

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of November 16, 2010
FACULTY SENATE

<http://www.utoledo.edu/facsenate>

Approved @FS mtg. on 1-18-2011

HIGHLIGHTS

Dr. Tom Barden, Honors College
Jo Campbell, Living Learning Communications/ Faculty in Residence

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, **Karen Hoblet**, Executive Secretary, called the roll.

I. Roll Call: 2010-2011 Senators:

Present: Anderson, Atwood, Barden, Barnes, Barrett, Batten, Baumgartner, Brickman, Chiarelott, Cluse-Tolar, Crist, Dowd, Fink, Fournier, Franchetti, Funk, Gardner, Gibbons, Giovannucci, Hoblet, Horan, Hornbeck, Jorgensen, Kistner, Laux, LeBlanc, Lee, Lundquist, Molitor, Moore, Moynihan, Ohlinger, Olson, Plentifish, Powers, Randolph, Regimbal, Rouillard, Sawicki, Sheldon, Skeel, Solocha, Stepkowski, Teclehaimanot, Tinkel, Wedding, Weldy, White,

Excused absences: Benjamin, Carr, Dismukes, Humphrys, Piazza, Shriner, Wilson, Yonker,

Unexcused absences: Barlowe, Caruso, Eastop, Hammersley, Malhotra, Nandkeolyar, Thompson-Casado,

II. Approval of Minutes: Minutes of 11/02/2010 were not yet 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.

I am calling the meeting to order. Welcome all to the sixth Faculty Senate meeting of the academic year 2010-2011.

To start the meeting, I ask Secretary Hoblet to call the roll. Thank Secretary Hoblet.

Welcome all to the sixth Faculty Senate meeting of the academic year 2010-2011.

Minutes from the October 19th meeting were sent for your review. May I have a motion for approval? Second. All in favor? Any opposed. Please let the record show the minutes from the October 19th meeting have been approved.

I want to provide some information that was shared by Dr. Nick Piazza, UT Faculty Senate Representative to the Ohio Faculty Council (OFC) of the Ohio Board of Regents. Unfortunately, Dr. Piazza is out-of-town today and unable to answer questions about the report; so plans will be

made for him to talk and take questions at the November 30th Faculty Senate meeting. The last Ohio Faculty Council meeting was held Friday, November 12, 2010. Chancellor Eric Fingerhut addressed the OFC meeting and addressed issues and future plans for higher education in Ohio. Chancellor Fingerhut's address was followed by informational business as well as one action item. The action item was a vote on a resolution to support House Bill 365, (Dr. Piazza brought to the Faculty Senate for our recommendation to support) which grants to part-time faculty and graduate assistants the right to collective bargaining as well as other rights. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 5 in favor, 4 opposed, and 4 abstaining. Many of those who voted against the resolution supported it for instructional personnel, however, opposed the resolution because it included graduate assistants. The opposition's position was that graduate assistants are students who receive assistance from the university and not employees of the university. Plans are to have Dr. Piazza report on Chancellor Fingerhut's address at the November 30th Faculty Senate meeting.

As you recall, at our last Faculty Senate meeting, Dr. Jacobs was scheduled to meet with the Senate; however, as you are aware, during the first question, an emergency arose and Dr. Jacobs needed to abruptly leave the meeting. In the interest of maintaining the momentum and energy, following Dr. Jacobs' departure, 14 questions were collected from Senators for Dr. Jacobs. And later that evening President-elect Anderson and I typed up the questions that were asked by Senators and were working on confirming the accuracy of our notes so the questions could be forwarded to Dr. Jacobs the next day. Meanwhile, Senator Olson had also collected the questions from his notes and forwarded questions to President Jacobs with copy to me the next morning. I informed Senator Olson and President Jacobs that Dr. Anderson and I had also completed a first draft of the questions. Dr. Jacobs then sent an e-mail to all members of the Executive Committee and suggested we not work on the "list of questions" and stated he is willing to return for new dialogue. Therefore, the Executive Committee invited President Jacobs to another Faculty Senate meeting. We had previously been told that President Jacobs would not be available today, so we extended an invitation to the November 30th Faculty Senate meeting and we are waiting to see if that date will work out. If President Jacobs is not able to make it for the November 30th meeting, the Executive Committee will make plans to set up a meeting with him to gain more information.

At the end of our last Faculty Senate meeting, the Executive Committee presented a first draft of Faculty Senate talking points on reorganization. After the meeting, the draft was sent to Senators requesting feedback and the list was updated prior to the Executive Committee meeting last Friday. Most of the time at the Executive Committee on Friday was spent on discussion of the Faculty Senate talking points on reorganization and the role of Faculty Senate. The Executive Committee studied the documents that have been provided on the reorganization by Dr. Jacobs so far, namely the e-mail with PowerPoint that was sent on October 12th as well as the November 9th e-mail letter from Dr. Lloyd Jacobs regarding the University of Toledo Reorganization Plan that was sent to Students, Parents, Faculty Senate, Faculty At Large, Alumni, Community Members and other Stakeholders. From these two documents, the Executive Committee attempted to deduce enough information to determine what President Jacobs is asking of us. After almost two hours of discussion, the Executive Committee concluded simply that more information is needed from President Jacobs. So, we look forward to the next opportunity we will have to gain more information about his plan.

Additionally, I want to share two items of information that I received yesterday by e-mail.

The first was an e-mail sent from Dr. Scott Scarborough to Senior Leadership and Deans informing that meetings will begin this week to restructure the financial accounts of the university to align with the new academic reorganization. These meetings are for the sole purpose of aligning existing indexes and budgeted funds with the new academic reorganization. Requests for additional budgeted funds to support the new structure will not be considered as part of these meetings. Requests for additional funding will be entertained as part of the FY 2012 budget process.

The second was an e-mail from Provost McMillen to all faculty announcing the establishing of three search committees for the three founding deans of the College of Visual and Performing Arts, the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics, and the College of Language, Literature, and Social Sciences.

Lastly, I feel compelled to comment following an opinion piece from President Jacobs in the Toledo Blade this past Sunday. The focus of the opinion piece was President Jacobs' interview of tenure candidates. As I read the piece, I reflected on the work with Ilene Muething of Gap International last month working toward better communication and a better working relationship between the Faculty Senate and President Jacobs. My comment is that this type of communication did not seem to align with what I thought was to be gained from the work. This concludes the Executive Committee Report.

Regular reports on the preparations for the university's upcoming review by the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools can be anticipated for most Faculty Senate meetings this year. Today is no exception. At our last two meetings, it was reported that three open forums were conducted in the past few weeks for faculty to share views and provide feedback for the self-study report UT is preparing for its 2012 visit from The Higher Learning Commission (HLC). I ask Dr. Thea Sawicki and Dr. Tom Sharkey, to please come forward to provide a report to the Senate on the outcomes the three Open Forums.

Senator Sawicki: Thank you very much for the opportunity to come back and report to the Faculty Senate. Three open forums were held for faculty, staff, and students to take a look at one each of the three topics that were included in the Special Emphasis as well as one or two of the criteria for Self Study. We are very pleased to share with you some of the preliminary findings that were identified by the individuals who joined us at these three forums. I want to begin by thanking the individuals who really helped to organize the forums and Penny Poplin-Gosetti, her assistant Heather Huntley, and Jim Winkler, who is going to be our final draft one-voice writer. All of those individuals have done an amazing job working with these Teams to date. Remember their drafts are due November 23rd and the importance is to have our responses to the core criteria under each of these core components, each of the criteria, the evidence base. Some of what we are going to ask you today is for you to suggest additional exemplars, if you know them. The first forum dealt with "*merging cultures and mission and integrity*," Charles Blatz, the team leader for Criterion One is preparing a survey to be sent to faculty, staff as well as a related survey for students, that asks them for their understanding of aspects of our mission and values.

We expect the survey to go out by email this week or early next week. As the work of the team identified some differences in perceptions, it is important for the team to gather additional data across the University on these issues for their self-study. Please encourage all your colleagues to participate in these surveys.

Higher Learning Commission

Self-Study

Open Forum Recap

Dr. Thea Sawicki and Dr. Tom Sharkey

Co-chairs of Self-Study

Faculty Senate

November 16, 2010

The HLC Study: Shaping UT's Tomorrow.

Merging Cultures: Mission and Integrity

"Where the rubber meets the road"

Creating a stronger institution

- Use of both campuses
- Traditions
- Faculty collaboration
- Role of athletics

Developing shared identity - exemplars

- Geographical change of the College of Pharmacy
- Land-use plan
- Student sub-committee of Council on Diversity
- Communication and relationship-building

Merging Cultures: Mission and Integrity continued

Challenges

- *Effect of locations on sense of identity*
- *Two of "something" (e.g. unions, chief academic officers, academic calendars)*
- *Competing interests and perceptions; no shared belief that "we succeed and fail together."*
- *Differing perceptions concerning mission statement clarity*

Teaching and Learning

Teaching and learning opportunities – exemplars

- Creation of Learning Ventures
- Dual degree programs and cross-college interdisciplinary initiatives
- Partnership between CCI and theater students

Assessing usefulness of curriculum

- Follow-up survey of College of Medicine graduates
- Employer feedback to College of Business Administration
- Biosciences partnership with alumni office

Teaching and Learning continued

Challenges

- Repository for student data
- Standardization of data collection across courses
- Defining terms (What is teaching? What is research? What is a scholarly endeavor?)
- Faculty need help prioritizing teaching and research

Outreach and Engagement

Collaboration on planning and resources

- IT merger and resizing
- Merger resulting in College of Health Science and Human Service
- Development of UT Innovation Enterprises (UTIE)

Engagement with constituencies – exemplars

- Options for Tomorrow – HSHS and Ability Center

- Wright Center for Photovoltaics Innovation and Commercialization
- Incubator Program tracking

Entrepreneurial environment and students' academic experiences

- Doctor of Nursing program in College of Nursing
- Entrepreneurship degree in College of Business Administration
- Residential energy audits by Engineering students
- Licensure Alternative Master's Program (LAMP)
in Education

Outreach and Engagement *continued*

Assets in creating an entrepreneurial environment

- Positive response and support from administration
- External funding
- President makes it a priority

Barriers to creating an entrepreneurial environment

- Resistance to interdisciplinary teaching and research
- Junior faculty fear of no reward in promotion and tenure process
- Lack of systems support

Senator Sawicki: Let me just finish up by saying that we will provide the PowerPoint for your Minutes. I was reminded by Senator Dowd's note, and I do know this and I do apologize, that two wonderful examples of developing a shared identity are the merged Faculty Senate and the merged Graduate Council; very successful mergers.

Senator Dowd: I would like to add to that, the Graduate College.

Senator Sawicki: And the Graduate College.

Senator Dowd: And the College of Administration that serves both campuses.

Senator Sawicki: I should know that one as well.

Senator Hoblet: The new Honors College as well.

Senator Sawicki: Yes, the new Honors College. Thank you very much. I will make a note of those as well. One more reminder about telling everyone about the upcoming surveys. And, while we have some very excellent exemplars for the College of HSHS, we would love to hear from the other Colleges so we will have a nice broad representation of examples of how well UT is meeting the HLC criteria. Thank you very much.

Senator Dowd: One of the first slides, one of the successes. I couldn't read it because of the podium, was it commercial or communication? I thought it was commercialization.

Senator Sawicki: Thanks.

Dr. Sharkey: Thank you.

President Powers: Thank you Dr. Sawicki and Sharkey and also thanks to Dr. Penny Poplin-Gosetti. I now ask Dr. Celia Regimbal to come forward for the Faculty Senate Academic Programs committee report.

Senator Regimbal: The Academic Programs Committee has met and reviewed the following items and would like to move forward as consent agenda.

**Academic Programs Committee Report
November 16, 2010**

Due to system changes program modifications are received in the following ways: posted on the curriculum tracking cite, handed to the chair of the Program Committee, and turned in to the Faculty Senate office. Every effort is being made by the committee to keep current with requests. If a College Curriculum Committee Chair has questions about a program request please contact Celia Regimbal, Chair of the Faculty Senate Programs Committee at x 2480.

The Academic Program Committee met on 10/29 and reviewed the following request. After discussion the committee requested further information, which was provided via email. The committee reviewed the requested information and the vote taken via email.

The following request were Approved:

Program requirement revision from **ENG, Bachelor of Science in Bioengineering**

A proposal to create a separate laboratory course that combines the laboratory components from BIOE 3300 and BIOE 4120. The proposed curriculum would include the following:

BIOE 3300 Biomedical Electronics, modified for 3 credit hour lecture
(3 contact hours) = 3 credit hour course

BIOE 4120 Biosignal Processing, modified for 3 credit hour lecture
(3 contact hours) = 3 credit hour course

BIOE 4140 Biomedical Instrumentation Laboratory, new course with 1
credit hour lecture (1 contact hour) + 1 credit hour laboratory (3
contact hours) = 2 credit hour course

The rationale is available for review.

The following request was approved:

Program requirement revision from **ARS, Psychology major**

Eliminate the requirement for an advanced research course in the psychology major and reduce the hours required for the major from 35 to 34 hrs.

Rationale: reduced faculty makes it impossible to offer enough research courses and laboratory opportunities to accommodate majors. Advanced research courses would continue to be offered for interested students.

Reduce the number of hours required for the major from 35 to 34 hrs.

Rationale: with the elimination of the advanced research course, 4 credit hrs, students will now take a 3 credit hr. elective resulting in a one-credit hr. change in the number of hours required for the Psychology major.

Senator Regimbal: Are there any discussions? Any questions? All opposed? All in favor?
Motion granted. Thank you.

President Powers: Thank you Dr. Regimbal. The next report today will be given by Dr. Tom Barden about the new Honors College.

Senator Barden: Hello everybody. As you may recall I was asked today to talk to you two weeks ago. I want to start off by thanking Peg Traband. I don't think she is here today, but I wish she were because I want to sing her praises -- she was a champion of the idea of an Honors College from the very beginning. In fact this important change could not had happened without her and the strong support of the University of Toledo Learning Collaborative. I know some of you have wondered what the UTLC is, and what it does, and how it all fits in the university's mission.. It came together a couple of years ago and among the other things it has become, it has been an incubator of ideas and a place to find shared resources. When the idea first emerged to transform from a program to a college, of course one of the questions was how could we possibly afford that. We'd need a business manager, a communication manager, an assessment person, all of these resources. The answer was the shared resources of the Learning Collaborative. The business manager of the University of Toledo Learning Collaborative is Joely Giamarco; she is now in the Honors College Business Manager and also that for the College of Adult and Life-Long Learning. So, the UTLC's pool of resources really made this possible. I want to thank Peg and the UTLC for that before we get started and show you all an example of how those shared resources work in my first slide. [The word Program morphs to College on the PowerPoint

The Board approved the creation of the Honors College on September 20, 2010 so note that it is not coupled with the other pieces of the reorganization of colleges. It is one of the ideas that came from the Committee of Twelve, and I want to thank that Committee for championing this idea all the way through the process of their deliberations. They thought it was a good idea from the time I proposed it and they made a major recommendation out of their committee. That being said, it is separate from the reorganization.

Here is the PowerPoint:

Honors Program

The University of Toledo

Board of Trustees

Approved the Creation of

The Honors College

Honors College Mission Statement

- The University of Toledo Honors College offers enhanced intellectual and experiential opportunities to highly motivated and talented students in all the undergraduate colleges of the University of Toledo. The Honors College provides a challenging and engaging higher education experience in a small-group learning and intensive advising environment that is conducive to growth and discovery.

The NCHC 'Best Practices' Document

Lists the criteria for excellent:

Honors Colleges

- 5% of the Undergraduates
- 25 to 28 ACT Range
- High School GPA of 3.75
- Minimum of 25% Honors Courses
- Residential Opportunities (LLC)
- A Stand-alone Building

UT Honors

- 923 students [as of F2010]
- All undergraduate colleges
- Engineering, A & S, Pharmacy, & Business
account for 80%

- 28.1 ACT 3.92 GPA [new 2010 class]
- Thesis or project required
- 3 internal Honors scholarships

Our status was very close to the level of an NCHC Honors College...

Needs that had to be addressed:

- The curriculum should be delivered by the best possible classroom instructors
- The head of the program should have direct access to the chief academic officer and the undergraduate college deans
- Hire a Lecturer with Honors Experience to teach in Honors and create an Honors LLC
- Make the director a dean with a direct line of report to the provost
- Authorize the College to hold tenure and tenure track faculty lines

Effects of Honors College Status

- Enhanced Prestige & Reputation
- Increased Ability to Recruit Top Students
- Better Chance to Attract Top Minority Students
- Restart of the Honors Alumni Affiliate
- New (and Repeat) Donor Possibilities

Conclusion:

Our institution has been underselling our Honors endeavor by not taken this step

The University of Toledo

Honors College



Senator Barden: As part of the reorganization process, my position was changed from director to dean, so, according to Faculty Senate rules I can no longer sit as a Senator from Arts & Sciences. I would like to thank all my colleagues in the College of Arts and Sciences for electing me to a three year term and say to all of you, my Senate colleagues that it has been a great honor to serve with you. I sent President Powers my letter of resignation and the Arts and Sciences College Council is in the process of finding my replacement.

Senator Sawicki: How many students are in the Honors College right now?

Senator Barden: As of the fifteen day count this fall, there were nine hundred and thirty-two; it passed the nine hundred level a couple of years ago. The largest cohort is engineering. the national Honors organization, NCHC, is very pleased with that, by the way, because it is very unusual. Typically the liberal arts areas have the larger share of students. The University of Toledo engineering Honors freshman class reached three digits this year. Pharmacy and the College of Arts and Sciences, the old entity are the next two biggest units, and business is next. One part of the plan is to have an Honors present on the Health Science Campus. The Provost and Chancellor and I are going to look around the HSC for a place to have Honors, Study Abroad, and Undergraduate Research housed so the HSC undergraduates will be able to more easily use the services of all three. Are there any other questions?

Senator Anderson: Congratulations!

Senator Barden: Thank you, Senator Anderson.

President Powers: Thank you, Dr. Barden. The next report today is from Director of Residence Life, Jo Campbell, on Living Learning Communities and Faculty in Residence.

Ms. Campbell: Thank you, I am thrilled to be here. I am wondering how many of you are aware that on our Main Campus we have living learning communities? How about our faculty in residence program? Just to give a brief outline to what Living Learning Communities are:

**Living Learning Communities
and
Faculty in Residence**

Students do better in LLCs!

What is a Living Learning Community?

- By definition, LLC's have the following three hallmarks:
- A program that has clear academic objectives and mission
- Students live together in a discrete portion of a residence hall or the entire building
- Staff, curricular and co-curricular programming, and resources are dedicated to that program only

Learning Outcomes

- Goal 1: Improve academic success
 - Objective 1.1 : Higher GPA
- Goal 2: Improve students' sense of well being
 - Objective 2.1 More social connectedness
- Goal 3: Increase retention rates
 - Objective 3.1 Statistically significant higher retention rates
- Goal 4: Increase participation rates in LLCs
 - Objective 4.1 The number who participate in LLCs will increase 10% every 2 years

Current LLCs

- Education
- Business
- Honors
- Arts
- Health Professions
- Engineering
- Environmental Sustainability
- Scholastically Enriched Environment
- Politics, Law & Society

The Quantitative Data Says...

- Improve academic performance
- Lower risk of course withdrawal
- Increase cognitive skills & abilities
- Higher overall satisfaction with college
Evans Commander and Ward conclude in an *About Campus* July-August 2009 article
- More positive student experiences
- Improved student learning
- Increased student success
From the 2007 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)

Recent Qualitative Data

- Student-professor connections
- Collaboration
- Engagement with the university or city
- Lasting friendships

Plans for 2011-12

- **Global Entrepreneurship and Innovation**
 - Hosted by College of Business and Innovation
 - Open to all majors, all years
 - Housed in the Crossings, a suite-style building
- **Leadership through Service**
 - Partnering with UTLC's Academic Engagement and Leadership UT program
 - Open to all majors, all years
 - Housed in MacKinnon Hall

Faculty in Residence:

Fostering connections with students outside the classroom

Advantages of informal contact

- Breaking down the barriers between faculty and students
- Building trust
- Understanding one another on a deeper level

Positives from the faculty perspective

- Establish personal relationships
- Receive candid student feedback/input
- Start dialogue on current events and new research
- Better understand students' needs, values & perceptions
- Remember what it was like to be a student
- Spend time connecting with other faculty and staff
- Interact with students from different backgrounds/cultures
- Enjoy the company of students outside the pressure of the classroom

What is expected?

- Be visible and available
- Foster a greater connection between academic & residence life
- Involve one's faculty colleagues
- Programs with visiting scholars
- Participate in residence life staff training
- Eating, attending athletic events and programs regularly with students
- Work with student leaders in helping them organize educational activities

Ms. Campbell: There is a lot of data on Living Learning Communities and our PowerPoint is available and I will be happy to send it to anybody individually if you like that. If I can ask our two current faculty in residence to join me, I have doubled the Faculty and Residence program. We had one in 2008 and now we've added another; they are living examples of faculty members actually living in a residence hall with students. I wonder if you can introduce yourselves and talk just for a second about what you enjoy about faculty in residence living with students.

Dr. McKether: Good afternoon. My name is William Mc Kether, I am an anthropologist and I live on the first floor of Carter West. This is of course my first year and what I enjoy about being a faculty residence is that it gives me the opportunity to deal with students on their level and on their home turf. I also consider myself a student centered Professor and this gives me an opportunity to dialogue with students for them to see me doing my laundry, for them to see me in my sweats, and I still get those surprise looks when they see me; but at least now they recognize who I am. They say "hey you are the anthropologist guy, right?" and I say "Yeah that's me." For me it has been an adjustment and I sometimes I see things that I wish that I haven't seen and heard things that I wish that I haven't heard, but it reminds me what it was like to be a college

student again. So for me, at least up to this point it has been a good experience. I can share many stories with you, although on one-on-one interaction, but time does not permit; so far at least so good.

Dr. Devabhaktuni: Hi everyone, my name is Vijay and I am actually a faculty member from the College of Engineering. I am very glad that our Dean is not in this meeting because he wouldn't have liked the way that I am dressed for this meeting.

Senator Dowd: We won't tell.

Dr. Devabhaktuni: I actually moved to the University of Toledo just a couple of years ago from Canada where me and my supervisor were doing research at two o'clock in the afternoon and on certain occasions we would decide to drive fifteen minutes and be in the wilderness and go kindling or fishing and come back. So for me moving here was a bit of an adjustment. There was a lot of distance between Professors and students. I hope that I am not annoying anyone by saying this, but just a relative term; so when you come from one place and then you find other place to be slightly consequently different. This opportunity quickly came as a blessing in disguise for me. I actually enjoy working with students. For example, I leave the I.T. student branch which is the student branch that represents the electrical electronic engineers of the College of Engineering. Recently we actually won the Region IV which is the Midwestern U.S.A Globe award which really expanded in terms of membership. At the end of that road I heard an announcement from the Faculty Business program and I applied for it. I really thank Jo for selecting me among several other applicants. We moved to the Hall and just as an example activity that we took up at the beginning of this semester is a living, learning community. Now when you talk about alignment it doesn't have to be engineering students, it can be students from other faculties as well. So when I did invite one of my friends who is a researcher from the United Kingdom, I invited him to the residence and we invited this group of students to be with him and we asked him all sorts of questions about how many birds get killed and he replied with a little bit of sense-of-humor and said "it's definitely less than the number of cats that get killed by driving reckless on a road." So, there were some very interestingly differences and I hope into the future which is the spring semester or summer term that I will be able to have made a difference and at that point pass on the position to another colleague on campus that is interested. We encourage you to work with Jo and as an example; we sent a proposal to the State of Ohio for concentration in which we have decided to include Jo Campbell and she would be able to get some learning data to the residence life that would support our obligation. Thank you very much and this is much more than one second.

Ms. Campbell: Any questions?

Senator Barden: This is a question for Dr. McKether; is this going to be participant/observer field work? Are you going to write..?

Dr. McKether: To be quite honest with you, I do consider this as field work and I am making notes, so as soon as I get to the I.R.V process I am going to.

Senator Anderson: How many faculty residences do you wish to have at some point or another? Are the terms one year or more?

Ms. Campbell: Terms are a minimum of one academic year and a maximum of three. My goal is to have a faculty member living in each of our residences halls, providing seven more.

Senator Barden: Where is the scholastically enriched environment? Is it Academic House?

Ms. Campbell: Dowd Hall. Thank you all very much.

President Powers: In an effort to improve communication with the administration, we announced at our first Faculty Senate meeting this year that Provost/ Chancellor Forums would occur throughout the year so Senators could bring the concerns of their constituents to the floor of the Senate. The first forum took place at our last meeting and good information was brought to the floor by Senators toward improving our University. Today marks the second Provost/Chancellor Forum, and I invite Chancellor Gold and Provost McMillen to participate in this second forum. Maybe you can take a seat in the front.

Provost McMillen: Jeff and I were talking just in the back for a second and I thought that I would start off by talking about a session that we had yesterday morning with all of the Deans from both campuses. I believe Tom Barden is the only person in the room that was there. Partly, this was planned for six weeks and it ended up not being the greatest day, although all the Deans were there. The basic purpose was to come up with an academic plan. I have talked to some of you before in different meetings about this that we thought that this year with the budget crises looming and the other changes throughout the University that it would be best to start out getting the academic act together. In a sense of being on the same page; talking through some of the priorities and some of the ways that we are going to talk about positives as well as some of the negatives that may come up like talking about cutting budget. We went on for four hours. I don't want to speak for Jeff, but I thought it was very successful: well enough for the deans who have precious little time to try to accomplish all that they have to accomplish and to say they want to come back literally again within seven to ten days; as soon as we can arrange it so that we can talk further. There is a lot to talk about and a lot of different issues. We want to present a united front as well as to talk about what the deans and the faculty really consider are the important things that should not be on the table and some other things that might be on the table and so on. It will be a complicated issue and I don't want to repeat myself from other talk's, but it is going to be very hard; all the other universities are facing the fact that they have to create a budget not knowing what the State is going to do, not knowing how the money is going to come in, and not knowing if the State will meet their deadlines. Even if the State will meet their deadline on June 30th, it will probably be after our deadline earlier as we try to put together a final budget before the first of the year and the complications of the State two-year budget and our one year budget. So, that was just a report. I don't know if Jeff wants to add some comments.

Chancellor Gold: I would just like to add that I too thought that it went really well. We had an great morning and I thought that it was very broad ranging views and a healthy open discussion which is exactly what Bill and I tried to provoke from this group, because there are no easy

issues left I am afraid. But I think if there is one unifying concept that came out of it, Bill or Tom certainly please feel free to comment with me, the absolutely critical role of the academic leadership and the academic mission of the University in moving forward is that is we make these extremely difficult decisions in the future that those basic principals look up and will prevail.

Senator Barden: Senator Olson and I were talking about that before the Senate today; I am glad to hear both of you say that publically because it is on everybody's mind.

Chancellor Gold: Bill and I and are very proud to say all of the Deans are very committed.

Senator Barnes: I was wondering if both of you would be willing to comment on your thoughts about Dr. Jacobs' article in *The Blade* about why he interviews for tenure and particularly the complete lack of mention of teaching as something that is of interest to him in terms of what he considers marginal or not marginal in faculty achievements.

Provost McMillen: I'll allow the more experienced Chancellor to answer.

Chancellor Gold: Certainly we are never presumed to speak for Dr. Jacobs. But first of all I don't think that piece was meant to be all inclusive and I know how much he values teaching, how much he values service, and how much he values scholarships. If it came off as being unbalanced, I don't believe that that was intent, but I certainly can't speak for him.

Senator Barnes: He didn't mention teaching or service at all.

Chancellor Gold: As I read through the dossiers, all of those components are critically important and I take it very seriously as well when I put my name on the bottom of the letter to the President recommending promotion or tenure.

Provost McMillen: I haven't yet put my name on a bottom of a letter, but I think that I will. As you know that there were those work load surveys that were at the beginning of this semester that were done by the Deans of their faculties and I certainly reviewed, saw, looked at, compared, and was introduced to a service components and how they varied from college to college to examine the teaching load and how those were divided among the faculty with the lecturers and so on. I found it very interesting.

Senator Barrett: There was an e-mail that went out today concerning nominating and self nominating for the three newly created Dean positions. There has been discussion before that this is an internal search, but it has raised in my mind two questions that I was wondering if you could clarify. First, will there be a fully formed Dean Search Committee for each of these Deans positions or is the selection process going to be somewhat different from that? Second, regardless of the answer in the first question, will these be interim Dean's appointments or are they going to be permanent Dean's appointments?

Provost McMillen: They are not going to be interim; they are going to be a two-year appointment. I'm not sure what full search means, but let me describe what they are going to be;

it has occupied most of my time within the last forty-eight hours, except for the Deans' meeting. I have through the Provost office put together by asking certain groups to submit names and by self submission a list of names. These names have been divided up of each by the faculty members departments that was in relation to the breakup of the new colleges and the makeup of the new colleges. Then I selected with the help of the Provost office a series of faculty members to call to notify that I was going to call them which I did last Friday and then made calls yesterday afternoon mostly and today, I saw a couple of people in person. I am not done with the process; there are about six more slots to fill. I called a couple of people in the room that I see here, and basically there will be six or seven members on each of those committees. The search committees will have a very brief timeline. The timeline will be by December 3rd, Friday. They will have to give me three names depending on how the Search Committee works out and I will then over the weekend make a recommendation on Friday to the President, he will submit to the Board of Trustees at the Academic Student Affairs meeting is on Monday, December 6th. It a very short timeline obviously that is getting some criticism. However, there are a couple of things that are unlike the typical search. There are no outside candidates; the candidates are coming internally from the University. Obviously there will not be a lot of candidates; it won't be sixty, thirty or twenty of them or anything like that, but it will be a smaller number of people interested in being the dean of each one of these new Colleges. There are already names of people that are either being nominated or nominating themselves to the Provost office. The deadline for that is next Monday, November 22nd. There will be one student and one member of PSA on each of the committees. So, the committees will be between six to nine people each. The way that it has worked out by chance, the committee for Natural Sciences and Mathematics race is pretty much done. The Committee for Languages, Literature, and Social Sciences is almost done. The committee for Visual and Performing Arts is about half done. It has happened partly because there were people that indicated they were interested but upon further reflection said that they could not do it because of their time and also they didn't realize that they were going to be gone so much. So, a couple of people took themselves out of the running. One person upon discussion with me thought that they would possibly consider an application for Dean, so that took that person out of being on a committee. There were two or three people that didn't just answer the phone, so I'm going back to campus tonight to make a couple of more phone calls and I may send a couple of e-mails out to try to get in touch with some people. Also there is at least one person in this room and if they linger around I will talk to them. So that's where it is, John. I don't know if I answered your question, it was a rambling answer. It has been hectic for a day and a half. I think that we have people that are basically senior faculty members.

Senator Jorgensen: I would like to follow up on that, Bill.

Provost McMillen: Yes.

Senator Jorgensen: About the timeline; the search is a person will have three business days to turn in their application and that's the deadline. The Committee has seven business days plus Thanksgiving to review them and then the Board appoints the person the very next business days which is nineteen days from tomorrow.

Provost McMillen: Yes.

Senator Jorgensen: How does that make sense with best practices for hiring? A Committee would want to research those individuals even though they are internal, but the members of the Committee may or may not know the individual and they may want to speak to the chairs that are in their area and even though there's value getting this done quickly, but nineteen days to appoint people with a founding positions, I mean that makes a statement about the institution.

Provost McMillen: Well, I don't know if it makes a statement about it. But I appreciate it though that there is very little time and I said that to every person that I called and talked to. A couple of people said that they couldn't do it, but they didn't say that they were uncomfortable, but that they are literally out of town.

Senator Jorgensen: What's the rationale then for doing it that quickly?

Provost McMillen: Well, the rationale that Dr. Jacobs wants to establish those three colleges for the spring semester.

Senator Jorgensen: So Deans will be in place for the spring semester?

Provost McMillen: Yes.

Senator Jorgensen: They would vote on tenure for an example in their colleges in January.

Provost McMillen: Yes.

Senators: Tenured are already done.

President Powers: Tenure goes through the deans' level in December.

Senator Jorgensen: At the deans' level?

Senators: Yes.

Senator Regimbal: I understand that the President has a timeline that he would like us to follow, but it seems to me that institutionally we really moved away from as Andy said "best practices," but certainly affirmative action, we have moved away from affirmative action. but certainly not affirmative action, have moved away from affirmative action?

Provost McMillen: Well, Kevin West of course is on our Provost staff and has been part of all of our discussion, so I am relying on his expertise and his advice in that area and he hasn't had a problem.

Senator Dowd: I would like to follow up on that.

Provost McMillen: Yes.

Senator Dowd: Would he be revealing the pool of candidates from each Dean position to see if they are efficient and diverse?

Provost McMillen: Yes, and we have talked about that and he's comfortable. I don't know what else to say Senator Dowd.

Senator Dowd: We don't know who are in the pool of candidates.

Provost McMillen: Yes.

Senator Dowd: When that pool is received and looked at and reviewed to make determination weather they are.

Provost McMillen: That's a plan and to add to that, people who are going to be on the committees will have to go through the training which is on-line now. Many people will have already been through that, but that's another aspect of it.

Senator Fink: Have salaries for these positions been determined?

Provost McMillen: No, that's another job.

Senator Dowd: What about having associate deans? Have there been a determination weather these Deans will be given an opportunity to have an associate deans?

Provost McMillen: Yes, they haven't been appointed yet.

Senator Dowd: So each dean will have at least one associate dean?

Provost McMillen: I think that will be at least the minimum so far.

Senator Anderson: What about the other staff people?

Provost McMillen: That's a huge question and that will be the work of the Provost office over the next five weeks.

Senator Anderson: Student services and all.

Provost McMillen: Student Services, Business, I.T., and obviously advising, which is a part of Student Services.

Senator Molitor: Will academic departments be moved to these three new colleges effectively at the beginning of spring semester?

Provost McMillen: Yes.

Senator Molitor: Okay.

Senator Anderson: And we all are going to support people who are going to replace in these.

Provost McMillen: Well, it will have to be.

Senator Barden: As those discussions go forward I would recommend thinking about the experience of the UTLC sharing resources to support Honors and CALL. The current Arts and Sciences Student Services for instance and the Business manager could be retained.

Provost McMillen: Yes.

Senator Barden: That's a model to consider.

Provost McMillen: I have heard this obviously; it aims among the staff that's in the College of Arts and Sciences right now, but they are all valuable.

Senator Jorgensen: Provost McMillen, this is simply an observation and not a question, this is more on the basis of hiring a football coach rather than a senior academic leader; one that does not bodes well for the process.

Provost McMillen: Yes, I understand where you are coming from totally. I guess part of the fact is that I have had people come to me to say that they would like to put their name in and I have encouraged that of course, and they are good people. We are drawing from the inside here and I would hope to do it with very good people. Sometimes we have gone to the outside and it hasn't worked.

Senator Chiarelott: There is somewhat of a parallel process that is going on between two colleges that are merged. Presuming when you merge colleges you are dealing then with multiple staffs that would be successful emerged into one staff. Would some of those people be given high considerations with this new position that will be created in the three former Arts and Sciences College, so we don't lose people? Will People from the JHCOE and HSHS be considered first for new positions that will be added to the new colleges?

Provost McMillen: Are you suggesting people from Health and Human Services and Education to be considered first?

Senator Chiarelott: Yes. It should be the highest priority. For example, there are two Business Managers, Development Directors, Dean's administrative assistants, etc.

Provost McMillen: Now I understand what you are saying, yes.

Chancellor Gold: Absolutely.

Provost McMillen: We have talked about that especially with Brenda Grant because the whole finance issue is going to be so important over the next six months.

Senator Cluse-Tolar: Has there been any attention relating to the student concerns? I only say that because I was part of a new college ten or eleven years ago and it was announced in January that as of July 1st we will have a College Health and Human Services. I know that we graduated our first group of students in December and we didn't even have college requirements for graduation yet. So as this all happens with the larger group of students that we graduate in May, what are we thinking about that?

Provost McMillen: Well, it's a lot of work to do and there are a lot of experienced people. The Deans are experienced and I would assume that they will have some experience with the academics that have been around here. We are not destroying the staff that will be working.

Senator Dowd: I would like to ask something that is related to what you just discussed, what about the Banner system? We have to move every single course and every single part of it.

Provost McMillen: We have talked about that.

Senator Dowd: Education and HSHS has to move courses, has that ever begun?

Provost McMillen: I don't know if it began, but we have talked about it.

Senator Dowd: What happen with registration with students that want to register for spring, are we going to try to get this registration so that alpha codes for an example and the college designations are going to be switched over? I don't see how we are going to do all of this by the spring because students are registering for classes now.

Provost McMillen: We have talked about that and we have to rely on Marcia's assertion that that will be accomplished.

Senator Dowd: Well if she gets it done she deserves a raise.

Provost McMillen: Well, she deserves that anyway.

Senator Olson: What about the budget? Have you allocated resources to these colleges? Its allocation of space, its allocation of the budget, its allocation of things that have to go in offices for instances, furniture and copier machines etc.

Provost McMillen: We are working on the space as we speak. Mary has read the e-mail from Scott Scarborough. In addition, I've been assured by the President that there will be added resources.

Senator Barrett: You sort of just touched on this. Is it the intention for each of the colleges to have a distinct physical presence? If so, when is the facility going to be identified, and is your intention to have it occupied by January 1st?

Provost McMillen: Yes.

Senator Barrett: Is that going to be a longer transition.

Provost McMillen: No. The three transition areas are Language, Literature, and Social Sciences and they will be in the space currently occupying the College of Arts and Sciences. The Natural Sciences and Mathematics will be in the space where the Pharmacy was at in Wolff Hall. The Visual and Performing Arts will be in the space of the Gealry building; which was where the book store actually was; it was there yesterday, but it's not today.

Senator Chiarelott: Let's go back to the question. I guess the merging of the two colleges I guess for Banner purposes; I don't think that's going to happen by January 1st.

Provost McMillen: I am not on Banner and maybe next time we will have a report prepared for the Senate. Will it be in two weeks?

President Powers: November 30th is our next meeting.

Provost McMillen: I will provide you with a report on November 30th.

Senator Wedding: Are you saying that you are going to physically move departments to a new location?

Provost McMillen: The home office of the colleges.

Senator Wedding: Okay, just the colleges.

Provost McMillen: Yes.

Senator Wedding: What about the degree requirements, will they change? For example, if I'm presently majoring in Chemistry.

Provost McMillen: Why would they change?

Senator Wedding: I don't know we have three different colleges.

Provost McMillen: It would be impossible to have them to change.

Senator Wedding: So, are they going to maintain the same degree requirements?

Provost McMillen: Yes, I don't see any reason for a degree change. In fact, it would be impossible to throw degree changes at students.

Senator Rouillard: The Deans will be named on December 6, 2010 and yet we still don't know if Psychology is going to move to the Department of Science and Mathematics or stay in the College of LLSS, even as we're changing Banner.

Provost McMillen: I had a request already for that very thing which is under consideration.

Senator Rouillard: When is that going to be determined?

Provost McMillen: Well, it seems to me that it should be determined with the new dean and with consultation with the provost. The deans are going to have to live with it, so it seem that we will have to wait until the dean that is selected which is coming up and then we'll have that discussion. But it seems imprudent to arbitrarily move X to Y because somebody stopped in my office. Dr. Gold is here by the way.

Senator Fink: I think the logical follow up with that.

Senator Fink: That's fine; this is something for the both of you. The logical follow up I believe to that question, what happens to someone who is appointed Dean is in the department then and then has to move?

Senator Dowd: They are Administrative's, who cares.

Provost McMillen: I'm sorry, Senator Fink.

Senator Hornbeck: Can you tell us the status of the dean search for the merge College of Education and HSHS?

Provost McMillen: Well yes, Jeff and I both have a piece of that; Beverly will become the new continuing Dean for that College.

Senator Anderson: What is the status of the selection of leaders for the other new entities for an example, the College of Innovative Learning?

Provost McMillen: Yeah, it's my intention that there's going to be a press release, maybe not tomorrow, but maybe Thursday because he's out of town, but appointing Ben Prior as the Dean for the College of Innovative Learning.

Senator Jorgensen: Remember when we spent the day together and we talked about the value of communication?

Provost McMillen: Yeah.

Senator Jorgensen: This sure doesn't do well for that; it sure doesn't help the sense of communication. This was a decision that was made without a process and we are moving in the wrong direction Bill I'm sorry.

Provost McMillen: The College of Innovative Learning is essentially a college that has operated in its part out of the Provost office and I felt that Ben was the best choice.

Senator Jorgensen: I'm not just speaking of that one; I'm speaking of the joint colleges and the whole process.

Senator Rouillard: Are there any updates with the Provost search?

Provost McMillen: No, I know nothing about it.

President Powers: Are there any other questions? Thank you very much Chancellor Gold and Provost McMillen.

I will also like to give a little up date; I know at the last meeting Chancellor Gold and Provost McMillen announced upgrade of the Faculty Senate administrative secretary position to thirty hours per week. Just yesterday I had some communication with Brenda Grant and it's looking like it is happening. So, we really appreciate your support for the Faculty Senate office. Thank you very much and thank you Quinetta for working so hard to get to this point. Thank you.

At the end of the last Faculty Senate meeting, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee provided some talking points on the reorganization. Since the meeting, Senators provided feedback to improve the talking points. At this time, we would like to devote some discussion time on the floor of the Senate to the talking points. The current version is displayed on the screen and we will take comments and suggestions from the floor on revising the talking points and what the Senate would like to do with the talking points.

Draft Faculty Senate talking points on reorganization:

Talking Points for Faculty Senate Involvement in Reorganization Going Forward

2010.11.16

1. In his letter to the University community dated 11.09, Dr. Jacobs asks for a Unity of Purpose. The Faculty Senate will ask President Jacobs to define Unity of Purpose and his understanding of the role of Faculty Senate.
2. Reorganization should support the Strategic Plan with a reduced or at least minimal budget impact. Metrics should be established that will determine if the right decisions have been made.
3. New college deans positioned as a result of the reorganization should have two-year appointments, whether by contract or as interim. Ideally, faculty under each dean should have some input regarding their willingness to work under a choice or choices for the selection.
4. The Senate retains authority over the University Core Curriculum. If the Core Curriculum at the University is to be changed, the Senate must be represented in the discussion, either through its Core Curriculum Committee or through specially appointed representatives. Ultimately the Core Curriculum Committee will craft the recommendation that the Senate will approve.
5. The Senate retains authority over curricular changes including the addition, modification, or elimination of academic programs. If the program structure at the University is to be changed, the Senate must be represented in the discussion, either through its Academic Programs Committee or through specially appointed representatives. Ultimately the Academic Programs Committee will craft the recommendation that the Senate will approve.
6. The Senate will revise its own Constitution as necessary to accommodate the new college structure.
7. The Senate will provide guidance and support to new colleges for drafting their constitutions and by-laws for alignment with the Senate Constitution.
8. The Senate encourages the AAUP Chapter, the Administration, and new colleges to develop acceptable language for Letters of expectation and tenure and promotion elaborations concerning school involvement and other interdisciplinary activity for those faculty impacted by the reorganization of the

University. College Committees on Academic Personnel should proceed cautiously with any changes in expectations.

9. As always, academic freedom in the classroom and in research activities is assured. Schools and/or commercial viability must not interfere with academic freedom. The Senate recommends that faculty work with the schools that overlap their teaching and research, to provide the best experiences for our students and explore possible contributions to economic and social development.
10. The Senate requests adequate student involvement in planning proportional to the degree it would affect them.
11. The Senate requests complete budget communication from the Administration regarding all aspects of the budget. This budget instrument should be formatted in the manner of what was formally known as the "Blue Book". This one item alone would go a long way toward re-establishing trust.

Senator Molitor: As a new Senator I hear a lot of discussion about changes to curriculum that may result from this re-organization; isn't Faculty Senate ultimately responsible for Undergraduate Curriculum now?

Senator Barden: Yes.

Senator Molitor: So why are we even dealing with issues that are pertaining to authority over the University's core curriculum? Isn't that coded in our charter or by-laws?

Senator Olson: So is strategic planning.

Senator Hoblet: I think that it needs to be reiterated and that's important.

Senator Molitor: Thank you for the clarification.

Senator Jorgensen: Related to that question, what could happen is the three individual Colleges broken up from Arts and Sciences could change their college requirements. There is the University's core curriculum; let us say for example, the College of Engineering students have to take two Social Science courses and the College of Arts and Science students now have to take three and that's a college requirement. The college requirement of three social sciences courses may not be retained in each of those three colleges.

Senator Molitor: But doesn't it still have to come through the Faculty Senate?

Senator Jorgensen: It still will have to come to the Faculty Senate and at that stage it is considered on a consent agenda. But you are right, it does have to pass. The core curriculum itself is completely in effect at this time.

Senator Barden: While we are on this subject, isn't it true that students are required to abide by the catalog that is in effect from the day that they started?

Senator Olson: Yes.

Senator Barden: So are there any curriculum changes that are going to be in a pipeline mode.

Senator Barnes: Maybe Senator Barrett can offer some insight onto this, but I thought that if the curriculum issue only affected one college, it did not come to Senate.

Senator Barrett: It's still higher.

Senator Barnes: Are you sure?

Senator Barrett: Absolutely.

Senator Barnes: People have continued to do that as a courtesy, but I honestly thought that the new Constitution, which I helped draft and we had a lot of input in eliminated the need to bring things to Senate if it impacted only one college. Is there anybody from nursing in here? I think that it was nursing that really made the push that if it stayed in nursing then they didn't want the Senate's approval.

Senator Batten: It wasn't that they didn't want the Senate approval, but the decision of the College requirement was holding up the old Constitution requirements. Changes should come through the University in the usual manner because that's how they establish their bi-laws etc.

Senator Barnes: I think that that's different from approval though.

Senator Batten: It was in a consent approval.

Senator Dowd: That's right, it's now part of a consent agenda which is typically not reviewed explicitly by the full Faculty Senate, but reviewed by the Curriculum. Senator Barrett did I answer that correctly?

Senator Barrett: That's what my understanding is, but I haven't looked at the exact provisions of that in quite a while. This only pertains, obviously, to the undergraduate education, but my sense was we were not trying to change any of the undergraduate approval processes because there is always some need to coordinate between colleges to avoid duplication, to know what's going on, and to get things in the course catalogs right; it is way out of my area, but my sense was everybody wanted to keep sending the undergraduate stuff in so that we could look at it to make sure that there weren't problems and I don't recall trying to strip any of that out.

Senator Barnes: I hope that you are right.

Senator LeBlanc: Senator Barnes, the issue that Senator Jorgensen was talking about let me give you an example, the Natural Sciences decided that they didn't want to take Social Sciences anymore, that cuts across colleges.

Senator Barnes: Absolutely.

Senator LeBlanc: So, that would have to come to Faculty Senate, even under the example that you gave.

Senator Barnes: True enough.

Senator Barrett: Since this issue has come up, let me say in a broader context that we have to amend the Constitution because we have three new colleges and although the Constitution provides for a committee to reallocate the number of seats, the colleges are designated in there. So we are going to have to amend this constitution. I want to say two things on that front. First, if there's anything that we need to fix, now is the time to bring it up with regard to how undergraduate curriculum matters are handled because the Constitution & Rules Committee is going to have to look at all of this stuff and come up with a proposal. If there's anything that you would want to change, anything that you think is broken, let me know. Obviously last year we specifically talked about what rank of administrators will be eligible for Senate; I think that we could move that into the Constitution at this time. That's the first thing that I wanted to say, if you have got suggestions, if you think that there is anything that needs to be changed, get them out there and give them to me now. Second, I would like it expressly approved by Senate, and it doesn't have to be today, but it can be at our next meeting that we are just going to leave everything just kind of as is through this year because we are not going to be able to get a good Constitution drafted and approved by January 1st because it has to be approved by the whole faculty, so I think that we are kind of stuck with our current structure and group of Senators through this year. I would like the backing of Senate on my call unless you think that this is the wrong call. If you think that that's the wrong call we should be discussing that now because we are going to have to go on some kind of weird hyper-drive to get it done by January 1st.

Senator Batten: I want to clarify something that was said. I don't know past practices opposed, but Scott asked a question about graduation, when HSHS formed the College of Nursing was a part of Arts and Sciences that got moved to HSHS and at that time it was the dean's decisions if there were curriculum changes like dropping something. But what was dropped was the language requirement that the student could opt to either follow their catalog of interest or from that point forward. So, there were some things that happened that were discretionary that would likely be considered; I am not saying that they are, but I'm just saying those things will come up and at that time it is at the dean's discretion and it was done problematically, so these things do happen. It's probably will vary depending on thoughts and opinions of people who are in leadership.

Senator Anderson: I do want to go on record as commending Senator Barrett for taking deliberative action as oppose to action within nineteen days.

Senator Cluse-Tolar: That was my question to the Provost about the problematic change, it took almost six or seven months as I recall getting that first group of graduation clearances completed. Because it was a problematic decision every student had to go through Student Services for graduation clearances and each program had to provide their own information. I mean that it was just crazy.

Senator Batten: And that impacted across other colleges as well. It was not done in solo, but it certainly wasn't done with a wave of a huge public ban.

Senator Sheldon: I really like point number three. Two years for a new college Dean seems like that is going to be shot down immediately.

Senator Anderson: That's what we're deciding.

Senator Sheldon: I find this somewhat ironic. I am behind standing up for A&S, but in my personal opinion-and I don't think I have been quiet in the last decade here on Faculty Senate--University College dealt with similar issues and nobody really cared. Now that it is A&S, we're all supposed to care. That makes me feel a little reluctant.

Senator Barden: While the Senators are reading, let me say to Senator Barrett, it will be **four** colleges because Honors will need to be considered now too, what its Senator count will be

Senator Barrett: Well I don't know if we lost one but we have the merger of two and it is clear that it all has to be re-done; the current wording is inaccurate to the future.

Senator Barden: Right, and the Gerrymandering needs to be re-done as well.

Senator Barrett: We also have the problem this year with the Senate spots that were allocated to a college that doesn't exist anymore. There is a little bit of fixing that needs to be done and we will get it all done and cleaned up. I would like to see how some things shake out, we need to see how many faculty are in each college, we have to figure out a new caps, so send me your wish lists.

Senator Olson: Would this have to go to the Board for an approval?

President Powers: Yes.

Senator Barrett: It has to be approved by the faculty first; the last time when we merged we sent it to the President and then to the Board.

Senator Regimbal: I would like to speak to number eleven, I think that the Blue Book needs to be available so someone here to interview will be able to find it easily. Right now it is so hidden that few can find it. I think when people are interviewed they frequently want information about budgets without asking a lot of questions in the interview process and our budget is not available. I don't care what Scarbough says, it's not available for somebody to find easily.

Senator Dowd: At the University of Toledo from 1958 to the time of the merger the most requested item from the Library was the Blue Book and since the merger there has been no Blue Book. There has been a void of information regarding the financial activities from this University since the merger. The Blue Book is what the community looks to to find out how we are handling our financial issues; that is information that is not provided now.

President Powers: We are looking for guidance from the Senate regarding what we should do with these talking points at this time.

[There was overlapping discussion and agreement that this document was consistent with the sense of the Senate. There was a request to solicit additional input from the Faculty so there would be a sense of the Faculty.]

President Powers: That concludes the executive business for this meeting. Is there any other business from the floor?

We now have time for general questions and concerns that the Senate should address.

May I have a motion for adjournment?

Meeting adjourned at 5:56 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Hoblet
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard
Faculty Senate Office Administrative
Secretary