

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of September 14, 2010
FACULTY SENATE
<http://www.utoledo.edu/facsenate>

HIGHLIGHTS

Tributes to Professor Rane Arroyo and Wally Martin
Provost Search Committee Report
Ohio Faculty Council of Ohio Board of Regents
Faculty Senate Response for Reorganization Proposals

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, Barrett, Benjamin, Caruso, Chiarelott, Cluse-Tolar, Cllew, Crist, Dowd, **Eisler**, Fink, Franchetti, Gardner, Giovannucci, Horan, Hornbeck, Humphrys, Jorgensen, Kistner, Laux, **Lundquist**, Molitor, Moore, Moynihan, Nandkeolyar, Ohlinger, Olson, Piazza, Powers, Randolph, Regimbal, Rouillard, Sawicki, Sheldon, Solocha, Teclehaimanot, Thompson-Casado, Wedding, Weldy, Yonker,

Excused absences: Baumgartner, Benjamine, Brickman, Herberle, Hoblet, Hottell, LeBlanc, Lee,

Unexcused absences: Attalah, Dismukes, Fournier, Funk, Grothaus, Hamer, Hammersley, Shriner, Skeel, Stepkowski, Tinkel, Wilson,

II. Approval of Minutes: The minutes from the April 27th meeting were distributed by e-mail. Is there a motion to accept the minutes from April 27th? Second? All in favor? Any opposed? Let the record show the minutes from the April 27th meeting have been approved.

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.

I will begin today's meeting by reporting on information of interest to the Senate from members of the Executive Committee.

Last month, the Faculty Senate Committee on Committees, chaired by Mike Dowd, determined approximately 90 committee assignments for the coming year. Letters were sent last week by the Faculty Senate office with your committee assignments. Additionally, e-mails were sent to committee chairs, and this week, the listing of new committee assignments for this year was sent by e-mail along with the agenda for this meeting.

So far, we have three new log items this year. Faculty Senate committees will be asked to investigate the log items and provide their reports to the Senate. Senators are encouraged to provide log items from your constituents, so faculty concerns can be examined and reported to the Senate. The log items can be communicated by e-mail, or brought directly to the floor of the Senate. I mentioned on our

last meeting that our secretarial support hours have been reduced by half this year and we done few things to try and to accommodate for the decreased amount of time that we have for secretarial support. One of the things that we have done was to establish an e-mail address, facultysenate@utoledo.edu, so a number of people will have access to the correspondence that you would want to send to the Faculty Senate office. The administrative secretary will not be in the office for as much time as in the past, so we want to make sure that access to communication isn't limited because of the decrease of secretarial support.

This past Friday, the Executive Committee met with Walt Olson, who is Faculty Senate representative on the University Finance and Strategy Committee and Walt provided us with a report on the work of the committee. It is planned that Walt will come to the full Senate and provide a report from the University Finance and Strategy meetings at the Faculty Senate meeting on November 2nd.

Also, this past Friday, the Executive Committee met with Steve LeBlanc, Chair of the Faculty Senate Core Curriculum Committee. It is planned that Steve will provide a report on the work of Core Curriculum Committee at the Faculty Senate meeting on October 19th.

Last week, Terry Cluse-Tolar from the Executive Committee met with Penny Poplin-Gosetti and was updated about the work with institutional accreditation, assessment and program review. It is planned that Penny will meet with the Executive Committee on September 24th and have the first regular report to the Faculty Senate on assessment and preparations for the university's upcoming review by the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools on September 28th. It is hoped that the Faculty Senate can be helpful as the University prepares for institutional accreditation.

Also, last week, representatives of the Executive Committee attended the first meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee of the Board of Trustees. The Charge for the ad hoc committee was announced. (From PowerPoint Slide)

The Strategic Planning Committee is an ad hoc Committee of the Board of Trustees.

Preamble: On March 19, 2007, the Board of Trustees of The University of Toledo approved a Strategic Planning Document entitled, "*Directions 2007*." Since then our mission has not changed, our vision has not changed, but the world around us has changed dramatically. The document entitled *Directions 2007* has served us well. However, the current situation calls for a greater emphasis on distinction for The University of Toledo. Furthermore, the 2007 document lacked metrics, currently believed to be important for the accomplishment of our goals. Finally, experience has suggested that *Directions 2007* does not serve well in a down economy. Therefore, the Board has directed a recalibration of the University's Strategic Planning document.

Charge: The Ad Hoc Strategic Planning Committee of the Board of Trustees is charged to communicate with and guide faculty, staff and other stakeholders assigned to develop a strategic planning document to be entitled "*Directions 2010*." Ultimately the committee will receive from the faculty and staff a final draft document, consider its content, format, and value; and will make recommendations to the full Board of Trustees concerning its adoption. The Ad Hoc Strategic Planning Committee of the Board will recognize that future directions of The University of Toledo will be guided by this document. It is anticipated that this work will be completed by March 1, 2011.

It is important to note that stakeholder meetings for the University's strategic planning document "*Directions 2010*" are scheduled for later this week. It is important that Senators attend these sessions to the extent your schedules permit and more importantly, get the word out to our faculty colleagues about the importance of attending and participating in these meetings. The first session is scheduled for the Main Campus on Thursday, in the Grogan Room of Savage Arena, Thursday September 16 from 8 a.m. –

12 noon. A second session is scheduled for the Health Science Campus on Friday, in the Dana Center, Friday September 17 from 1 – 5 p.m. As announced at our last Senate meeting, later in today's Faculty Senate meeting, we will have an action item to determine the Faculty Senate's response to the strategic planning *Directions 2010*, and especially focusing on the Faculty Senate response for reorganization.

I reported at our last meeting that the Provost search committee was announced over the summer. The committee is chaired by Dr. Nagi Naganathan, Dean of the College of Engineering. Dr. Naganathan will provide a brief report for the Faculty Senate today. Now, I am pleased welcome Dr. Naganathan.

Dr. Naganathan: Thank you, Mary. While the search committee does not have a whole lot to report right now, Mary and I thought it is important we communicate with faculty early on about what has transpired so far. To start with, I want to thank you for the opportunity to address you today. You all should have received an e-mail from President Jacobs, it was on August 13th, about the search with a web link to the job description. Several members of the Search Committee are here that I can see in the audience -- Larry Fink from the College of Business, Mary Powers, Alice Skeens in the back, and perhaps others that I cannot spot from here. Certainly, we want to be in touch with you. The link is kind of long, but it is in the e-mail. I didn't want to crowd your inboxes again during the last couple of weeks when so many things were going on. I will send another email announcement next week and again include the link in the announcement. While we do know most of the strong applications are derived from nominations, there will be formal ads that haven't been placed yet; but they will be done very shortly. Committee has now convened, as Mary mentioned. We met once. There are eleven members in the Committee, with broad representation from both campuses. We met once at the beginning of the semester. In our discussions we also collectively decided that I will serve as the spokesperson for the Committee and I will be sure to be in touch with you and will be giving you periodic updates as the search progresses. Your role is very important. First of all your engagement with the search is extremely crucial. So I invite you to be in touch and respond to requests from the Committee. One of the most important things is the nomination process. I invite you to nominate as many qualified individuals, both from within the University and from outside. You can send the nominations either to me or to President Jacobs or to Diane Hymore in the President's office or to the Search Firm directly. All of the contact information was in the President's e-mail and once again it will be in my e-mail when I send it to you next week. At this point, I will be happy to answer any questions you may have.

Senator Jorgensen: Is it required that the Provost must have served as a faculty member at an institution at a higher education?

Dr. Naganathan: As you can see in the job description it does not specify this as a requirement. But, if you see the qualifications, it talks about substantial experience with academia and higher education. So, that was deliberate. We didn't want to exclude any good candidates that might not have been in a traditional role. That is the reason I am saying your involvement in the process is very important. As you know more people outside, please do nominate as many outstanding individuals. It is really early in the process. We don't have much traction so far. This is just about the time people start paying attention to these things. Again, please do nominate as many qualified candidates.

Senator Olson: Are there Faculty Senate members on the Committee?

Dr. Naganathan: Mary Powers is serving on the search committee and also Alice Skeens and Larry Fink. They are all here. Anyone else have a question?

Senator Regimbal: Is this Provost is going to be the Provost for all the campuses or specifically for one?

Dr. Naganathan: That is a significant difference as we seek this individual. This person is going to be a Provost for both campuses. Over the summer I spent a substantial amount of time looking at other universities and other models and such models exist. One example, if you want to look at it, look at the Duke University. The Provost is the Chief Academic Officer for the entire campus, even though there is a Chancellor for the Health Science campus. In this case, it is a he and [the Chancellor] has certain colleges reporting to him as well.

Senator Fink: Could you explain to the group, I know that there is some concern because some people have talked to me, how Jeff would work with the Provost and how authority would work?

Dr. Naganathan: The question is about how Dr. Gold as Chancellor would work with the Provost. There was a substantial effort coming up with the job description, I believe about sixteen iterations, before we came up with the final document. Of course, no document ever turns out to be a perfect document. But in terms of the relationship, to a new person, it might look as though nothing has changed, in terms of their roles. But the Provost is now responsible for many functions for the entire campus and will be responsible for many operational elements of all colleges of the University, whether it is coordinating the accreditation efforts, curricular efforts, and so forth. Certainly the Chancellor will have specific oversight over the four colleges reporting to him right now. But this is going to be a very cooperative relationship and is going to be an evolving relationship as the Chancellor steps into newer responsibilities such as the ProMedica partnership. So who ever comes, we hope, will be a mature and experienced individual who understands higher education and who understands a comprehensive institution and will work in a collaborative fashion with the Chancellor.

Senator Dowd: Correct me if I get this wrong as I'm trying to remember this from a preliminary draft of the job description. It said that promotion and tenured review would go through the Chancellor and not the Provost. Has that changed?

Dr. Naganathan: Well, if it reads like this, it should be corrected. There is no intent to change the promotion, tenure, and renewal process for the people in the nine colleges that will be reporting directly to the Provost. Of course four colleges reporting to the Chancellor will have their RPT process go through the Chancellor. Nothing has changed. Andy.

Senator Jorgensen: So, how is this person going to be a chief academic officer if for some colleges the tenure and promotion is through a different individual?

Dr. Naganathan: Say that again, please.

Senator Jorgensen: How is this person going to be a chief academic officer for the entire campus and yet a tenured or promotion decision is going to be made by a different individual for some colleges?

Dr. Naganathan: The idea right now is to have the RPT process align with the person that is principally responsible for the recruitment. Dr. Gold will be working with his department chairs and the other deans within his office. The idea is it is more appropriate for those RPT processes to go through the Chancellor. The Chief Academic Officer comes more from the Provost being the chief spokesperson for the academics of the entire institution. So he or she will be the spokesperson to the external community and the internal community, for the academics for the entire institution. Some of the processes including hiring and RPT for those four colleges will reside with the Chancellor. Again the collaborative relationship is going to be very important. Yes, please.

Senator Barnes: Is the Duke model of the Chancellor and Provost similar?

Dr. Naganathan: Yes. If you go and look at the Duke Website, the Provost is described as the Chief Academic Officer of the University and there are other models like them too. The title of Chancellor, I was surprised to see how common it is on health science campuses. In some places they are called Vice Chancellors and in some places, Chancellors.

Senator Barnes: Were you involved in the creation of the Chancellor position here, or do you know anything about it? It was news to me.

Dr. Naganathan: I was not involved in the creation of the Chancellor position. But as this document evolved it was important to be rendered as accurate and descriptive as possible, making the document as clear as possible at this stage. So, while I was not responsible for the creation of the Chancellor role, as the position got created, I did my research while this document was evolving. Yes, Lawrence.

Senator Anderson: Will there be any particular issues where this Academic Provost will have to go through the Chancellor to reach the President? Or is everything that the Academic Provost does directly responsible to the president?

Dr. Naganathan: Everything you said in the latter statement is true. Everything that the Provost will do, he or she directly works for the President. But there would be lots of cases where the Provost and the Chancellor will have to work collaboratively.

Senator Dowd: What about budgetary authority. Will the Provost as the Chief Academic Officer have budgetary authority over all academic colleges or will the Chancellor also have resources available that he can distribute to colleges under his authority?

Dr. Naganathan: As you read the document it talks about the Provost having specific oversight over all aspects of the nine Main Campus colleges. Likewise the Chancellor will have all oversight over the four Health Science Campus colleges. That is why I said, for a first time observer, this will look to be what we are doing today. But this is something that will evolve. The budgetary aspects will remain separate for the Main Campus and the Health Science Campus.

Senator Cluse-Tolar: Are those separations consistent with the Duke model that you looked at?

Dr. Naganathan: I cannot answer at that level of granularity. I just looked at the Chancellor versus the Provost model. Again, that is not the only model; there are many others. If you look at Pittsburgh, they have a model that is similar. Every model is a little different. But such a model does work. This wasn't derived directly or adopted from the Duke University. Other questions?

Senator Dowd: What is the time line? When do you expect to interview candidates and then make an offer for this position?

Dr. Naganathan: Well, we all will like to do this as soon as possible, but the reality I think is going to be, most campuses activities will take place in early spring. This is what we were talking as a committee because the ads are not out there. Even with all the electronics, the paper ads still take a lot of time. But that is something we have to do as a public institution, in addition to all of the electronic means of generating interest. So, I anticipate, this is simply a speculation at this point; it will be early spring when much of the action takes place.

Senator Dowd: The goal of hiring. Will the person be starting July 1?

Dr. Naganathan: We haven't had any such deadlines mentioned. But we would like to bring the individual on board as soon as possible. We just have to see [what the starting date would be] depending on the individual's availability and what she or he might be doing at that time. These are some of the factors. Are there any other comments or questions? Again, feel free to e-mail me if you have any questions or comments or if you have any suggestions. On behalf of the Committee, thank you.

President Powers: Thank you Dr. Naganathan. Last Friday, Dr. Nick Piazza attended the first meeting for the academic year of the Ohio Faculty Council of Ohio Board of Regents. Nick gathered timely information at this meeting that is of interest to all of us, so I now ask Dr. Nick Piazza to provide a brief report from the September 10th meeting of the Ohio Faculty Council of Ohio Board of Regents.

Senator Piazza: This is why you should read your e-mail so you will know that you are on the agenda. I apologize I would have been a bit more prepared. On Friday I attended the Ohio Faculty council as your elected representative. And this is an opportunity where all of the universities in the Ohio system are represented as well as number of private institutions and we were discussing basically some of the activities and projects that specific universities are considering. As a result of this, especially in as far as how we are going to deal with changing the economic circumstances, budgetary constraints, limitations, elections that they result in changes in funding, those kind of things. A number of institutions are taking a look and are trying to do very much of what we are doing at the University of Toledo. I am pleased to say that some of the things that we doing here at the University of Toledo seem to be very forward thinking, but there are also a number of things that we are doing here at the University of Toledo that can maybe use some additional thought. Probably one of the things that I learned was access to a couple of reports Friday. That may help inform re-organization at UT. One was to consider cost containment and spending limitation as being a primary concern in addressing transformation within the educational system. What is interesting is that colleges have done remarkable jobs retaining cost. Unfortunately, as we all know because the state is no longer subsidizing the cost of education at the same level a lot of that cost has been shifted to students. Even though cost has been contained and spending is limited, much more comes out of student tuition than comes out of the State subsidy. One of the recommendations for future consideration for transformation in education is to take a look at how to contain costs? How to limit some of the spending so that these costs and this spending do not get transferred to the student in the form of higher tuition. These reports are being made available to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, but as they study the reports hopefully they will pass them along to you.

So, other things that I felt was interesting in the report was notion that we need to consider as educators. How can we make college more cost effective for students? In other words, how can we that the number and proportion of students who will finish? How can we shorten the time to finishing? And how can we address the increasing debt that students have to carry over as a college graduate? All of these I thought were interesting proposals and certainly if you like to take a look at it, any kind of transformational, reorganizational or strategic realignment needs to consider these factors.

As these reports become available to you, hopefully they will inform some of your discussion that you will have here right now. Another point that was raised that I thought was whether interesting regards our colleagues at Kent State. They are in the process of organizing several department, programs, disciplines, and majors into a large College of Arts and Sciences because they feel that this will be cost efficient, that it will allow them to have better quality control over there over their core curriculum, and they thought by having a single College of Art and Sciences, managing this core curriculum will be more efficient and more coherent. This is obviously some of the difference that will be discussed on this campus. And we looked at models for example Arizona State and looking at Kent State model might be useful to us how we might want to reform the University. Considering that this is in our own back yard and it does not require a trip to Arizona, this might be something that you want to take a look at. What are they studying?

What are they looking at? What are their goals to accomplish and does that translate to the University of Toledo?

This was my first meeting so I was challenged to learn from my co-members. Hopefully in the future I will continue to collect additional information that I will bring back to this body and inform you as to what's going on in Columbus. There were a couple of house bills that were discussed, HB 365 looks at allowing part time and graduate assistants to bargain collectively and this particular proposal is coming out of committee. So I suspect that it will be finding its way to the floor on a later date. The other thing that I learned was that any legislation regarding STRS will probably be put on hold until after the elections. If you have any questions I will try to answer them.

Senator Thompson- Casado: Cost containment is really a hot subject right now and it is logical that we look at this, but often the focus of cost containment focuses on the faculty and students. Was there any discussion of cost containment on the administrative side? We know that during the past 15 years here at the University of Toledo our administrative costs have grown exponentially, was this discussed at the State level at all?

Senator Piazza: I don't know if administrative costs have been discussed at the level of OBOR, however, the reports I referred to earlier did discuss administrative costs. One of the things that seem to come out of the report is that the administrative costs are a significant area to take a look at. Administrators tend to produce no income and they generate expense. The problem with revenue generation at this point is that there will probably be no new unencumbered money coming to the university from the government. Government and benefactors may be willing to give you a bunch of money to do this piece of research or build this building, but it is not money that you can use to spend on an operation, for faculty salaries, and things like that. So, one of the proposals was not so much that administration needs to cut the costs because spending on administration has grown exponentially. In fact, some of the myths is out there are administration has grown exponentially, that faculty aren't doing much work, and faculty resist change. What they have found is that faculty recognizes the need to change and faculty are working hard trying to find innovative ways to improve education. But what the reports did recommend is kind of a lead by example approach. For administration to engage faculty in considering cost savings and in considering spending reduction, and to do so by taking the first hit. So, this more or less sets an example, sets the tone, and helps to build trust. There were a number of examples. If fact, if it do get distributed out, I will call attention to one report that was from the University of Maryland that seems to be a very good model.

Senator Wedding: What is the source of this data involving the percent allocation to faculty? Is this a nationwide report or just the State of Ohio? I didn't quite get that.

Senator Piazza: One report was fairly nationwide; the other reports seem to involve interviewing a lot of individuals. It had a very wide scope. A lot of the people were identified as sources were from Ohio. I would recommend that you take a look at the report and how they collected the data. It is going to be important part of reviewing the report and its recommendations.

Senator Fink: You mentioned that they are not talking about service to after the election. Do they really think that there's going to be a major difference in how resources in... do business?

Senator Piazza: I think the difference is going to be between the Democrats and Republicans. I really think that right now we have a kind of known quantity. I think that if the election brings in a lot of Republicans, things can change. So I think that the idea right now is to wait to see how the election goes.

Senator Chiarelott: I have a comment about the discussion regarding distant learning and alternative ways to learning. Can you put on a future agenda that we will discuss such things as to last year how we

are regions to the University of Southern California and Ohio to offer teacher... The State of Ohio is obviously is going to drop students from the colleges and universities within. Ohio is going to be a significant change on the way the Board of Region are going to do business, but it's pretty clear in fact it could be on a number of our programs as well as this University and other University at stake. I'm not suggesting Bob... or someone from the state. But, perhaps some discussion about representatives from various Universities...the Board of Regions.

Senator Piazza: This body is an advisory body to the Board of Regents. It was a Vice Chancellor that was in attendance at the meeting. So, if there are issues like that, quite frankly I am going to have trouble with remembering that, but just send me an e-mail and I will be glad to forward that to the Chair of the Committee so that it can be put on the agenda. At least we could have someone from OBOR come and explain why they thought that it was a good idea for California to come in and recruit Ohio teachers in such a good way. It makes sense to me that if we are going to spend Ohio tax dollars to educate those people we should keep them here for a while, at least.

Senator Fink: Can I ask one more question?

Senator Piazza: Sure.

Senator Fink: Do they think that depending on who's elected that will affect the State's fund to educate people from Afghanistan or from another country?

Senator Piazza: Larry that was not discussed so I really don't know. I think at this point they are just waiting to see. We are six or eight weeks away from the election, let's see how it goes. But I think as far as budget concerns, and this is a personal opinion, we have not discussed this. I think personally on national and state levels, elections are going to determine how money is going to come to the states for education. Again, I really don't know and I don't think anybody will know what the education on this election will be because it's going to be a real mix and match kind of election.

President Powers: Thank you Nick. I think that everybody will agree that you brought important information from your meeting in Columbus on Friday that is relevant to what we need to do here at the Faculty Senate especially today. So thank you very much. We would now like to honor and pay tribute to two of our colleagues who died in the past few months.

I would first like to introduce Professor Tim Geiger who will provide a tribute for our colleague Rane Arroyo who passed away in May.

Professor Geiger: Did anybody know Rane here? On May 7 this past year we lost Rane quite suddenly as Spring drew to a close. Rane Ramon Arroyo was selected as a Distinguished University Professor of English just this past year, the highest acclaim a professor at this University can aspire to. In the past he has been awarded an Outstanding Professor of the Year award, a Dean's Merit Award, and a Master Teacher in Arts and Sciences designation. He taught Creative Writing, Poetry Writing, Playwriting and Performance texts as a full professor in our Department. In the past he also served as Associate Chair, Director of Undergraduate Studies, and Director of the Creative Writing Program. Rane came to the University in 1997, the same year as me. In fact, it was quite unusual for an English department to be able to hire 2 poets at once. Coming straight out of graduate school at my first tenure line appointment, I could not have asked for a better mentor and colleague than Rane. Being a bit older than me, and having worked in academia for years, he was always willing to offer me invaluable advice on developing syllabi, dealing with students, and working toward tenure and eventual promotion. In fact, I found that all I had to do was what he did when it came to the steps toward tenure.

Together, with Rane and Jane Bradley, and our colleague Joel Lipman before he ventured into the Art Department, we built the Creative Writing Program at UT into a successful, nationally recognized program. It was with Rane's work that we created the Creative Writing Concentration in the Department specializing in the study of Poetry, Fiction Writing, and Non-Fiction Writing. Rane developed courses in playwriting, contemporary literature studies, and special topics such as Performance texts and Writing for the Internet, and supplemented our curriculum with a Capstone Portfolio course in order to best prepare our students for graduate Studies and life beyond UT. Our times together in curricular meetings were always easy and straightforward. Many times we would talk about how lucky we were to be in a writing program where everybody got along, and I remember, on more than one occasion, laughing about the horror stories from a colleague at some other University stuck in a dysfunctional department. Rane was always supportive to me as a teacher, and as a fellow writer. In fact, when I think about it, Rane never once came to my office with bad news. Every time I saw him he had good news to share—about his own work, his publishing, and of course, about his students. Rane's number one concern was always for his students.

Now, I could simply cull through Rane's student evaluations and tell you how much his student's praised his knowledge, his advice and his guidance. But I think what is more significant is to look at his students' achievements. Rane's students have ventured out into the world to earn Master of Fine Arts degrees and PhD's at such institutions as NYU, Iowa, LSU, and Emerson. His students have published books, produced plays, and been in the pages of such influential magazines and journals as *The New Yorker* and *American Poetry Review*. And what seems most telling: his student's stayed in touch with him even after they moved hundreds of miles away. The outpouring of grief at his passing that was expressed on the internet, in blogs, and on web-sites was a testament to his good deeds from people all around the country, not just his own backyard. And this seems to speak highly of Rane's reputation, not only as a teacher, but as a poet and playwright of international acclaim.

Rane is a poet who will be long remembered in American Poetics. His subjects included immigration, Latino culture, and homosexuality. Rane was openly gay and often his work was self-reflexive and autobiographical, so the best way to learn who Rane was, is to read his own words. His archives are housed at Hunter College/CUNY and at the Ohioana Library Association's Ohio Authors Collection in Columbus, and he is included in the Heath Anthology of American Literature, published in 2006, a book commonly used in English college classes throughout the country. He was the author of 10 full-length collections of poetry, a book of short stories and numerous performed plays. His poems and plays appear in literally hundreds of magazines and journals. His work has won the Carl Sandburg Prize, The John Ciardi Poetry Prize, a Pushcart Prize and grants from Ohio Arts Council and our own URAF program. In his capacity as a nationally recognized poet Rane was also the Midwest Representative on the Board of Directors for the Association of Writers and Writing Programs, the AWP, which is THE academic organization of Writing Programs in America. That appointment alone should explain his stature in the world of American letters.

And so, while we may say that even though Rane has passed away his work will live on, what will not live on, and what we will all miss, is Rane's energy, his personality and his utmost devotion to his students. As a teacher, as a colleague, and simply as a person, we can never replace Rane, but we will long remember him. Rane is survived by his long-term partner Glenn Sheldon who is currently a professor in the Honors Program. Now I am going to invite Glenn Sheldon to say a few words.

Professor Sheldon: I am going to keep this very brief because I know that we have a tribute to Dr. Martin coming up. And reorganization is in the foremost of everybody's minds today. I didn't know what I could even say about Rane, other than what Professor Geiger said which I would like to echo. Rane's devotion to his students was something that was fierce. I couldn't imagine somebody more devoted to students than Rane was to his students. In terms of Rane's archives, actually his archives OMIT: they are going to be housed in the University of Michigan. It was interesting, the three major newspapers that carried news of Rane's death, the Toledo Free Press, the Toledo Blade, and the Independent Collegian. As a former editor of the printed journalism, I found the Independent Collegian the best article among the three. The

reporter, Sura Khudar asked me when she interviewed me--what was the greatest lesson I had learned from Rane? I had no immediate answer, none at all. I think a lot of you probably did know, maybe met him, and knew him briefly. I realized when I was asked to come up here that actually the greatest lesson that Rane had taught me, was if I wanted to work and publish on the level he did and I'm going through his archives now for appraisal and there are seemingly hundreds of thousands of printed pages of electronic files. I realize going through those that his lesson to me OMIT in which I have not yet taken, was get the hell off of committees. Rane did not do very much committee work. He stayed home and lived and loved his laptop. That's it. Thank you.

President Powers: Thank you both very much. I would like to now introduce you to Professor Lipman, who will provide tribute for our colleague Wally Martin who passed away in July.

Professor Lipman: When Dr. Wallace Martin passed away over the summer, the College of Arts & Sciences and the Department of English lost an irreplaceable colleague, a generous friend of the arts, and an old-school academic and scholar who never was out of touch with the immediate cultural scene.

Wally Martin's degrees were from Oberlin College [BA, 1954], Stanford University [MA, 1957] and the University of London [PhD 1961]. A significant scholar, his first book, *"The New Age" under Orage: Chapters in English Cultural History* [Manchester University Press, 1967], examined the editorship and career of Alfred Richard Orage [1873-1934], whose pre-WWI intellectual leadership was marked by the theories of his famed teacher, George Ivanovitch Gurdjieff. Martin's second book, *Recent Theories of the Narrative* [Cornell University Press, 1986], importantly examined the social functions, theories and self-defining constructions of the stories that structure, shape and govern our lives.

Wally was brainy, learned and commonsensical as a writer and teacher. He understood that stories create our sense of self and other and he wrote that "we need not go to school to understand the importance of narrative in our lives. News of the world comes to us in the form of 'stories' told from one or another point of view. The global drama unfolds every 24 hours – split up into multiple story lines that can be reintegrated only when they're understood from the perspective of an American (or Russian or Nigerian), a Democrat (or Republican or monarchist or Marxist), a Protestant (or Catholic or Jew or Muslim). Behind each of these differences there is a history, and a hope for the future. For each of us there is also a personal history, the narratives of our own lives, which enable us to construe what we are and where we're headed."

However, Martin's most widely read scholarship was under the radar of celebrated and notable big books. For decades he wrote important articles and entries for literary histories, for disciplinary handbooks and literary encyclopedias. For example, in 1993, Wally wrote the revised entries for "Metaphor," "Metonymy," "Synecdoche" for the *New Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*. He both wrote the introduction and constructed the bibliography for the University of Minnesota Press's essential publication *The Yale Critics: Deconstruction in America* and his more than 50-page article on "Criticism and the Academy" was published in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*. These standard reference and resource volumes impacted the generational foundational education of students and scholars around the world. He reviewed books and wrote articles for absolutely top-tier journals, among them *Diacritics*, *College Literature*, *Bucknell Review*, *Comparative Literature*, *PMLA*, and *Contemporary Literature*, and his scholarship was included in anthologies from the most prestigious academic publishers of humanistic thought — Princeton University Press, Indiana University Press, Cambridge University Press, among others. He wrote on difficult topics and complicated poets — deconstruction, Wallace Stevens, T.S. Eliot and Ezra Pound, Robert Frost, formal analysis, critical theory. And, distinctively, and in a manner that broadly and subtly influenced the canon and scholarship of English letters, Wally was a manuscript reader for the finest academic presses, among them Princeton University Press, University of Illinois Press, Harvard University Press, Columbia University Press, Johns Hopkins University Press,

Cornell University Press and the University of Michigan Press. He was a notable visiting professor at the universities of Michigan and Washington.

Wally Martin was an excellent violinist, a serious amateur who over the years performed with The University of Toledo Orchestra, the Jewish Community Center Orchestra and the Sylvania Orchestra, as well as with chamber ensembles. His violin has been passed along to a young violinist.

A regular at Peristyle concerts and at classical performances in Ann Arbor, he was a constant scholarly user of the University of Michigan Library. For many years, he hosted receptions for visiting writers, poets and scholars at his Old Orchard home. His keen intelligence, warmth and hospitality made visits to Toledo memorable for occasional distinguished guests to our community.

Wally Martin didn't make a big deal out of himself. He was quietly social and bookish, playful and always intellectually poised for discussion. His collegial presence as a professor, superannuate and emeritus, will not be forgotten.

President Powers: Thank you Professor Lipman.

Before, moving forward with our agenda, let us pause for a moment of silence in remembrance.

[Memorial Silence]

Thank you.

We have a few action items at today's meeting. First, as announced at the last Senate meeting, Dr. Ruth Ankele, who was a Health Science campus representative on the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, resigned her position at UT. I ask Elections Committee Chair, Mike Caruso for his assistance with the election for the open position on the Faculty Senate Executive Committee representing the Health Science campus.

Senator Caruso: Yes. This is for the Health Science representatives only, and just a Health Science representative can serve in this position. Are there any nominations?

Senator Piazza: I would like to nominate Dr. Kris Brickman from College of Medicine. Would you accept the nomination?

Senator Caruso: Thank you. Any other nominations? Do I hear a motion to close to nominations? Second? Okay, nominations are closed and we have our new member.

President Powers: Thank you and we appreciate your willingness to serve. Thank you Mike for conducting the election. The next action item is to seek approval by the Senate of a non-Senator to be chair of the Faculty Senate Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. The Faculty Senate Committee on Committees has recommend Dr. Steven Peseckis from the College of Pharmacy to serve as chair of the committee. Steve is not a senator this year, however, Steve has served as chair of the committee for many years. Because of his experience and expertise, coupled with the complexity of the work of the committee, I believe it will be valuable to the Senate and University for Steve to continue in this role and he is willing to continue serving in this role. So, I nominate Steve Peseckis to chair the Faculty Senate Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and seek approval by the Senate. All in favor? Any opposed? Thank you for confirming Steve to provide this important service to the Faculty Senate and the University.

Before we move to our last action item I will ask for Provost Bill McMillen to address the Senate with some news.

Provost McMillen: Just a request. I wanted to if I may, add to Joel's commentary a small foot note about Wally Martin. When my wife started teaching at BGSU in poetry, she eventually became the director of the writing program there. She had a colleague Phil O'Conner and Phil O'Conner was a novelist. There was a journalist named Fred Lutz. The Blade, believe it or not, held a poetry contest for a number of years. I don't believe they've done that for a while. Phil asked Barbara to join Wally and Fred, to be on the Poetry Selection Committee for the Blade. That was Barbara's introduction to a cocktail lunch. It seemed to take more than one lunch to decide on the vote. I told Barbara when I came over here to start work a number of years ago, that I would see Wally and we would exchange greetings a number of times and she was glad that I gotten to be reconnected with him. I had a meeting with my staff and we would like to move ahead to form a committee and have some meetings concerning how we can coordinate the enrollment and admissions with some of the efforts that I believe we are making. But we can do better in the first year experience. It seems to me that it will be appropriate to plan a Curriculum Committee or whomever you might choose. That way to become members and if you don't have a date yet, it would essentially be some of Larry Burn's people and some of Provost people. I would like to congratulate Nick for going down to the Board of Regents Faculty Committee. I have spoken to this group and spoken to the College of Arts and Science council about the Regents. There are many issues that our Faculty should have a huge concern, more of a concern than previously because the Regents had a set define set of duties that was important to all the universities. It has become more important. I appreciate Nick's presence in Columbus on that Committee. It is an old Committee that been around for years and years. It is never more important than it is right now. I would like to make a couple of comments on a couple of things said. I believe that there will be a pension reform bill. I believe the legislatures just can't leave it alone. The reform essentially will be about double dipping. It is important for us that we keep track of that. Secondly, I will like to mention about the comments about the upcoming election; there is a debate tonight on television. The first of the two debates. The second one as you know is here on campus in a couple weeks. The first debate is in Columbus and it is on tonight. I believe, a lot, a lot at stake for us.

President Powers: Thank you very much. The last action item is to discuss and formulate a response from this body on the reorganization proposals. Last Tuesday, an e-mail was sent to all Senators from the Faculty Senate Office, calling for comments about the two reorganization proposals that are currently under consideration by President Jacobs. In response to this call, comments have been received from Senators from the Colleges of Engineering, Medicine, Health Science and Human Service, Pharmacy, and Arts & Sciences. I will add what I learn today that some of the comments, the call for comments will go to the email address at Faculty Senate, faculty senate@utoledo.edu and some comments were sent to our part-time administrative secretary e-mail address. She hasn't yet been able to incorporate those comments into the collection of comments that were distributed with the materials for today's meeting. So because of time restraints we had to make summary of all the comments that we had that was submitted were included in the documents of today's meeting. To provide some background, at the end of June, I sent a newsletter to Senators that contained information about plans for reorganization at the University of Toledo. In the letter, I mentioned a proposal by a President-appointed committee for strategic organization as well as dates for open meetings that would occur in mid-September. Since that time, another faculty group has also developed a proposal for reorganization. There are currently two reorganization proposals under consideration by Dr. Jacobs, and the reorganization proposals that are under consideration are available online at a website in an e-mail that I sent to you early this week (<http://www.utoledo.edu/strategicplan/strategicorg/index.html>.) So clearly we need to recognize that a good number of people have spent a good amount of their time and effort on these two proposals. And their efforts are acknowledged and sincerely appreciated.

It is our understanding that President Jacobs will make a decision about the direction of reorganization on September 24th, before our next Faculty Senate meeting that takes place on September 28th. Unfortunately, the circumstances do not allow for lengthy discussion and thoughtful consideration by the Faculty Senate before Dr. Jacobs makes his decision. However, I believe it is our responsibility of the Faculty Senate, as a body, to review, discuss, and make its recommendation on reorganization, even in

the short time we have. To accomplish this, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee has drafted a backbone for a Faculty Senate Resolution to serve as a starting point for the Faculty Senate response, and the backbone statement was sent to Senators yesterday along with the meeting agenda. Within the fifty or so minutes or less, we should come to agreement on the response from this body so the Faculty Senate, as a body, can provide a useful and helpful recommendation to President Jacobs as he makes his decision about the direction of reorganization on or about September 24th. The recommendation from the Senate that is determined today would also be presented at the open forum for strategic planning this Thursday.

The following information, which I will go through very quickly, was compiled from notes of the Executive Committee members who attended the meeting. Please note that this information is NOT an official record of the meeting. It is simply some notes that were made by our Executive Committee members to provide us with some understanding of the direction of strategy for the University.

- It was reported that Dr. Jacobs stated his commitment for UT to be among great universities. He does not believe that merely trying to “catch up” to, say, University of Michigan, will work. He believes we need a game change in strategy.
- Dr. Jacobs noted that our current strategic plan, *Directions 2007*, was excellent. Our mission and vision has not changed, but the world around us has changed- and this requires “recalibration” for *Directions 2010*. It was reported that the following forces of change were presented, many negative:
 - 1) Globalization is more rapid than anticipated. We have too few foreign students, too few opportunities for our students to study abroad. Southeast Asia and Arabia are spending billions on higher education, using the American model; and they are beginning to keep their own students.
 - 2) High school students are less and less prepared for college. The need for remediation has grown to 30-50%. We only need to look at the fiscal woes of our public school system. We need to be better partners.
 - 3) Higher education is a bubble ready to burst. Tuition is increasing at twice the rate of inflation. 18% of our budget is “one-time” money (stimulus dollars, money from state projects, etc.) According to a USA Today poll: 19% feel a college education is no longer a good financial investment.
 - 4) Competition is on the increase. For-profit and online universities are growing rapidly. Two-year colleges are also growing, taking a larger share of state dollars.
 - 5) Structure and forms of knowledge itself are changing rapidly: some examples given were machine reliance, social media, and pedagogical technology.
 - 6) New levels of stewardship and engagement are expected out of universities. It was stated that a health-care mission is becoming an integral part of higher education.
 - 7) The structure of the education establishment is changing. The University System of Ohio is becoming more interconnected, and there is a need to reduce duplication. The concept of tenure is eroding- there is a decreasing number of tenured/tenure-track faculty relative to lecturers and part-time faculty.

It was reported that planning principles were also provided at the meeting: It was stated that preparations must be made for budget stringencies. It was stated that we cannot go it alone- there is a need for more partnership. Globalization will continue. It was stated that sustainability requires: financial stability, tractable organizational structure, workable personnel policies, and a merit-based compensation policy. It was noted that in a constrained environment, choices are difficult. It was stated that distinction requires prioritization, and that the University must become narrower and deeper- it was stated we have been a mile wide and an inch deep.

- It was reported that one trustee noted that *Directions 2010* ultimately will be a Board of Trustees document and stated the Board of Trustees needs an intention to be non-passive, meaning they

should not simply receive the document and approve it. The trustee asked for further conversation with stakeholders.

- It was reported that Dr. Jacobs stated that he views the September 16-17 faculty meetings this week as important and he stated the document may very well change after these meetings. It was announced that a “final” draft of *Directions 2010* will be submitted to the Board of Trustees committee in mid to late October. It is assumed the committee will take several months to analyze it before submitting it to the full BOT. Additionally, in a number of different meetings, Dr. Jacobs has stated that if faculty are passionate about the reorganization, they should “pack the house” at the stakeholder meetings on September 16-17.

In consideration of all of this information, I would like to proceed with the process of determining a Faculty Senate resolution that can serve as a useful and helpful recommendation to President Jacobs and the Strategic Plan Committee. I believe it will be important that our recommendation could be helpful to President Jacobs so we can work together toward building a more excellent University.

Thank you to Senators who provided comments in response to the Call for Comments that was sent last week. Those comments have been provided to you and Senators were asked to review the comments prior to today’s meeting as well as review the materials on the website of the Committee of Strategic Organization. Additionally, Dr. Schmoll is present at today’s meeting in case there any questions. Others who are present may also be able to answer any questions.

Because time is so short, members of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee provided a backbone resolution for our consideration. I would like to take about 10 minutes or so to decide on a backbone statement for our response, and then take the remaining time to determine any other statements that would follow in the form of “bullets”. Lawrence Anderson-Huang volunteered to edit the slide as we work to develop our response this afternoon. I know already we had a suggestion to change to the backbone statement. I don’t know if you already inserted the suggestive change.

Senator Anderson: No, I haven’t

President Powers: The slide show shows the suggested backbone statement. At this point I ask for participation from Senators. Dr. Barnes, first.

Senator Barnes: Can I ask you to repeat Dr. Jacobs point about tenured faculty? Sorry I didn’t catch it.

President Powers: O.K. I didn’t want to rush.

Senator Barnes: I just didn’t catch it and I want to.

President Powers: That point of the notes said, again this is from the notes that were taken “The structure of the education establishment is changing. The University System of Ohio is becoming more interconnected, and there is a need to reduce duplication. The concept of tenure is eroding- there is a decreasing number of tenured/tenure-track faculty relative to lecturers and part-time faculty.

Senator Anderson: I can add what he meant by that. He didn’t say that tenure itself was eroding or particularly under threat, he said that the proportion of tenured faculty to lecturers and part time is decreasing.

Senator Barnes: Thank You.

President Powers: Dr. Lundquist.

Senator Lundquist: just to be clear was that one of the problems that we face is that that proportion is changing.

Senator Anderson: He was just saying it as a matter of fact

President Powers: A national trend. Next. Dr. Piazza.

Senator Piazza: First I don't see confusion and uncertainty as necessarily a bad thing. Any time you go through any kind of transition that, even a transformation for the better, there is going to be confusion and uncertainty. But what important to me, is whether or not the proposed reorganization is data driven and address certain data items that are important to me. For example, I will like to know how is this reorganization going to reduce spending? How it is going to increase revenue? How it is going to contain cost in the future so these costs are not passed along to students as higher tuition? How is the proposed reorganization going to reduce student debt? How it is going to increase the number and proportion of students completing degrees? These are data items to me that far more important the confusion and uncertainty. But I feel that there are positive answers to all these items. But I have not heard yet how reorganization is going to address any of that.

President Powers: I see a number of hands. I think that Tom Barden was up first.

Senator Barden: I think we must insist that whatever change occurs should be data driven. A clear purpose must be stated and the change must be based based on quantifiable numbers.

Senator Fink: I would think the correct way.

President Powers: Nick does that address your concerns?

Senator Piazza: Oh yeah. We should seek to avoid re-organizing according to some educational ideology or philosophy. It seems to me that having a data driven reorganization is preferable. Especially one where the data shows that we are going to be more vital institution as a result of the reorganization.

President Powers: Thank you. Dr. Olson, I think your hand was up next.

Senator Olson: I don't think that we should be word-smithing here but we do need some ideas inserted in this.

President Powers: Dr. Anderson.

Senator Anderson: I am sorry to maybe interrupt here, but I am thinking about how we should organize the whole thing. I am perfectly willing to, for an example, put a period here and delete the confusion because that could be a bullet that would say one of the reasons why we don't like it, as opposed to a direct statement. The backbone would be the direct statement. So my feeling is, we should agree on a short introductory paragraph. Then put bullets of some sort, the kinds that people are talking about.

Senator Barden: Could I suggest that we not edit from the floor? If the Executive Committee could take these ideas and draft something to circulate after today's meeting, that would help. Otherwise, we could spend a lot of time working on this at the sentence level.

Senator Olson : I don't think that we should.. but we do need some ideas inserted in this.

Senator Dowd: Senator Anderson should be able to do that.

Senator Anderson: I could do that.

Senator Dowd: When completed the Executive Committee can provide final language.

Senator Anderson: So, is this first paragraph reasonable as a first paragraph?

President Powers: I would like to establish the first paragraph now. Is that acceptable? Can we do this informally without a motion?

Senator Hornbeck: I have a comment. I'm trying to be sensitive to any value laden words that may pop out in the first sentence for us. I think that we need to stay away from the word *extended* and maybe use something like *comprehensive data driven*. That way extended is not our concern.

Senator Fink: I would like to add and that I agree with her. The word *extended* to administration is going to spell stall. I don't care how long it takes, if they answer to these question in a week, great. You know we have Jamie Barlowe here, who helped create some of the (re)structuring and I think that it is ridiculous to have this conversation without involving her. Jamie, how long do you think that it would take to respond to some of the concerns we've raised? I'm assuming that you looked at these issues when the report was generated. Realistically how long do you think that it will take them to do this? Also if I can just, I'm not clear. The word *meaningful engagement*, I'm not sure what that mean either. So let's be clear on what we want them to do.

Senator Rouillard: Right.

Senator Fink: But the word extended to me spells. Knowing the President and I worked with him. He's not going to take an extended stall. Anything that smells or act like a stall, he is going to dismiss that. On the other hand, to ask reasonable questions to the questions that is asked are reasonable. Again, if they answer within a week, leave it up to them when they can provide a report then we can look at it. Why does it have to be extended? I mean obviously they have been looking at this for a year. So I would like it taken out every place where the word *extended* is and I would like to give Jamie a chance to respond to how long realistically you think that it would take to answer some of these questions?

Senator Barlowe: Some of these questions have already been answered, and they were taken into consideration by the Committee during its process. I think some major confusion and misunderstanding are driving the response to the proposal by the committee on strategic organization. The reorganization is an implementation strategy of strategic planning. Strategic reorganization was originally discussed because the Strategic Planning Committee asked a series of questions. One was about whether or not our current organizational structure can accommodate change easily, big, small, large, or narrow, whatever kind of change. Does our current structure in any way inhibit innovation or creativity or disciplinarity? By inhibit, I don't mean somebody is standing there trying to stop you. I mean that we have processes in place that make certain kinds of creativity and interdisciplinary efforts very difficult to accomplish. Team teaching, for example, is very difficult. How does team teaching relate to the reward structure? How are decisions made about who gets credit? Whether it is a FTE credit or individual faculty credit? We also asked whether our current structure allows every unit to have voice and visibility and whether our current organizational structure will allow the implementation of the strategic plan, *Directions 2010*. We began to look at other institutions. Nick made a joke about our traveling to Arizona, but that was a very important trip. We went to Arizona, we went to Ohio State, we talked to Indiana, and we looked at about fifty different institutions that are or have been in the process of reorganizing. Most of them did not reorganize to save money. Reorganizations ends up, most of the time, costing some money, as Nick was indicating. Financially, the hope is that reorganization results in cost savings down the road and revenue

enhancement. Most of the institutions that have reorganized reported to us that they had significant increases in enrollment and in retention, which then created more revenue. There are all types of reasons for reorganization. In addition, the CSO collected data and read the literature on reorganization and then constructed guidelines and assumptions for reorganization. We met for many, many, many hours, on nights and on weekends, all through this thirty-day process . . .

Senator Mike Dowd: Point of order. Senator Barlowe was asked to respond to a specific question.

Senator Barlowe: And I'm getting there Mike.

Senator Dowd: With due respect, Senator Barlowe is giving a history of the actions taken by the Committee. Because we have very limited amount of time today, I would like to ask Senator Barlowe if she would address the particular question.

Senator Barlowe: Mike, there's a reason why my answer is taking a bit of time. Most people do not have the context for the reorganization. And it makes me really uncomfortable when we're putting together a resolution without context or knowing what we are talking about. It seems to me that the Senate should have asked for a presentation on the reorganization proposal. A number of people would have been happy to provide such a presentation. The point that I was starting to make is that the CSO plan is a proposal not a mandate. Most of it was a set of examples. Those were possibilities to start, not end, the conversation about reorganization.

President Powers: Thank you.

Senator Barlowe: I mean some of these questions can be answered quickly and some of them cannot.

President Powers: Thank you very much.

Senator Dowd: I would like to provide clarification on this issue. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee invited the "Committee of 12" to meet with the Executive Committee. They declined our invitation.

Senator Barlowe: You didn't invite me. I would have been happy to come.

President Powers: We went through the Chair.

Senator Dowd: Perhaps the Committee Chair refused to distribute the offer to the other committee members.

Senator Barlowe: As I said, I would have been happy to come.

Senator Dowd: With regard to providing context, that was what we were requesting and the Committee refused to provide that context.

Senator Barlowe: I just tried to give you context, Mike, and you stopped me.

Senator Dowd: But the Senate Executive Committee asked for that information over two months ago.

President Powers: Dr. Thompson-Casado

Senator Thompson-Casado: I would just like to respond to Senator Fink's question. Did not vote Arts and Science Council and Faculty Senate ask in Administration as a cost to out the plan for reform out as well as to give us a clear reason on change? That have been quite a while ago and we still haven't received a response. So I don't think that that's going to happen this week.

Senator Fink: No point is, we're requesting it before it goes on, so whenever they provide it they provide it. Obviously they are motivated to do it, so they'll be motivated to provide it to us.

Senator Thompson-Casado: It's been questioned already by both Faculty Senate and Arts and Science council with no response.

President Powers: I feel a need for us to be able to come with a response today and we have very little time to formulate a response that we all will agree upon. So I appreciate all the work, the energy, and interests that people have. So I ask that further comments would directly speak to what we are going to do to make the recommendation from the Faculty Senate. We will need to complete the recommendation within the next twenty or so minutes.

Senator Rouillard: Andy had his hand up.

Senator Jorgensen: I agree with. Kati about the word *extended*, it's not a good word to include in there. *Meaningful engagement*, however reflects our thinking when it says, in fact our constitution approved by the Board of Trustee's that engagement with the Faculty Senate is required. We are the 64 elected representative with almost 1000 faculty members. We are elected by these faculty of this University. This body engaged in any major activity relating to our responsibilities. Let me use the phrase form follows function. How can we deduct this future plan at the same time trying to change the University in a way and the strategic plan is not even finished and not been accepted by a group? This committee was appointed in the spring time and the group was put together without any request to Faculty Senate for suggested members, which is again contrary to our shared governance, our role in the constitution and our contract. And I think that the suggestion that all feedback will all come from a group of people on Thursday morning to say. For example this plan refers to literature and other studies, we have not seen it. We saw a PowerPoint and that's all. This is not a way for a major University to move forward. Faculty wants to help. Faculty wants to be part of us, but we need to have the facts like we would in a research project so that we can get involved with it.

Senator Fink: Andy just to clarify my comments. I was not discouraging your requests for the information. I'm saying that it may not; let's not say how it will take for them to do it because it's their obligation when they will provide it to us. But when you sat extended that means that no matter what it is...

Senator Jorgensen: Then you can take *extended* out.

President Powers. Unfortunately we do not have time to have the conversation that we would like to have, but we do need to come to an agreement to what the Faculty Senate recommends on the reorganization. So I will ask politely that all comments would pertain directly to how to make a better statement... Dr. Barden.

Senator Barden: The Chair of the Board of Trustee's spoke to us at the last Senate meeting. I asked him straight up, "if we pass a resolution saying Faculty Senate would like for this whole train to stop until we can work through it and understand it, will the Board listen? As I recall he said yes, absolutely. Didn't he? It's in the minutes. He did say "yes."

President Powers: I ask for any suggestions to revise the backbone statement?

Senator Sharon Barnes: *Comprehensive* instead of *extended*

President Powers: Please repeat.

Senator Sharon Barnes: *Comprehensive comparative study* instead of *extended comparative study*. The second line where it states extended. No, leave comparative; remove extended and put comprehensive.

Senator Dowd: The last line.

Senator Barnes: *Comparative* was o.k.

Senator Dowd: Senator Jorgensen, would you repeat the issues that you raised previously? I could not hear.

Senator Jorgensen: My point was that this is not the time within the development of the strategic plan to talk about reorganization. Reorganization will come after you approve the strategic plan and we, as Jamie said, this is an implementation of a plan. How can you plan for an implementation of a plan that is not even complete?

Senator Wedding: You need to have a bullet saying that. We need to have a bullet saying that, that's good.

President Powers: Can somebody provide a specific suggestion?

Senator Anderson: I do believe that this is being recorded. So if you say that in one sentence so I can write it down?

Senator Jorgensen: Two sentences will do it. What I suggest is related with what you are talking about. If we can just agree to the first paragraph and that's what we would vote on, because we need to vote on something today. Then submit other bullets that are related to the point such as order, such as the cost, such as the uncertainty, that sort of thing and submit with the approval of the Executive Committee these bullets and add to this as evidence. I think if we agree to the first paragraph as a resolution that we could vote on, I think that it makes a stronger statement.

Senator Wedding: Well, I think that your statement should go in there somewhere. That is a good point and it needs to be put into this document. Somewhere down in the second or third paragraph.

Senator Anderson: So far the bullets are just these. I believe we are making reasonable sense.

President Powers: Dr. Lundquist.

Senator Lundquist: I don't think it's merely a stylistic point to say that both sentences say substantially the same thing. It could be edited into one sentence: "The faculty senate resolves that any restructuring must result be data-driven, emerge from a clear purpose and from extended and meaningful engagement with faculty senate.

President Powers: Good suggestion.

Senator Lundquist: It can be a lot shorter.

Senator Fink: Can you say it again slower so they can hear you.

Senator Lundquist: No I can't say it again. Make it MUST, must be data driven.

Senator Wedding: After *comprehensive*, insert *data driven*.

Senator Fink: After *comprehensive*.

President Powers: Have all of the necessary adjustments been included?

Senator Olson: There is one thing that I heard in Senator Barden statement and that was discussed last week. We also need to indicate that we have not had time to consider this. Consider that they want the date to be the 24th of September, so we really need to put in there that Faculty Senate have yet to hear all of the documents and decisions and we're are not to be able to do this by the 24th, as directed by our President.

President Powers: The documents on the strategic organization website are the only documents available. Nothing else was provided.

Senator Olson: That's not a full documentation.

Senator Lundquist: And also to say that inviting individuals to look at a website and express individual judgments is not what is meant by faculty governance. It is a way AROUND the elected bodies – Faculty Senate and A&S council and other councils whose job is to come to a consensus opinion of the faculty from which members have been elected.

Senator Olson: I will also indicate in this document that Faculty Senate has not time to make a decision as requested at that time

Senator Rouillard: I would like to come back to Walt's point and Kati's point in reference to the budget. I think that there have has to be a sentence here that says "any restructuring proposal must be accompanied by a proposed budget." Back to Kati's point, you're absolutely right, we have asked for this to be costed out. Dr. Jacobs said that would do it the day after the proposal was presented. I sent an e-mail as Chair of council even last week asking if there has been any final report on that. They said that there are no available figures yet. So, I think that the word "budget" and "finances" has, has to be in this resolution

President Powers: If so, can we make that adjustment now?

Senator Anderson: I would add that as a bullet.

Senator Rouillard: You can add it as a bullet, but it does have to be in there.

Senator Dowd: Can we finalize the one paragraph? We can present various issues with these bullets and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee can provide the final language.

President Powers: Excellent idea Dr. Dowd. What do we need to do to get the first paragraph so it is agreeable to the whole Senate?

Senator Barden: I don't think that this is a bullet point. It should be right at the top. Engagement with Faculty Senate, as specified in the constitution of the Faculty

Senator Lundquist: is the BOT approval necessary?"

Senator Barden: Yes it has been approved by the BOT's. Engagement is in the ... with the constitution of the Faculty Senate. That's the authorizing document.

Senator Wedding: I would put a capital "C."

President Powers: So are you working on Tom Barden's sentence?

Senator Anderson: Yes.

President Powers: What needs to be edited Tom?

Senator Barden: As required by the Faculty Senate constitution.

Senator Dowd: And the collective bargain agreement. Capital letters on each of the words.

Senator Wedding: I would put a capital "C, capital D"

President Powers: Dr. Lundquist.

Senator Lundquist: The first sentence should include "Faculty Senate" because it is faculty governance that is being evaded.

Senator Barden: The Collective Bargaining Agreement doesn't require engagement, does it?

Group of Senators: Yes it does.

President Powers: So, did we take care of everybody's concern?

Senator Wedding: You have "responding meaningful to a clear purpose." I think that I would put in "including."

President Powers: And including.

Senator Wedding: Including, I, N, G. that will be consistent with responding.

Senator Cluse-Tolar: This is in relation to what Tom said earlier about, do we need to have something that says Faculty Senate does not support the current restructuring? I mean, we need to just say that. Because this is just...

Senator Wedding I think that constitution should be identified with a capital "C." Faculty Senate constitution, a capital "C", I wouldn't capitalize *collective bargaining agreement*.

President Powers: If there are no more changes for the main backbone may I have a motion? All in favor?

Senator Dowd: Just to be clear: we are voting on paragraph one.

President Powers: We're voting on paragraph one.

Senator Wedding: And we are going to spell out "Faculty Senate" and a capital "C" for constitution.

President Powers: O.K. to spell out "Faculty Senate" and put a capital "C" for constitution. May I have a voice vote first? All in favor? (unanimous) Any opposed? (none) The backbone statement is now approved. Dr. Joregensen.

Senator Jorgensen: I have a proposed bullet that I will provide. A model for restructuring as part of the implementation plan to a strategic plan must be developed after the adoption at the strategic plan so the structure can support it. I will give it to you in writing later, but a bullet on the fact that the structure must be after strategic plan is adopted.

President Powers: So there's a bullet

Senator Jorgensen: Type that down. Any bullets can be submitted to the Executive Committee and the Executive Committee can decide where they want to put it.

President Powers: So, that will be the motion that the Senate will give the Executive Committee discretion at where bullets should be. Is that what I'm hearing?

Group of Senators: No

President Powers: Is there any discussion whether or not that the Executive Committee has its discretion for including bullets?

Senator Wedding: I think that Andy's bullet should be the second paragraph and it should start off, "furthermore." I think that it is a very important point that is more important than a bullet. It should be pointed out.

Senator Dowd: I suggest we place a motion on the table to give the Executive Committee the authority to provide final language.

President Powers: A motion is on the table to give the Executive Committee discretion for adding bullets. Are there any comments that the Executive Committee will have the discretion for adding bullets?

Senator Wedding: I vote yes. Is that what you're asking?

President Powers: I asked if there's no discussion before I take a vote. We have a motion and a second. If there is no discussion, I now ask for a voice vote that the Senate approves that the Executive Committee has the discretion for determining bullets. All in favor? Opposed? Motion approved.

Senator Anderson: Send in your bullets.

President Powers: Send in your bullets by today at midnight. We really need to have this ready for the Thursday morning session of the faculty stakeholder meetings. So, anyone with any bullets for the Executive Committee to consider needs to be submit them to us and I will ask that you will send it to faculty senate@utoledo.edu, so a number of us will have access to your suggestions. Dr. Olson.

Senator Olson: I just want to add when writing a resolution, you should have the “Whereas’s” first then the “Resolution” afterwards. So, all of those bullet items should be “whereas.”

Senator Wedding: I would like to see Andy’s bullet there as part of the main paragraph, I mean second paragraph, instead of being a bullet.

Senator Dowd: That information will be part of the resolution as bullets of the resolution.

President Powers: We’ll make that one first.

Senator Ohlinger: I will just like to know, what will be the plan for presenting this? Will the Executive Committee be there to present this at the... meeting on the 16th or 17th or will it be presented in writing?

President Powers: The plan is that we will submit this Dr. Jacobs and also take it to the Strategic Plan Committee faculty stakeholder meetings on Thursday and Friday. Is there anything else? O.K. I really appreciate your participation in this discussion. I think that as a body, we have accomplished a good deal given the short time frame that we were allowed. I appreciate that you will give the Executive Committee the authority to formalize the resolution..... In the few minutes remaining, I would like to open the floor for questions from the Senate, any questions from the Senate, outside of what we already discussed. Any general questions?

Senator Anderson: Any late-comers please step forward to record your presence.

President Powers: Any Senators who came late and weren’t here for the roll please check in with Dr. Anderson Huang to make sure your attendance is recorded.

Senator Lundquist: Just to say that there is going to be a memorial for Wally Martin on Sunday September 19, between the hours 2:00-4:00 at the Toledo Art Museum, Glass Pavilion.

President Powers: This Sunday from 2:00-4:00 at the Glass Pavilion, at the Toledo Museum of Arts. Thank you. That concludes the executive business for this meeting, are there any other items that Senators will like to bring from the floor? Any general questions? Can I have a motion for adjournment? All in favor?

Meeting Adjourned at 6:00 p.m.