

FACULTY SENATE
Minutes of the Senate Meeting of April 22, 2008
<http://www.facsenate.utoledo.edu>

HIGHLIGHTS

Chair of Core Curriculum
Trustees Rick Stansley & Olivia Summons

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: Barlowe, Barnes, Beatty-Medina (for Jakobson), Cluse-Tolar, Fink, Floyd, Evans (for Olson), Funk, Horan, Hottell, Hudson, Johanson, Kennedy, Lambert, Le (for Zallocco), LeBlanc, Lipscomb, Monsos, Moorhead, Morrissey, Peseckis, Piazza, Piotrowski, Relue, Schall, Skeens, Spongberg, Stierman, Teclehaimanot, Tierney (for Klein), Thompson-Casado, Ventura, Wikander, Wolff,

Excused absence: Barden, Edwards (for Baines), Hamer, Lundquist, Martin, McInerney,

Unexcused absence: Ames, Ariss, Chen, Fournier, Fritz (for Humphrys), Greninger, Hefzy, Kistner, Sundar (for Pope), Wedding

II. Approval of Minutes:

Minutes of 3/25/08 and 4/08/08 were approved as distributed.

III. Executive Committee Report:

Chair Floyd: Since this is the last official meeting of the Main Campus Faculty Senate forever, we will have to approve the minutes of this electronically, as it doesn't seem appropriate for the new senate to approve them. When they are done we will ask you to approve those minutes via email. A couple of announcements: On today's agenda, Trustees Rick Stansley and Olivia Summons were supposed to be here to answer questions from the Senate, but Trustee Stansley has been called away on business at the last minute and will not be able to be here. If you would like, I can ask him to come to our April 29th meeting. As a reminder, the elections officially close at 5:00 p.m. tomorrow, Wednesday, April 23rd. Another reminder, the first meeting of the new senate and the election of the new officers will be Tuesday, April 29th at Scott Park Auditorium at 4:00 p.m. Even if you are not elected to the senate, we urge you to come to see what will be the new University of Toledo Faculty Senate.

Also, we had some issues arise this week relating to the proposed restructuring of the University College and its impact on University committees and the Senate. First there is the question of University College's representation on the new senate. I would suggest to the new executive committee that we seat the elected senators from the University College for next year since they are duly elected by their colleagues, and we reevaluate the situation at the end of next year. By then we will know better what the "New Entity" is and what it means. Does anyone have any concerns if

we proceed with this idea? If not, I will then recommend this to the new executive committee. Then there is also the representation of the University College on UCAP and UCS. I am not sure who makes the call on this. These are not Senate committees, we merely carry out the elections process for these committees. Their functions are under the collective bargaining agreement. This will likely require a recommendation of both the executive committee of the Senate and the AAUP executive committee. My suggestion is to hold off on those committees until this fall and hopefully by then we will know what this “New Entity” will be. These committees don’t start any work until the fall.

While we are on the subject of UCS, some of you asked me why you received ballots for UCS representation in colleges you are not part of. The reason is that the UCS election process is a two-step process where a nomination is done by ballots done in the colleges, but the actual election of the UCS committee is done by the senators. So you are voting for representations to UCS from colleges other than your own. This is spelled out in the CBA, so we are just following that process. That election process is due this Friday.

Aaron Baker from Government Relations has asked for representatives to work on an application for a Carnegie Foundation Community Engagement Classification. The University hopes to apply to the foundation and be recognized for its level of engagement. This does involve a rather lengthy application process. He would like faculty currently engaged in community service to work over Summer to help prepare this application.

V.P. McMillen: Aaron is taking the lead on this and working with the Provost’s Office. It’s a new category that the Carnegie Foundation has established, this is only the second round of applications. Only a few schools in Ohio applied in the first round. In these categories there are a number of sub categories that you can commit to, Bowling Green is in one of those categories in the first round. It’s a prestige thing.

Chair Floyd: If any of you are actively engaged in the community and would like to be considered for this committee you can let me or Aaron know.

V.P. McMillen: This is a long term commitment.

Chair Floyd: All of you in the College of Business, Library, Engineering, Education and Pharmacy should have received a message from the Provost regarding the deans’ assessment. This year, this will be an online assessment. Your responses will be anonymous. You will have at least until the end of next week to complete the assessment. From now on, this process will be every two or three years for those deans that have been here for more than three years.

Finally, at the suggestion of Nick Piazza, the University photographer will come today to take our photograph as the last meeting members of the Main Campus Faculty Senate as it has existed since 1966. Apparently they did this on the Health Science Campus at their last meeting as well.

Next on the agenda is Marcia King-Blandford, Chair of the Core Curriculum Committee, who will talk about some changes in the guidelines for core curriculum courses as well as the issue of mid-term grades. After Marcia’s presentation, I will give my Executive Committee report.

Marcia King-Blandford: I have hard copies of the guidelines in color and they were sent to you electronically. The Faculty Senate Core Curriculum is bringing to you an introductory paragraph that we would like to add to the guidelines. It states the philosophy of the general education curriculum. Take a moment to read it and we will ask you for your recommendations. In the guidelines we made some other modifications, marked in blue and red. We tried to be consistent and clean up some of the language. The major change was the introduction paragraph, it says, *“The University of Toledo’s General Education curriculum is a foundation for undergraduate*

education. It exposes the student to a range of disciplines that give breadth to the learning experience, prepares students for their degree programs, and develops students as life-long learners who will thrive in, and contribute significantly to a constantly changing global community.

The General Education curriculum gives students critical reasoning skills to explore complex questions, grasp the essence of social, scientific and ethical problems, and arrive at nuanced opinions. It hones their ability to communicate orally and in writing. It allows them to recognize their place in history and culture, and to appreciate their connection to others in a multicultural world. It prepares them to be thoughtful, engaged citizens in participatory democracy. It requires them to explore the whole range of the liberal arts, both for the intrinsic value of doing so, and also in preparation for study in their degree programs. Specifically, they gain insights into the social and behavioral sciences, become familiar with the history, aesthetics, and criticism of the fine arts, gain experience in the scientific methods through laboratory work, and use philosophical and mathematical processes to examine theoretical and natural phenomena.” Any questions?

Senator LeBlanc: Do you really need the next paragraph? It seems that it is repetitive.

Marcia King-Blandford: We felt we needed an introductory paragraph.

Senator Morrissey: Take out the comma in the first paragraph after “thrive in...”. In second paragraph you need an “a” before “...participatory democracy...”

Rene Heberle: Take the comma out after “...value of doing so...” and take out “...also...” in the same sentence.

Senator Morrissey: I don’t like the word opinion. Maybe “*perspective*” will be better.

Senator Barlowe: I would like to see the word Humanities appear in there somewhere. Maybe in the sentence, “...*Specifically, they gain insight into the social and behavioral sciences, become familiar with the history, aesthetics...*”, and maybe *critical analysis of the Humanities and the fine arts.*”

Senator Stierman: I don’t like the words “*scientific method*” take out “the” after “...gain experience in...” and add “s” in the word “method”. That wording is the same later on in the document in the section on Natural Sciences.

Marcia King-Blandford: Back to Steve’s question about the second paragraph being repetitious. You want it left in there? Any other changes?

Senator Horan: There is a font problem in the first paragraph.

Marcia King-Blandford: Yes, that’s due to cut and paste numerous times. Can we have a motion?

Chair Floyd: This comes from the standing committee and it doesn’t need a second.

Senator Wolff: Are we voting just on the first paragraph?

Marcia King-Blandford: Yes.

Chair Floyd: All those in favor, please say “aye.” Opposed? None.

Senator LeBlanc: On page 2 in “Skills Areas” the first sentence should go under the heading DEVELOPMENT OF GENERAL EDUCATION COURSES.

Marcia King-Blandford: Ok.

Chair Floyd: Does anyone else feel we need to vote on this, or you are accepting it as written?

Marcia King-Blandford: Ok. My next item is the Log Item 0708-11, **Assigning Mid-Term Grades**. The Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee was charged with investigating the issue of assigning mid-term grades for those taking general education classes. Mid-term grades would assess students’ standing in their courses. It would not be a part of the student permanent record. Of particular concern is what processes would be required in assigning such grades to large general education classes, and how difficult it would be. What would be the most effective way for students to get a sense of their academic standing? The Faculty Senate Core Curriculum Committee researched this issue to get ourselves up to speed on this first. Mid-term grading started in the 1990’s and at that point in time they were given a mid-term grade. What has happened is mid-term grading has evolved to a different kind of best practice. Under this scenario institutions

have gone to what is called “early alert”. An early alert is based on a lot of research that has also come out of the first year experience groups. What it recommends is that students need to have feedback prior to mid-term, which really helps students stay in college. And we support their academic success to have feedback between weeks 4 and 6 in that kind of time frame. The Core Curriculum Committee is recommending a hybrid of this mid-term grade, and early alert grade, and what we are recommending is that for the academic year 2008/09 we initiate a pilot project and invite faculty teaching general education courses to participate. What this would entail is between weeks 4 and 7 the Registrar’s Office would open up the grading system. Faculty teaching gen ed courses would be encouraged to give students who are earning a C+ or lower mid-term grades. The intervention would be an email notification that would go to the students with verbiage that told them to contact their instructor immediately. An email would also be sent to college advisors and our recommendation is to the Learning Enhancement Center. What the Core Curriculum Committee was hoping for was that this would be a triangular approach, a safety net. The faculty teaching the course would know, the student would know, the advisors would know and also we would let the existing support system know. We felt it was important that this information be disseminated through the FYI courses as one methodology for getting this information out there. Our recommendation is that this takes place between week 4 and 7. We knew we could get the FYI orientation classes in this period and we would educate the students why they are getting mid-term grades. The research out of the FYI reports that students who know their grade in more than one class have a better chance of getting retained. We would explain to them why it was coming at this point in time in different courses. English Courses, Comp I and II, Mathematic courses are part of general education so if they would be earning a C+ and below in those classes along with other general education courses, they would be getting this feedback in multiple courses.

We are also suggesting for academic year 2009/10 we add a button to the grade A,B,C,D,I,F EA – Early Alert. In 2009/10 the option would be to click on the Early Alert and send an Early Alert notification to the students. The difference between getting the actual grade, that’s what we are recommending for the first academic year, and having an Early Alert sent is Early Alert works more like what you do with student athletes. Early Alert goes along with, are they attending classes, are they participating, are they completing assignments, so it has a much broader spectrum and is a different system by design, than what we call an Early Alert grade. It is the recommendation of the Core Curriculum Committee that we run each of these sequentially. There are strong feelings that we want to have a very comprehensive and well thought-out system. At the same point in time we recognize that this would require a lot of collaboration across a lot of different lines, and it also requires partnering with The Center for Teaching and Learning and investing in faculty development in information centers, and it requires a partnership with Institutional Research to get the kind of data collection that would give us feedback to answer the question we were charged with. And because this takes place in about 60% of the institutions across the United States there is data out there that is proprietary to those institutions. Any committee members that are here, can you add anything?

Senator Thompson-Casado: Are you envisioning this for summer courses as well or just Fall semester courses?

Marcia King-Blandford: We just talked about the new academic year.

Senator Stierman: Regarding student athletes, I rarely see a productive change in behavior; they still don’t turn in assignments and still don’t show up.

Marcia King-Blandford: We did meet with the representatives from the Athletic Department and we met the people from QUEST, and they are looking at their systems also. That’s why we felt it was important to have that kind of cross information to be shared not only with the instructor but with the advisor and with The Learning Enhancement Center.

Prof. Anderson: I’m a visitor to the senate, two comments; one, I maintain continuous grading on Web CT for the students, as mentioned it doesn’t have much of an effect. Everything is delayed

until the last two weeks and then they do all the work. The second thing is, we've already got a grading form and the attendance record form and they are all in different locations. Can all of this be put in one place so that if we are going into Early Alert for anything we just have to do that on one page; even the athletic program material could be put on the same page for the students.

Marcia King-Blandford: We can take that recommendation forward and that was part of the conversation with the Athletic Department and the QUEST program. My understanding is that QUEST built their form based on Athletics. We already had initial conversations about making that form electronic. That's a very good suggestion. The Faculty Senate Core Curriculum also has made the recommendation that there is a way for Web CT grades to be linked to Banner, so that you aren't giving multiple grades and multiple systems, repeating things.

Prof. Lipman: One suggestion about the label of Early Alert; it seems that every time something questionable is brought about, we have another alert, or red flag, or language of alarm. I'm thinking of the security protocols that have been implemented recently and I wonder if there isn't a way to label this positively as opposed to it sounding threatening. The other thing that crosses my mind is that at least for those who are in a department with TA's, you are going to have a lot of first time teachers who are issuing grades for five or six weeks, and it's going to take some real responsibility for those departments to make sure first time TA's evaluate their own instructional methodologies for the first year.

Prof. Dowd: Just for context, a few years ago the Economic Department did this for all our sections of Principles of Macro and Principles of Micro classes as a pilot study for the provost's office. I have a bit of advice based on that experience, you need to get the word out as early as possible to faculty members because this will influence the way they determine course grades and the timing of when they offer exams. The Econ faculty members did not object in any substantial way to this program, but it is very important to get the word out to them as soon as possible so they can build this into their syllabi as a mid-term grade

Senator Morrissey: Do you still require that students sign up so parents can see first semester grades?

Marcia King-Blandford: They can sign on and see the finances but I don't know about grades.

Prof. Jorgensen: Students are like all of us and fool themselves sometimes. When you ask them how are they doing in the class, and they say, about a "B". A "B" means I got a "B" on one test and two "C"s in others. With Web CT teaching introductory classes it is very easy to total the points to date at least once in the semester. Essentially every student in a 1000 level in Chemistry class this past fall, about 2,000 students, got a letter grade next to their name, saying right now you are getting a "C", or a "C-" or a "C+", and actually seeing that grade. Even though they know the scale and they know what a 75% is, I think that seeing that grade, does get their attention. From what I understand students establish study habits like what do they do Sunday nights or Saturday afternoons, within just the first 5, 6, or 7 weeks of class. If they are faced with a grade that is not what they expected, clearly not the grade they got in high school in those classes, I think putting that grade out there can be educational.

Jennifer Rockwood: There is quite a bit of research in the first year information resource center about early grades and it does in fact change a student's work patterns and their study habits when they know that they are not doing well, especially in the first semester of their college year because they are unclear as to the academic rigors. There is a lot of proof that it does make a big difference. I do think it is hard to put a positive spin when you are not doing well, or you are failing. I think some universities call it Early Warning, but it is hard to find positive words for "you're on your way out, buddy." It does have a really big impact on first year students because that is when they are establishing their study habits and time management skills. It does make a big difference.

Senator Piotrowski: You are aware that in Composition I, "C" is the only grade? Will there be a way to indicate that they are doing poorly on assignments and they need support?

Marcia King-Blandford: Midterm grades or early alert grade, until we get a different name, once it has been turned on, it will be turned on across the university for every class, so it is either on or

off. If this recommendation moves forward, it will be turned on. If an instructor in composition chooses to send a grade, they would have that freedom. We are just asking for the pilot project to see a "C" or better. There were some conversations around composition. The answer to the second question, the follow up with the actual instructor, and we talked about what this means and how it is a pilot project and how that verbiage e-mail is going to be written; what is actually going to be said in there and we just haven't gotten that far yet. I think we've had a lot of conversations about what that has to say to get people's attention.

Unidentified speaker: For some students who just aren't showing up and nothing will work no matter what you do.

Prof. Lawrence: I teach 300 and 400 level courses. I wonder whether this formal structure creates more pitfalls than a policy written for general ed. courses, that would require courses themselves to track their progress. I have two quizzes and two assignments before the end of that date. All of my students can see those grades. There is an intervention with an advisor and certainly all of them can see those grades and how they are doing in the course. I don't see how that is any different than formal process, I also wonder is there an issue of releasing the status of these grades through e-mail to other individuals besides the students with student's permission to do that.

Marcia King-Blandford: The advisor will get an e-mail that the student has received a "C" or below. They won't get an actual grade.

Prof. Lawrence: Even without the actual grade you are still giving an indication to someone besides the student as to the progress of the grade assigned. You're actually classifying those students at a certain level of their status. It just seems to me that there is a potential here for a lot of confusion among the students, as well as advisors and instructors.

Marcia King-Blandford: I think that the points you raised have been heard, and we had those same conversations in the committee.

Senator Barnes: One of the things we were concerned about was the work load of giving everyone a midterm grade and we've batted around the idea that it would be confusing for students. The idea was that if you only had to record students who were really in trouble then it would be easier even though you are still going to have to calculate all those grade but we just thought it might be easier on the faculty.

Prof. Lawrence: I give midterm grades for all my students and all my students have access to that. The question is formalizing it through an official grade structure and how do you go to the extra step to only submit those that are a C+ or below. As a suggestion to you there are other ways in handling this within a classroom structure. You could make it a requirement of all gen. ed. courses to report midterms to all their students, or some equivalent of that without formalizing it through an official grading system which does create extra steps to have to report only those grades, and raise the question to students, instructors and advisors, why some students may or may not get a grade and try to explain why this is in place. Why can't all instructors of general ed. be informed to please advise all your students of their midterm status?

Prof. Dowd: I'd like to support the statement made by Prof. Jorgensen. There is a difference between telling a students that their average is 75% and the student seeing that is a "C". There is a difference here especially for students who are newer to the university. They may not be used to seeing grades in percentage terms but they do understand the "A-F" metric. If faculty give them a midterm grade, it needs to be in a letter form because that's what they relate to and that's what they understand.

Senator Barnes: It certainly isn't enough to just tell them what their individual grades are on the assignments. What I do is I make a matrix and say this is worth 20% of your grade and keep track of your grade here, and they don't do it. They might do more when they see the actual letter grade.

Senator Fink: I'm a little confused by this. Are there formal letters that are generated to all the students? I can't imagine what the cost of that would be.

Marcia King-Blandford: No, it's just an e-mail.

Senator Fink: Isn't it true that, at least in the College of Business, every syllabus is supposed to show our grading scale? What percent is an A, what percent is an A-, so they have that on their syllabus. I would think most of them would look at their syllabus.

Marcia King-Blandford: There is enough research out there that shows that there is value and it can be debated a lot of different ways. We don't know who is doing what in what areas across the university so by at least offering this as a pilot program, this gives us at least the beginnings to get to know what areas are affected. Faculty that are on the committee that speak for their colleges or their program know which students are struggling academically and get feedback.

Senator Fink: I think it is not enough just to give the students their grades. I have a grad assistant and she is best friends with another of my colleague's grad assistants and she is doing great in her graduate program, but she has a sister who is a freshman here who got off track somewhere. I know her sister tried real hard to help her but her efforts were not enough to save her and, as a result, I have come to the conclusion that it is a good idea to notify advisors if students are at risk and I believe it should be required that these students then have to meet with an advisor. This may be the only way to get these students back on track. It has to be helpful that the students know there is somebody who cares about their performance and someone who can help stop their downward spiral.

Chair Floyd: I think it is important to remember that this is being recommended as a pilot project so there is an opportunity to come back at the end of this pilot and look at what was successful, what wasn't, and what might be implemented permanently. So I hope that we can keep that in mind in voting on whether or not to accept this. Any other discussion?

Senator Barnes: From the committee's perspective, we were also encouraging enormous amounts of intervention at that point, so that it wasn't just an e-mail and a phone call, which I agree, often results in the student coming back for two days and then disappearing again. We hope to have sort of an ongoing strategy for support when this happens. So we are asking for that and we know that requires investment and staffing and things.

Marcia King-Blandford: We really want to invite participation in this. For those of you who already do that, that's great, and for those of you who want to try it, give us that feedback about what works and what doesn't and how meaningful it is for the student. I think that is very important to have those voices in the process.

Senator Fink: I was talking to a student today and they had just gone through a problem with depression and was getting help here and was doing a fantastic job with it. Every semester I have students that go through a very tough depression. I don't know if it is the stress or whatever but apparently we have a very good support system. I do tell the students about the Testing Center. I think that every faculty should be sent a list of phone numbers at the beginning of every semester of how to provide support to students with depression and other things, because we lose a lot of good people. I had a student last year who dropped out, and with a lot of encouragement from the College of Business she came back and fought it everyday, and by the end of the year she had a very good control on it. So instead of being a statistic where she might have done nothing with her life now she's going to graduate and have a good life. If people could be sent this and we have an opportunity to share it, it we could make a big difference.

Marcia King-Blandford: The University Counseling Center is online and there is a lot of information online about what you can do to help students.

Senator Fink: How do you even know that? If we could just be sent a list of telephone numbers at the beginning of the semester that would be terrific.

Chair Floyd: We need to take a vote on whether to take the committee's recommendation. The motion is to accept the committee's report and forward this as a project next year. All those in favor please say "aye". All those opposed, "nay". The report has been accepted.

Executive Committee report

As this is the last Faculty Senate report for this year, and in fact the last Faculty Senate report for this body after 42 years, the executive committee has decided not to offer you a summary of what has happened over the past two weeks as we usually do, but rather to provide to you a report of where we stand as a Senate, a sort of “State of the Faculty Senate” address if you will. We felt this was important for several reasons. For one, since we are electing an entirely new Senate, it is likely that there could be few holdovers from this Senate and this executive committee, so this is our way of helping to establish the agenda for the next Senate and to make sure that some important issues are not forgotten. Secondly, after a year of experience as leaders of this group, we have seen several issues emerge that concern us for the future. So what you will hear today is a mix of what might be called “unfinished business,” and “future concerns.” We also felt this could be the beginning of a tradition for the last meeting of the Senate each year. As I review this list with you today, I would appreciate your feedback and input.

Before I get to my report, however, I would like to take a few moments to thank some people who have helped me tremendously this year. First, I would like to thank all of you for your service as senators. At a time when some of us feel that the faculty voice is diminished and the Senate’s role lessened, I am heartened that you have chosen to serve this year. Your voice, and the passion in that voice as you have discussed issues of deep concern, have proven to me that being engaged is the most important way we as faculty can help influence decisions on this campus. It is very easy during times of unease and uncertainty to retreat to our classrooms and our research, and forget about our obligations to our colleagues. Many of you may have asked the question this year, “Why bother?” But as Thomas Jefferson said, “the price of liberty is eternal vigilance.” I would amend this slightly to fit our role as faculty members by saying, “The price of being a faculty member is eternal vigilance to the values we hold dear.” That means we cannot shut down, tune out, or ignore. We must continue to offer constructive comments that can, hopefully, shape our university’s future.

I would also like to express a special thanks to the members of the executive committee. This has been a wonderful group this year, and you should know as senators that they have served your interests well. Carter Wilson, Walt Olson, Jamie Barlowe, Sharon Barnes, Alice Skeens, Nick Piazza, and Harvey Wolff have brought to the table their many years of experience and their unique perspectives. My deep, deep thanks to each of you. I also want to thank Kathy Grabel, our secretary, for being the glue that keeps this operation together and running smoothly, or at least as smoothly as the Faculty Senate is capable of running. I don’t know how this body would operate without you.

In no particular order, here are the issues that the executive committee believes we are facing us as we move into becoming a new representative body of the faculty, and that we hope the new Senate will address in the coming year.

The budgeting process. Let us start with an issue that is timely—the proposed process for developing a budget for next year. As you have undoubtedly heard by now, the process is either: a) an intellectual exercise about creative thinking to address how we, as an institution, might begin to implement our strategic plan; or b) an actual reallocation of as much as \$20 million from current programs to new or existing strategic initiatives. In presentation after presentation on this extremely important topic, we have been told that

this is a “conversation” that is meant to unleash our creativity and help us begin to think “outside the box” about the way we carry out our responsibilities. We have heard that this process should be bottom-up, that it should reflect shared governance, and that it will be transparent. That may be the intention—and unlike many of you, I take Dr. Scarborough at his word—but it does not appear to be happening in the manner he envisioned. The “conversation” in many colleges is a one-way conversation, if it is occurring at all. The vast majority of faculty have not been involved, even though this budget process has the potential to greatly impact academic programs. While budget hearings have been held, few of us have any idea what reallocation ideas have been put forth. When this process for developing the budget was first explained to the executive committee about a month ago, we knew it was going to be difficult. But we believed it would be transparent. The “conversation” has not occurred. The creative thinking this was to unleash has been stifled. One is left to conclude that a) the process was never really meant to be transparent; or b) what Dr. Scarborough believes is happening is not.

The budget process brings to mind many bigger questions about the future of our institution and whether the strategic plan presents a vision that we, as faculty, endorse. There must be a method by which feedback on the plan is received, and that this feedback then informs revisions to the plan. It cannot be a static strategic plan.

While all of these larger issues loom in the background, I believe our real concern as faculty about the budget development process is not at the institution-wide macro view. For many of us, we realize that while it may be called reallocation, when it happens to our departments, it is a budget cut, and it affects our friends, our colleagues, or perhaps even us personally. And it affects programs that we have helped to build and develop, sometimes for our entire academic careers. Some of the programs that may lose out are not weak or ineffectual, but rather strong and vibrant and with considerable potential. Their only fault is to no longer be a part of the visionary picture of our future as an institution.

The diminishing voice of the faculty. The administration has shown an unwillingness to hear and understand legitimate faculty concerns. Rarely a day goes by when I do not see some small way in which our voice is muted. In addition to these smaller ways, there are major ones as well. Let me list a few of these for you. 1.) The lack of a university committee structure. This has been a concern of the faculty for at least three years, even before the merger, and we seem no closer to having this resolved now as we did then. Without university committees with established charges and identified membership that represent all of the constituencies on campus, the faculty and staff voice will not be heard. 2.) The lack of faculty representation on Board of Trustee committees. We have been promised that this will be addressed next year, and that there will be a faculty representative on the Academic and Student Affairs Committee. I hope that happens. 3.) The lack of faculty input into the faculty hiring plan. As you know, we had a process in the past where a committee reviewed proposals put forth under the faculty hiring plan, and this peer review aided the provost in making the decisions about where precious faculty positions should be placed. The executive committee continues to believe that this input is important. We do not believe that faculty should have the final say, but faculty can provide insight into these decisions that can be informative and useful to the provosts. 4.) The lack of a functioning Facilities Planning Committee. We have heard in recent presentations all of the grand plans for new buildings and building renovations on our campuses. But what we have not heard is how the faculty have been brought into the discussions of these plans,

and most importantly, how we are helping to set priorities. Building new facilities is, by definition, a long-term commitment of resources by our university, and as faculty, we should have a voice in the discussion of those commitments. The Facilities Planning Committee has met once this entire year for an organizational meeting. 5.) The complete “reengineering” of the undergraduate curriculum with no input from the faculty, or the Faculty Senate. Our Core Curriculum Committee, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, Academic Programs Committee, and Academic Regulations Committee were not involved in the discussions that will apparently lead to a complete re-vamping of the undergraduate curriculum, starting this fall. Indeed, the first I heard about the details of this plan was at a rehearsal of the president’s State of the University Address the day before he delivered it to the public, which left the faculty in the awkward position of merely reacting to the president’s ideas. While the provost and president may be able to enact such sweeping changes without faculty input, my question to them is—why would you want to? Would not it be better for the future of this institution to have the faculty on-board and an active participant in such discussions from the beginning? What is to fear?

Some people may rightly ask the question: why should the faculty have a strong voice in our university? It is a fair question, I believe. In answering this, I would like to recall comments made at one of the meetings I attended this year as a member of the “Senior Leadership Team” when one administrator proudly commented on how valuable their experience had been in teaching a course each semester—how it opened their eyes to the student experience, how it helped them recognize issues they never would have known about otherwise, and to see them in an entirely new perspective. Yes, indeed. Front-line classroom experience does color the lenses by which we view this institution, and is why the faculty voice is so important to our institution. As faculty, we also have a long-term commitment to this university, and an institutional memory. As one of my colleagues on the executive committee has stated several times, it is simply inefficient not to seek out the faculty view on issues. We can save the administration a great deal of time and keep them from making costly mistakes, for all of the reasons I have just stated.

The proper role of dissent. A corollary to the issue of diminishing faculty voice, I believe, is the question of what is the proper role of dissent at our university. The executive committee has experienced many times this year an aversion by our administration to critical comments. As faculty, we are trained to analyze, to be skeptical, and to critique—to do otherwise would abdicate our responsibility as critical thinkers. What is seen by us as a way to strengthen our institution is seen by others as a risk that could be potentially damaging to our university’s image within our community. And while the administration has focused considerable time, energy, and money on outside consultants in order to build a sense of “teamwork” within senior leadership, teamwork can quickly degenerate into groupthink. We need look no further than our current national leaders to see what can happen when insular leadership develops. Conversations need to occur both up and down the hierarchy if leaders are to be effective. Leaders should encourage criticism, not avoid it. Only through rigorous and spirited debate can consensus be formed and people feel they have buy-in to decisions.

I was thinking about this issue recently when I saw a news story one Sunday morning about a church somewhere in the Midwest that has made its parishioners take pledges to not complain for 30 days. The pastor stated that complaining uses up good energy, and fuels depression. I was startled by this. While some may complain too much

and about minor concerns that eat up valuable energy, it is important to remember that some of the great revolutions of our time started with complaints. The Reformation and the American Revolution each started with a simple list of complaints. Complaints are not a drag on our potential as an institution or represent a threat to our image as a university. Constructive criticism will make us better, stronger, and more effective. Listening to that criticism ought to be one of the most important jobs of our administrators. Avoiding debate will only lead to weak ideas and ineffective plans.

Administrative bloat. At the Board of Trustees Finance Committee meeting last Monday, Dr. Scarborough said that, in his analysis of our budget, too much of our resources are spent on salaries and benefits. I cannot let this go unanswered. I would like to remind you how much our administration has grown in size and cost these past two years. Two weeks ago, a story in *UT News* indicated that not only do we now have a senior vice president for finance and administration (which seems completely reasonable to me), we will also have no less than four new vice presidents and one new associate vice president under this senior vice president. There will now be a vice president for human resources and campus safety, a vice president for facilities and construction, a vice president for finance, and a vice president for technology, in addition to an associate vice president for budget and planning. One of those vice presidents will make \$190,000, and one who used to be an associate vice president received a \$38,000 pay raise at Monday's board meeting. At a time when we are being asked to reallocate money from back-of-the-shop operations to front-line interactions with students, I fail to see how this plan involving many new layers of administration fits that objective.

Merging of our faculty cultures. As we have observed the merger of the two institutions over the past two years, it has become obvious to the executive committee that it has been culturally and organizationally completed only at the top layers. Much of that has occurred because those who were UT administrators have been completely replaced by either those of the former MUO or by new hires. An organizational chart of UT in 2005 contrasted with today's shows that 20 of the former UT's top leaders are no longer here or will be leaving soon.

But for those of us at the lower levels of the institution—the faculty and the staff—the merger has not happened. I hope that the Senate next year will take this issue seriously and figure out how we, as faculty, can begin to move beyond “us” and “them” to become just “us.” As I said a few weeks ago, I believe we will be a stronger Senate when we are more diverse. We too will prosper from vigorous debate. I believe our colleagues on the Health Science Campus will benefit from our experience as a Senate, and I believe they are genuinely looking forward to joining with us.

I hope that the Senate will put together a task force or committee that can work on ways to identify the cultural differences between us and propose creative means to bridge those differences. One of the reasons given for the merger two years ago was because faculty on the two campuses could benefit from the synergy that would develop, and this interaction would produce new research areas and interdisciplinary enterprises. Let us dedicate ourselves next year to making this actually begin to happen.

Defining “shared governance.” Since the merger, the executive committees both this year and last have had a few meetings with administrators, board members, deans, etc. to address the meaning of “shared governance.” Unfortunately, all of those meetings centered on one topic: the role of the Faculty Senate in shared governance. There is

obviously much, much more that ought to be discussed, because these limited conversations have shown that there are many misperceptions about the topic. The executive committee recommended many months ago that we consider developing a “shared governance matrix” similar to something developed by the faculty and administration of Central Michigan University. This matrix would lay out exactly where decisions were made, by whom, and with input from what constituents. But we have not gotten anywhere with this, and we hope the new Senate leadership and the administration will make this a priority. I believe that if we all understood our roles and agreed to them, there would be much less animosity between all of the groups that share in governance at our institution. We would also begin to institutionalize the concepts of shared governance so that every time the administration changes, we do not begin all over again struggling with what shared governance means.

Gender equity. At one of the last Senate meetings, you heard the results of a study that looked at the issue of salary inequity by gender. That study, based upon the data reviewed and the methodology used, concluded that salary inequity is not statistically significant at UT. In the discussion the Women’s Leadership Council had with the provost following that report, we discussed other institutionally imbedded and structural ways in which gender inequity may exist on our campus. I urge the Senate to continue to monitor this issue, and to work closely with the Women’s Leadership Council. While the statistics as presented may not show inequity, all of us, both male and female, can probably provide countless examples of how our institution creates a hostile climate for woman and minorities. We have seen the departure of several of our most respected female colleagues in recent months, and that does not bode well for our future.

Commitment of the Senate to be a positive force in our institution. When I assumed the position of Senate chair a year ago, I made a commitment that the Senate would be seen as a positive and productive force in the university. The executive committee has worked hard at this, and I think the new constitution shows that we have been successful in overcoming some of the misperceptions that existed about the Senate. Just to remind you, when we began the conversation about a new Senate constitution, there were those who sought to use the occasion to dramatically change our role. At one time, it was proposed that the Faculty Senate be replaced with a ‘University Senate.’ Another idea was to have all curricular decisions be made within the colleges with no Senate oversight. Some did not want a single Senate, and the president himself said he didn’t particularly care if we had one senate or two. Fortunately, none of these things happened, and I would like to congratulate you as senators for approving a constitution that maintains our role in the university. Being a positive force for the institution doesn’t mean that we go along with whatever we are told or that we sacrifice our beliefs, but rather it means that we pick our battles wisely based upon our core beliefs, and that we offer constructive criticism that can lead to solutions to our institutional problems.

Lastly, what is the role of the past in shaping our future. This is a difficult question, but one that has been of great interest to me this year. On many occasions, we have heard the administration proudly proclaim us as the “new” University of Toledo. If I interpret this correctly, it means that our past is the past, and our future bears little connection to what came before. As a new institution, we can wipe the slate clean and become whatever we wish to be. I remember one meeting when Dr. Jacobs reviewed the recent history of the former MUO during a particularly difficult period of three disastrous presidencies in a row,

and said that was the past and the institution had moved on. The lesson I took away from this story was not that this should be forgotten, but rather that if they had learned the lessons of their history, it would not have taken three failed presidents to figure out what was wrong. Regardless, I think even though we are a new institution, we need to build upon the history of our two institutions, and there is much to be gained from its informing our future. The institutional memory of all of us matters. While we may be a much different institution than the one founded by Jesup Scott back in 1872, our goals remain essentially unchanged—as Scott so eloquently stated it, this university was created to train “artists and artisans” for their role in what Scott envisioned to be the Future Great City of the World. Isn’t this, 136 years later, what we are still trying to do? And should not the collective wisdom of all of us in this room, and our institutional memory about this institution, help to guide the university in the future? Any discussion at this point?

Senator Johanson: You read this to the Board of Trustees, right?

Chair Floyd: No, not this report, a much briefer version, a version more appropriate for the Board, that emphasized particularly communication with the Board and membership on committees.

Senator Johanson: What was their reaction?

Chair Floyd: It was a very long meeting and I rushed through my report and there were no comments. But they did say, “Thank you for the information.” One of the issues with the Board is that we are not sitting at the table as we had in the past. There isn’t a proper means of communication between the Board and they feel it and we feel it. That will be something that should be focused on next year.

Senator Johanson: There is no agreement between us and the Board itself as to how that communication should take place. Am I right?

Chair Floyd: I would guess that is true. It’s not quite clear how the Faculty Senate leadership should communicate with the Board. Is it through the President? Others on the Board believe there must be a more direct means of communication, I believe.

Prof. Andy Jorgensen: Two points that you made: 1) You were successful even though there was pressure to greatly change the role of the senate. It did not. The situation evolved and it became better with respect to curriculum issues and authority and other areas. For this the Senate is to be complimented for that favorable outcome. 2) Referring now to the President’s talk about future education, I think this is a serious threat and the Faculty Senate needs to speak for the undergraduate curriculum as the primary body through the departments and colleges. The fact that the speech was given at all before any discussion among the faculty says there is a broken link in this institution which is related to education, our primary goal. I would urge next year’s senate, even this summer, to be completely on top of this, because this cannot go unchallenged.

Chair Floyd: I volunteered faculty members to work this summer with the Provost’s office and I hope we will get people willing to do that. We all feel this is an extremely important initiative, even if it means working during the summer. There are people who really do want to participate.

Senator Olson: I just got back from China and I have been following the events. What I have been reading is the Board is saying the President and the deans are doing what the Board wants them to do. If that is the case, then the Board needs to tell us what they want us to do because we have a different view of the world than apparently does the Board and the administrators. Back a few months ago when the President brought in ex-president Cartwright, she said it was not the duty of the faculty senate to provide communications. If not the faculty senate, whose job is it? Obviously it’s not the president’s, he hasn’t done it. And not the deans’, they haven’t done it. So my real question then is who is responsible for communications on this campus. The Board apparently has made directives that the deans and the President are implementing but we haven’t

heard anything about at this level. It is only fair that we would be upset because we are moving in this direction and they are moving in that direction.

Chair Floyd: Since you walked in late you don't know that Rick Stansley was going to be here today and I think it would have had a much more productive and constructive discussion if he were here because we would have had feedback from him. I will try to get him to attend the April 29th meeting and see if we can have some of that dialogue at that time because I think from my conversations with Mr. Stansley he feels that there was a communication breakdown somewhere between them and us.

Renee Heberle: I think that the Faculty Senate has helped under incredible circumstances these past two years. I was looking back at a faculty senate meeting from October 2006 at the meeting minutes and I just wanted to read a couple of things that the president said back then. This is all about shared government and his ideas about that and concerns about it but he opened his address to the senate with this kind of language: *"It is clear to me and I believe to my core that the faculty is the most important part of this institution. The faculty is the most important part of any institution of higher education. The faculty is what makes a great institution such as this. It is not by chance that diplomas are given. You may have heard me saying that institutions are not bricks & mortar, not even made of fiber optic cable, or computer boxes. They are made by human beings, at best often imperfectly... The faculty possess the knowledge and it is our mission to transmit to subsequent generations. The faculty possess the creativity that results in discoveries to improve the human condition. The faculty are the core, the heart and the soul of this and every other institution of higher education."* I find that beautiful, and I find nothing that they have done in the last two years representing anything like this commitment. I see nothing in terms of encouragement of programs to facilitate faculty communication collaboration across the campus. I see nothing to look at what faculty has already done. My experience in the College of Arts and Sciences in terms of initiative for reinvesting resources, new ideas, and new initiatives - nothing. So I would like to bring those words back to the president and to the Board, and also just say to the Board, in **The Blade** coverage the main response to the Board and to the vote of no confidence in the Arts & Science Council to our dean was, "we didn't know it was happening so somehow therefore it shouldn't have." There were two weeks in between so speaking of breakdown of communication, a vote with that kind of significance, a vote not important, whose job is it to know these things?

Chair Floyd: I'll just add that one of the trustees asked me about that, why didn't they know anything about the issues and I didn't know what to say to them. I don't believe that a vote of no confidence in a college is an issue for the senate. It is a college issue, so how does the college convey those concerns? We don't have these kinds of votes all the time so the protocol on how to handle them has not been established. I think that there is a lot of grey areas here, and because these are rare events, there will always be these questions asked.

Renee Heberle: My concern is that with this administration we might be beyond the bend, and rely on those institutional forms and it seems to me that it is just an issue of paying attention.

Chair Floyd: I would really like our discussion to be productive and constructive and I think that you have made some constrictive suggestions. I hope that we can move forward with those ideas. Any other discussions?

Senator Relue: I would like to thank Barb and the Executive Committee for all they have done.

Chair Floyd: Thank you so much. Before I conclude, I would like to express my sincere thanks to all of you for the confidence you have shown in me the past year. It has been my honor to serve you and this university in this position. When I think back to when I started at the University of Toledo in 1976 as a freshman student, I never could have imagined that I would have the privilege of serving as the chair of its Faculty Senate. This experience has taught me a great deal about myself, about the importance of a strong faculty voice at our university, and the meaning of leadership. I will continue on the executive committee next year as past chair, and I look forward to helping to ensure that the Senate, even as it goes through a fundamental change next year, will

continue to serve the faculty and the university in all the important ways it has for the past 42 years.
Thank you all, and can we have a motion to adjourn?
Motion was made and seconded.

V. *Calendar Questions:*

VI. *Other Business:*

Old business: None

New business: None

VII. *Adjournment:* Meeting was adjourned at 4:35 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Alice Skeens
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Kathy Grabel
Faculty Senate Office Admin. Secretary