

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO **Approved @FS mtg. on 1/8/08**
FACULTY SENATE
Minutes of the Senate Meeting of November 27, 2007
<http://www.facsenate.utoledo.edu>

HIGHLIGHTS

Undergraduate Curriculum update
Strategic planning
Core Curriculum update
Provost Haggett
Emergency closings

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, Cluse-Tolar, Compora (for Moorhead), Evans (for Lipscomb), Fink, Floyd, Fournier, Funk, Greninger, Hefzy, Horan, Hudson, Johanson, Kennedy, Kistner, Klein, Lambert, Le (for Zallocco), LeBlanc, Lundquist, McInerney, Monsos, Nandkeolyar (for Ariss), Olson, Peseckis, Piotrowski, Relue, Skeens, Spongberg, Stierman, Stone (for Hamer), Teclehaimanot, Thompson-Casado, Ventura, Wedding, Wikander,

Excused absence: Chen, Edwards (for Baines), Fritz, Hottell, Jakobson, Martin, Morrissey, Piazza, Schall, Wolff,

Unexcused absence: Sundar (for Pope),

II. Approval of Minutes:

Minutes of November 6, 2007 were approved as distributed.

III. Executive Committee Report:

Chair Barbara Floyd:

Faculty Senate Meeting
Tuesday, November 27, 2007

On the issue of the rules and appendices

The rules and appendices as drafted by the executive committees of the two Faculty Senates were distributed to you and to all faculty on Friday, Nov. 16. Given that this is the last Senate meeting of the semester, and everyone is busy trying to wrap up activities of the semester, the executive committee does not want to try to gather formal input from the faculty this semester, but rather we suggest waiting until early in the Spring semester. We will schedule an extensive discussion for our first Senate meeting on January 8. We will also schedule several open forums for early in the semester so that faculty members who are not senators have an opportunity to provide input.

In the meantime, I hope you will, as senators, actively seek input from your colleagues. The rules and appendices as written reflect only the collective wisdom of the two executive committees, and we want to make sure that the structure we put in place will work. We have received comments from the provosts and will also seek comments from others in the administration. But in the end, the rules and the appendices govern the internal workings of the Senate, and therefore must reflect the views of the faculty first and foremost. So please, take this seriously and do what you can to get comments from your colleagues. To date, I have received comments from only one faculty member.

As you might guess, our hopes of having a merged Senate to start the new calendar year will not be realized. Our goal now is to get this done in time to elect officers for a new merged Senate in the spring. Logistically, this probably makes more sense since it would be disruptive to start with a new Senate in the middle of an academic year.

Log items assigned

The executive committee has reviewed two requests for log items, and we have assigned both to committees for investigation. The first issue is that of certificate programs. It has come to our attention that some departments offer certificates to students after they take specific course offerings that appear to indicate that the student has some sort of official specialization in a topic. The series of courses represent less than a minor. At this time, there appears to be no oversight of these certificate programs from the provost's office, and no Faculty Senate oversight of them. Also, it is unclear if these programs become part of the students' transcripts. We have asked our Academic Programs Committee to look at this issue and make recommendations concerning whether the Senate should have some oversight of these programs.

At the request of a senator, we have asked the University Affairs Committee to look at whether the university should have a policy concerning the use of university facilities by political candidates when the political rallies held are not open to the public. This issue was addressed in a Blade editorial of several weeks ago. Allegheny College in Pennsylvania has developed a policy that prohibits candidates from holding staged political events that are not open to the public and where the audience is controlled by the candidates and the political parties. We have asked the committee to look at the issue, look at the policy enacted by Allegheny College, and make a recommendation on whether such a policy would be appropriate for UT.

I have made photocopies of the Blade editorial for anyone who missed it and is interested in the topic. If anyone has any comments, please contact the University Affairs Committee.

Other issues.

Student Government: We received a communication requesting help in supporting Student Government to ensure they receive adequate financial resources next year to offset the increasing cost of providing tuition and fees for the SG president and vice president. I have asked our Student Affairs Committee to work with SG on this issue.

College of Nursing representation: We have been asked by the College of Nursing about our Senate reviewing curriculum, academic program, and core curriculum issues from the College of Nursing because the college has no representation on the Senate or in committees. I responded to Susan Batten, the associate dean, and offered that we would be happy to add Nursing reps to our committees, and asked her to send me possible names for appointment. She pointed out that the college has no representation on the Senate which ultimately approves the recommendations of the committee. I responded that this is a temporary problem, that to allow Nursing faculty to be elected members of the Senate would require a change in our constitution that would have to be voted on by the entire faculty, and that by the time this was done, we would more than likely be a merged senate and the point would be mute. I also pointed out that representatives from the college are always welcome to attend

our Senate meetings and speak on any issue of interest to them. I have not received a response from her, but do hope we can move quickly to get Nursing reps on our curriculum committees.

Safe Places Project: You should have received a communication this week from President Jacobs regarding the president's endorsement of the Safe Spaces program. This is a program this body endorsed last month, so I am pleased to see that the president also supports this program. Congratulations to UT-Spectrum for their efforts on behalf of this program.

Academic Compliance Council: I had a meeting last week with Lynn Hutt, UT's compliance officer, concerning the creation of an Academic Compliance Council. She is putting together a group to begin discussions of what such a council would do. The Senate will be represented at this meeting, as will the UT-AAUP. It is unclear to me exactly what ultimately the charge of the Academic Compliance Committee will be, but we will be at the table when the discussions begin, so I will keep you posted on this issue.

Greek Life academic achievement: I received an email from Heather Hildebrand, assistant director of Greek Life, concerning a new initiative from her office to help ensure academic achievement by members of fraternities and sororities. They are discussing the possibility of midterm reports for Greek students similar to those completed for athletes, and also a series of workshops aimed at improving the academic success of sorority and fraternity members. I have referred her communication to our Student Affairs Committee, and asked the committee to work with this office.

Update on Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics. At our last meeting, I asked Jim Klein to look into whether we as a Senate ought to join the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics and whether it would be appropriate for this group to participate.

Senator Klein: After consulting with Alice Skeens, UT's faculty athletics rep and members of the Athletics Committee, my recommendation is not to join COIA. This group consists of 56 Division 1A institutions, whose faculty senates belong to the COIA. Out of the 56, 38 come from the Big Six Conferences - the ACC, The Big 12, the Big East, The Big 10, The Pack 10 and the SEC.

Nine more come from Conference USA, and the Mountain West Conferences. All of these conferences, especially the first six are the "haves" of Division 1A. The "have-nots" include the MAC schools - OU and EMU. The four critical issues identified by COIA in the most recent white paper were academic integrity and quality, student athlete welfare, campus governance, athletics and fiscal responsibility. Right now, I do not feel that there are significant problems regarding these areas at UT. I think that AD Mike O'Brien's report to the FS several weeks ago confirms this. These issues are more relevant to the schools and conferences that have huge resources. This is not to say that faculty oversight is not essential. In this regard there are six UT faculty on the Athletic Committee - three members elected by this FS - Celia Regimbal, Robin Kennedy (Chair), and me - and one more faculty member from the college of Medicine; in addition, Sharon Barnes, appointed by the president, and NCAA faculty athletics representative Alice Skeens serve on the committee. There is sufficient faculty oversight of athletics at UT. For these reasons, I suggest that we do not join COIA. Perhaps there will be a time we should revisit this matter and have a broader base group get involved.

Chair Floyd: Any comments on this? I will take your advice and discuss it with the Executive Committee and make a decision.

This is the last meeting of the semester. Does anyone have any suggestions as to what speakers we might want the next semester? One person that we might want to invite is Chuck Lehnert to give us an update on the facilities planning and construction, and also the President.

Senator Barden: I would like to hear from Dan Johnson on the technology corridor.

Chair Floyd: I think he is more involved with the global initiatives but for old time's sake, we can invite him.

Senator Wedding: I would like to see guests and more important topics on future agendas go first in the first hour, as opposed to late.

Chair Floyd: We do have the business of the Senate that we must carry out first. Then the committee reports which is the working aspect of the Senate, and that's why sometimes we have to delay some things. We do have the Provost moved up on the agenda at this time. Any other suggestions?

As a reminder, two candidates for the VP of Finance & Administration are having an open forum, Scott Scarborough was here today, and Bill Logie on Thursday, from 12:00 -1:00 pm next door. We also have some log items assigned to various committees and we will follow up on those next semester.

Steve Peseckis, Chair of Undergraduate Curriculum is first on the agenda.

Senator Peseckis: Course modifications and new courses recommendations were emailed to you previously. Any comments or questions on those? If not, all those in favor, please say "aye". Opposed, "nay". *Passed unanimously.*

Course Modifications and New Courses Approval by the Faculty Senate on November 27, 2007

Updated 11-21-07

College of Arts and Sciences

New Course

BIOL 4210	Molecular Basis of Disease	3 ch
BIOL 4250	Introduction to Neurobiology	3 ch
COMM 4340	Visual Communication II	4 ch
PSY 3230	Psychological Testing	3 ch

Course Modification

PSC 3730 American Foreign Policy 3 ch
Change prerequisites from "PSC 1200 or 1400 and PSC 2700" to "PSC 1200 or 1400 or PSC 1710 or PSC 2700"

College of Education

Course Modification

SPED 2040 Perspectives in the Field of Special Education 3 ch
Change course title to "Perspectives in the Field of Exceptionalities"
Update catalog description.

SPED 4600 Professional Reflective Seminar 1 ch
Change credit hours to "3"

College of Engineering

Course Modification

MIME 2600 Engineering Economics 3 ch
Change pre-requisite from "Sophomore Standing" to "Engineering Students Only"

MIME 3300 Design and Analysis of Mechanical Systems 3 ch
Change from "pre-requisite MIME 2300" to "co-requisite MIME"

College of Pharmacy

New Course

PHPR 4810 Finance and Personal Planning for Pharmacists 1 ch

Prof. King-Blandford: The members of the Core Curriculum Committee ask for your support to make a correction to our general education curriculum in our transfer module. A few weeks back we brought a visual transfer module; it's a subset of our University general education core curriculum. We have the HB-95 which requires us to meet and be in compliance of the transfer module. This was established more than 12 years ago. The transfer module by State law requires us to take six hours of English Comp and what has happened in our curriculum and general education curriculum is that in all programs and degrees and our undergraduate experience we require Composition I but it never has been designated as a general education course. So it is the recommendation of the Faculty Senate Core Curriculum Committee that we designate Composition I, which would be both courses, English 111 and English 110 as general education. We are not increasing any programs and are not adding any requirements. It's just a technicality. Every semester as an institution we are required to guarantee that transfer students are treated as native students. About 12 years ago it was established and OBOR and the State law put it into effect that students are required to take 6 hours of composition. As an institution we were concerned about adding more credit hours, so we made Comp I a pre-requisite, so it is not officially designated as a general education course. Because of this we are not in compliance with the State of Ohio every semester.

Senator Barnes: Can students test out of it?

Prof. King-Blandford: Yes, it's just that we never designated it as part of our general education curriculum.

Senator Barnes: They don't have to take another one?

Prof. King-Blandford: No, it's just a technicality.

Chair Floyd: Any comments or questions for Marcia?

Prof. King-Blandford: May we have your approval?

Chair Floyd: All those in favor, please say "aye". Opposed say "nay"? *Passed unanimously.*

Can we have a motion to approve the minutes of November 6, 2007? All those in favor, please say "aye", opposed say "nay." *Minutes approved unanimously.*

Provost Haggett: I was asked by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to address four different items. The faculty hiring plans, retention - and I'm going to address that today, and also talk about some highlights of some recent analysis we've done and explain why we've done them. I've also been asked to address agreements with international universities - and will do that but I want to put it in context of our international engagement - and then where we are with our gender equity salary study. So I will begin by talking about the faculty hiring plans. I know that those are important to you. You want to know when you are going to have new colleagues, or have the opportunity to pursue new colleagues. To remind you, back in July, Jeff Gold and I sent to the university deans and chairs, a memo talking about the ways we would hire faculty this year, and we outlined several different ways. Today I'm going to talk about the three ways that we are going to hire faculty for which you and your department have submitted proposals to my office and to Provost Gold. You want to know what we're going to do with them. Let me remind you what those are. These three are:

- the strategic tenure track faculty hiring plan
- the strategic lecture faculty hiring plan
- the early retirement incentive plan

You know the first two as 10x10 and 5x10 in the shorthand. This is the fourth year of a ten year commitment by the university that was started prior to the merger to increase the number of tenure track faculty by 10 per year and lecturers by 5 per year over a ten year period, and we are continuing that, this is the fourth year. The early retirement incentive plan, also initiated prior to the merger,

was the opportunity for faculty to take an early retirement, and this year we have accrued savings in that plan which allows us to start to replace some of these faculty. Let me generally tell you what we identified in the memos to the university as some of the selection criteria, how we decided to distribute these. Then I will tell you who has asked for positions and how many of them. In all of these positions we will be going back to our strategic plan and asking how would replacing this faculty member or adding this faculty line address the strategic plan, so you'll see responsiveness are aligned with the Directions document in all three.

The 10x10 plan, we're also asking how does it align with the research focus areas? How does it either create or add strength to the institution? Does it have an integrated impact on research and education? Then we're also asking, does it promote translational research, interdisciplinary research, does it have a regional economic development impact, what's the return on investment, can students get involved in research, does it really have a transformative impact on your program, your department, your college, the university? And we recognize that not every faculty hired, or every proposal would address all of those things. We've asked you to make the argument about how to address this, and this is the template that your chairs and colleges filled out. The 5x10 program, again is to meet our instructional needs and decrease our dependence on part time faculty so that will be an important part of the argument. Does this proposal do that, and again how does it align with Directions, how does it allow for growth, and what's the return on the investment. And then the early retirement incentive program, remember all of those lines return to the provost office and now we're looking to replace the student credit hours taught by these faculty, as well as the ability to generate new student credit hours.

Again, how does it align with the strategic plan, will these people that we hire be able to bring externally funded research - that's not to exclude them if they can't but we want to know what the opportunity is? How does this hire improve program quality, and we know, we've heard faculty's concerns about accreditation issues for many of our programs. So let me give you a run down of why I have stacks and stacks of papers in my office right now. There were 29 proposals that came in under the 10x10 plan requesting a total of 62 positions. Don't hold me to these numbers because everytime I look at the binder, I recount. Roughly Arts and Sciences requested 9 different proposals and 31 positions. But you'll see that there are a lot of great ideas out there. I think that is an important part that I want to share with you. Obviously we can't fill 62 positions even over a 3 year period, 30 slots. But we hope this process of talking across departments and disciplines and new ideas has created some really new and exciting avenues for the university. There were 16 positions requested under the strategic lecture faculty plan, 6 of them in Arts and Sciences, 3 in Business and Engineering each, and then in HS squared and Pharmacy and University College. A total of 66 positions were requested under the early retirement incentive plan program. Somebody said to me today that there were only a total of 42 people who have retired in the first 2 years of the plan, and we have 66 requests. It's because we allow the colleges to request new positions as well under this plan, and asked them to prioritize them. So we do have priority orders from all of the colleges as well. The bulk of the requests did come from the College of Arts and Sciences with 9 from Engineering, 5 from Pharmacy, a couple from HS squared and 1 each from Business, Education, Law and University Libraries. Before I go on, let me conclude by saying that yes, this is a very high priority for us, we are looking through all of the data, we are going to try to make decisions as quickly as possible, certainly having a plan before holiday break, and have some sense of where these positions might go.

Topic number 2. You asked me to talk a little bit about retention, perhaps you heard me talking about the fact that we have a student retention task force. I've been talking about my concerns with retention of our students since I got here, and when I talk about the word retention I'm specifically talking about new students, first year, full time students, primarily DHS students, although that's not exclusively in our data, but we're talking about first to second year retention. This task force is a

group of people across divisions, because one of the things that we know is that retention isn't just an academic issue, it's also a student affairs issue, an enrollment issue, etc., and that's why we've had a variety of people talking about what's going on here at the University of Toledo. We have a first to second year retention rate of 68.3%, and our goal is to improve it to at least 72%. Where do we start? We have to start at looking at our own population and we have been aided greatly by the members of our own task force, by Dr. Bin Ning. Dr. Ning is the new Director of Institutional Research and he has been incredibly helpful in terms of helping us think through this analysis. So we are looking at our own students and what we see in our own students confirms what we see in the literature as well. Both high school g.p.a and ACT scores are strong predictors of retention, with g.p.a. being a slightly stronger predictor. The good news is our ACT composite scores and high school g.p.a. of the incoming class is higher. Right, Kevin?

Kevin Kucera: Yes, it is.

Provost Haggett: We hope we will get a little boost in retention simply by our students having a better composite score and high school g.p.a. By looking at our data we know that college retention rates vary, with some rising, some have gone up. Education and Business have gone up a little while; some have fallen like Arts & Sciences and University College. I believe we can learn from past practices. For example, Engineering's retention rate is at 80%, of course, we also know that engineering students have a higher g.p.a. and ACT scores. In each of these colleges we can learn from best practices in terms of retention and improving retention of the general student body. We also look at demographics and African-American students have the lowest retention rate among any racial groups. That is what the data tells us. The good news is that two of the African-American student enrichment initiatives that we initiated several years ago have shown a positive impact on retention. It is very important as we move forward with the retention initiatives that we set them up that way and that we can ask questions like did they work, and if they did, how do we spread that across the population.

When we looked at our own data we found out that retention rates for residential students have declined 30% since 1999. A substantial decline began in 2001 and we are drilling down into that data a little more to find out why that is. The literature tells us that on campus students should have a much higher retention rate than off campus students, and that's not true right now. We know that there is a relationship between student financial need and retention. We know that students with the highest financial need have some of the lowest retention rates, so this is an area that we need to explore further. Even though it's a small group, the new adult student cohort has a very low retention rate too, about 42%. Not a large group but one we might want to figure out and look closely. We also know that students who don't complete the high school core have a low retention rate. We subdivided that population and their retention rate is 51%. There is some controversy whether or not we should admit students who don't have the core and are now admitted conditionally. We can see that particular population needs additional support.

We need to take retention and carve it into pieces and think about the different phases of retention and get you all involved to help us figure out each stage what we're currently doing and how we can do it better. And what are the critical control points. We can't control every step of the way, you have to figure out where the critical control points are that have the largest impact. I think what we need is to look at retention this way as well. So retention at Pre-Rocket Enrollment includes factors that affect students prior to entering U.T., what brings them here, how do we market and communicate, how do we recruit them, how do we set expectations to make them ready for college? We focus on successful transition to enrollment and for students with special needs we may need early alerts and intervention and other types of activities. Rocket Enrollment is when students are here, this is our First Year Experience activities, how do we get them to persist through the ranks to graduation. This is where we have to look at instruction and faculty engagement and all those things you work so hard on. And then Post-Rocket Enrollment when students either successfully complete or transition into the next

phase of their life, or if they have to leave us for a while because they withdraw or are suspended, how do we get the stop-outs to return? There will be much more to talk about and much more engagement with you. I hope that the next semester you will invite me back to talk about this topic.

Agreements with other international universities. A little bit of an overview and where I got the data from and what it might tell us. In the Fall of 2007 some of you might have been asked by your departments what are you doing in international activities. President Emeritus Johnson and Bob Cryan were working on a report and they asked if I would help them by collecting an inventory of that type of information, and we did. Thank you for this information. International activities, programs and relationships - you defined what those were. A total of 243 were reported. Some of those were simply that you worked with somebody at Cambridge or in Japan and it could be a one time event. Of those only 114 are classified as active, 64% of them were in Arts & Sciences, 21% in Engineering and the rest scattered among Business, Education, Law and Pharmacy. The Judy Herb College of Education Camp Adventure was not included in the inventory but it was referenced because it does send students to a 100 different countries every year. So clearly it is an international activity. But the real reason you asked me to talk about this is because of the Memoranda of Understanding. So who do we have MOU's with? Over the past 15 years, U.T. has signed MOU's with 62 institutions and 24 nations across 6 major regions of the world. There are currently 20 active relationships with countries such as China, United Kingdom, Germany, Costa Rica, Sudan, India.

Who knows about these? The MOUs are kept in the Office of Global Initiatives and the Office of General Counsel, and I have not personally read these MOUs but it's been reported to me by Bob Cryan that no agreement changes U.T.'s authority to admit students, which has always rested with the Office of Undergraduate Admission or the admission part of the College of Graduate Studies. We understand that graduate faculty in the departments actually select students for admission, but the College of Graduate Studies is the official admitter. The variable that created the confusion with Yanshan University - some of these MOUs have taken on different looks in terms of eligibility for consideration for admission. So by saying that students are eligible to participate in the agreement we translate as saying they are eligible to be considered for admission, that doesn't mean they are admissible. That is my understanding.

Senator Olson: What this really says is that some students are required to take GRE and some are not. All are required to take the TOEFL and IETLS, but students coming from certain universities predominantly take the IETLS, which is considered to be inferior to TOEFL. So what these agreements do is establish different criteria under which the students can be admitted.

Provost Haggett: The gender equity salary study. I realize that this is something the university faculty has been asking for some time, the study has been completed and I give IR credit for completing the study in a timely fashion given all the changes in that office over the past 18 months. It's under a review right now by an external legal counsel. That is my decision. Any time a report such as this is created I will have somebody review it before it is released. It should be finished around mid December. I am in the process of setting up a time when Provost Gold and I can meet with the Women's Leadership Council to discuss the study. It looks like that won't be until early January.

One last thing that will take a lot of my effort and engagement from you to make this happen. We have a wonderful strategic plan, that is not to confine us in our thinking but to help us focus and the first two goals of the strategic plan has to do with undergraduate education and graduate education and therefore I believe that they are ours to make happen. I listed here just some of the things under the first strategic goal related to undergraduate education:

- STEMM and liberal arts
- General education curriculum
- Innovative ways to integrate S&T literacy

- Degree completion programs
- Student-centered learning and engagement
- Admission standards: by inference University College mission, Scott Park
- Distance learning
- Interdisciplinary collaborations - new innovative programs
- Retention/graduation rates
- Real World experience across all disciplines

These are the things we will focus and work together on next semester. Now Penny Poplin-Gosetti will talk more on strategic planning. I will end with this quote:

“We are what we repeatedly do. Excellence, then, is not an act, but a habit.”

Aristotle, 384-322 B.C.E.

Senator Barden: In the retention area the people who drop out for a semester and come back, do we consider them not retained?

Provost Haggett: That’s correct, there is some discussion in the literature, particularly about six-year graduation rates for students who have no choice but to come in and out because of financial reasons.

Senator Barden: Adult population is like that, they may drop in for one semester and drop out the next. It hurts our statistics but eventually they graduate.

Provost Haggett: When we compare ourselves with other institutions it’s one of the comparative factors is our first year retention rate, our six-year graduation rate and our predicted six-year graduation rate versus our actual six-year graduation rate.

Senator Barden: As long as that six year is in there that corrects that to an extent, is that correct?

Provost Haggett: Assuming that students would come back and be able to complete in six-years.

Senator Klein: Your point of reference was residential students, approximately what percentage of our student body are residential students?

Provost Haggett: That’s an excellent question and Kevin Kucera knows the answer.

AVP Kevin Kucera: About two-thirds of the incoming class.

Vice - Provost Carol Bresnahan: We have about 4,000 beds and about 16,000 undergraduates, so you can do the math.

AVP Kevin Kucera: I thought Jim’s question was about our incoming DHS class which was 3,600 students, about two-thirds of our campus.

Provost Haggett: That would be the population we are talking about when I was looking at retention rates.

Senator Barden: So if a student comes here, lives in an apartment second or third year, is he considered residential or non-residential?

AVP Kevin Kucera: That would be non-residential.

Provost Haggett: That would be a factor maybe on the 6-year graduation rate, but the retention rates we look at is the first to second year.

Senator Fink: Do we track the reasons when they leave? Obviously each year is different.

Provost Haggett: That’s a very good point, we have not yet talked about having to do focus groups with students who are leaving, Kevin, do we have any exit data?

AVP Kevin Kucera: I have not seen any recent exit data. When I first arrived, Institutional Research had some older data that mirrored national statistics; it wasn’t anything that was put forth specific differences, but our group has talked about it.

Senator Fink: So when you start turnover research, do we know if it’s our better students or worse students that are leaving. Or are there different reasons by college for people leaving?

Provost Haggett: We do know that retention is positively linked to g.p.a. and ACT scores. It’s Kevin’s data, Kevin do you want to talk about this?

AVP Kevin Kucera: We all know about ACT scores and g.p.a.'s but the one missing link is the finance factor, and that's why it's one of the points the Provost put forth, what's the relationship between student finances and the ability to persist in the institution?

Senator Fink: I would also suggest that depending on the status of a particular college, the best students might be leaving because they can get to another "higher" status school. We have to think of a way to stop this from happening.

Provost Haggett: We do know that students with the highest g.p.a. have the highest retention rates. But that's not at 100%. We are talking about first to second year retention rates. What you're talking about is the sophomore to junior retention loss which exists not only here, but it's documented in literature that's the second place where you are going to lose students is in the sophomore to junior transition loss, and that's because they feel they have a better place to go.

Senator Fink: My suggestion is that we should track turnover by year and get some more specific data on why students are leaving. Are they bored on campus because there are not enough things on campus to do? Also, we need to know whether turnover was helped or hurt by some colleges raising their standards, and, if it was, whether turnover was higher among lower performing students. Are people leaving because they do not believe they will be accepted into the college of their choice?

Provost Haggett: All these are good points.

Senator Fournier: How was that 72% retention data arrived at and how will it translate in improvement of the six-year graduation rate?

Provost Haggett: The 72% would take us up to our Ohio peers and their average, that was one of the reasons and I think it's a realistic goal.

Senator Fournier: How would that improve our six-year graduation rate?

Provost Haggett: Bin, any ideas on how the increase to 72% would affect our 6-year graduation rate?

Dr. Bin Ning: Our current six-year graduation rate is about 42.3%. The interesting thing is we actually see an increase in four-year and five-year graduation rates which means our students took a shorter time to graduate. The impact of this increase in retention rate we probably won't see for a few years. Down the road we will see better graduation rates. Right now we are monitoring 4-year, 5-year and 6-year graduation rates.

Provost Haggett: Thank you for reminding me about the increase in 4-year and 5-year graduation rates. So we have to remember if our 6-year graduation rate was to drop, we have to make sure we look at our four and five year graduation rates and if they go up, that's actually a good thing that our students are successful in getting their degree in a shorter amount of time.

AVP Kevin Kucera: One thing about the retention rate and how that impacts the graduation rate, Bing's office has helped develop a model to illustrate how, if the retention rate did alter the graduation rate, that would numerically impact our overall head count. So, I have not looked at it in terms of percentage in graduation, but I have looked at in terms of the actual head count if we make the mark of 20,000 undergraduate students. You can alter that and see if it's the 72% rate where we would be, or the 69% rate where we would be, so it gives us a very good feel for the amount of students, plus or minus.

Senator Fournier: Regarding the faculty hiring plans, is this over and above what we lose by attrition and early retirement? It almost seems to me that we lose more faculty than we get back by all these plans. I just want to know, did somebody benchmark in 2005 we had "X" number of faculty and lecturers and our goal in ten years is we are going to hit this target by this plan and also account for attrition? That was never really made clear.

Provost Haggett: That's a very good point. What I can tell you is that at least today, attrition positions - positions that become open in a college by attrition - remain in the college that are eligible to be refilled. What I have been asking from the colleges in addition to the normal form that you fill out that justifies the position justification, is additional language about how this advances the strategic plan. We have been approving those positions to be filled. So this is over and above the positions lost to attrition.

Senator Olson: Please tell me how faculty are being involved in the final selection process that will be made on which proposals will be selected.

Provost Haggett: We believe that when we look at these - Provost Gold and I looked at these just yesterday - that in all of these it will be very clear from the documentation that was provided that this is something that we have to do. As having a total of about 10 years of grant experience that I'm bringing to this, in terms of how we sort, we believe it will be obvious that this is something that the institution needs to invest in right now. And there will be the majority in the middle. We will ask the faculty to help us sort the ones in the middle.

Senator Olson: Also from previous experience with proposals, you know that evaluators almost all agree on the best ones and the worst one, but the ones in the middle will consume their time. So why not give all of them to this group of evaluators?

Provost Haggett: That's something we will take under consideration.

Unidentified speaker: I take it from your answer to Walt's question that there actually is no firm process at the moment for deciding on the 30 or so,

Provost Haggett: What I can say is that the final decision will be a joint decision between Provost Gold and myself. We did not set a process in stone before we got the proposals because we didn't know what to expect. This is our first time. Now we have a sense of the requests and we do want to get the faculty involved in the decision making process. I shared a quote not too long ago when I made a presentation to a group of students, that, "...Sometimes you have to take the leap of faith and build your wings on the way down." So, this is a work in progress, too.

Senator Barnes: My understanding about the gender equity study is that at one time the salary component was to be one part of a much larger study of gender equity on the campus at large. I hope that we can continue to talk about what other kinds of follow ups should happen, other than salary equity adjustments.

Provost Haggett: That's a good point. I think this study is a point in time. As I thought about this salary data of 2005, time moved on since then and it's a good place to continue our discussion.

Senator Barlowe: One of the other categories of the study that Sharon is referring to is rank. The Women's Leadership Forum considered rank, as well as the impact by race, age, seniority, etc., to be important factors for the study, but we were told that these categories would not be considered.

Provost Haggett: The data has been partitioned by rank.

Senator Barnes: And it includes the lecturers?

Provost Haggett: Separate from tenured faculty.

Senator Fink: Has it been analyzed by college? It might be possible that there might be a higher percentage of women faculty in colleges that pay less than some other colleges (e.g. education vs. business or engineering).

Provost Haggett: The data has been corrected for college.

Chair Floyd: Next, the Interim Vice Provost for Academic Innovation who will be talking about the strategic planning process and she is also the convener of the strategic planning coordinating committee and she will bring us up to date on the strategic planning process.

Interim V. Provost Poplin-Gosetti: I do want to stress that I am the convener; the chairs of the committee are Provost Haggett and Provost Gold. I want to update you on a few things, the implementation group, the template and the bridging document that is now called the prism, and, finally, where we are with the strategic planning dates.

The implementation work groups' reports were received by the beginning of September. The coordinating group has been reading through those and, to date, they are finally up on the Web. As of this morning all but one are up there. What we included on the Web are the charge to the committee, the membership of the committee, the unedited reports, and all of the appendices. The coordinating group has been going through the reports to look at and prioritize recommendations. Many of the items have already been completed and those notes will be added to the Website. After our meeting this week, we will finalize some of the things that we have been talking about and add those to the Website. You can go to the President's Webpage and a link on the left hand side, that says

Implementation Work Group, will take you to the listing of all the work groups. What's there is unedited so it's exactly what the committee has given us. Some of the things already approved are the standards for unconditional admissions effective Summer of 2008, implementation of a single DL platform across both campuses, a reinstatement of faculty compensation to develop DL courses, the identification of a senior level person to coordinate economic development and an economic development office, and the creation of an office of student customer service. There are a number of other recommendations that have costs associated with them and those are being prioritized. The President did set aside a fund for one-time, immediate kinds of projects. Those that are more base-budget oriented will need further discussion. That is about all for the implementation.

The mission and vision statements were all submitted by the university and college strategic groups. The coordinating group looked at the mission and vision statements to see if they spoke to altruism and to service to humanity, whether they aligned with the mission and vision of the University, whether they reflected a balance of aspiration and pragmatism, whether they provided a frame work in which change could occur, and whether they were clear and easily understood. Almost every one of them met these criteria and we are in the process of getting back to the groups. There were a couple that needed clarification. You should be hearing by the end of the week on those. But most were a good reflection of the University mission and vision.

In terms of the strategic plans, we had a series of five or six meetings where different university strategic units met with the college strategic units to talk about the relationship between the different strategic plans. These were very useful meetings; a number of people said how useful it was to talk about the strategic issues and how the university and college strategic units can learn from each other. There were some good conversations and those ended last week. The draft plans for submission from all the units are due in December. I think we are going to revisit the due date in our next coordinating group meeting. We might adjust the date because the prism document on the Web came out a little bit later than we anticipated, so we will get back to everybody on that. The final products are due in February and we are going to work with those in-between deadlines a little bit. The prism training is going on. The prism is the document on the web that allows people to put their strategic plan into a format so that we can do comparisons across units. Everybody can have access to that. If you wanted to see if anybody had mentioned the honors college, you would be able to do a search and see if another college specifically referenced that area. So, the prism allows everybody else to see what other units are doing. We have had training in those areas. There are 3 more trainings this week, one on Wednesday at 4 P.M. on the main campus, one on Thursday at 8:30 A.M. on the main campus, and one on Friday at 2 P.M. on the Health Science campus. These trainings are primarily for people in the colleges who will be contributors, that means getting in and making additions to the document. Viewers probably do not need the training. Anybody can be put down as a viewer, contact your dean's office to find out who is doing the additions on your plan. Viewer status allows you to see what your college is doing and what other colleges are doing and what the university's other strategic units are doing. This is as transparent as we can make it. Please do not ask me to put your name in, I will have everybody contacting me. Your dean's office will know who the people are who can be added to the users' list. That's my update. Several members of that group are here, Kris Brickman, Barbara Floyd, and Provost Haggett. Any questions? I'm also available if your college or if your unit needs any assistance with the prism. Please contact me, I'll be more than happy to answer questions.

Chair Floyd: Our next speaker is Gary Jankowski who will be talking about the university's weather related emergency revised closing policy.

AVP Jankowski: Hello everybody, I'm an Associate Vice President of Safety & Health for the University of Toledo campuses. We're going to do a PowerPoint presentation on emergency awareness that covers more than emergency closings. I have received emails, especially since

Virginia Tech, what do we do if we are faced with a situation such as Mr. Cho at Virginia Tech? What guidelines and assistance can you provide us on how we can deal with these types of situations? First thing I want to make you aware of is that our operations run 24/7, 365 days a year. Call 68-3770 for Campus Police on the HSC, and ext. 2600 for the Main Campus Police - open twenty-four hours a day. Dial 68-5069 from the Main Campus for safety issues, and 68-5353 to report utility problems. One of the things I was asked to do is the flow chart in case of cancelling classes. In case of inclement weather, the dispatcher in Campus Police calls Dawn Rhodes, the AVP for Finance. She in turn contacts Provost Haggett and they make a joint decision as to delay or cancel classes. VP Rhodes will call all of the other vice presidents. Provost Haggett will notify University communications and they will get the word out to the media. Provost Haggett and Provost Gold will notify all of the deans on their respective campuses. I had a conversation with Barbara Floyd and the faculty has been satisfied with receiving information through the media and the University webpage and the intent is to keep it that way.

- Fire in your classroom:
 1. Try to rescue anyone in danger
 2. Sound the alarm by pulling the red handle of one of the pull stations, the red little boxes on the walls
 3. Call ext. 2600, Main Campus Police
 4. Contain the fire by closing doors and windows, and extinguish the fire if you have been trained on how to use a fire extinguisher. They are very simple to use.You evacuate the building if the fire is too big to put out with a fire extinguisher.

Those are the four steps you do in case of a fire.

- Tornos. When you hear emergency sirens sound, you stop classes or exams immediately, seek shelter in a tornado safe waiting area designated in your building. Every building on campus has a tornado designated area and they are located on the Safety & Health webpage. Tornado sirens sound continually for three minutes indicating imminent danger to U.T.
- Public address system. We hope to get inside and outside buildings for better notification.
- Student Behavior Review Committee. We have established on the Main Campus a Student Behavior Review Committee and the purpose of the group is to look at problem students. We meet every other week or as needed on an emergency basis. The membership includes police, safety & health, a cross section of individuals, and we discuss issues of potentially disruptive student behavior that has been brought to our attention by you, the faculty. We create specific clear action plans designed to defuse the situation. We meet to resolve specific issues. These students in many cases are not scary enough to justify calling the Campus Police. Those students make others feel unsafe, so the Student Behavior Review Committee is there to address those issues. If you have any concerns about a problem student, call Campus Police at ext. 2600 for violent student, or the Office of the Dean of Students, Zauyah Waite at ext. 2256 to report erratic behavior.
- Signs to watch for in general:
 - Extreme withdrawal
 - Extreme agitation
 - Refusal to respond in class when called upon
 - Inappropriate outbursts
 - Lack of self-control
 - Lack of affect
 - Threats of violence to self or others

Most of workplace violence involves military veterans, Caucasian males. I will send to Barbara Floyd the entire list of characteristics to watch for. Because you are on the front lines with the students, you will have something to go by and you are now informed of whom to report those concerns to.

Senator Relue: You said that the tornado safe waiting designated areas are online. Are they labeled at all?

AVP Jankowski: Yes, they are one foot square signs with a picture of a tornado that say, *Tornado Safe Waiting Area*.

Senator Stierman: The Center for Teaching and Learning had an excellent program earlier this year in dealing with disturbed students and it recommended a counseling number and it's been useful.

Senator Kennedy: How are the Tornado Safe Waiting areas designated, and who determines which is the safest part of the building?

AVP Jankowski: I do and some folks from the Facilities & Maintenance using guidelines from the National Weather Service. You seek the lowest point, interior walls and away from windows. Some buildings like residence halls were tough to find the best area but we did the best we could.

Senator Kennedy: The reason I ask is that in the Law School building the designated area is situated under the Library which is a heavy facility.

AVP Jankowski: You never want to go up.

Senator Kennedy; I'm worried about it coming down.

AVP Jankowski: You seek the lowest ground and we did the best we could in the Law Building.

Unidentified speaker: I would like this information available to all faculty. Another point, do we have a plan or a strategy in the event we have a student on the campus with a gun and how to respond when you teach a class.

AVP Jankowski: RED ALERT. We started this initiative before the Virginia Tech incident. Soon after the merger I was asked by my boss to come up with the top ten list of safety concerns and one of my biggest concerns coming from the HSC where there is a public address system, was that there is no public address system on this campus inside or outside. That's not unusual on college campuses. So we addressed a task force first of the year and begin looking at a number of different programs and one of them we looked at is called E2Campus, which we rejected, but Bowling Green just implemented it on their campus. We chose RED ALERT. It's a program where the Campus Police Dispatcher sends out text messages and emails to 20,000 people in two minutes. For example, let's say there is a shooter in the Student Union. The text message will say, "*Attention, Tuesday, November 27th, 4:00 pm, there is a shooter in the Student Union, remain in place, lock your office door.*" Or for a tornado warning, the message would be, "*There is a tornado warning for Lucas County, seek shelter immediately.*" It comes across as a text message and also as an email. We just finished the sign-up page for RED ALERT and it will be a real simple thing. When we announce it to the world, you go to the sign-up page, type in your mobile phone number, and we want you to chose email as opposed to voice mail because voice mail slows down the notification process. We intend to do some tests in December then go live in January. That's how we will be able to get the information out to you very quickly. I realize that a lot of you don't have your cell phones on while in class, that's why we want the public address system inside the buildings, and we are working on it. In order for the PA system to be built, Maintenance has to complete what is called the maintenance network. That will be the platform on which this network public address system is built and that's about 3-5 months out before it's completed. You will see a lot about the RED ALERT system within a week or two. I urge all of you to sign up and there is no charge to you from the university. If there is a charge from your carrier for text messages, it will be a small price to pay for receiving urgent information very quickly.

Senator Barlowe: I know three professors at Virginia Tech who notified security and the police about the disturbing behavior by Mr. Cho, and they were told repeatedly that there was nothing the University could do. So he had to do something terrible before anything could be done, and he did. So how do you address in your group the notifications about such behaviors? How do you deal with someone like this? Also, how do you address these issues and the student's rights in such situations?

AVP Jankowski: If one of you calls Zauyah Waite at ext. 2256 and tell her you have a student that is very disturbing, Ms. Waite will take steps to talk to that person. If necessary, a Campus Police officer will talk to that person discreetly and professionally. One of the problems that we are finding

and I think that is an issue way beyond all of us is perhaps some of these people need medication, and the wait for a psychiatrist could be two to four weeks. These are the people that have low tolerance for frustration and that is a real problem. If you bring these student concerns to our attention, our group will address and deal with that as best as we can. It's a difficult question because people have rights. But signs like Mr. Cho was showing at Virginia Tech would not be treated in the same fashion here. I am absolutely positive and I sit with this group every two weeks. So now that you have the number, you have to call.

Vice Provost Bresnahan: I sit on that committee. The student judicial code allows this committee to intervene. If we have a faculty member saying that they have a student disrupting class, that is a violation of the judicial student code. What we try to do, Zauyah will try to talk to that student and tell him or her that their behavior is not ok. You are not allowed to disrupt the learning process. If it's more involved and if there is a medical issue -- for example one student was on medication, it wasn't working well, the student was bipolar, was taking 21 credit hours of advanced classes -- we got the student to drop some of those classes, brought the student down to 12 credit hours and he took most of those classes either online or by independent study. So we try to intervene in ways that allows them to continue, be sensitive to the student, but at the same time understanding that disruption of classroom is not ok and is a violation of the judicial code. If necessary, we can suspend the student.

Senator Cluse-Tolar: A question about the RED ALERT, once this text message goes out, we should lock down our offices. But what about when we are in the classroom and classrooms do not have locks?

AVP Jankowski: That's a good question. At this point RED ALERT will serve it's best purpose by letting you know where the incident takes place and if the shooter is mobile and moving around the campus, then we would tell you to seek shelter or evacuate the building and go home. I can't give you hard and fast answers because it depends on circumstances. If a shooter is in the Student Union the message would be to stay in place, or stay away from the Student Union. But if the shooter was going from building to building we would try to give you instructions that would guide you away from the campus. In the case of Virginia Tech, I would recommend that Campus Police get everyone to the ground floor or evacuate the campus. That would be a call for Chief Newton to decide. Does this answer your question?

Senator Cluse-Tolar: The issue is that classrooms do not have locks on the doors.

AVP Jankowski: I would love to have a lock on every door.

Unidentified speaker: Or to have safe areas on every floor.

AVP Jankowski: That is a good idea.

Senator Barnes: That issue was raised when Chief Newton was here in terms of the labs. The buildings themselves are unlocked and graduate students are in labs at any hour of the day or night. And some of them are disturbed by the open access.

AVP Jankowski: That's the discussion the University needs to have. How far do we go in locking down, closing and restricting access to make ourselves safer? Those are all good questions. Phase one for the PA system will include Carlson Library, The Crossings, North Engineering, Gillham Hall, Health & Human Services, Nitschke Hall, Parks Tower, Ottawa East and Ottawa West. The reason these buildings were chosen is because they are the easiest to wire for the PA system because of the technical features of those buildings, and they are heavily populated buildings. Implementation Task Force composed of I.T., Police, Safety and Health, and Maintenance. We are hoping to have this up and running in Spring of 2008.

Public address system on the Main Campus grounds on December 10th at 10:00 a.m. there will be a demo truck here from Federal Signal Corp. to do a Doppler study on how signal travels across campus. The company has a lot of experience in PA system installation on military bases. Next month we should have the report to give to Dr. Jacobs telling him what we need and how much it will cost. I'm hopeful that also can be funded.

Some of the things on the HSC:

- Overhead paging system throughout buildings in existence for many years
- Code Blue telephone devices exist across campus as they do here
- RED ALERT will also include the HSC campus faculty, staff and students
- Outdoor PA system is planned for both campuses, the HSC for 2009

Senator Cluse-Tolar: We are in the Health & Human Sciences Bldg. and two weeks ago we had this steam event and the fire alarms went off and students were walking through the hallway to leave the building and these firewalls came down and almost killed a couple of them. There was no warning or anything and this steel wall came slamming down. Is that a malfunction?

AVP Jankowski: It shouldn't come down that fast.

Senator Cluse-Tolar: Those students screamed, that firewall almost got them.

AVP Jankowski: That's part of the building feature to compartmentalize the smoke and fire but it shouldn't have come down like a guillotine. I will notify Jeff Jacobs and Martin Haas, the safety techs. How long ago was that?

Senator Cluse-Tolar: About two weeks ago on the second floor south-east corner of the building.

AVP Jankowski: Thank you and I will notify the safety techs.

Chair Floyd: Any old or new business? If not, can we have a motion to adjourn?

Motion was made and seconded.

V. *Calendar Questions:*

None

VI. *Other Business:*

Old business:

New business:

VII. *Adjournment:* Meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Alice Skeens
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Kathy Grabel
Faculty Senate Office Admin. Secretary