm not sure that's the case.

Senator Olson: It came as a directive.

Trustee Stansley: Many times we talk about absolutes when you and everyone here has experienced the fact that decisions are made and are not absolutes, until you implement. That's not where we are right now. This is an attempt to transform the budget process. It's an attempt to change it. I'm not sure who is involved today at the administrative levels related to input or decision making as it related to the ultimate plans. I know this is just in very beginning stages of the new budget process.

Senator Olson: I suggest you get the document that was provided to us last Thursday and look at the decision makers on it.

Trustee Stansley: I will look at it, I think that's reasonable. The Board believes the financial issues of the institution are Board prerogatives. We look hard at it.

Senator Olson: Absolutely. That's your responsibility.

Trustee Stansley: That's the kind of input that we need.

Senator Olson: I fully believe it is your prerogative and administrative prerogative, but I also believe there needs to be critical input about curriculum programs in this process, and if that is absent, then we have not achieved what we should be achieving.

Trustee Stansley: I agree, I don't think anyone in the administration would disagree with you. These are the things that we spend a vast majority of our time on, talking about what the impact on the budget has on programs, how do we do it, how it's going to be managed. That's the genesis of the concept of having college centric management style that has started over a year ago. The two budgets have been managed independently up to this point. This is where they are coming together and this is the process that is being laid out not because it's absolute, but you have to start somewhere. That's what we were told.

Senator Olson: I fully agree. I think you do need re-allocation. I think the problem on this campus is not that somebody is hiding the money, it's just that we are trying to do too much with what we have. We just don't have money for contingencies built into the budget. And that needs to be achieved, and I appreciate you all moving in that direction. But we have to do it without hurting people.

Trustee Stansley: Ten years ago we had no reserves. Today we are dealing with things, reallocating resources, focusing on areas and on the objective of the Strategic Planning because we have the opportunity. The important thing to remember is that you know every decision that is made. That is something that everyone needs to consider. As a Board member I'm going to say this, I don't care what the increase in wages are, we should pay our people as much as we possibly can. But when we get to the point that we break the budget what ends up happening is the faces and names of their people are impacted by their decisions. I'm not going to be the one that wants to choose who is not going to be employed. That's not what I want to do. I want to try to build a bigger and better place and that's what we all should do.

Senator Barden: Two comments, first you should be proud to have been on the UT Board of Trustees when the merger happened, and have been part of making it a reality. That is one of the best things that

has ever happened to this University, and I applaud you for that. Secondly, you mentioned the strip on Dorr Street as a student friendly corridor. This is wonderful, but only if we slow that traffic pattern down. I have said that to everybody at all sorts of meetings, at Town Hall Meetings, and many other places, and everybody shakes their heads, and says, “Yes, that’s a good thought.” But we have to get serious about it; we are going to kill a student unless we slow that Dorr Street traffic down.

Trustee Stansley: No doubt about it. I need a representative from our Real Estate Trust and people looking at that property who are actively involved in the development of that plan. What we talked about is working with the City and the State to create slower traffic. I think the University cares enough to see that gets done.

Senator Olson: You might consider tunnels and pedestrian overpasses.

Trustee Stansley: The Gateway Development Program, something that got started over two years ago, they are trying to roll all that into the Strategic Master Plan. So those are all the components that need to be addressed.

Senator Thompson-Casado: I would like to return to the issue of the 10-5-5 plan. It has caused tremendous anxiety already among the faculty. Did the Board discuss the ramifications of this in any detail?

Trustee Stansley: No, we did not. The document was presented to us in the Finance Committee meeting and some questions were asked about the numbers. We asked specifically if there is something meaningful in those number, and we were told, no, just picked them from the air. They seem to be the right ones. A lot of times what ends up happening is, people are busy, a lot of time people don’t articulate properly where we are in that kind of process. I will tell you this, the budget takes from now until July to complete it. I know there will be plenty of opportunities to ask questions that you are presenting. The idea is that no one should feel anxiety over it, it should be clearly understood. That’s our objective.

Senator Fink: Why is it that we have to cut the budget at all? We have an increase in enrollment, in a lot of places departments are starting new programs and the programs are taking off. Where is the logic that cuts need to be made at all?

Trustee Stansley: There will be more resources, the areas identified in the Strategic Plan will be the focus. I can’t tell you why it was put together the way it was. I have not talked to Dr. Jacobs or Scott Scarborough on this. It was just presented at the last Committee meeting so there was no action taken on this, at the very earliest next month. No one has to do anything about it yet, it was just a presentation.

Senator Wikander: I enjoyed your remarks earlier when you remembered some of the things of nine years ago and the very painful across the board budget cuts, and I have to say I don’t see much difference between the exercise of cutting 10% across the board in programs and in colleges, and imagine giving yourself 5% back, from what we were doing nine years ago when we had to cut 3% and giving ourselves 1.5% back, cutting 6% giving ourselves 3% back, cutting 4% and giving ourselves 2% back. It seems to be very much the same kind of arbitrary exercise.

Trustee Stansley: I would strongly disagree with that. We have option now. This is a proactive approach in looking at redistribution of resources. That is what it is. It’s a proactive approach. In prior years it was a reactive process where we had nowhere to move. Today the University has options and this is part of an active process. We can talk about it, discuss it and debate it. I would tell you though that you should have a low level of anxiety because it’s not done. Secondly, be involved. That is the purpose of having a plan. Lay it out, generate discussion, debate over it, and maybe we find out it is not so good and other changes need to be developed. As the plan develops and you start to recognize what you believe is a fatal flaw in something that would significantly impact the institution, in a way we would never recover from it, there are methods and ways for people to talk about that.

Senator Olson: So you are thinking we are still debating the plan. The plan is in motion already, and my concern is that every unit is being asked to do a 10-5-5. And that means that every unit that is being asked to do that is going to have to put 10% on the block. Whether it’s in the STEMM area, even they are doing this, or other areas. And if you just brought in a new professor that you want to be your leader in the future and he sees his name on it because he is new, that’s the problem with the way it is being implemented.

Trustee Stansley: I believe there is a huge distinction where we were and where we are today. Those resources are not disappearing. We have them. They are available and will be available to spend on things here at the organization. Before when we had to deal with the cuts it was because the resources were not available and couldn't be properly invested because there was nothing there. What we are attempting to do is define a method whereby we can make investments for the future of the institution.

Senator Olson: But keep in mind in this process you will have to be somewhat more selective, unless you are really going to take 5% from every unit on campus and destroy parts of that unit in order to get to where you want to go.

Trustee Stansley: It doesn't make sense casting stone. We already identified a number of reasons why it couldn't be. What I am telling you is that these things are not absolute today. I know for a fact they are not, and you shouldn't treat them as absolutes. I understand you are voicing a concern and they are legitimate concerns. I will go back and ask questions.

Senator Olson: They are implementing directives that are now published and they are really making the leaders of this campus do this.

Trustee Stansley: I think you are raising good issues and we need to ask about it. If I was a professor and saw that this could be an issue with my budget, or me, I would be looking around. Those are very valid point that you are raising.

Senator Wedding: I have a copy of the plan here. Two issues, one, the budget is based on undergraduate enrollment of 10%, and patient admission of 3%. I don't know what all that means. One of the objectives they point out is they are eliminating entire departments, programs, activities that are not strategic and are losing money. That would shut down Humanities and Arts.

Trustee Stansley: That's an exaggeration.

Senator Wedding: I am reading from the plan.

Trustee Stansley: I understand what you are saying. In reality, the situation is different from what is identified there on paper.

Senator Lipscomb: We are being asked to make these decisions now and identify how the 10% cut will impact and the only way to do it is eliminating positions, and to me the core of the matter is you are asking us to identify the 10% cut in each department.

Trustee Stansley: Here is what I'm going to do. I am going to call the President tomorrow and I will ask that we sit down with our finance people to have a better understanding of what the current expectation is. I will then present to you all an email through Joan Stasa that will explain exactly what my understanding is. Is that acceptable? What's happening here is I am trying to provide to you a bigger picture, you are asking about detail and I can't answer that because I don't know. So let me find out and I will get back with you.

Senator Piazza: Can I also ask that there be faculty representation on it?

Trustee Stansley: Yes, I would like to see faculty representation and I will ask that question too.

Senator Lipscomb: I hear at the State level there is a lot of discussion going on about the relative roles of State universities should be, and whether there will be encouragement for state universities to collaborate mergers, like what we have done here. What have you heard? For instance there are research intensive schools, and non-research intensive schools.

Trustee Stansley: I believe the leadership at the State level is supportive of higher education. It was proven with the last budget, we were able to secure existing funding. We were not affected by any kinds of cuts. That's a good thing. Secondly, they took a politician and put him in charge of the Board of Regents. And I don't think that's a good idea. So I don't think what they are talking about is meaningful, they are just trying to make headlines in its publicity. My biggest concern is not the inability for the State to make adjustments to start educating 250,000 additional people which is a defined objective, but it is to create opportunity for those people to go out and earn a living after we educate them. I don't put a lot of faith in what the current Board of Regents is talking about increasing enrollment. I don't see it happening from a practical stand point.

Senator Lipscomb: Shouldn't we be at the table trying to position ourselves, at least we would be at the table talking about it.

Trustee Stansley: University of Toledo is the only University mentioned in the Governor's State address. We, of all state universities are in the best position to take advantage of the goodwill that's been created by the merger. Bill McMillen is doing a good job representing us. Jim Tushman, on the Board of Regents is truly watching and looking after our best interest and talking regularly about the issues they are dealing with. We are in the best position that you can be at this time.

Senator Skeens: I want to go back to our merger. We planned on having it done already, but can I just ask you what the Plan B was if we don't get there?

Trustee Stansley: It's a fair question to ask. There are times when people say things that they don't think through. There is no Plan B. There is nothing that has been clearly defined. Expectations that we have provided have not yet been cleared. So what I would suggest will happen and should happen is, we will see where this issue of merged Senates stand at the Board meeting in March. Then you will have a clearer understanding what our expectations are and the Board will not take any action that is dramatic unless there is a clear understanding by all the parties involved. I appreciate your question but I think it was just a comment that was made but it shouldn't have been made.

Chair Floyd: Thank you very much Mr. Stansley. Now returning to the Executive Committee reports, the first issue is the approval of the minutes of January 22 and February 5 meetings as distributed.

Minutes approved.

As you heard there has been a lot of talk about the budget plan being developed for next year. Scott Scarborough, the new Senior Vice President for Finance, has been invited to the next Senate meeting on March 11 and we will certainly hear more about this at that time. Also, the Finance and Strategy Committee, the former Fiscal Advisory Committee, will be involved in the preparation of the budget at some level. There will be a lot more on this in the near future.

Other issues that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee is discussing includes the Interim Vice Provost for Faculty and Organizational Development. In November, the Provost appointed a search committee to start a national search for this position, which is a new position in the Provost's office as part of the reorganization. The search committee met twice and drafted a job ad for this position but as you heard that search is not going forward and last week an interim person was appointed and the search has been suspended.

The Provost's office asked us to look into the issue of assigning mid-term grades to students in general education courses only. This will allow students to have some idea where they stand at mid-point in the semester. We have asked the Core Curriculum Committee to take a look at this issue to investigate what issues there might be to go forward with such a plan. The idea is to assign mid-term grades that will not be a part of the student's permanent record but they will be posted for a brief period of time.

At the meeting of the Senior leadership team last week, I made the point that while the merger of the two institutions seems to have occurred on the deans' level and higher, it really has not filtered down to the lower levels of the faculty yet. This is a point of some concern—we haven't begun to culturally integrate the two faculties. I believe this concern should be addressed next year once the two Senates are merged, and beginning to merge the two cultures will be a great contribution to the future of this institution.

At the last meeting Chuck Lehnert offered a tour of the Field House. Two dates were offered, March 7th and March 14th. A vote was taken and March 14th from 10:00 to 11:00 am seems to be the best time for most.

Non-attendance of Senators. We have had problems with senators repeatedly missing meetings, and according to the Constitution, if you had four unexcused absences you will be replaced on the Senate. Some letters went out recently to those that had three and four unexcused absences, but some of them have since been cleared up. I would ask that if you cannot make a meeting, you contact the secretary in advance to let her know you will be absent and request to be excused.

Walt Olson will be leaving the Senate after this meeting due to his departure for China for several weeks. However, he has a replacement, Ted Evans, and also Walt agreed to remain on the executive committee by way of email.

Our next meeting is March 11 because of a Spring Break and we only have four Senate meetings left this academic year.

We will now move on to issue of the Rules and Appendices. As Mr. Stansley said earlier, at the February 11 Board Committee meeting, the Board expressed some frustration with the lack of speed at which the merger of the two Senates is moving forward. The two executive committees also have experienced some frustration with the pace. The conclusion of the Board was that we need to get this done and get it on the Board's agenda as soon as possible, so that we can have elections of officers by the end of the year. It is our hope that we can get a vote on this issue next week and get the approval of the proposed rules and appendices. The proposal is that we want this vote to occur simultaneously on the two campuses so that one vote does not influence the other. So, what we are proposing to do, if acceptable to you, is to send out an email ballot which will say, 'Yes, I approve of the Rules and Appendices,' or, 'No, I do not approve.' If you don't mind that your vote is anonymous, which would be similar to raising your hand at Senate meetings, you can email your response to Kathy Grabel in the Senate Office and we will record your vote that way. If you prefer to be anonymous, when you receive the ballot you can tear off the top that has your name attached to it, fill out a paper ballot, put it in an envelope, deliver it to Faculty Senate office, and Kathy will have you sign a log that says you have turned in your ballot and put it in a ballot box.

Unidentified speaker: Suggested to use zoomerang survey on the Internet, a do it yourself type survey, where you generate the survey questions and post it on the web as a link.

Chair Floyd: It sounds like a great idea but we want this done in three days. How do you know that people don't vote twice.

Unidentified speaker: You don't. Actually, not sure, maybe somebody else knows more about this.

Senator Skeens: I don't think that's a good idea because we would have to meet with the HSC and get their permission and I'm tired of meeting with them.

Chair Floyd: The ballot will go out next Monday, and you will have one week to turn in your ballot. The following week is Spring Break, and the following week is a Board meeting and we would like to have this on their agenda for the March 10 Board meeting.

Senator Barden: I think you should continue with the system you have.

Senator Fink: I don't have any concerns with merging the Senates, but I am uncomfortable that we are not having any debates about the rules and appendices.

Chair Floyd: We will discuss it right here in just a few minutes.

Senator Thompson-Casado: When the ballot goes out will you have instructions on it?

Chair Floyd: Yes, absolutely. It will be included as part of the ballot.

I will reiterate what I said at the last Board meeting regarding the merger process. The constitution has occupied our energy over this past year and it represents the most important legacy that we as the representative body of the faculty can leave this University. The constitution we have written will hopefully withstand the test of time, the way constitutions should. But writing such a historically important document that brings together faculty with much different cultures has not been easy. It has been a series of difficult compromises on both sides. We believe we have produced a constitution and rules and appendices that can serve The University of Toledo well. The revisions which we have made recently are the result of input from the constituents and the provosts. We have listened to their concerns and addressed them. Last May the faculties on both campuses overwhelmingly approved the new constitution for a merged Senate. With that it was clear that one Senate is in the best interest of the University. In some ways the merger of the two senates will symbolize the success of the merger of the two universities as it will now allow the faculty to move forward beyond their individual parochial

interests and begin to develop a single shared culture as a collegial body of scholars. We can begin to address issues that are common to all faculty. As I said in my first report to the Board last August, I believe the Faculty Senate exists to make this University better, to provide input and insight on issues from the faculty perspective, to make sure the outlook of those who serve our students on the frontlines is understood and considered and helps guide this University as it develops. This new merged Senate, which we are on track to have completed at the end of this academic year, will help us achieve that goal. I will now walk you through the changes only, as we have been through two forums already and discussed the rules and appendices.

There was a lot of discussion with the HSC on UCAP and UCS, committees that do not concern them. We simply have added a section that states which faculty are covered by UCAP and UCS. Any comments on this?

At the open forums we received a lot of comments on College Governance. We have made it a little more generic, yet tried to maintain what I think is basic framework that allows colleges to have college governance bodies. As you heard from Mr. Stansley, college centric was never defined. So we tried to define it and establish a basic structure where each college will have a body that is identified as a college governance body. What we outline here is what a college governance body may participate in: academic regulations, policies, curriculum programs and other issues of concern to the faculty of the College. Any comments on this?

We have outlined what must be a part of any college governance body: they must have regular meetings that meet the needs of the college, there needs to be a process by which faculty can call special meetings, and the electorate for these bodies has to be the college faculty. However, if a faculty should for some reason want to elect people who are not faculty, then as long as faculty elect these persons, we can live with this. As one example, University College for eight years had a dean that did not have faculty rank, which presented a lot of issues in a college governance structure. Any comments or concerns on this?

One of the complaints we received from the HSC is that because of their clinical schedules, attending Faculty Senate meetings may be difficult. What we proposed to deal with this is that college bodies can elect proxies. This would be a group of people officially elected as proxies. If you were a senator and could not attend a Senate meeting, you would call a proxy to attend in your place. This is not the way we have done things here, but it seems to be a way around the problem, and would allow for the Senate to function if a majority of elected senators could not attend.

Senator Thompson-Casado: What about proxies not having any knowledge of the issues of the Senate?

Chair Floyd: I would hope that proxies would make it their business to become knowledgeable of the Senate issues.

Senator BeattyMedina: There would be similar prohibitions on excessive absences?

Chair Floyd: You would either have to attend or have your proxy attend.

Senator BeattyMedina: So you could have an unlimited number of proxy attendances?

Chair Floyd: I'm afraid that is the way the document reads. One thing to remember, this is a working document. It requires two-thirds votes of the Senate to amend. Some of these issues will work themselves out during the academic year as we try this new structure. I wouldn't want you to walk away thinking this absolutely is not going to work. We need to try it to see if it is going to work.

Senator Olson: This is something that is a compromise with the HSC. They are religious about their clinics and we need to have a way if they are going to be participative in a merged senate that they can send a proxy to vote for them or to participate in the Senate meetings. I am going to China and Ted Evans will be my proxy for the rest of the academic year. It's a process that we used before.

Senator Thompson-Casado: It's a little different because he is sitting here already and will be attending all the meetings and will know what's going on. Can you remind me how many seats the HSC will have in the Senate?

Chair Floyd: They will have an equal number of seats of what the College of Arts & Sciences has, I believe it is fourteen.

Senator Piazza: This is an accommodation of physician faculty. These are faculty who find themselves in a position involved in one of their clinics and unable to leave to attend a meeting. So we are not saying this will be used by all faculty on the HSC. Also, it is hoped that the proxy system will be akin to an alternate serving on a jury and will attend meetings and become knowledgeable in what's going on in the Senate. So when they do step in as a proxy they will be able to represent their colleagues. I will be on the HSC when this goes into affect and I would not want people representing my interest who don't know what's going on. I think we need to recognize that physician faculty have special needs that could perhaps be addressed in this document. If it doesn't work when the Senate is conducting its business, a change to the bylaws could be proposed.

Chair Floyd: We do have now six senators who have three unexcused absences and are looking at removal from the Senate. Those colleges are not represented by anyone when they don't show up to Senate meetings.

Senator Hottell: I am confused as to the difference between our classes and clinics on the HSC. I have to change my classes around, and even ask my students if we could meet at another time on Tuesdays, so that I can be here. We all have done something to alter our schedules in order to be here. I don't understand why the HSC can't do the same.

Kris Brickman: Keep in mind that our clinical responsibilities are very unpredictable from day to day. In the ED I can never predict my schedule and many of the clinics are the same. Without a proxy we would not be able to serve on Faculty Senate since we could never meet the meeting requirements. On the HSC we have only met once a month. The 2/mo meetings would likely exclude any physicians without a proxy option.

Senator BeattyMedina: Can you give us a clarification on the mater of whether "proxy" senators would be voted in?

Chair Floyd: They would be elected by their college, and if a senator could not attend, he would call on one of the elected proxies to vote in his place. It would be a set group of individual identified as proxies. You could not just call on anyone to fill in for you.

Next I would like to move to the issue of Senate committees. In Article IV, Section 9, we have clarified that Senate committees make recommendations to the Senate, and the Senate, if they approve, forward those recommendations on to the provosts. Any questions on this?

In the Academic Programs and Undergraduate Curriculum committees, we have said that any changes in academic programs or undergraduate curriculum that do not impact other colleges will be monitored by the committees, but will not be considered by them nor brought to the Senate. The only items that will come to the Senate as consent agenda items are those that impact across colleges. Any questions on this?

Lastly, we clarified the issue of appointing representatives to University committees to indicate these are standing university committees, and also added that the president can appoint additional faculty representatives if the president desires. Any questions?

We will go forward with a vote on the rules and appendices next week, and hopefully we will be forwarding these and the constitution to the Board of Trustees for approval at their March 10 meeting.

Due to a technical problem with the equipment, the rest of the meeting did not get recorded. Some speakers whose comments did not get recorded, were willing to fill in with their comments to the best of their recollection, and they sent in their remarks. See below.

Senator Lipscomb: Report on Log Item 0708-7

**UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

MEMBERS: Bradene Moore
Suhasini Kumar
Glenn Lipscomb
Mary Humphrys (chair)

LOG ITEM: 0708-7

TITLE: Representation on Research Council

CHARGE: The committee is asked to look at the current make-up of the Research Council and investigate whether all colleges are represented on the Council. Make a recommendation on whether the Research Council should provide representation for all colleges, or if the current make-up of the council provides adequate representation to faculty from all disciplines.

OVERVIEW: In its investigation of this charge, the University Affairs Committee found the following:

- The current criteria for Research Council membership listed in III-3-3 Article III of the University Research Policy do not include the stipulation for a faculty representative from each college.
- The current Research Council membership does not include a representative from each college.
- The current Research Council membership does not appear to match the criteria outlined in III-3-3 Article III.

RECOMMENDATION: The University Affairs Committee recommends that the Research Council membership policy be revised to include at least one faculty representative from each college.

Senator Lipscomb: A motion to approve the committee's recommendation was made and seconded.
The motion passed.

Senator BeattyMedina: How many people are on the Research Council?

Senator Hottell: I am on Research Council named by the Faculty Senate and I represent the sub-division to Arts and Humanities. I believe that Frank Calzonetti makes an effort to insure that all areas are represented.

Senator Lipscomb: Report on Log Item 0708-10

**UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

- MEMBERS:** Bradene Moore
Suhasini Kumar
Glenn Lipscomb
Mary Humphrys (chair)
- LOG ITEM:** 0708-10
- TITLE:** Policy on Political Candidate Meetings
- CHARGE:** The Executive Committee would like the University Affairs Committee to investigate and recommend whether the University of Toledo should adopt a policy regarding political candidate rallies on campus when those invited to such events are selected by the political party of the candidate.
- OVERVIEW:** In its investigation of this charge, the University Affairs Committee found the following:
- Creating a political candidate rallies policy would require extensive research into the possible effect or infringement upon existing University policies (including but not limited to the “Policy on outside speakers sponsored by students”).
 - Since the University of Toledo is a public institution, an investigation of applicable laws would need to be conducted prior to determining the ramifications and limitations of a political candidate rallies policy.
- RECOMMENDATION:** The University Affairs Committee recommends that the University’s general counsel investigate the legal foundation for and guidelines associated with establishing a policy on political candidate rallies and report this information to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee in a timely fashion.

Senator Lipscomb: A friendly motion to change the wording of the recommendation to:

“The University Affairs Committee recommends that the University’s general counsel investigates the legal foundation for and guidelines associated with establishing a policy on political candidate rallies and reports this information to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee in a time fashion.” (“investigate was changed to “investigates” and “report was changed to “reports”). The changes were accepted. A motion to approve the committee’s recommendation was made and seconded. *The motion passed.*

Senator Cluse-Tolar: Report on Log Item 0708-6

Proposed Motion

The Faculty Affairs Committee makes the motion to adopt the following policy statement concerning faculty authored textbooks:

Policy on Professors Assigning Self-Authored Texts to Their Students

Faculty requiring students purchase textbooks the faculty member has authored shall follow one of the following concerning remuneration:

1. Textbook decisions that have been approved by a departmental committee or a department chair may be made, with the faculty-author receiving all royalties acquired on such texts.
2. Textbook decisions made individually by a faculty member requiring students purchase textbooks authored by the faculty member, may be used. Royalties on such textbooks or other educational material must be donated to their departments, schools, scholarship funds or other non-profit entities. No reporting of such receipts is required within the University. It is understood that the faculty member must estimate such receipts arising from sales to his/her classes due to the variety of sources from which a student may purchase texts and the varying mixture of new and used texts acquired by students. Contribution of royalties does not apply to royalties generated through sales of educational materials unrelated to the course in which the author required them, such as sales to students in other courses or at other universities.

Prepared by the Faculty Affairs Committee
Log Item 0708-6
February 19, 2008

Senator Fink: If a Chair uses his/her own book then it should go through the approval by the department committee if the person is going to get to keep the royalties.

Senator Peseckis: My concern is that under one of the scenarios presented, it seemed that the author would be expected to turn all royalties over to the department or someone else. Since the publisher would report the royalties as income to the author, the author would be liable for taxes – a factor that the policy does not take into account. If authors are not to gain financially from their work, it also should be that they should not be hurt financially by it as well.

Senator Kennedy: Regarding Paragraph 1 of the proposed policy, how will it work in a small college – such as the Law College – which has no departments?

Senator Cluse-Tolar: The college should form a committee for this work.

Chair Floyd: Given the lateness of the hour, I am suggesting we table a vote on this, and bring it back to the Senate at our next meeting. Is this agreed?

The Senate body agreed to table it.

Motion for adjournment was made and seconded.

V. Calendar Questions:

See reports above.

VI. Other Business:

Old business:

New business:

VII. Adjournment: Meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Alice Skeens
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Kathy Grabel
Faculty Senate Office Admin. Secretary

