

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Senate Meeting of September 28, 2010
FACULTY SENATE
<http://www.utoledo.edu/facsenate>

HIGHLIGHTS

Dr. Lloyd Jacobs, President, University of Toledo
Dr. Penny Poplin-Gosetti
Dr. Thea Sawicki and Dr. Thomas Sharkey

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.

President Mary Powers called the meeting to order, **Lawrence Anderson**, President Elect, called the roll.

I. Roll Call –2009-2010 Senators:

Present: Anderson, Atwood, Barden, Barlowe, Barnes, Batten, Baumgartner, Benjamin, Carr, Caruso, Chiarelott, Cluse-Tolar, Dowd, Fink, Franchetti, Funk, Gardner, Giovannucci, Horan, Hornbeck, Humphrys, Jorgensen, Kistner, Laux, LeBlanc, Lee, Lundquist, Molitor, Moore, Moynihan, Ohlinger, Powers, Piazza, Randolph, Regimbal, Rouillard, Sawicki, Sheldon, Shriner, Skeel, Solocha, Stepkowski, Teclehaimanot, Thompson-Casado, Weldy, Wilson, Yonker,

Excused absences: Barrett, Brickman, Hoblet, Hottell, Malhotra, Olson, Wedding

Unexcused absences: Attalah, Crist, Dismukes, Eastop, Eisler, Fournier, Hammersley, Nandkeolyar, Tinkel,

II. Approval of Minutes: Minutes of 9/14/2010 were not ready for approval.

III. Executive Committee Report:

President Mary Powers Senators and guests should introduce themselves before speaking so the speakers' names are recorded accurately in the minutes.

President Mary Powers: I am calling the meeting to order. Welcome all to the third Faculty Senate meeting of the academic year 2010-2011.

The minutes from the August 31st meeting and September 14th meeting are not yet ready for approval and it is anticipated that both sets of minutes will be ready for our next meeting on October 19th, to be held in the Student Union of the main campus.

The executive committee report will be brief today. Much of the focus on campus for the past two weeks has been about the strategic planning process and specifically, the reorganization proposals. Today, Dr. Jacobs will address the Faculty Senate starting at around 4:30 this afternoon. He will also take questions.

At our first meeting, the Executive Committee announced that this year, the Faculty Senate will have regular reports on preparations for the university's upcoming review by the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. It is hoped that

the Faculty Senate can be helpful as the University prepares for institutional accreditation. There will be three different areas of focus for these reports: 1) The Higher Learning Commission Self Study; 2) Program Reviews; and 3) The University Assessment Committee. The HLC reports will be given by Dr. Thea Sawicki and Dr. Tom Sharkey. The reports on Program Reviews will be given by Dr. Penny Poplin-Gosetti. The reports on University Assessment will be given by Dr. Ron Opp.

So, at this time, I ask Dr. Penny Poplin-Gosetti to start us off with a report on Program Reviews at UT.

Dr. Poplin-Gosetti: We'll have time for an extended conversation on some of these things later on. Today we have a very short time, ten minutes each, prior to Dr. Jacobs's arrival. So I want to give you an overview of where we are at with program review right now. I met with Faculty Senate Executive Committee and went over with them information about this and I am sharing it with you now. First of all, I want to tell you, and many of you are aware, we really have not had a systematized program review since 1998. At that time, for a variety of reasons, one of which I have in a letter from Tony Atwater, who was here at the time, was that program review had turned into something more about a wish list than a critique of programs. Because of that and because obviously we have been doing a lot of other things, like merging etc., we have not had program review over a period of time. But, HLC and OBR are two external groups that really look towards program review as a part of what the institution is doing to demonstrate its commitment to continuous improvement, particularly in quality and particularly in the curriculum areas. However, we should not be conducting program review just because the external forces are asking us for that; it really is inherently important for us to be doing program review because it informs some of the decisions that we make about how to enhance programs or to look at ways that we might consolidate and be more efficient at what we do. What I have up here on the screen is the larger purpose of program review, which is providing an opportunity for our programs to look at their alignment to the University mission and how they are working with our strategic directions, that they are following best practices, and that they are managing resources in a good way, contributing to students' general education, and providing a value added experience. There are many, many more purposes. I tried to pull out just a few that I think are really central in what we do in the academic area. What I'll be presenting here is actually something I have modeled after the University of Cincinnati, who was also trying to get up to speed on program review during their self-study. What they did is put together a three phase process that led up, during the same time frame that we are looking at, to their self study, which occurred in 2009. What I am proposing is a three phase process. The first phase has been going on since May. This particular phase looks at reviewing our degree program database that we would need for preparing a report. For instance, since the merger there are a lot of things that need to be cleaned up in the programs themselves. Programs have changed colleges. We have closed some programs. We also need to be determining what percentage of our programs are DL courses. The new HLC policy is that any course that is 51% or more web assisted in some way, is now considered a DL course. We need to be considering what programs we want to use for assessment because HLC is now asking us to assess at a program level rather than a department level or college level. So there are a number of ways we need to clean up the data. We need to gather IR data that we need for the review of the degree programs. I am working with Sunday Griffith to gather information on things like average class sizes, entering student data, etc. We

also need to prepare financial indicator reports by program, establish some kind of dash-board quality indicators which will be college data. That could be your loans. That could be your research productivity in terms of publications and presentations. And then having the colleges select programs against which they would benchmark the quality indicators for their programs. So, the benchmark programs would be selected by the colleges, by each of the programs. Then we would move to phase two. A big thing that is going to be going on right now is the development of the University Academic Program Review Committee to set up a long term process for program review. I have been working on a short term solution for HLC and a long term solution for on-going program review. This committee will advise the Provost's office in procedural development for ongoing in-depth program review. I'm going to say undergraduate program review. There's a separate process going on for the graduate programs. At some point we might bring those processes together, but right now we are trying to develop them individually so we can get them going. I'm proposing a seven year cycle. Our old cycle used to be five years. Based upon my bench-marking, most institutions are using a seven year cycle at this point. The committee membership will be based upon position. For instance, an idea will be the Chairs of the College Curriculum Committees or Director of IR etc. So we've got similar kinds of people from the colleges and committee membership goes with the position. So if somebody from the committee leaves the University or his/her position, we know that we have somebody coming in and will not have to go back to processes of picking people out. During Phase 2, we will create a base line. The last time we did program reviews was 12 years ago. What we are going to do, and Cincinnati did this also, is a mini review of all of our programs to establish a base line for future program reviews. We will use both IR data from the snap shot census point and also college data. We will provide evidence of our claims; HLC wants everything evidence based. From the review, the Colleges would develop and implement degree program recommendations. The other piece that we are going to be doing during this time, is establishing the process for the seven year cycle and ongoing program review. So working with this University Academic Program Review Committee, we'll talk about what are the criteria for program selection, how are we going to compose our review committees? How are we going to include internal and external reviewers? What's the review process and work flow going to be? And what will be the self study content, understanding again that it needs to be factual and explicit? The goal is that we will begin in fall 2011 the ongoing seven year cycle. The choice for programs at the beginning, given that we will have completed the mini-reviews, may include some that have found themselves in a little bit of difficulty and need a little input. The process that begins in Fall 2011 will be a much more in-depth process that literally uses the mini review as a base line. The mini review will get ourselves set so that we can continue with the in-depth process and show HLC that we had a good intent with getting a base line and a good intent with continuing onward. I talked to Faculty Senate Executive Committee about a committee to advise me on the mini review. They are going to recommend a few names to work with me on coming up with some of the quality indicators and looking through some of the logistical pieces so we might make that more smooth. The structure for the larger committee would include Faculty Senate reps, we would have college reps, we'll have someone from finance, and we'll have someone from IR to make that a committee that really can advise the process. We have two minutes for questions. I can come back and talk about this more in depth, but there is a certain time essence because we going to be starting undergraduate program view, very, very quickly.

Senator Fink: How do you determine the percentage of something being distance learning? Is it the classrooms, or the assignments? How do you come up with the percentages?

Dr. Poplin-Gosetti: Well the HLC guideline is 51% of what you deliver, through distance learning, methodologies, and practices.

Senator Fink: Counting the number of words, counting the number of days. I'm a little bit confused by how you judge percentage of delivery.

Dr. Poplin-Gosetti: You know that's a very good question that we've been wrestling with. Sunday Griffith and I are meeting with the Deans, and the assessment liaisons, and each of the colleges this week and next week to talk about these kinds of things and we'll try and answer those. We may need clarification on that. As we go through the conversations I think that we'll learn a little bit more and have the guidelines out for everybody. But that was a good question. This is a new request from HLC, starting last summer.

Senator Rouillard: Penny, is this same kind of program review that Dr. Jacobs indicated would follow restructuring?

Dr. Poplin-Gosetti: This is different. That's a good question. What he talked about is department review. This is program review. One of the distinctions that I want to make is that in the reorganization that he presented, the programs are separate. Now, we can talk about what colleges are going to be and all of that. But, the programs as they exist is what we're talk about. And that what's going to be of interest to HLC and actually the Board of Regents also. Other questions?

Senator Lundquist: What is a program then? Is it a major? What is it?

Dr. Poplin-Gosetti: I don't have my language in front of me. A program generally is a degree program that has its own distinct learning outcomes. So, it will include certificate programs. Now, if you had a program that you have sort of a spin-off from, that students can take maybe a smaller portion of to get something, but it's still using the same objectives of a larger program, that probably will not be considered for a program review or assessing. Because it's just a spin-off of a larger program. There's a state definition of it that we can get to everybody. Good questions all. Thank you.

President Powers: Thank you, Dr. Poplin-Gosetti. Now, Dr. Sawicki and Dr. Sharkey will report to us on the HLC Self Study.

Professor Sharkey: Hello, my name is Tom Sharkey and I am here with Thea Sawicki. Thanks to the Executive Committee for really being behind this Higher Learning Commission self study that we've been engaged with for about the last two years. We will continue on to Penny's favorite date, 2012. What we would like to talk about a little bit today very quickly, is several forums that we have coming up in the next month or so to try to get the word out about self study and get some input from the community.

October 22, 9 – 11 a.m., Main Campus - TBA

Special Emphasis: Merging Cultures

HLC Criterion 1: Mission and Integrity

- How do we show understanding and support of the university's mission within the institution?
- How do we move toward a shared identity that embraces our mission and strategic plan?
- How do the separate cultures of each campus translate into one stronger institution?

October 29, 9 – 11 a.m., HSC – Dana Center

Special Emphasis: Teaching & Learning Synergies

HLC Criterion 3: Student Learning & Effective Teaching

HLC Criterion 4: Acquisition, Discovery, & Application of Knowledge

- What do we intend students to know and to do, and how do we determine what they actually can know and do?
- How does the institution provide support to ensure faculty, students, and staff responsibly acquire, discover, and apply knowledge?
- How do we move beyond conversations into greater interdisciplinary teaching and learning?
- What is the balance between quality undergraduate teaching and research for a 21st century research university?

November 5, 9 – 11 a.m., RI Room 1010

Special Emphasis: Economic Viability

HLC Criterion 2: Preparing for the future

HLC Criterion 5: Engagement and Service

- How do all levels of planning work together toward our mission?
- How do we serve the needs and expectations of our constituencies?
- How do we balance our responsibilities with our own mission and vision?
- How do we maximize our intellectual capital while streamlining resources?
- How do we foster an entrepreneurial environment?

Senator Sawicki: That's the fun of being a co-chair; Tom and I get to switch positions on presentations. There are fifty copies of a handout version of these five slides for you up here on the front table. We will also be sending the PowerPoint to the Faculty Senate so it can be distributed to you. The faculty forums are opportunities for the Special Emphasis team to bring you issues that fall under each of these three topics. What they want your help to do is brainstorm. What do you think? What will your input be? What will you like to see included or any additional questions that you think are appropriate within each of those three topics. So, the third one is on November 5, at the Research Incubator, between Dorr and Westwood. And its topic is briefly called "economic viability." It is aligned to criteria two and five of the major Higher Learning Commission self study. Criterion two is preparing for the future and has to do with strategic planning, and resource allocation. Criteria five, "engagement and service," is both within and to external constituencies and bodies. This is how the institution and its programs engage in and for their community. So for the "special emphasis", it deals with the area of economic preparation of our students: for job placements, for careers in the future, and for us serving the economic health of the communities around us. The issues seem to be: how does all planning work together for our mission? How do we serve the needs and expectations of our constituencies? As I said this extends to inside and outside the University. How do we balance our responsibilities with our own mission and vision? How do we maximize intellectual capital while streamlining resources? Finally, how do we foster an entrepreneurial environment? So those are the three specific areas that were proposed within the special emphasis proposal that the University of Toledo submitted to the Higher Learning Commission about a year ago, and

that was approved by the HLC. Acceptance of additional proposals is not an automatic thing. It is actually a bit of a pat on the back from the Higher Learning Commission, and indicated they assume that we will do well in our self study; that we have enough resources to handle and to present our self study of UT's activities and complexity that we could also take on another job, if you will. So it's already a plus for us to have been allowed to do a special emphasis. Other important dates for you are some small revisions to and highlights of the time-line for the self study.

Important dates for Faculty:

- November 23: Submission deadline for five criterion team reports for review
- April 2011: Campus-wide feedback on Self-Study first draft
- September 2011: Campus-wide review of full Self-Study report
- December 23, 2011: Final Self-Study report submitted to the Higher Learning Commission and North Central Association of Colleges and Schools

Thank you so much for your attention and if you have any questions or comments on the open forums or the self study, don't hesitate to send them to us. We need and thank you for your help. Thank you very much.

President Powers: It appears that we may have a few minutes before Dr. Jacobs arrives. I am wondering if Dr. Gold would kindly share his greetings this afternoon.

Dr. Gold: Thank you. It's a pleasure once more to welcome Faculty Senate to the Health Science Campus. I just have a couple of announcements that I would like to share and as always, will be willing to take questions as we wait for Dr. Jacobs. I had the honor this morning of attending the ProMedica Health System Board of Trustees with Dr. Jacobs which is an ongoing part of the relationship that we have structured with ProMedica Health System. Indeed the planning and the achievements of the AHC that is now currently known as the Academic Health Center Corporation will continue to grow. They include achievements such as new residency and fellowship programs that are being implemented this year or on July 1st. They include new clerkships, experiential, and preceptorial opportunities for physician students, nursing students, pharmacy students, and many of our wide health specialty as well, which continue to increase this year and next year. They include a dramatic change in the structure of the Research programs and within the ProMedica Corporation. Through these changes we have first of all, constructed in an arrangement where the institutional review boards of both institutions will respect and accept the IRB product of the opposite institution. There will be a faculty member from the University's IRB that sits on the ProMedica IRB and the faculty member from the ProMedica IRB who will now sit on the University IRB. We are about finished with a single consent form, which is really important for enrollment of patients. I have announced these changes nationally to a number of corporate sponsors as well as of course, federal sponsors of research. And the interest has been dramatic with a number of pharmaceutical companies and bio-technological companies that has reached out to us now that here before we would have had a really hard time engaging in clinical trial. The way that this arrangement is structured is that all of these extramural research dollars will be their corporate funded trials or will be their investigated initiated federally funded trails, foundation funded trails etc. are going to flow through the University's office of research sponsored programs. It will continue to add to the research spent and the research repute of the University as we are taking direct responsibility for

the management of these trails, for the contracting of these trial, for the use of an application called Study Manager, which is the software that is used to track the progress and the legal credentials within these trials system etc.

Senator Anderson: Can you tell us roughly the distribution of the amount of research money in this arrangement, University of Toledo vs. ProMedica?

Chancellor Gold: Looking at the numbers that Dr. Calzonetti distributed recently, it looks like the total research spent for the College of Medicine, now of course this does not include Pharmacy, Nursing, HS square, Engineering, etc., but just in the College of Medicine, it is about \$26.5 million dollars. So as of July 1, with the ProMedica dollars being processed through the same research and grants office, that will come pretty close to \$31 or \$32 million dollars. It's about a \$4 or \$5 million, currently clinical research spent. However, the number of applications that we have had for a new clinical trial in the last three months has just been dramatically higher than we have seen historically. It is likely that we will double that \$4-\$5 million dollar number this year alone, which can take us to \$34 or \$35 million which will be obviously a really nice achievement as we aspire toward this club of one hundred status. Did I answer your question?

Senator Anderson: Yes.

Chancellor Gold: We are actively engaged in a strategic planning process to not simply deal with the operational aspects, bringing together the consent forms, the IRB's. We are building a full set of programs to educate teaching faculty. In other words, they have a very large medical staff who has never taught a student before frankly; nursing student, medical student, pharmacy student and etc. So, we are trying to build educational programs to help them become familiar with the concepts of curriculum, pedagogy and assessment. In addition to that we have programs scheduled and hopefully will be implemented by the middle of October. What it is needed to enroll patients into clinical trial? Because the overwhelming majority of these three hundred or something full time physicians, about twenty-five hundred to three thousand part-time and volunteer physicians have probably never enrolled a patient or only barely referred a patient for enrollment and clinical trials. I would like them to know that there is no big deal. They don't have to take any magic course; they don't have to be the people that attain consent, but indeed our research has shown that a very substantial number of patients leave this community either referred out or just leave on their own to enroll in clinical trial or other institutions, Ann Arbor, Cleveland, Columbus and on the coasts etc. and Texas. We have access to quite a few excellent trials, frankly are no different to whether a trial S57B, Andy Anderson, Roselle Park, Memorial... or here. It's exactly the same trial and administered exactly the same way. We will only simply need the physicians and the patients to understand all it takes is a single phone call to enroll. That's why we are so optimistic about increasing the clinical trial enrollment. They admit roughly 75-85 thousand patients per year to put it in perspective. We admitted about 13-14 thousand patients per year. We have 30 thousand ER visits; they have 286 thousand ER visits. So the opportunity to grow these clinical trials and to have both faculty initiate it and corporate funded research is really dramatic.

Senator Barden: Are there plans for doing the same with the Mercy system?

Chancellor Gold: We currently have those relationships with the Mercy system. We have reciprocity with the IRB and indeed we are trying very hard when we reach out to one organization, to reach out to all of the large health care providers in town. It is our plan. We certainly have not eliminated or diminished relationships with anybody, we're just growing them.

October 1 is the first day for Dr. Jeffrey Blumer. Dr. Blumer is the Chair of the Department of Pediatrics, the College of Medicine. Dr. Blumer is the Senior Pediatrician and Vice Chair of the Department at Rainbow Children's, Case Western in Cleveland and is respected internationally regarding pediatric critical care physician and probably is one of the ten leaders in clinical trial for new drugs and devices pediatrics. He has specifically reached out to both Toledo Children's and Mercy Children's to be sure that we are solidly anchored across the entire community in all of our clinical trials in pediatrics. Hopefully that will turn out to be successful. Thank you for your questions. Thank you.

President Powers: Thank you Dr. Gold. I think it is timely that Dr. Jacobs is speaking to us today and hope the floor of the Senate can provide a forum for constructive and productive dialogue this afternoon. Dr. Jacobs, welcome. We appreciate your availability at this critical time in the history of our University.

President Jacobs: Thanks Mary, thank you colleagues for inviting me. I have been thinking and spoke earlier, some months earlier to John Barrett about the fact that my coming with you once a year is probably inadequate and I may have to think about some other arrangements. I will be willing to do that in a less formal way. But any way, I do appreciate the annual visit. I enjoy being here and I am glad to see all of you here. We have more cars in the Dana Center parking lot than I normally see when I am over here. I appreciate that. I think that it would be an understatement for me to say that there's a lot going on at the University of Toledo. I think there's the pace it seems to me at least to be frantic and almost of the news is stressful if not bad. I'll try to run through some of those things just briefly. Perhaps to start at the maybe most difficult. Perhaps dismal small news item and maybe work up to some of the better items. We were notified roughly a week ago, and almost ten days ago now, that the State was going to defer an SSI payment to the University of Toledo and to all the other universities in the State. The magnitude of this for us is about \$7.9 million, roughly \$8 million of deferral of SSI payment. Almost everyone in Columbus, I spent two days, three days there last week, predicts that we will never see that. We will never see that money and that deferral is a pleasant way of saying recession. We have to begin to plan for that; that will be frankly difficult. If it is deferred it will be deferred into fiscal year 2012, which we have been talking about a very difficult year in any case. So this is frankly just another stressful or kind of ill moment on the horizon that we have to think about. On the other hand, there are many, many, good things happening. I believe that the strategic planning effort is moving nicely. The Board has organized a Strategic Plan Ad Hoc Committee. I have been successful in convincing them that that is an Ad Hoc Committee and not an ongoing, forever Committee which would run the University and monitor the implantation of the strategic plans. I will list that as a positive. The strategic plan itself is coming along very nicely. If you haven't seen it, I urge you to sit and read it in its entirety. Although, I need to confess I haven't read every word in it. This is still an opportunity for significant feedback to the groups, the leaders of the various half dozen or so major headings of strategic plan. The thing that I wanted to mention most of all however was not the strategic plan in isolation, but its

connection with the self study for the Higher Learning Commission. The Higher Learning Commission is self study project, a major project, a major undertake that is being led by Thea and Tom Sharkey. Thank you, Thea. Tom Sharkey I don't see him here. There he is Tom, how are you doing? Thank you for working on this, along with Penny Poplin-Gosetti and the Main Campus Provost office. Yesterday Bill McMillen and I went to Chicago to visit with the liaison person who many of you met of the Higher Learning Commission to give him a heads up about all the many changes that are going on here. Ranging from Ben Gains departure at the University to a change in Provost, a Provost search is on its way. I mentioned to him the item that you have just been discussing, mainly the relationship with ProMedica as well as the strategic planning effort and on and on. Not to mention the proposed reorganization that I'm sure we will get to in just a moment. At any rate, all of that was accepted with... , most of it with acclimation, with strong support. Most of all or work to try to connect the Strategic Planning effort with the Higher Learning Commission Self Study. Which will culminate formally later this month and a meeting between, I think on the 21st a meeting between the leads of the strategic planning undertaken and the Higher Learning Commission Self Study. He thought that was very important and worthwhile idea. I just wanted to report that. The Higher Learning Commission is progressing well, very nicely. I think the various people leading Criteria Teams are doing a terrific job as well as the people names that I have already mentioned. And that is yet a major undertaking that I wanted to report on to you just a bit. We did also speak to the liaison at the Higher Learning Commission about the multiple searches going on. I will point out the, perhaps at this juncture; the most important one of those is the Main Campus Provost Search is well under way. The job description has been written and...and published. Candidates are being contacted and gathered by the Search firm called m/Oppenheim and we should have candidates brought in for review in a matter of a couple months. The search for the Dean for the College of Law is likewise well on its way. The search firm involved there is Corn Ferry, there is a Search Committee Chaired by Tom Gutteridge in College of Business; likewise that group is moving quickly and on its way. Both of these searches are in that sort of silent period between the interactions of the Search Firm and the Search Committee, and the unit in question, and the candidates. So both of these we are not hearing much about or hearing much from the Search Firms and the Search Committees because they are sort of in that silent period. This weekend of course is homecoming. I hope all of you will be involved. I wanted to list that as one of the more pleasant things. I found myself sitting across the table on Sunday morning from a person from Purdue. I just wanted to report to you that he was pretty subdued on Sunday morning and I of course was gloating a little bit, as you may imagine. I was really, really proud it is a great win. I think that we are nicely matched with the University of Wyoming and told from those that understand these things better than I; it should be a great weekend. I kind of wanted to remind all of you that this is a time for all of us to turn out, be available to students, be available to our community and be a part of that pageantry. On Friday, last Friday at the strategic planning session, Jamie and Chuck Lehnert have been calling it the Committee of the Whole, I reported on how I hoped to synthesize multiple inputs from students, student Arts and Science Council, individual students, the Arts and Science council itself, multiple Deans, The Group of Twelve people who thought long and hard about the organizational structure, as well as others; how I had hoped and attempted to synthesize all of that into a proposal that I think if we spend another two or three days on and sort of get some final tweaks, perhaps I will be presenting, recommending to the Board of Trustees on the 11th of October. I know that you want to talk about that, so I'll just mark it there for you and you can ask me questions in just a minute and I'll give you some of the broad outlines of that. Maybe

worthwhile, however to speak on why one might want to consider looking or relooking at an organization chart. An organization chart is a paltry, not very authoritative, preliminary map of a set of relationships. A set of relationships that attempt to draw out, a map that attempts to draw out relationships among no fewer than thousands and thousands of people; Ten thousand staff of various kinds, Faculty, and Administrative, Board members, and others, Twenty thousand students and a total of a maybe thirty thousand people.

An org-chart is a poor attempt to begin to map out relationships among those people. The purpose of those relationships of course, is that that large group of people can carry out the mission of the institution. If we are considering strategy, i.e. mission of the institution, it may be worthwhile thinking whether those relationships can be influenced by redrawing that map a little bit in various ways and thinking about whether we can do that better. That's ... poorly I think the University of Toledo has been talking about Org-chart changes now for several years. I think, I have been believing that it is time to make that discussion a little bit more concrete. So, with all of those broad inputs, I have been thinking too about that Org chart. Why tweak it at all? Well first of all if it does in fact do the function that I have spoken of and attempting describe the set of relationships. It may be that there are groups, or units, or people in the organization; thirty thousand or so people who don't have adequate voice at the table, who don't have adequate visibility. So just considering the org-chart, one might want to consider with visibility and adequacy of representation of various groups. There is of course a belief in some quarters that there is money to be saved and efficiency to be gained by tweaking an org-chart. I think that there's perhaps some truth in that, but frankly I am not sure that it is worth the pain and effort of changing the org-chart for the purpose of getting efficiencies. But it's a widely held belief as Michael knows; in some quarters if that's important motivator for doing that for considering organizational change. I would be less than honest. I will be disingenuous, I fear if I didn't say however that the pretty dismal budgetary future was much on my mind when I formulated reorganizations that some of you saw last Friday. The fundamental and most important reason to think about the org-chart is to think about those relationships; the conversations that occurred, the people that was brought in to... the position, formally or informally, the water cooler conversations, the people that may come to sit next to each other by habit, or chance at departmental, or other meetings bringing new people into contact, creating new conversations and new opportunities for attraction, is probably the single most important reason to consider the organizational chart or reconsider that as the case may be. So there are a number of reasons to do that and we had a lot of input. I had a good plan that I call the McClelland plan. I had a good plan that I call the plan of the Twelve. I had a good plan that I would maybe stylize, characterize as the Arts and Council plan. I made an attempt to salvage or at least extract the best of all of those to try and put something together with a little bit more of an eye for frugality that maybe I thought would be necessary than two or three months ago as we have embarked on this journey; given the fact that every day that the fiscal outlook looks to be more and more dismal. So I am going to stop there and not describe that because I know that you are going to ask me questions that will bring out more detail around all of that. And stop here because I would welcome your questions. The format that I prefer most of all is the question and answer format. So, let me stop and take some questions. Mary, how much time do we have?

President Powers: Twenty minutes or so.

President Jacobs: Twenty minutes we are being given. Who wants to start? Before, let me just comment this is a small part, but it is a piece of that reorganization plan, recognizing that there was something that already happened and I think that it is very... that the Honors program becomes a Honors College. Congratulations Tom you were the prime mover for making that happen. That's a real step in the right direction. Lawrence you had your hand up.

Senator Anderson: On the slides that you presented on Friday, you made some comments about tenure. You stated the department homes and the college will be tenured homes in some sense. Could you elaborate on that please? Will the tenure be actually assigned to a department or is that in reference to the present practice?

President Jacobs: I meant that only in the context of the common use of that phrase, where is your tenured home. Tom Barden where is your tenured home? English. So he is on loan if you will to the Honors College the Honors program. His tenured home is in the Department of English and the College of Arts and Science currently. It is only in that common usage context that I meant that.

Senator Anderson: It's to my understanding that the actual tenure line belongs to the University, it's in the contract.

President Jacobs: I think that's true in the same sense that all resources belong to the University and ultimately the State of Ohio. Once again it is common usage, common parlance that a faculty line in English belongs in the Department of English. Although, on a completely note unrelated to all of this, faculty hiring plan that needs to be clarified I think. It might have something to say about whether if Tom Barden gets run over by a bus will that tenured line stays in the Department of English or whether it reimburse back to the University and require reassignment. I think that is a separate issue.

Senator Anderson: That's a separate issue.

President Jacobs: I did not mean to make any comment about that.

Senator Anderson: We will follow up on that in the future.

President Jacobs: I trusts that is not going to happen. I better stop using that metaphor, right?

Senator Anderson: About the College of Solar and Advanced Renewable Energy. A college usually means a learning environment in some sense or another. We may have graduate programs there in the future. But how do you see at least in the near future where faculty will have their own tenure home in that particular case?

President Jacobs: It is as you know currently a school. That was approved by the Trustees some months ago. I portrayed it at a level of a college on Friday. Since that time I have gotten a number of suggestions from Deans who are deeply involved: Nagi and Gutteridge who suggest that it ought to stay at the school level. I think that it is still a little bit fragile if you will and I am willing to consider that. However, as a school as I defined it, that's a school without that tenure

home and in that sense if it makes sense and treat it as a college it would be a college more like the Honors College which would not be a tenured home for people, but use faculty from other colleges. So it would be an exception to the generalization that a college is usually, but not always perhaps constitutes a tenure home. Yes, yes ma'm.

Senator Cluse-Tolar: I completely understand your interests in and appreciate your interests in creating colleges that have not had an adequate voice for instance, the College of Visual and Performing Arts in the past. But I am wondering how is that going to be consistent with or what is the thinking behind creating the combined college of Education and Health Science and Human Services?

President Jacobs: Kind of goes the opposite direction doesn't it?

Senator Cluse-Tolar: Seems to me.

President Jacobs: To make something bigger or smaller as the case may be. Let me first comment on the Visual and Performing Arts, I do agree that that may be an example of a group that has not had an adequate voice. Particularly in this world that is clamoring for more and more STEM under the belief that it has a quicker return on its investment for economically development. I think that it is coming from State and so forth. Putting them at the table for budget considerations, for budget hearings may not be a pleasure to them. Budget hearings may not be a pleasant experience for anybody, anybody that I know of at least. But at least it puts them at the institutional table. What about putting two other already sizable institutions together? It does feel like it's going to some extent in the opposite direction. However, we got strong leadership, got strong expertise in both sides. I think both of them have an adequate voice. It is a common joiner and other institutions and while I agree that it appears to be. We can't have it both ways. I personally think that there's enough in common to make it a viable grouping. Somebody else? Mike I'll come back to you. I want to get out here.

Senator Sheldon: I thought my new tenure home was Honors; it has no faculty lines? I thought my tenured home was Honors. Considering that my faculty line moved from the University College Degree Programs.

President Jacobs: Where do you want it? Tell me where you want it.

Senator Sheldon: I'm really happy at Honors. I would rather be there than just about anywhere else.

President Jacobs: Good.

Senator Sheldon: My question as I looked at the PowerPoint was your definition of a college as having Faculty. Why then do we have the College of Adult and Lifelong Learning? That's not to criticize reorganization, but it is simply a question. Why do we have a college with a Dean and an Assistant Dean and no Faculty? That seems to me to be a case where reorganizations and money savings might go together.

President Jacobs: Yeah, I hear you. When I first wrote that trying to attempt it to that deferential work, I wrote that a college always has Faculty. Alright? And only after the fact thinking about few of these exceptions, I decided that I needed to insert the modifier *usually* has faculty. Alright? And what I learned if I have never learned anything else in my life about higher education is that you can't generalize almost everything. So clearly the College of Adult and Lifelong Learning is going to be somewhat different from say the College of Pharmacy. I have come to accept that. I think that we'll try to make general definitions that cover the general case. But there clearly going to be exceptions. If the College of Solar and Advance Renewable Energy stays and if the school says it becomes a college it will be different of a college. Adult Lifelong Learning will be different. Honors College will be different. And I am OK with that and I can live with that. It's enough order that seems to me in the proposal that we currently have on the table to minimize confusion. I'll get Tom then I'll come back to Mike. Is that alright? Tom please.

Senator Barden: The piece of this plan that excites me is the school of the Arts. It is surely time we developed a closer relationship with the Toledo Museum of Art. If that piece could work to the same extent that the UT-MUO merger worked, we could actually have an Arts campus. It could possibly be a similar unit to the Health Science Campus. With residences and Living Learning Communities, and an expansion of our music department's interactions with the Toledo Symphony. We have never had the range of cooperation we could have with the Museum. I have some real reservations about many parts of the reorganization plan but the School of Arts idea is very good and I think that we should go for it.

President Jacobs: I too am excited about those possibilities. You may recall that. I think that you were involved in those conversations almost a year ago when Don Bacigalupi announced his departure and the Search Committee were formed to seek a new director of the Toledo Museum of Arts. I think that you were in the room, I think you were involved. We argued and fought till we got a good representation on the Search Committee. I think it has turned out well. If my memory serves me, that tomorrow evening a group of people from the University of Toledo will be having dinner with Brian Kennedy, the new director who's interested in building this relationship. I think it is one of the great potential, most powerful potential relationships. So I am with you. Michael Dowd how are you Sir?

Senator Dowd: Just peachy.

President Jacobs: You look good.

Senator Dowd: Thank you.

President Jacobs: The last time we were at one of these meetings we discussed his hypertension, but now today he's in good health.

Senator Dowd: I don't know if my hypertension has improved in recent years. Regarding the restructuring, you have said that there will be one dean position with the combination of the Colleges of Education and HSHS. You will be creating two new deans for the former College of Arts and Sciences and you will be adding another dean with the Honors College. So overall

there is a creation of three Deans. My question has to do with the cost of this decision. Each of the new colleges will need their own dean's office staff, their own office of student services, their own computer services, budget officers, and many other positions. Are you going to cost out this proposal and have that information included into your presentation to the Board of Trustees on October 11th?

President Jacobs: No Mike. I don't think that we will probably have time to do all that. However, let me say this, by putting the jointer of the Life College of Libraries and the College of Graduate studies, you can pick up one mean ship.

Senator Dowd: I'm sorry. I didn't fully understand your response.

President Jacobs: The other one that you spoke of creating two more in the enhancement, not the breakup, but the enhancement that which is currently Arts and Science that seems to be a wash. Now I understand that we already created a Dean of the Honors College, so that's when you start the clock for the count. However, I believe the number of Deans is roughly a wash. I think that we are going to have to be creative about the assertion that you made about there needs to be at least some student services. We may wish to leave student services in one of these and borrow student services. Overall you are quite right. We are not going to be able to duplicate a lot of services. We are going to for several years be in a very difficult and in fact a financial time. I think that we would have to be really creative about duplication of services.

Senator Dowd: Is that the case for the remainder of this year?

President Jacobs: That's the rest of our life time.

Senator Dowd: For the former Arts and Sciences, those new colleges are going to be at a disadvantage relative to all other colleges if they have to borrow resources or share. The new College of Arts will have to borrow, say, student services from the new College of Natural Science and Mathematics. This is going to lead to problems for our students.

President Jacobs: Not necessarily. Maybe we should borrow student services from somewhere else. But in any rate, I want very much not to put one group at disadvantage to another group. Whoever it might be to be a second class citizen at not having student services, I think that we are smart enough to work that out between you, me, Lawrence, and a few other people. I think we can get that. But I see your points and it is an important point and we won't lose sight of it. Dr. Rouillard.

Senator Rouillard: It's not just creating new colleges; that may in fact balance, but it's going to be eleven new schools. Which means eleven new directors, which means eleven new directors' salaries, which means eventually there will be support staff for those directors. This is going to escalate very, very, quickly. It's going to cost our students. You just told us that we are going to be losing eight million this year, a deferred payment that may not even show up and the predicted eight million shortfall in 2012. Is this really a time to be doing what is going to turn out as expensive restructuring?

President Jacobs: Well I think that it could be expensive if we did everything that we would like to do. But we will have to do this frugally. And as I mentioned the other day I think emphasizing recruitment from within. And administrative differentials for people that are ready here. I believe Dr. Rouillard, that the concept of building schools is the single most important vehicle to building interdisciplinary or cross discipline functions. Bringing different people together and in fact, I think that the creation of schools which we will encourage and have to cross out on individual basis has greater potential for creativity and interdisciplinary than changing a couple of colleges. Is that going to cost? Yes. Let me just quote one of ours, a person that I think everybody in Toledo knows. Everybody or almost everyone knows Nick Anderson, a wonderful friend. He is a great citizen, a father of this community. And I'll just quote him as having said recently in another place, in another context, "If you got a good plan even though times are tough, stick with it and don't give up. Don't dig in. Keep moving the ball". I believe that by being forward thinking and creative as an institution we will fare better under whoever the next Governor is, under whoever the next State Administration is than if we take a hunker-down attitude.

Senator Rouillard: I understand that we cannot afford to hunker down, but we also can't afford to not cost this out for the Board of Trustees to approve or disapprove. Another layer that we are talking about, there's going to be a Vice Provost of Arts and Sciences. It may not be a College of Arts and Sciences, but apparently there is going to be a Vice Provost. That is going to cost money. We could recruit from within, the people who are currently teaching, who's going to replace them? Are we going to do this more on the backs of more part-timers?

President Jacobs: Sure, ultimately whatever you do costs money. I believe that this will be a good investment. I will do my best to get at least some of this costing done quickly in the time frame that you are speaking of.

Senator Rouillard: Well, I am speaking of investment. At the same time this University is investing an awful amount of money in business enterprises. I understand as well the moral responsibility the University has to help the community especially in these times. But I am not sure that we can afford to continue at it at the rate that we are because that also jeopardizes our student's education.

President Jacobs: It's all about priorities Dr. Rouillard. We have a lot of money. Even after the State gets done with us we are going to be talking about six or seven hundred million dollars. It's a matter of where you spend it. It's not that we don't have money; it's that we have to make hard decisions about where we spend it.

Senator Rouillard: But shouldn't priority be on our student's education before business ventures? Without saying, I'm not saying that those things are not important but.

President Jacobs: Thus far at least, we have spent no SSI and no tuition dollars on business ventures. I can say that categorically. What will we do when we are faced with meeting that possibly in the future? I think we have to consider where the State is. It is nice to say it at least; everyone in the country is talking about the new role of universities as being involved in economic development.

Senator Rouillard: I understand.

President Jacobs: The Internationally Economic council just spent their entire session of their meeting on what the new role of universities is in that regard. I think that we will ignore that trend that is peril. Now are we spending too much of it? Maybe. Too little? Maybe. But we can't ignore the trend it seems to me. Let me just get in the back. Yes.

Speaker: Maybe you can give a little bit of an idea about prioritization of the proposed changes and maybe there could be something that could be implemented right away. Maybe some things that have to be implemented right away and others deferred, depending on the finances of it.

President Jacobs: First of all, as I said on Friday to those of you who might have been there, that the college level discussion is fairly well jelled. The school level discussion will evolve and hopefully more will be added. Notwithstanding Dr. Rouillard's point about the cost of doing that. It's a lot of work I think that it has to be done in sorting and considering departments at that level. That frankly will be some of the most difficult setting. That will take place I hope over a course of many months. So we will kind of work down, from the top down in terms of not only time. But also recognizing that the lower you go in hierarchy the greater the malleability are present.

Senator Anderson: I have a question about the calendar. As I remember your report to an Academic Affairs Committee to the Board, you would be presenting to the Board in October. Then the schedule was that the Board will consider everything for several months and finalize some of it. So it leaves time.

President Jacobs: That's not my understanding Dr. Anderson. My understanding is that and we can certainly change this, but my understanding is that the Board will probably give their blessing to this, some part, all of it, or something else in October. Nick.

Senator Piazza: I just wanted to make a few comments as kind of an historian of our College. I was there at its inception. Most of the departments and programs were there at the time the College of Health and Human Services, which is now Health Science and Human Services, was created. They joined that College because their voices were not heard, they were not enjoying good representation, and they did not have good relationships with their home Colleges at the time. We came together in order to create relationships that would produce a new and more vibrant College. In fact, in a very short time we became the second largest College in the institution prior to the merger. Also, as part of that history, the College very adamantly insisted that it would be part of the Health Science reporting line and not the Main Campus. We saw ourselves as a Health Science and Human Service College and being more aligned with the Health Science Campus and having our relationship being more consistent with those colleges and preferring to be there. Your proposal will put many of us back with education which is the College we left looking for a better home. Also it would take us out of the reporting line to the Health Science Chancellor and put us in the reporting line with the Main Campus Provost. All I would ask is that you come and talk to the people at our College and get their opinion, get their

feedback, get the sense of what our Faculty feels, what this would mean for them, and what it will do to them before you finalize your decision.

President Jacobs: I will do that. You want to give me a call or e-mail me or something so we can set that up?

Senator Piazza: Alright.

President Jacobs: We'll do that. Dr. Jorgensen.

Senator Jorgensen: I would like to take the discussion in a little bit of a different direction, but still on the reorganization. First, two positive things, one faintly positive: One, I was pleased to see your reorganization did not include some of the aspects of the Committee of Twelve that I thought were just imprudent to say the least. Second, I have some affinity for schools, I think there's a good possibility to talk about particularly if there's not tenure involved. But my question is, what's the future of shared governance at the University of Toledo? When several weeks ago the College of Arts and Science Council, which I am not a member, but I am an Arts and Science faculty member, the Council voted unanimously in opposition to a plan that would make significant divisions of the College. You call it not a break-up course, but Toledo Blade did call it a break-up. And on the face of it, it does look very much as a break-up into three with separate deans. So the Arts and Sciences Council was unanimously opposed to it. This Faculty Senate two weeks ago had a resolution that was somewhat broader, but also cautious about any plan along those lines. Without objection that was passed. So the two largest and most appropriate Faculty governance bodies spoke against the decision and your decision last Friday was 180 degrees opposed to that. How do we work together when it is apparent that we can't sit at the table and talk about things?

President Jacobs: Well we can Andy. It seems to me, however that we're confusing listening with obeying. I listen very carefully. I did my very best to receive all the plans and inputs. However, ultimately what I intend to recommend is not exactly what any of them suggested. It's not exactly what the Group of Twelve suggested, it's not exactly what the Arts and Science Dean, Chairs suggested. I listen very carefully. I listen and I'm listening to you now, however I don't always have to comply exactly. So when you say that there was unanimous opinion in those two places I think that it is important. I want to hear it. But shared governance was defined pretty clearly by our own Board not by me. Now remember but by the Board had input and dialogue and not necessary control. And so I subscribe to that view and I will do my best to continue to listen and take suggestions. I got a lot of hands on that, I think that Larry's was first.

Senator Fink: This is on a separate note. One of the reasons I think these Colleges and Schools are being created is to stimulate creativity and entrepreneurship, in terms to how programs are marketed and how we improve the quality. Many faculty who speak to me would like to see a more decentralize approach to recruiting, where people in my college have budgets for recruiting and printing out advertisements. For example, in the College of Business we don't even has a budget to print the brochures about the College. We are depending on a University wide advertising campaign and the University decides at a University level to whom we are going to give our scholarships. I would ask that you consider decentralizing this a little bit. What

works for Engineering may not work at another college. For example, Engineering has extra money to bid for the top students. The College of Business would like to have its own advertising program and other colleges would as well. If we follow a decentralized recruiting approach, faculty and staff will have to focus on how to make their colleges/schools more marketable and would have to take some responsibility to how we deal with recruiting. So I am asking to increase our responsibility, but also to increase our authority in making decisions on these matters. I respectfully ask that you take some time and consider this request.

President Jacobs: Yeah, I agree. I agree. It's my hope that we do decentralize. Believe it or not I have been trying to decentralize for various authorities and functions. It is a couple of things about that. First of all, I think this organization structure proposal, organizational structure can do that. Secondly, I would point out that there's a natural and I'm assuming that you are aware of it, as a College of Business Faculty member, it is this sort of natural attention in difficult times when budgets are tight there is this tendency to centralize all budgetary decisions. We have been struggling with that now in Ohio for almost a decade; we certainly have been struggling with that for the last five years. To decentralize in the current time and in the current milieu is almost pushing against the tide.

Senator Fink: I realize in challenging economic circumstances there are dual pressures. First, centralization sometimes increases operational efficiency and we need to save money. On the other hand the traditional business response to dealing with rapidly changing environments is to decentralize decisions and authority. In these circumstances, units who are operating "where the rubber meets the road" and are most familiar with their particular situations need the ability to make quick adjustments in reacting to their business environment. While recognizing the extreme financial pressures facing the university I am asking your executive team to consider given the colleges/schools just a little bit more freedom to make advertising and recruiting decisions that make sense for them. I recognize there will still need to be coordination overall to make sure our individual efforts are aligned with the overall strategy of the university. To be clear, I am not talking about changing or breaking up the entire advertisement/recruitment budget but instead just asking that a small amount of funds be given to each college to allow some specialization in these overall efforts.

President Jacobs: I appreciate your point and I want to decentralize its on principal. It's a tough sell in this time if there's a particular thing that you believed that needs to be advertised, you are welcome to e-mail me, Bill McMillen, or Larry Burns. We are looking; they are looking for good themes for that advertising campaign. Let me go over here I had a couple of hands up. Nina, you get to go ahead of Dr. Rouillard.

Dr. McClelland: I will like to make a comment. Mary could I do that with your permission please? Move over Sir. Is that alright?

President Powers: I'll allow it.

Dr. McClelland: Well it relates to this. I would like to tell the Faculty in Arts and Sciences where I am coming from now and I will like to do it at the Senate with your permission. Mike, no go?

Senator Dowd: We have such limited time with President Jacobs and that time is precious to discuss this issue.

President Jacobs: I promise you that any time that Nina takes; I'll come back and give you equal time. You time it.

Senator Dowd: Okay.

Dr. McClelland: I think that it is important for me to say what I want to say and I think I'll shock a lot of people when I do this. But, you know in my opinion it probably isn't so important what is done, it's how it's done. And I think we're at the how stage. I personally am quite pleased to know what we are to do. It was much harder to wonder than it is now to know. So we can plan and manage how we are going to get there. I think there are many, many questions and all of those questions are important and they need to be put forward. I will encourage you through any source to put your questions on the table. I can assure you that there are many things that have not been thought about. Many things perhaps were not even known that should of have or could have been thought about. The questions will be forth coming and will help to direct the future, I think. President Jacobs mentioned recalling the proposal. As Dean of Arts and Sciences, I am not going to tell you that McClelland preferred Jacobs. It wasn't that way. McClelland would have liked to have seen Jacobs take McClelland's proposal and present it to the Board. But if you look at his proposal, he is right. It reflects many, many virtues of all of the proposals that he had received, including the one that I have submitted to him on behalf of our Chairs. I think that it is a workable thing. I understand that he had a lot more information than I did. When I drew up my proposal I drew it up based on what I knew. When he presented his he had a lot more information to go on than I did. So, I understand the discrepancies, but my job now as I see it is to manage the future in the best way we can for all of us. It's really to support the institution that we all love and we wouldn't be here if we didn't. So I want to be supportive. I want to ask you to be supportive. I spent the weekend developing a draft proposal for transition which I have not shared yet with Dr. Jacobs. Because I haven't had enough input from people that I need to talk with to see if I'm on the right track, or not on the right track. But I think that we all can get on board and make this thing happen and manage it to the best of our ability. I'm asking you to be a part of that and help. My own personal feeling is that I'm not here to jump ship and I wouldn't expect that you would expect for me to do that. But I am here to help put it on the right course and to stabilize it and I will ask you to join me. We can do this. We can make this a very, very workable thing and a better UT, and that's what it's all about. I had to say what I am coming from, for my people.

President Jacobs: Thank you Nina, I think you are right on. Almost everyone that I know loves University of Toledo. How many minutes Michael do I owe you? Did you count them?

Senator Dowd: I stopped counting.

President Jacobs: So, Dr. Powers will invite me back I will come back at another time or do you want me to stay up here for a little bit now. What's your pleasure?

Group of Senators: Stay up there.

Senator Dowd: I would like to follow up on a point that you had made regarding shared governance. I'm of two minds when considering the proposed restructuring. First, if the restructuring takes place then Faculty Senate has a responsibility to participate and provide leadership to create the best organization we can produce. But on the other hand, you had a responsibility to turn to Faculty Senate for input on this process. We were not asking to make the decision. But you had a responsibility to involve us in the discussion, the contract says so. More importantly, given your authority I would think that you would want input from Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate was never brought up into the discussion. We never, never sat at the table and were never given the opportunity to discuss the issues with you. We all want this to work, but you had a responsibility that you didn't address. Why?

President Jacobs: I would like to disagree a little bit. We specifically constructed from the first day that I had asked these twelve people to look at this thing to make certain that the outcome of this was folded in the time frame of the Faculty. I very much aware that the Faculty, I had an annual invitation to the Senate to occur between the time of my recommendation and the Board approving it. I am interested in your input. I met with after consideration with the Arts and Science council that has an overlap with this Body. I am interested in, thinking about and talking about shared governance. I would not however want it to be defined by the collective bargaining agreement. If we inadequately, certainly describes appropriate relationship between you, me, and all of our colleagues.

Senator Dowd: The Board defined that, but it is specified.

President Jacobs: I think that this is a good time for input. I think that it is, even though some of this discussion occurred when the Faculty was away, we specifically and carefully set this up and thought this out so that it will be no date involved while the faculty were away. Here we are, we are together, the Faculty Senate and me. I can't remember which of you were first.

Senator Dowd: Sir, with respect, you didn't answer the question. We work in good faith that you would follow your responsibility to invite Faculty Senate into such discussion and prior to the time you would make your decision. That invitation did not happen.

President Jacobs: I do not believe that I had that responsibility. That is not a question Michael, that is an accusation and which I disagree. So.

Senator Rouillard: I would also like to point out that council asked our Dean during the summer when this was going on, we asked for representation from Arts and Sciences and she said that she had asked you and you told her "no."

President Jacobs: I must confess, I do not recall that, so I can't therefore. Lawrence.

Senator Anderson: Also, you say that supposedly Faculty was brought onto the table for discussion at the September feedback meetings. We weren't brought into the planning stage. We were presented with something and had a very limited time to make our voices heard. It is one thing to react to a plan that already seems to be railroaded along compared to sitting at the table when the plan is actually brought in.

President Jacobs: None of the three plans or four, three four, it were some movement there, none of them come out in the wash as the one plan. You just heard Nina say that the McClelland plan, there's some, but not the complete resemblance to the final thing. That suggests to me that people's input, all of those were influenced by Faculty members including the original twelve. Even though that was a group of size a number of whom had administrative titles. Most of them were Faculty. In fact, it seems to me that given the fact that none of those plans come out the other end without influence and mixing so it was presented to you at the stage when it was malleable at its attention. Did I come specifically to the Faculty Senate and say please convene a planning group? No, but a lot of Faculty input was put into this thinking and I have taken it into an account as serious as I can.

Senator Anderson: What reaction were you planning on? And we didn't have time to formulate or research alternatives. Even the Committee of the Twelve only had a month to provide a detailed structure, without time to really research and provide context and reasoning.

President Jacobs: I wouldn't want to agree or disagree at that point. I happen to think that they were diligent, committed, and worked hard.

Senator Anderson: I'm sure.

President Jacobs: Dr. Powers, where are we here?

President Powers: Can we have one more question?

President Jacobs: Sure you can have many as you want. Yes ma'm. Dr. Barnes.

Senator Barnes: I would say your characterization of yourself as someone who listens, but doesn't always agree, is incomplete. My perception of that is that it's rare to never that I have been able to sway a decision that was already in process. When I got a chance to have input, rarely did my opinion sway. I think that some of the frustration, on the part of the Faculty is that it seems as if the people most impacted by this in terms of the workers here at the University think this is not an good idea and yet it feels as if no amount of input from those folks would matter to the outcome. I know that I hear you saying that the input matters, but it doesn't ever seem, at least from my experience and perception, to affect the outcome. Nobody wants; I don't want to control anyone. But I am interested in understanding that there is consideration on a level that would affect the decision. Honestly, my number one concern is impact on students. I just read something about change, to the effect that "Educational change should be dictated by a student need." I really have been deeply concerned from everything that I have heard, from faculty in terms of the strategic planning as well as from the administration; nobody seems to be talking about the student need for this significant change. And that's a concern to me.

President Jacobs: I agree the Faculty and I haven't spoken much with students. I have met with students. I think that this is a student centered plan. One of the issues for students is to improve accessibility. Mike Dowd made a statement about students of services is being central to how we implement that. As regard to your. Sorry. It turns out for better or for worse, you see me hopefully in a reasonable light. You see me from a considerable distance. If you move a little bit closer to some of the decisions that I have to make, recommend to the Board, or have an impact on, I think that you would see that I alter those decisions dramatically to relationship in input. However, given the sort of structure of the institution that usually end up coming from Deans, Provosts, and Vice Presidents, that when I am sitting with them I can promise you and I believe that those kinds of people will testify that I alter my decisions or shape them dramatically based on some of those inputs.

Senator Barnes: Can I ask a little bit more about the student need, in the sense of what the students need? I heard access, but what is the outcome for the student that will be better as a consequence of the re-organization?

President Jacobs: I think that this will probably elevate the journey that we are on toward excellence and international recognition. They will have a diploma that will ultimately be worth more by virtue of their recognition. I believe, you may not, but I firmly believe by me being creative, by doing this sort of thing that we will lessen the impact of the budgetary stringencies by the governor. I think that we will advantage the institution by looking at and thinking about possibly depending on if you believe it or not, modernizing our organizational structure. I think by having increased interaction and visibility for some of the disciplines as we spoken of this morning will help students. Students I think in theatre and music and in visual and performing arts have not gotten a voice at the budgetary table and we spoke about that. Even though the student won't be sitting there, someone specifically with those students that's sitting in the background will be at those budget hearings as painful as they are. I think that there are many advantages ultimately to students. I think that. I understand that our conversation when I am talking to you and a group of Faculty say that we don't talk very much about students. I'll take that to heart and try to think about that more. Overall, my thoughts and my consideration are extremely connected to students needs are.

Senator Barnes: You started with that it's not going to save us a lot of money. You started with that.

President Jacobs: Right.

Senator Barnes: It sounded like some of your answer here, like it's going to save money.

President Jacobs: I don't think that it is going to save us a lot of money. But I think that it will advantage us in the external budgetary process.

Senator Barnes: OK I get that. So the advantage to students is the degree will be worth more to them?

President Jacobs: In the long run I think elevation, recognition, more recognition as we building more stature at the University of Toledo will elevate the value of the student education.

Senator Barnes: I would like to ask you to think more about something. And again, I recognize that you have a different set of priorities that you take most seriously than what priorities I take most seriously. But my job is to teach the individual students who are in front of me. And what happens, for example, when I'm restricted to making only ten copies when I have eighteen students in front of me is that I can't deliver the quality of education that I want to give to them. By my way of thinking, it is the quality of education that is the greatest student need, and that raises the stature of the institution. Not to minimize the things that you're saying...

President Jacobs: They both do. You need both. You need more copying time. Incidentally I admire your passion about teaching the students that are in front of you. I visited your classroom and I thought you were demonstrating that in a real time way and it is admirable Sharon. But, you need everything. You need both. We have a role, I have a role, you have a role and together we can make this place great. And I think that we are on the right track. I have this vision, if I may warp up a little bit. I have this vision that some of you may think that it is delusional; I think the University of Toledo can take its rightful place among some of the great institutions in the world. I believe that we are already excellent. I believe that we can be even greater. I think that we are much, much better than we are recognized to be around the region and world. I think that all of us together as Nina sort of suggested, can put this institution on the map and help it take its rightful place among the greatest institutions in the world. There are those in my own personal family life and some other places that think that that's delusional thinking, but I don't. I believe it's real. I think that it is actable. That's the dream that I wake up every day trying to propagate. I think that we can get there. Mary, I thank you so much for inviting me. I promise Dr. Dowd that I'll come back for whatever number of minutes, so if you want to invite me to the next, I'll do that, I'll come if I'm able.
Thank you.

President Powers: Thank you very much Dr. Jacobs. The Faculty Senate, as a body, has an opportunity and responsibility to respond to the recommendations of Dr. Jacobs. I hope we can use the remaining time in today's meeting to determine how the Faculty Senate will proceed. It is my hope that the response of this body is productive, constructive, leads to the betterment of the University of Toledo, and is in the best interest of our students. I note that two weeks ago, the Faculty Senate, as a body, provided its recommendations to President Jacobs regarding the reorganization proposals in the form of the resolution. Those who were at the stakeholder meeting have already heard the resolution. Also, the resolution has been posted on the website for the strategic planning.

FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION

WHEREAS reorganizing a major institution of higher learning requires substantial and purposeful study;

WHEREAS our primary mission is to our students;

WHEREAS a responsible proposal for restructuring must include clear budgetary impacts and outcomes;

WHEREAS the time to begin a study of reorganization is after a general consensus on the directions in a strategic plan has been achieved;

WHEREAS faculty are appropriate and willing partners in planning transformative change at the University of Toledo;

WHEREAS any outcome of a small select committee working for one month cannot achieve the above goals;

THEREFORE: The Faculty Senate recommends that any restructuring must result from a comprehensive, data driven, study responding to a clear purpose. First and foremost among purposes must be the quality and cost of the education provided for our students. Further, restructuring must not proceed without meaningful engagement with the Faculty Senate as required by the Faculty Senate Constitution and the collective bargaining agreements.

So, at this point we as a body need to decide where we go from here. Do you think that we should accept the plan and populate the Committee's and move forward or are there other ideas? I would like to open the floor now for discussion.

Senator Anderson: Before people start walking out, I just want to remind late comers who didn't get on the roll to check themselves off.

President Powers: Dr. Ohlinger.

Senator Ohlinger: From a time line stand point of course we have to realize that yet it's still a proposal and it will still have to go to the Board of Trustees for approval. So there could be still be changes. I mean, I just don't know how specific we want to be in reaction to something that is yet still a proposal.

President Powers: Good comment. Any other comments?

Senator Barnes: I think that he indicated that the college level part of it was pretty solid. That's what I thought I heard him say.

Senator Lundquist: It doesn't feel that way. I'm unsure about in two weeks what entity I am going to work for. Who's going to be the Dean and all kinds of other things? I know that he thinks that it is solid, but it doesn't feel this way.

President Powers: Dr. Jorgensen.

Senator Jorgensen: It's a proposal, but a decision will be made before the next time we meet. Then there is no time to provide any input to any possible changes. I think that it is unlikely

though that it will have significant changes, particularly in the college area. We did comment about some inconsistencies in the plans. It's not as clean as a plan as a couple of slides suggested it will be. But I think that it is appropriate for the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to request discussion with the President at this stage as well as the Board of Trustees Academic Affairs Committee, which is a sub group that is going to be involved in to making this decision. Because if we are not speaking up now, it's going to be whatever the President tweaks it up to, until that meeting and then after that the institution will be guided by it. That is a legal authority. I wanted to comment a bit in terms of the President suggestion. My comment was not to suggest that the president obey, and it was obvious that isn't what I was suggesting. But the idea of having Faculty Senate input which Mike Dowd talked about, rather than this proposal just coming through after public forum. This is in a rare occasion when a major decision was made that the Faculty Senate was not part of the discussion before a proposal was made. It was done and it been done on other things but I think Senate Executive Committee should be in there expressing our thoughts.

President Powers: OK so what I 'm hearing you say is that the Executive Committee should attempt to meet with the President as well as some members of the Trustees prior to the October 11 date. That is a good suggestion.

Senator Barnes: Can you clarify whether the Board has seen this resolution. Do you know?

President Powers: I don't know if the resolution was seen by the Board, but it was posted on the strategic planning website. It wasn't specifically sent to the Board.

Senator Barnes: I wondered if it would be useful to them to know that in September we had already articulated our position. It's not just the Executive Committee, but the entire Senate has. I don't remember if it was unanimous or not.

Senator Jorgensen: Without objection.

President Powers: Without objection.

Senator Barnes: I would really like to know that they have seen this and that they know what the Senate thinks of the idea. Personally.

President Powers: Do we think that it is appropriate to have reaffirmation of this resolution?

Senator Dowd: We don't need to reaffirm the resolution. It's not necessary. I think that it is important to make sure that copies are delivered to the Board of Trustees office.

Senator Ohlinger: What does the Board of Trustees Committee on Academic Affairs meet? Would that be before the October 11, date?

Senator Dowd: No

President Powers: I don't believe the Academic Affairs Committee meets before October 11

Senator Jorgensen: But they can meet.

President Powers: Yes they could.

Senator Jorgensen: All they need is a few days public notice.

President Powers: Dr. Rouillard.

Senator Rouillard: I think we have a responsibility to insist that a budget be worked out for these new positions. So we will have a better idea, how much this is actually going to cost before any decisions, any implementation goes forth.

President Powers: So, can I just get some sense about how you would see that?

Senator Rouillard: I would be happy to insist to the Board of Trustees and to the President that we see figures. The estimated budget, what it is going to cost?

President Powers: So what kind of action is requested?

Senator Dowd: We don't need to reaffirm the resolution. It's not necessary. I think that it is important to make sure that copies are delivered to the Board of Trustees office.

Senator Cluse-Tolar: When the Board President was here, I asked a question about costing it out, and he said the Board would not move without doing that. I don't know if that's still true or not.

President Powers: OK that's good. Thank you. Dr. Lundquist.

Senator Lundquist: This resolution that we've voted on last time uses the word *any restructuring*. I think that we've gone beyond *any* which implies that there might be many and it still might be time to make a new one or a better one. Perhaps we need a resolution that deals with the one that we actually have before us.

President Powers: I'm sorry, I didn't hear.

Senator Lundquist: One that deals with structuring plan that we actually have before us which looks to be going forward. In other words, not the budgetary impacts of any proposal. But the budgetary impact of this particular proposal. And so on down the line.

President Powers: Are you suggesting that we would update this resolution for the current state of affairs? Good idea.

Senator Rouillard: No.

President Powers: So, if I can just clarify what we would update, should we take out the last *whereas* and change the *any* to *specific* is the current restructuring plan? Dr. Barden.

Senator Barden: I don't think that will help. We have a real Faculty governance issue here. Because this already says *must not* you see that "must" in there and the President just said "I do not need to obey" when we said "you *must*". So we clearly have a power issue. To simply say OK he didn't like that, let's do another resolution that is more specific, basically gives the argument away that we have any power at all.

Senator Lundquist: But this one and a new one will have an additional audience which would be the Board of Trustees.

Senator Barden: Well, this one should also have an audience as well.

Senator Barnes: I think that they should all get it.

President Powers: Is there a need for an additional resolution? If so, can I have a motion? OK, there is no need to have an additional resolution for the Board of Trustees.

Group of Senators: No.

President Powers: Yes.

Senator Barden: A new resolution would be just saying "OK, you didn't like that, let us try something else."

Senator Barnes: I think that it is true; restructuring should be the result of comprehensive study. Any time someone wants to do that.

Senator Cluse-Tolar: This was going to be my next question, but then he left; In the College of Health Science and Human Service after this was announced last Friday, we received an e-mail from our Dean that actually served on the Committee of Twelve, and said that she was essentially not consulted about moving our college with the College of Education and that she was surprised when the final plan came out that this happened. I think he indicated that he consulted with the leaders about this, but he left numbers of the leadership team even out of it. Not just Faculty Senate, but he left other members of the leadership team out of this decision process too. This makes me wonder how this decision was formed at all.

President Powers: So is there any other discussion on this matter. I think that the Executive Committee has some pretty good direction from the Senate. I appreciate the thoughtful questions and input that have come forward from the Senate. Are there any additional comments?

Senator Barnes: I would like to say that I don't really feel that it's a power struggle. I feel that it's a struggle over what is the best for the future of the University. For all my commentary around, I wish that he'll give us a win every once in a while. I really think about this case, is this really a wise thing to do? And shouldn't we do some deeper thinking about it before we do it?

Senator Dowd: I understand the point you have made. I can't get past the issue that the President has so little respect for the Faculty and the Faculty Senate that he couldn't be bothered to ask us for our thoughts on of this proposal. He had several months to simply talk with us and he would not do that. The Committee that he charged to come up with the original plan were rushed to deliver something. They were given a rather insane deadline of four or five weeks to deliver the final product. The President had their plan since June 28. The President could have invited Faculty Senate President Powers or the Senate Executive Committee into a meeting to discuss this issue. He could have just asked us what we thought of it. Could we make suggestions? Could we identify problems that he could avoid? He did none of this. He said today when Senator Jorgensen asked about this very issue, he said "no" he wasn't going to do it, because he didn't have to do it. I asked if he was going to cost out the plan and include that in his presentation to the Board. He said "no." No, I can't get around the fact that this is so discouraging. He has so little respect for the Faculty Senate that our opinion could not inform him in any way. I disagree with Senator Barden as to whether there is a power struggle. There's no power struggle. The President has the power and we have none. The Faculty Senate is supposed to be here to discuss issues and help inform decisions. We all know that Senate does not make organizational decisions. But President Jacobs doesn't want to even hear our opinions.

President Powers: Any other comments? Dr. Lundquist.

Senator Lundquist: I agree that he talks all the time about consulting with faculty and in fact sets up forums where faculty can come and speak. But this body was elected by the Faculty to do precisely that kind of work, to come to a collective wisdom about things. You can't call a four-hour meeting and expect large numbers of busy faculty to show up. Even if they did, it's all going to come forward and sound like chaos and confusion. Consultation with the president, on the other hand, is precisely the job of an elected body like this one. In agreeing to serve, we set aside time to do the work we were elected to do. He makes a show of consulting the faculty while disrespecting the body that was elected by the faculty. I think that it is a waste of collective wisdom about our university, which I don't understand.

President Powers: Dr. Jorgensen.

Dr. Jorgensen: Shared governance is an attribute of a healthy institution. I think that it is imprudent for the President to move along these lines without the advice of the Faculty groups. We are coming up for reaccreditation in just a year. This is part of our record now that the President made a decision 180 degrees in that position to state an opinion from the Faculty. That should not happen at the University.

President Powers: Thank you. Are there any other comments on this subject? Is there any other business from the floor? There is no other business. We have time for general questions. Are there any general questions? May I have a motion for adjournment? Second. All in favor? Any opposed? The meeting is adjourned. Thank you.

IV. Meeting was adjourned at 5:58 pm.