

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of September 2, 2014
FACULTY SENATE

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

Approved @ FS meeting on 10/21/2014

Summary of Senate Business

Interim President Nagi Naganathan
Interim Provost John Barrett

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 Hoblet: I call this meeting to order. Welcome to the first Faculty Senate meeting of AY 2014-2015. **Lucy Duhon**, Executive Secretary, called the roll.

I. Roll Call: 2014-2015 Senators:

Present: Present: Anderson (Quinn), Barnes, Brakel, Burnett, Cappelletty, Caruso (Seligman), Denyer, Devabhaktuni, Dowd, Duhon, Edinger, Edwards, Ellis, Giovannucci, Gohara, Gray, Gunning, Hasaan-Elnaby Hoblet, Humphrys, Keith, Kennedy, Kistner, Krantz, Lee, Lundquist, Malhotra, McAfee, Molitor, Monsos, Nathan, Nigem, Ohlinger, Plenefisch, Porter, Randolph, Relue, Rouillard, Schafer, Sheldon, Springman, Srinivasan, Teclehaimanot, Templin, G. Thompson, Thompson-Casado Van Hoy, Weck-Schwarz, Wedding, White, White

Excused absences: Boardley, Brickman, Crist, Duggan, Farrell, Quinlan, A. Thompson, Williams

Unexcused absences: Bailey, Black, Elmer, Federman, Hammersley, Lee, Prior, Moynihan, Skeel, Slantcheva-Durst

III. Approval of Minutes: Minutes are not ready for approval.

Academic Year 2014-2015. I ask that Executive Secretary, Lucy Duhon come to the podium to call the roll.

President Hoblet: Welcome to all Senators and guests. I want to share with you that your FSEC team has been working throughout the summer.

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee have attended all Board of Trustees meetings in June, July, and August which included Clinical Affairs, Finance and Audit, Trusteeship and Governance, Academic and Student Affairs. We also attended two special Board of Trustee meetings in June and July.

Communications regarding the context of both of these meetings were disseminated to all University personal (faculty, staff, and administrators). The first was about Dr. Lloyd Jacobs assuming a new role within the university and the second was announcing Dr. Naganathan as Interim President and John Barrett as Interim Provost.

We have had special meetings with Interim President Naganathan regarding the Presidential search and about the search for Deans in the COM and COBI.

We have had several meetings with Interim Provost Barrett to discuss remaining issues from last year and several new concerns that have surfaced which include: – Core Curriculum, General Education, and the Ohio Transfer Module; parking issues; Hiring Plan; Honors College admission standards, courses, and experiential learning for course credit, online education through Vice President Cruickshank’s area; Bill McCreary and gamification; ongoing library issues from students and faculty; international programs occurring without the knowledge or approval of Senate; daycare concerns and the new vendor creating a loss as a partner with Toledo Public Schools.

We have worked with Vice Provosts Peg Traband and Kelly Moore to finalize a draft proposal to address many of the gaps and issues with General Education and the Ohio Transfer Module. Drs. Molitor, Humphrys, Keith along with Vice Provost Traband will be bringing a comprehensive three-part proposal to Faculty Senate for discussion to address issues, gaps, and processes that have caused a great deal of frustration for faculty , staff, students, and administration.

All members of the FSEC were invited to participate in an all-day Leadership meeting called by Interim President Naganathan. We were to think of a high point in our time at UT and were asked to think about programs and processes that could be developed to improve, rebuild, and promote UT in Ohio and in the nation. The work products from this meeting were summarized by Frank Calzonetti, Vice President of Government Relations and Chief of Staff. Dr. Calzonetti will continue to coordinate work on these initiatives.

Last week, Linda Rouillard, Kristen Keith and I all attended several sessions regarding “Flashnotes,” a note-taking vendor that has partnered with UT and contracts with students as note-takers for others with special needs that require this service. The concerns were expressed and it appears that this service must be in place to accommodate students. We will be asking “Flashnotes” personnel and Student Disability Services to address concerns and answer questions you may have at a FS meeting in September.

I am sure I am missing some of the work that FSEC completed this summer. In general there are many things that need to be fixed or rebuilt at UT, trust being one. UT is a great university with untapped potential. The University has a new Interim President and Provost. The BOT appears to have a more realistic perspective about the hardworking, committed faculty and staff. These changes can make a difference. It remains to be seen if they will. As most of the individuals I have spoken with state, currently I am cautiously optimistic.²² With that, that ends the Faculty Senate Executive Committee report. I would like to ask Interim President Naganathan to come to the podium. Thank you.

[Applause]

UT Interim President Naganathan: Good afternoon everyone. Thank you for the opportunity to address you today. As recent as three months ago, little did I know that I would be on this journey, to have the privilege of serving all of you, as your interim president. I was indeed touched by the extraordinary degree of support from so many of you encouraging me to accept this role. During the last 28+ years at UT, I have been fortunate to fill multiple roles – a teacher, a researcher, a grant writer, a student adviser. I’ve served as a department chairman and as dean. And throughout that time I’ve been incredibly fortunate to have had the opportunity to interact with some truly gifted and remarkable faculty at the university – many of whom are in this room now. It is not an easy time to be a faculty member. A growing portion of the public doesn’t understand or chooses not to accept the role of a faculty member. With almost 10 days under my belt in the new role, I was on a live interview with Jerry Anderson of Channel 11 in July and one of his questions was about faculty — he asked: do they teach too much or not enough? And what I tried to convey to him and his listeners — a fact you know well — is that there is nothing monolithic about the role of a faculty member. There is no “one size fits all” approach. And I’m not mentioning this to you because I think you are unaware of it. Rather, one of the things I want to try to do during my time in the president’s office is make sure the various UT stakeholders understand that. While it has been a few years, I remember the joys and satisfaction as well as the frustrations that are the reality of being a faculty member. I remember the days when I really felt terrific after lecturing in the classroom. I also remember some blank stares, when I failed to connect. I remember the excitement of a grant award and the endurance required when you don’t get the grant and you have to start the process all over again. It is my hope and my intention and my commitment to engage you all and as many faculty as I can, as we work together to determine our trajectory in the coming months. You and I have a shared future at The University of Toledo — no matter what my future role is—and I am committed to doing my very best to make it inclusive, positive and bright. I’ve been spending these first few weeks trying to get my arms around the vast scope of teaching, research and service at this University. I am meeting with a lot of groups around campus and outside, and I’m hoping to develop a short list of priorities for the months ahead in consultation with all of our stakeholders. I would encourage you to share your thoughts and views with me — *though knowing some of the people in this room*, I don’t think too much prompting would be needed! But in all seriousness, I am tremendously honored to lead this University that has become a home for me. I have great affection for it and great respect for you and the work you do on behalf of so many. And when it comes to UT, I know you feel the same way. I promise to do my very best in serving this great university, and all of you, in my capacity as interim president. I’m looking forward to hearing from you, today and in the months to come. Some of you have heard me say, “The title is Interim; the responsibilities are not.”

So, what has happened in these last two months?

We are working on a new direction for the university that affirms our core commitment to education and scholarship. I know some of you might have missed the convocation due to other commitments. So I am going to take the liberty of repeating some of my thoughts from there. As we all readily agree, this university exists to serve students and to create new knowledge that will advance our society and our understanding of the world around us. While as a university, we may be in a time of leadership transition, UT's commitment to our core mission is not in flux. As a university, UT's commitment to high quality instruction and research are continuous. As a public metropolitan research university, we must and we will continue to elevate the degree of excellence of our contributions in learning, discovery, engagement, and regional economic development. There needs to be no more debate on the value of research and scholarship at this university. We are not going to dwell on funded research versus unfunded research. Every academic unit has to create and deliver the right balance of teaching, research, and service.

What else have we done?

- Several “meet & greet” sessions – students, faculty, community partners.
- Day-long retreat -- Larger initiatives across campus – the entire Faculty Senate Executive Committee was invited to participate.
- “Walk with the President” -- Students feedback; Division of Student Affairs and reporting directly to the President; Enrollment and retention – direct tie-in to the president's office. I would like to hear your thoughts on these topics.
- Visits to each of the colleges and the various divisions across campus, coming up. Ms. Karen Bell will work with the Deans and division heads.
- Faculty hiring plan and the University Libraries.
- Master Parking Plan for our university
- Revisit the Campus Master Plan

It is my hope that at the end of the year, we can collectively look back and say with conviction, “We have turned the tide, towards a brighter future.”

Again, in closing, I thank you all for this opportunity to say a few words today.

I wish you all a very successful academic year and I look forward to working with each and every one of you. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

President Hoblet: We knew that many of you may have questions for Interim President Naganathan. He is willing to entertain any questions from the floor of Senate.

UT Interim President Naganathan: May I add, I know that Interim Provost John Barrett is also going to speak.

President Hoblet: Do you want him to speak first and then you both begin to answer questions at the end, is that amendable to everybody? Perfect.

Interim Provost Barrett: Thank you for having me here today. Welcome back to the new school year. As the president said, it is indeed an honor to be in this role; it is also a very humbling responsibility. It's been quite the learning curve over the last couple of months. I am going to focus on what the Provost Office is going to try to accomplish and work on this year with my time up here. A lot of this is not fully ready for primetime. We've only been at it for two months basically, and some of it is very close. However, I did want to kind of give you a sense of the tone and tenor of what we do and also "tee" these things up. Probably the biggest overall theme is working on improving shared governance, improving our relationship. I think the faculty-administration relationship certainly can use a lot of work. I think the dean-provost relationship can be improved upon. So shared governance is a major thing (I think) that you are going to see both the president and I working on. I too, will be going to each of the colleges. In fact, I had my first meeting with COCA on Friday, so if you were there I apologize for a certain amount of redundancy. If you are here today, which obviously you all are, when I meet with your college there will be a similar repetition. So for that, I apologize, but we do need to get the "word" out.

As I am staffing various committees and as the people in my office are doing so, I am repeatedly reminding them, have you reached out to Senate to ask somebody for a recommendation? Have you put faculty on there where appropriate? Have you put students on there? Just one tiny little example, we started an Honors College speaker series last year and the provost picked all the speakers and we are now setting up a committee to make suggestions that we can choose from going forward that will have both students and faculty on it. Hopefully, the speakers will be challenging and diverse, but at the same time, a greater interest to the wide range of the students, faculty, and members of the community. We are going to be bringing out things to be more college-centric as well. The hiring plan that I will come back and talk about a little bit more is going to be very much driven by the colleges that are currently proposed. It has not been fully vetted yet, but it is a very college-driven model. We are trying to come up with a method to move the workload process far more in the colleges, which is not nearly as far along in the details, but conceptually we want the decisions to be made where information really resides. I think we spend a lot of time not listening to ourselves and hiring outside consultants at times. It is my view that we have a lot of expertise here and I would rather tap into that expertise for decision-making wherever it's possible. I think that's a general sense of the importance and relevance of shared governance to the equation. I think you'll also find I am a pretty brutal, candid individual and that is unlikely to change, so we will have a very transparent Provost Office. If you want information, you got it. We had a meeting that Dr. Hoblet was referring to a minute ago, this summer, and the suggestion was made – I believe by Dr. Rouillard – that it would be nice to get all the things we send to Columbus to OBOR and I said, "fine." Then I went and told all my staff, "Anytime you send anything to OBOR, copy Dr. Hoblet on it." So, Dr. Hoblet, you will be getting a lot more emails this year.

President Hoblet: I look forward to it.

Interim Provost Barrett: You say that now <laughter>. But, really and truly, my door is always open. I do want to hear from you. I do want this to be a collaborative endeavor and a transparent endeavor. I will no doubt make mistakes, but when I do I will stand up and admit it before the group and then we can move forward to make a better decision. Hopefully through shared governance and consultation we won't make many mistakes; we will make good decisions at the front end. We are trying to move away from talking about the Health Science Campus and the Main Campus, moving us more towards one culture and that obviously doesn't happen overnight. It takes doing things like having everybody report to the

provost, so my job got a little bigger. It takes deliberate activities. It takes whenever you are thinking about putting something together and figuring out ways to be inclusive of everybody. The other really major initiative – and this comes out of being an interim – it doesn't really feel appropriate as an interim to be stopping any major initiative we've already started, or starting any major issue/new initiatives. That sounds more like a job of a permanent in my mind. So, I am choosing to focus our attention on building a stronger foundation, or as I frequently like to refer to it as, "weeding the garden" – making things better and stronger going forward. That won't always be possible. There are things that have to be done now that can't wait, that look a lot like major initiatives, but to the degree possible that is where I want to focus. So we will be looking at all the academic policies this year, making sure they make sense so they perform the best practices; it is a specific task of Kelly Moore, one of our new Vice Provosts. We will be looking at policies to make sure they close the loops and provide remedies. You know, we don't always have our policies make "good" sense in terms of the results for the students or when we schedule things, or things of that sort; we are going to be working on improving all that. The compliance of being a lawyer by training, I want us to dot our "i's" and cross our "t's" where possible. So we will be looking to finish up on the gen ed. project we started last year to move forward with the gen ed. assessment and bring it fully in-shape with HLC. We are going to be making a major filing with HLC on some major matters coming up. If and when a handbook comes out, we will move towards compliance with the degree requirements. We won't rush to that, but we will comply when we need to. We will jointly figure out what we are required to do. We will make sure that it is indeed required, because obviously pressure to increase general education, while pressure to decrease credit hours, stresses our ability to gain expertise in our subject matter disciplines for our students. Probably the biggest mantra that I like to use, and I say it negatively, but my wife says to say it positively- she says, "say 'be smart'" and I prefer, "don't be stupid." She says, "Well, people are going to think you are calling them stupid." But it's a reminder to me not to be "stupid" <laughter>. We need to get out of the habit of just following a rule because it's said to you. This is something I really noticed in my new role, people really take what I say super seriously like it's a command written in stone and I'm not use to that and I can be a little bit casual at times. And so I say that not because of the reflection on me personally, but rather when you are confronted with a situation that is going to press you to do something that you think makes no sense and leads to bad results, don't do it. Stop and think about it and make sure that is how you feel. And if you really think that, then go talk to somebody that is going to give you permission not to do it. Rules are there because when they are good rules they work 98-99% of the time, but all rules have to be deviated from on occasion when it's appropriate, that's why courts have the power of equity. Now, I am not encouraging chaos here. I am not saying, "Go out and do whatever you want whenever you want," it's quite the opposite. Most of the time the rules should make sense and do make sense. But if you really strongly feel there's a problem then talk to your chairs and chairs talk to your dean and deans talk to the provost. Somebody has the power to say, "You're right, that's bone-headed, let's not do it." We can't afford to just keep doing things because it was written on some piece of paper. This was driven home with the workload mandate under the prior provost because some chairs and deans applied extreme literality and it resulted in some bad situations and other chairs and deans came to the Provost Office and said "This doesn't make sense." And we made exceptions for our deans where appropriate. And that's the way we need to do business. We need to be smart. I think that's one of the cultural changes we need to embed in ourselves. The other cultural change I'll get to before I talk about hiring, but before I do I want to talk about the other initiative quickly. The president has mentioned on several occasions that we are going to invest more in people. I think that's important because we haven't done an exceptional job of that. I will be continuing the Provost Shining

Star Award, but expanding it to include one for staff as well as one for community engagement that will be open to faculty, students, and staff. It is my intent to have a much more robust sabbatical policy going forward. I've asked for a little more additional information on the form from the chairs which they have a choice to give. I am hoping they will, because I'm hoping by focusing on the cost of covering somebody being gone rather than what we are paying them not to be here we'll see the really marginal cost of this incredible benefit, both for professional development and to get the word out about UT.

We have actually done a pretty "crummy" job in many ways about talking about all the amazing things we do here. That is something we need to be better about and that's why we reintroduced giving a report to the Board on recently obtained grants. In addition, we are showcasing one faculty member's research to the Board at the Academic Student Affairs meeting every other month so that the people in attendance can learn about the great things, as well as turn our Board members into ambassadors to describe some of the great stuff going on, and in the Provost Corner Video which I will make a few comments mostly about the Shining Star recipients. I will also be showcasing two outstanding researchers. Generally speaking, no differential needs to be made between funded and unfunded research in a healthy distinction other than a limited circumstance or two where it really has a functional impact. We are reintroducing the Kohler grants. We will comply with the terms of the grant itself, but they are coming back out. I will be reinstating from a provost ago an award to help faculty go to conferences to present their work. I am working with the Office of Institutional Research, which already has a fund for this, to create a fund for those who have to pay to publish to help get their works out. We are doing some workshops for chairs to help train them; we are bringing some people to help work on those, you may have gotten an email on that already. And I am looking into whether we should be sending some of our young chairs for some chairs' training. We are going to have a lot of turnover this year. We already had a lot of turnover and we need to be grooming the next generation of leaders. The library is another emphasis; we have some capital money set aside for them. We're bringing together a group to come up with a more multi-tier plan to bring our collections to an appropriate level for a major research university. I want this to be very much a faculty-driven process in terms of the collections and the physical facility. Before we just start doing things, we want to look at how best to create a library of the 21st century, so there's a committee of non-library faculty and students that will be looking at that. I would like to see a little more consistent approach to advising and coaching. I know some colleges report great student satisfaction and others not so much, probably because of limited resources and years of budget cuts. We moved somebody into our office whose primary responsibility is advising and coaching and we will be looking at other ways to improve that. Just so you'll know, there will be several more dean searches this year. We have three deans retiring this year, Bev Schmoll, Dan Steinbock, and Tom Gutteridge. Actually, Dr. Schmoll's search has actually started as I understand it and the college will be ramping up pretty soon; I met with them a week or so ago to talk about it. Lastly, we've come up with a concept of a hiring plan. A group of us has drafted a plan. I got the final person on the committee's comments back to my write-up over the weekend and so I am going to clean that up and present it to the president and the CFO for their approval. Once they approve it I will bring it to the deans and the Faculty Senate Exec for comments, and then hopefully within the next couple of weeks we can roll out all the terms of it. I think there are a couple basic principles I will comment on right now-- one, we need a change of cultural habit here, in my opinion. There's been a tendency after year-after year of budget cuts, to say when you get a line, "let's fill it immediately," or you might lose it. I'd really like to encourage that not to happen this year. The number of people retiring from The University of Toledo because of the STRS incentives, plus the number across

the state because of STRS, plus across the nation – normally combined with the nation, given the growth of higher ed. back in the 80's – means in some disciplines we may not get exactly who we want; we may not get the quality we want. And so, we ought to look at this as a multi-tier experience to find somebody we are really in love with. Hiring does not have just a two-, three-, or five-year impact. There are other decisions the president refers to, it will affect us for 20-30 years. We need to get this right. It is vitally important. So, it is my intent to provide whatever assurances we need that once you're given a line, you have three years to fill it. I think that's of paramount importance, to allow us to really find people we are extraordinarily excited about. In the interim we can bridge the gap through visitors, adjuncts when necessary, but also through strategic re-hiring of faculty. Once again, the model has not completely been vetted, but the idea is to create a situation where colleges and departments can use these re-hires where appropriate, and it will be a win-win with the faculty that would like to come back or the people we would like to have come back. They are better off economically for doing so and the university is better off economically as well because they are able to double-dip, so there should be some savings to both sides of the equation. I would also like to see us engage in a very strategic process of figuring out what the right blend is in a department between tenure-track and lecturer. We need to move away from saying, "I lost 'x' and I have to get an 'x' back," but focus on, "I lost 'x,' but what do we really need?" And as part of a college-driven process, the colleges can figure out which college and which disciplines most need to grow, and which ones don't need to grow as much or may need to shrink. It's also a matter of figuring out, where do we need more teaching capacity where a lecturer might make more sense? Where do we need more research specialization because of a growing area, an opportunity, and a claim we already have? To me the smart use of this isn't just about saving money. It's not just about trying to bring people in to teach more courses or expensive research. It's about allowing us to do both in a full and productive way. If we create the proper blend, we will have the teaching capacity that we need to allow the productive research faculty to have reduced loads and engage in more research. This needs to be seen as both a win-win for the department and for the university as a whole. So, as I say, I will be rolling out the details of that hopefully within the next couple of weeks, but for now I just wanted to let you know that it is coming. It is a college-driven process and it is designed to create economic incentives that help the college and presumably from the college down to the department when smart decisions are made to benefit both sides. So, that is all I have to say and I guess we are opening up for questions now. Thank you.

[Applause]

Senator Dowd: Interim Provost Barrett, with regard to your comments on teaching workloads, have you fleshed out any details on what changes will be made to that process? As a department chair it would be nice if conversations about workload would take place roughly when chairs schedule classes. For next Fall we will be scheduling classes starting in November and I think they are submitted in January. Senator Lundquist, do I have the timing of that about right? Do we enter them into the system in January?

Senator Lundquist: Yes, that is usually how it goes.

Senator Dowd: It would be quite helpful if any preliminary discussions taking place at your level could filter down to the deans and then to the chairs. Having some idea of what teaching workloads will be would make the scheduling of classes much smoother and much more reliable. It would help students in that we would avoid canceling classes or being forced to add classes at a very late date.

Interim Provost Barrett: Well, it's a good thing I don't have anything on my plate so I can "hop" right on that <laughter>. More seriously, obviously, there is a lot going on and there's only so much manpower to do things. I've reached out to the deans already. I'll be reaching out to the colleges as I visit them and I'll reach out to you right now. I would love to have it done by November, which would be fantastic. My basic view on workload is – if I can take an easy scenario just as an example – if on average the faculty in the department, the appropriate workload is five courses a year, a 2-3, which is about the university average – some colleges are much lower and some are significantly higher, but just using an average – that means the department had two people and we need to have ten courses taught approximately. Now, maybe they really don't need that. Maybe they can teach nine or eight and still meet their instructional needs. One of the things we need to be doing this year as part of looking at the curriculum for the state as part of the hiring process, is culling excess courses that have crept into the catalog and putting them on active status. In Program Review we heard over and over again this last year from outside reviewers, "Boy, you've got a lot of electives." We, in numerous departments have more electives than programs three or four times our size in Ohio State. And at least that raises a question, should we pull that back a little to allow us more research time by teaching in a little more core areas? I don't want to mandate that. I want the departments to engage in that process. But, if we think about ten courses that need to be taught if that's the right level and we have two faculty, I personally could not care less if they both teach a 2-3 or if one person teaches a 4-4 and the other teaches a 1-1 and does a lot of research; it makes zero difference to me because we've got the courses covered that the students need and people move towards graduation. So it's an internal research allocation from where I stand. What I cannot have is both of them teaching a 1-1 and then you coming and asking me for three more faculty hires that are all going to teach another 1-1, we can't afford that. And so what I am struggling with is how do we give the departments the power to allocate and make those decisions without creating a mis-incentive to set loads very low and ask for a lot of additional resources. I've reached out to some people outside the university to ask their thoughts and so far I have not heard a brilliant answer yet. If you have a brilliant answer and you can give it to me by the end of the week we will have this done well before November. But that's what I'm struggling with. To me it's all about, what else do we need to get you? Part of that is when people leave, and hiring the right blend. Part of that is culling your curriculum if it's overgrown. Part of it is making an internal decision about who your most productive researchers are and who you want to give the release time to. We are always going to have extra needs to hire and some of those are quite legitimate, most of them and maybe even all of them. We've all been cut year after year after year. I came here in 1994 and we were about 76% state funded then and we are now 22-23% funded. It's kind of "a death by a thousand cuts" and I think nobody feels like their department is overstaffed. I haven't heard anybody saying, "Boy, we really have a lot of fat here and we need to get rid of a few of these people." So, if that's the case, everybody is going to say, "Boy, it would be nice to take the loads down and hire some more," but we have to do that in a smart way. So the hiring plan provides part of that opportunity. I don't have the answer, but that's what I'm dealing with.

Senator Dowd: What you just described is part of what I was asking for. Please convey that message to the deans and have them convey it to the chairs. That way, when the scheduling process begins in November, all chairs would have a rough idea of the plans you just described.

Interim Provost Barrett: I think you definitely will have a rough idea. There will be a meeting with the deans and the chairs and all of the Provost Office in the next couple of weeks. We do a once-a-month meeting with them, it's The Academic Leadership Team. We will continue that meeting and I will go

more in-depth with the hiring plan ideas there. We will talk about this a little bit so we will have some general sense. I really do want this to be very much driven by the chairs, but it's going to take responsible decision-making on their part and by the deans because as some of you have heard me say, "I have not yet found a leprechaun at the end of the rainbow with its pot of gold." So we do have an overall deficit situation and I have to be mindful of that.

Interim President Naganathan: Let me add something else to it. I think it's something you can do from your end to be aware of the challenges. Senator Molitor is here and he created a great system in Engineering where we kind of changed the culture of students wanting to enroll earlier. Part of the challenges on the one hand, you are trying to identify what faculty are going to teach while at the same time you don't know which classes are going to go. I think there was a preliminary attempt this Fall across all the colleges trying to get the information to each of the units on making it easier for them to contact students for enrollment. When I came to the Dean's Office in 2004 in November, one of the things we always heard is the culture of Engineering Technology Department; the students were not enrolled earlier. They said they tend to enroll at the last minute and to some extent it made sense because these are primarily non-traditional students. But one of the things today, I think the students in that department can enroll just as quickly as traditional students in other departments because we discovered a way to reach out to them. It's not that they don't want to enroll because there is no cost for registering earlier; it's a question of making them aware. Senator Molitor came up with some cool tricks that identified the faculty members that these students are likely to see more often. So they appeal to the students, if you register early it is better for you and better for us to make sure the classes are appropriately staffed with the right talent. And that has paid big dividends in terms of why the College of Engineering numbers are further ahead when they are compared to a similar timeframe. We know at the end it will be only 2-4%, whatever the non-growth is. But early on it will be 8-9% because students are choosing to register early and that puts you into a better position to staff courses appropriately.

The second one is, Interim Provost Barrett and I have had some casual conversations and we are going to have more in terms of how to incentivize the efficiencies. For an example, if unit "x" is going to save \$5,000 or \$10,000 (whatever the number is) and if the central administration is going to say, "thank you, we will take all that money away," why should units be incentivized to participate in this? On the other hand, if some of the savings can be left back in the units and the colleges, it could be for any purpose. It could be used to improve quality of life; it doesn't mean money in the pocket all the time. It could be a professional development opportunity or many things. Then there is an incentive for the units to participate in creating efficiencies. The faculty may even step up and say, "You know what? I don't mind observing the students in my section if I can get something else done," there are possibilities like that. So, I think that's the way every unit has to think. The solution to all of this is determining what should be deliverable as a college to the central administration in terms of tuition-bearing hours so we can have some robustness about our budget process. Right now there is no incentive we can do to schedule classes. There are not enough students we will teach and if not, we will go through the struggles year after year. I think it is about flipping the model in terms of why would the colleges and departments want to be part of this solution and we are going to have that conversation within faculty hiring; that's also the workload process.

Senator Dowd: Good.

Senator Anderson-Huang (Senator Quinn): I think you've already answered one of my questions which was to re-look at the way courses are dropped because of low enrollment. There should be some form of a different way of doing it and perhaps this idea of advance registration is one way to make that more efficient. But the other comment I have is for Interim Provost Barrett, which is a suggestion perhaps, and maybe you already have this in-mind. Workshops for faculty who are potential chairs, not just waiting around for a new chair to come into office because I've got several faculty in my department who I would think would be very good replacements for me, but they should have some idea of what the job is like (some kind of workshop for leaders etc.).

Interim Provost Barrett: I think that is part of the model we've been thinking about – more on the internal workshop model rather than sending them some place, so, yes, I think you are actually right.

Senator G. Thompson: How much are we spending on this firm that is doing the outside presidential search? Does the president think this is good use of student fees in the sense that they are ultimately paying for it?

UT Interim President Naganathan: The honest answer is, I don't know the exact amount, but I think we have learned as a campus from previous searches. I am told the arrangement with them is a lot more cost-efficient. The Board is the one doing the search, so the president is not involved in any of those details. With respect to the searches, I think it is necessary even as we accept. When I participated in a national search in 2003, it was a search firm that identified candidates from all over the country. They are committed to doing a very expansive search and that is going to require a talent from outside to identify those people. From what I have heard, they have been very conscious of the cost.

Senator Humphrys: I had a couple of faculty members ask me if I got the opportunity to ask this question and so this is what I am doing. Actually, now, as of today it affects me too. This is the first time we have been asked (the first time I remember) to enter into what is called a "contract;" if you have a student who will need some special considerations for testing. I guess now we either call it the Office of Academic Access or we call it the Student Disability Services, I am not quite sure.

Group of Senators: The Student Disability Services.

Senator Humphrys: Okay. I was sent an email from the Office of Academic Access so one must be a part of the other.

Group of Senators: They're the same.

Senator Humphrys: Okay. I'm wondering, are you aware of this? There are several faculty who are really concerned about this. In the past we were asked to give a student half again as much time for a test or something like that. But, there was never the word that I can remember, or any of the faculty that brought this to my attention, that we are entering into a contract. I mean, that sounds a lot more official and a lot scarier (I think) for the faculty. I wondered if you were aware of this and if you have any comments about this? Coincidentally, I received two emails about this today about students I have in my classes.

Interim Provost Barrett: I am not aware of any change in the wording in the emails, but to be honest, I don't know if I looked at them that closely from when I last got one which was in 2013. I received a

couple of them in 2013 which was the last semester I taught. I will look into this. I think we need to put this in a little broader context in some ways. Our obligations under the Americans with Disabilities Act are law – we have to comply with them. We as an institution rely on you, the faculty, to provide what the at-cause reasonable accommodations are. I will also tell you my personal opinion; the Department of Education does not interpret reasonable accommodations in any way that I consider remotely reasonable. They tend to take more of the view of “equal access” rather than “reasonable accommodation.” We’ve already been under a consent decree once for failing to comply. We came out from under it about a year ago. But it is something there are constantly threats about because anytime one student feels they have not gotten the accommodations they’re entitled to, even if they need a book “Brailled” and they switch classes three days into the semester, they still want it for their course assignment we have to kind of bend over backwards to make that happen. That’s an office that almost always runs over budget at almost every university because of this kind of need and requirement. The DOE says if you take a penny of federal money you have to do it their way. They are very inflexible. I actually asked someone that I worked with to reach out to the other Ohio and Michigan schools to see if we can create a database of resources we’ve already made accessible. And they made accessible to kind of create a shared resource database like OhioLINK for disability things that isn’t ready for primetime yet. But it is something we are looking into. I wouldn’t worry about the word, “contract” or not. I mean, we are legally obligated to do this. You, as a professor are obligated to do it. I had to do it. If you are unsure about what the accommodations need to be, talk to the office and if you still have questions, come see one of the vice provosts or myself and we will make sure it will get straightened out for you. But I will look and see if they changed the wording.

Senator Humphrys: If you would, because the email says they’ve created a testing contract for review by using an existing contract with your permission as a template. But they don’t include anything in the email, so I don’t know what the contract says or what it refers to. I really think that maybe it’s more. I understand that we have to comply with laws, but I think maybe a better job could be done with disseminating what the expectations are for us.

Interim Provost Barrett: I won’t disagree. When I got the letter last Spring, (not the one last Summer) even as a lawyer when I read it I was like, “I’m not entirely sure what I have to do here.” <laughter> I reached out and contacted (myself) and at that time they did clean it up, at least what they were sending me, which was not involving a test; it was other forms of accommodation. I then understood it and I hope that other good people could too. I will find out if we can clean up that language further.

Senator Humphrys: Thank you.

Senator Molitor: If I can follow up on Senator Humphrys’ question to Interim Provost Barrett. There also seems to be an issue about placing the burden on some faculty where faculty may not have the time or the expertise. I have a colleague who is teaching a course that has both a visually-impaired and a hearing-impaired student. She was told that she has to convert all of her notes that she distributes to students to accommodate the visually-impaired student, and she also has to “close-caption” all the videos she is going to show in the class to accommodate the hearing-impaired student. This colleague has no expertise how to do this and certainly doesn’t have the time. But, she is being told, “No, you have to do it.” The solution to that if I was in her position, I’m going to say, “I’m not going to show videos and I’m not going to distribute notes and that’s how I’m going to make it fair to everybody,” which of course is harming students and not improving the learning experience. So I think when we talk about workload and

resources we also have to look at staffing issues, advising, student disability services, counseling and different areas as well. We really need to focus on what we need to do to improve the student's experience overall as well. Thank you.

President Hoblet: This is an ideal time because I just spoke with you this morning about disability services. I had the same conversation, Interim Provost Barrett, with the language being used by some staff in Disabilities Services. It is being perceived as very threatening to faculty because it is their role and their responsibility to legally make these accommodations and then if they don't, they're going to be responsible and they will be reported to the compliance officer, that's what the faculty who actually contacted me said. And so, that was a concern. I don't know from my perspective and I'm certainly not an attorney and I'm certainly not first in compliance as far as ADA, so I told Interim Provost Barrett that there are some issues here and I do have concerns. I hope we can "hammer" it out.

Senator Dowd: For general knowledge, the civil rights complaint against the university does not name any individual faculty member. Instead, it names The University of Toledo and the president of the university. The university is responsible, not faculty members. This issue has resulted from a serious miscommunication between some administrators and some faculty members.

Senator Edinger: May I change the subject a little? I want to say this delicately; our last administration grew the administration substantially and we have an awful lot of vices and associates and assistants in the administrative ranks. Assuming that shared governance actually takes place, when you talk about culling the weeds, we may not need all those levels of administrators. So I'm wondering with two of you in place taking a fresh look at things, if this could be one of the things you might look at. Did I say that delicately enough?

UT Interim President Naganathan: You said it in a very straightforward fashion and that's the way to do it. The general answer is, yes. One other thing that was missing in the conversation, when you really look at all the data that floats out there and when you look at administrative FTEs, for a person counting, they will count someone in a secretarial support role as one FTE administrative and someone who is a VP in the same position as one FTE, so apples and oranges were added in the same thing. Also, when faculty members go to serve in those roles, immediately there was an assumption they are not doing anything faculty related. I can assure you in my experience of 20 years as chair and dean, so many of our faculty in administration still serve as faculty and they continue to do so. I think we should just leave it to a plain headcount. We will take a close look at it as we get closer to the budget process, but we are not going to do it desperately at the last minute.

Interim Provost Barrett: If I may add on to that just briefly, I've already done my part. The provost and the chancellor is just the provost now <laughter>. I think you are right, we do need to look at that word appropriately. As the president said, what counts can inflate those numbers? I mean, every chair counts. We certainly added a department here and there and regulatory compliances will loom and the number of offices we have to have for various filings for the state and federal level. I can tell you the people that I work with regularly that report to me are working pretty darn hard. I rarely go home without seeing the president's car being the last one in the parking lot, so he is working pretty hard. I don't get the sense that we are particularly over-staffed in most areas. I don't see every area. I can't say I know that definitively. I can't say with precision where greater cuts have been made over the last ten, fifteen, or twenty years between administrative and academic areas. I can say I think everybody is pretty thinly staffed relative to

what their responsibilities are across the university and it's a matter of creating a smart balance in all those areas and doing what we can to control the cost. I think we do need to look at it, but I don't think if there's a silver bullet there, that we're going to suddenly find a huge amount of money that we weren't expecting to find.

Past-President Rouillard: I have a couple of comments and a couple of questions. I appreciate that government regulatory considerations do add to our budget expenses, but in terms of ADA and in the course of going to one of these "Flashnotes" meetings I don't know if I misunderstood, but I think I was told that that Office of Disability Services only has approximately \$30,000 allotted to take care of the note-takers for classes, and that doesn't seem like it's very much to take care of that important service, so that might need to be increased. The other thing that I wanted to comment on and also ask a question about, I appreciate very much about your comments on workload, about making intelligent decisions based on individual units rather than applying a "one size fits all" rule, I truly appreciate hearing that. I wonder if you might comment on the Learning Ventures "request for proposal" email that went out, because I think there's might be some contradictions between the initiatives coming out of that office and what you believe and what you want to do. It may also be that simply there are processes or there are steps that simply have not been addressed in the request that you might be able to clarify. I'm specifically concerned with some contractual issues that are not appropriate for discussion here. The very first sentence is that Learning Ventures is soliciting course development proposals from all faculty- but courses are offered in departments and programs. If we are going to have coherent programs, then these need to go through certain steps, department curriculum committees, college curriculum committees, and Faculty Senate. We had this issue last year where it appeared like there was going to be competition between Distance Learning and departments scheduling courses and staffing these courses. And if we are going to be wise about our staffing, it seems to me that Learning Ventures and any distance learning needs to be done coherently. Yes, faculty are the ones who develop the courses, but there's still a collective agreement that needs to be reached on how we are going to offer these courses and what courses fit into programs. So, could you talk a little bit about that discrepancy which may have absolutely nothing to do with you and it may simply be miscommunication between two offices?

Interim Provost Barrett: I think this is something that may merit a longer discussion to build a better mousetrap and to come up with a better approach. That ad was run by me before it was sent out. I made a few comments as it went out. I signed off on it and so it didn't trip any major alarms for me. Courses are scheduled by department, subject to oversight by the Provost Office, both for a request for additional courses or for cancellations for low enrollments. Courses are staffed by department chairs and that's how we do things and that's how we are going to do things. We can only develop DL courses or flipped courses, whatever we want to do through Learning Ventures with the coalition of willing- you have to find faculty who want to do it. So I don't think it is essentially inappropriate to ask faculty, "who is interested in doing this?" The faculty that are going to do it are full-time regular faculty of the university who are presumably already teaching the course. Now I guess you can put in a line that says, "are you already teaching this or are you qualified to teach it?" But at the proposal stage, one of the things I said when I saw this thing to begin with is, shorten it and make it simpler. This is for trying to find out who is interested, so put the details in the vetting. And so, if we need more disclosure to say, "you will have to already be teaching it and it has to be something that the department offers regularly," I don't mind putting any of that in there. There's no intent here to do some end-run or to authorize people, but we are not going to fund everybody and support everybody that applies. It's a matter of, who applies that is a

“good” teacher and a qualified teacher in the area of teaching the subject already, that’s part of a responsible vetting of the proposals you actually get. Now, if you want us to work with Learning Ventures and put a group together, we can have some conversations about the right way to make sure it is vetted properly. There’s nothing underhanded or sneaky going on here, at least that I’m aware of and I’m pretty sure I would be aware of on this particular topic. I’m just trying to identify who is interested.

Past-President Rouillard: And I believe that that is your stand on this. But I remember last year when there was a similar initiative that was announced- it really did seem to set up competition between Distance Learning because there is a particular office that’s in charge of distance learning; it put those courses in competition with face-to-face courses. There was another incident last year in which I believe faculty members signed up to teach these courses and everything was going along and the chairs weren’t aware that their faculty were going to be teaching those courses which has all kinds of implications for workload and program coherence, and course offerings, and so on and so forth. So, if you can make it clearer; make your vision that you’ve already articulated here part of this, that this has to be done in concert.

Interim Provost Barrett: I’ve already communicated to Cam and Barbara that scheduling goes through departments and faculty assignments go through departments and I will reiterate that to them. If we need further processes I’m happy to discuss what the appropriate ones will be. This needs to be driven by the subject matter experts which are the departments.

Past-President Rouillard: I would really appreciate that. Thank you.

Senator Lundquist: Just to add one thing. Many other things that faculty apply to do require at least a chair’s signature, if not an endorsement. Including a line for a chair’s signature would at least have the effect of involving the chair as he/she needs to be.

Interim Provost Barrett: Would that be sufficient at least as a starting point?

Group of Senators: Yeah.

Senator Lundquist: I think it would. You can’t really plan if you don’t know what’s going on. I am willing to work hard to support worthy initiatives, but if I get blind-sided by something at the last minute, I can’t manage that. One of the things that happened with that issue the last time was people were promised money and they were promised course releases and suddenly, I have a problem with workload. I have to figure out how to release somebody that I didn’t know was going to be leaving. I think departments try very hard to plan ahead and have things go smoothly and to have some type of curve ball thrown at them at the last minute makes things hard.

President Hoblet: Senator Lundquist and Past-President Rouillard, thank you for those comments <disk change>.

President Hoblet: We need a way to know how many online course dollars to develop, then they can get “warehoused.” [and ... anything more?]

Interim Provost Barrett: President Hoblet, I just want to say, I certainly don’t want to be developing courses that nobody takes, that’s a silly use of resources.

President Hoblet: Of course.

Interim Provost Barrett: I think we can all agree on that. I do think sometimes there may not be a huge enrollment necessarily on campus, in a course here, but they may through College Credit Plus or other things going on be a perceived market elsewhere and then the question is whether we should be entering that market or not with the use of our faculty, with appropriate controls over how it's scheduled, things of that sort (coordination). People's crystal balls are not all the same.

President Hoblet: Exactly.

Interim Provost Barrett: Sometimes you will predict something, sometimes you will build it, they won't come. We want to try to do it right.

President Hoblet: Thank you.

Senator Giovannucci: My understanding is a number of the lecture halls in some of the seminar rooms are being fitted with software and hardware to record lecture content and to report the lecture's video. It's not clear to me how that's controlled. It seems like there's a lot of legal issues with that – recording an instructor and the PowerPoint presentations. Who makes the decision to do that? And once it's done, then how is that information controlled? I don't know if you are aware of this or what the policy is.

UT Interim President Naganathan: I'm not directly aware of it. But my daughter is a student in the College of Medicine. I remember her listening to virtually every one of the lectures that were recorded so I didn't know if it was something happening already on the Health Science Campus.

Senator Giovannucci: The audio recording.

UT Interim President Naganathan: Pardon me.

Senator Giovannucci: The audio recording. This is video recording and the PowerPoint presentations and synching them all together.

UT Interim President Naganathan: I see.

Senator Giovannucci: Essentially, the faculty makes those lectures and I think there are some intellectual property concerns there. The other thing is (I'll speak for myself), a lot of my PowerPoint have images that I don't necessarily own the copyright to, and I think that's okay, except if it's online somewhere and it could be accessed by more than just the immediate students in the class – then I think there's a larger copyright issue.

Past-President Rouillard: Senator Giovannucci, I don't understand. Are you saying, in these rooms, that audio and visual are automatically being captured without your approval?

Senator Giovannucci: That's what I don't know. They are installing software and hardware to do that. I talked to an IT person and they said you can opt out of it.

Dr. Margiotta: My understanding is that you can opt out of it; you have to give permission.

I have another question that is related to faculty development and the adage of, “be smart.” I like that statement that you made. This concerns faculty hiring. I think that at least in the College of Medicine that we missed an opportunity in faculty hiring by being constrained to only consider possible candidates who have extramural grant support. What this has done, I think, is to limit the population of very excellent junior candidates who have great promise. And if they were hired here and succeeded they would have great loyalty, I think, to the institution for being hired. My question is, in faculty development, are you going to be aware of candidates who might not necessarily have that extramural support and will you consider them for hiring?

Interim Provost Barrett: As I mentioned in terms of developing this faculty hiring plan, this is going to be a very much college-driven process with input from the chairs and departments. There are a lot of areas already where there is no extra funding. As I look around the room I think a number of you are in those areas; there’s very little in Law, which is my area. The Provost Office has never really controlled the decision of who is an appropriate hire in a department. The department basically controls that. The line is given and the department decides who’s the best candidate within the parameters of what’s being searched for, and I don’t perceive that changing. So to me, that’s more of a cultural issue within the College of Medicine, or within your department, in terms of what you ought to be looking for rather than a decision. I would be hesitant to pronounce from on high what the right standard is in any given discipline. I don’t know each of your disciplines well enough.

Dr. Margiotta: Well, it’s not necessarily something that is a department issue. It’s been a dean of the Department of Medicine issue previously. So I guess the decision is going to be left up to Dr. Cooper.

Interim Provost Barrett: Yes.

Dr. Margiotta: Okay.

Interim Provost Barrett: Well, I guess I say, ultimately yes. But I would hope he engages in the same spirit of shared governance and consults with the chairs and the faculty for what is the appropriate standard in this day and in this time and who is out in the market. Funding is changing in many ways and in many disciplines so I think those are healthy discussions to have.

Dr. Margiotta: So as long as you’re conscious of the fact that we have a larger pool of candidates to draw from, that include people who may be very...and non-funded, I think that’s a good way to proceed.

Senator Devabhaktuni: Interim Provost Barrett, you talked about faculty hiring being a long term... You also mentioned something that I think that I can...with the other statement you made which is to attract the people that probably have retired to come back so there’s some savings on both sides. I personally think that that approach may not be a good long-term plan in hiring, especially, if we’re looking at the fact that faculty who are hired are going to be in departments for the next 20 or 30 years. The second thing is, you are the provost and I’m pretty sure you are a very busy man, but when the deans come to you and present a case of faculty hiring I am not entirely sure whether the qualitative arguments are being made at the department level or if the Excel spreadsheet containing the numbers reaches you, and then you make a decision based on those numbers. As an example, in our own department which is Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, if I want to make quantitative arguments in a department meeting and say, at this point in time, the Electrical Engineering Department has the number of faculty that can teach

electrical power, zero, or if I make a statement that this is the first computer science program in the nation and the last hire we have in the department is from 1993, do those quantitative inputs reach you and get filtered out? I made a point on this, but I would like you to make an approach where you instruct your deans to bring you quantitative data along with the numbers, so we have a plan that can survive for the next one or two decades. Thank you.

Interim Provost Barrett: Well, I sympathize with the struggles that you are having. I guess we can say, it's lucky that you no longer have that dean to worry about <laughter>. But on a more serious note.

UT Interim President Naganathan: There's only one person you have to worry about and he's in this room right now <laughter>.

Interim Provost Barrett: If you are going to take away my sense of humor too, I will go back to being a faculty member <laughter>. I can honestly say, I don't think I've ever seen an Excel spreadsheet from a dean. I am not sure if all the deans would prepare one for me if I asked. The hiring plan is going to be a 5, 6, or 7-page document with a fair amount of detail in it. It contemplates a visioning process or strategic vision for the college. I'll use LLSS as an example, how many people should be in the Economics Department and what should their sub-disciplines be? How many should be in the English Department and what should their sub-specialties be? What's the right blend of lecturers and tenure-track? It's very much my intent that once that plan is developed, and if that plan is signed off on, I kind of want the college to manage the plan on its own. I don't really want to be engaged in a spreadsheet analysis on each hire because the college has a plan that they thought about and they worked through, and I want to empower that plan being implemented. So the question is going to be the support, the spreadsheet, and the data and developing a plan this year. Now, this year is going to be really "tricky" when it comes to hiring because we have no idea how many people are going to retire. And people can change their minds in either direction up until the last minute. That brings me back to the first comment of yours, which is, number one, we don't know how many people we need to hire and we don't want to blow our budget way out of the water by anticipating 70 people are retiring and only 30 do and having to hire 40 extra people. We are going to have to be a little bit conservative this year because we really don't know. One of the ways we bridge that gap, you could just bring in a bunch of adjuncts, but I don't think that is as high of quality solution as bringing back the people who retired and want to come back. One of the ways you can bridge and have a multi-tier process is through the use of re-hires. Some people who are leaving don't really want to retire. They would like a few more years. But they are doing this because of financial incentives that are built into STRS. Some departments have people that are world-renowned and when they retire where we can lose a major international figure. Wouldn't it make sense to bring them back for a while and bring in some new experts so that we maintain that reputation? So I think the intelligent use of rehires for some limited period of time is not just about economics. Yes, I tried to structure it as a win-win, so the college wins and the university wins and the faculty member wins with some revenue retention to allow for other initiatives, but it is also about retaining expertise and mentoring PhDs and Masters students through their process. It entails multiple factors that I think as well as keeping good quality high classroom teaching while we're sorting through finding the next generation of UT scholars that we're going to be hiring. So, I think it all blends together and if used intelligently it makes a lot more sense. When I vet the plan through the upper levels and then disseminate it more broadly, people will tell me if I'm off the mark, I'm sure, because this doesn't seem to be a very shy crowd.

UT Interim President Naganathan: Let me add to it too. The incidents that you talked about, since I know a little bit about Engineering, those decisions came about for various reasons. First of all, the only way somebody at the center could make a decision – which unfortunately we did during the last few years – is simply looking at the unit’s income statement and that is not the right way to do it; that’s why the chairs and the deans have to make later decisions. The reality is, we had one last power-electronic person leave a few weeks ago unexpectedly, right? The department did hire people in computer science post-2000 after I came to the dean’s office and there are not there for an accommodation of reasons. So, I think all these things only the colleges and the departments would know and they need to weigh in. It doesn’t matter how knowledgeable you are of the institution. I don’t think the provost or the president can make a decision which area they should be hiring in within certain units, those opportunities that units are close to.

Assistant Dean Pollauf: Certainly, the issue of Learning Ventures speaks to the idea of coordination. But I think there’s another element that wasn’t explored there that perhaps isn’t determined necessarily by Faculty Senate, but needs to be discussed and that is, what is the purpose for all these online courses? If you have 500 online courses, but four degree programs, there’s a disconnect somewhere and it’s led to some really interesting administrative issues and overselling in my opinion by online admissions of what’s possible to actually accomplish online here at UT. I think there needs to be a conversation about for what purposes are we selecting these courses? Ultimately, are they placed into a bigger selection of programs? Who is taking them? Are we sending them? Are we serving our dorm population that doesn’t want to get out of bed before noon rather than attracting new students? These are all issues that to me we haven’t had a good conversation about. And that brings us also to this idea as everyone in this room said, we are a year out on workload, so when somebody gets a great idea to have an initiative somewhere else and think they can hire faculty in two weeks to teach all these courses, and then it’s put to the people that own the courses that they are being resistant because they are unable to do that, we need to have everybody on the same page. What does it take to create and deliver courses at UT and for what end? Then we can move forward with a lot of these things.

Senator Barnes: Separate issue unless you are going to comment on that.

Interim Provost Barrett: I didn’t have anything specific to comment on. We do need to coordinate better. I think those are appropriate questions to be asking and so I’m going to ask a few questions about how they’re making those choices and maybe we need to envision a better process for figuring out what it is. You clearly start with some degrees – who is interested in doing things. Not everything is a true DL, some are flipping the classrooms and doing hybrid things that can be used in traditional classrooms. I know that’s been an initiative over the last year. Some of it is specifically targeted at exterior audiences like the College Credit Plus program which is not remotely designed for our current students; it is designed for a different population entirely. I have not gotten into the mock-up what the details are and how they ultimately choose which ones to fund and develop each given semester and I will do so. If it’s appropriate then we will bring other people into the conversation.

Senator Barnes: I have two questions. The first question is going back to the hiring firm for the presidential search. I’d just like to underscore from my perspective and from the perspective of people in my department that the voice of the faculty and the students matter in that process, and so I hear you saying that there is a necessary evil. I am not at all convinced that search firms are a necessary evil in this

regard. Please, please be aware that the voice of the faculty and students were not included in the last round of these hires and I think we all have ample evidence of the consequences of our voices not being heard, so please, please enforce (President Hoblet, this is for you too) that we really need voice-wide representation in that process, and that would include faculty in the Humanities whom I did not see on the list of folks that I read about in the Toledo Blade. There weren't people from the Humanities in that process, so I would encourage you to bring that point forward, please.

UT Interim President Naganathan: I had this conversation with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee during the summer. I did take the concerns to the Board. There was one more person added to the search committee and that is Dr. Coulter-Harris. She is now added to the search committee to add the voice of undergrad education from the Humanities side.

Senator Barnes: Thank you.

UT Interim President Naganathan: In terms of search firm, their principal purpose is to (only) identify candidates. They are not going to dictate who these candidates will see. As a matter of fact, I know I was in this meeting when the Board discussed the process and they are coming to have a full vetting of these candidates. When they come to campus it will be a comprehensive interview involving students and faculty for sure.

Senator Barnes: Thank you. The other comment/question is to both of you, but may be more relevant to Interim Provost Barrett. Dr. Jacobs promised us 100 women full professors when he was interviewing for the job. At that time there was a lack of women in the pipeline and we all know that 40-50 years later the pipeline is long since been overdue to see that consequence. Part of this is about workload and how we share responsibilities for service on campus and I hope that that will be something that you all will pick up in terms of the women being promoted on campus, especially to full professors.

Interim Provost Barrett: I have a file on my desk, and I apologize that I haven't gotten around to reading it yet, about some recommendations and policies from one or more committees of women, UT faculty. So that is on my mind. Part of the hiring plan will envision a diversity hiring plan. I think we can do more in both those areas, both in getting people up through the ranks and who we hire in diversity in every sense of the term. I guess that is something we ought to be working on.

Senator Keith: It's not been mentioned and I am curious, what do we know about enrollment?

UT Interim President Naganathan: I was hoping for a fresh update today because even the ones we can...is somewhat old. I did not see...research. Last time I saw the undergraduate headcount was about roughly 2%. We also have been looking at the target in terms of how we're standing relative to last year's census. Last week when I looked at it we were at 100% of the undergraduate headcount. We were a little behind on the graduate. Senator Scott, I wouldn't be surprised if you have the numbers here today.

Senator Molitor: For Engineering.

UT Interim President Naganathan: Only for Engineering, okay. I did ask Institutional Research and I didn't get that information. But I think it is good. I think that is one thing we all have to collectively take charge. If we do, many of the other problems will go away. That can happen only when each unit and each college takes ownership. Just from my own personal experience in Engineering, for many years we

heard our Bio-Engineering could not attract enough students because they were new programs that started in undergraduate program and a lot of good faculty were being taken away and students were being attracted etc. But the department took ownership of it, three, four, or five years ago and now we have record-setting classes. I believe you've crossed 100 students – new students – this year for the first time. So I think when the units take charge, things will begin to happen and that would solve so many other issues when it comes to managing the quality of life. I am going to check my phone. Please don't mind me because I am going to look at the number of enrollments here. The total headcount is 20,646, in comparison to the last census date, last Fall's undergraduate is 99.7% and graduate is 98.2%. You will have a full tracking report tomorrow. I think it would be nice to erase the .3% in some way.

Senator Wedding: In light of these favorable enrollment figures, what does our budget look like, this year and next year? What's the future financial outlook of the university?

UT Interim President Naganathan: The good thing going is two things. One is, we are not dealing with a huge decline this year, that itself is good news. We are at the same level. We are still a little behind on the graduates that are housed and I think those things can be corrected. So in that sense it is slightly better news and I think we can turn this around with some focus measures. There is another thing that is good, who is looking at this projection and how they are reacting to it? I think we have a very good person who is in charge of finances, Dave Morlock. He is very refreshing to work with. You are going to see many more open dialogues so I'm going to be remaining cautiously optimistic in terms of how our future budget outlook is going to be. It is not expansive growth at this point, but I think we have opportunities. What I believe we should not do, you know many of the concerns I heard around the room here about DL, it is not so much about DL, it is how we choose the approach of DL as this "vehicle" that is going to get us out of all this misery and how we are going to cut cost, plus the conversation was not... So I think every unit has to get involved and even modest growth will help to project favorably and take some proactive measures and even take some optimistic approach to future budgets. I am hoping come Spring we are in a better place so that we can project next year's budget more favorably. But I think we are at a point close to what we are looking at. I believe we projected for a flat undergraduate and we are very close to flat. We may project a little bit of growth in graduate, but we are not quite there.

Interim Provost Barrett: I'll add a few more details. We did project on a flat and we are a hair below that overall. I haven't seen a report this week, but we are right on the line (like, 69.9%) and we need like two more people to come back to hit a 70% retention rate for the first time in about a decade, so that's very exciting. When you translate bodies into economics it does get a little more complicated as you might expect because you've got to look at FTEs and you've got to look at SSI. We are attracting a better caliber student overall, but we are paying a little bit more in scholarships than we have in the past, so that is a negative to the bottom line, but it is also retention and that helps us with SSI and revenue in the future years. Our housing is up by a fair amount. We have several hundred more beds filled and that's all a benefit to the bottom line. Overall, I think we are a hair below what we budgeted, but very close when you factor in all the details. A lot of positive trends are happening.

Senator Molitor: I appreciate Nagi's comment about enrollment, but I ought to give credit where credit is due. A lot of it was Nagi asking me, can you do this and can you do this? And also, a lot of the credit is due to my colleagues in Engineering who responded to this information and acted on it. It really has made a big difference. One of the things that I would like to comment on is in the planning for enrollment and

budget - keep in mind that for research-intensive graduate programs, when you're down in fulltime faculty which we clearly are, you're going to be down in graduate students enrolling in these programs. I think we need to be realistic about graduate enrollment in those programs until we can recover the numbers of research intensive fulltime faculty.

UT Interim President Naganathan: If I could respond to it? I agree with you in terms of research supervision, in many places we are maxed-out. But in terms of classroom instruction we still have capacity, that's going to require departments doing. Even those research departments creating opportunities where they can instruct more students and more doers of course work...degrees. It does two good things. First of all, it increases enrollment and the most important thing to a research faculty member, it allows you to offer classes that support your research mission which otherwise could get cancelled because of insufficient enrollment. So I think it is a win-win for both sides. What the challenge is, is when they come here without support to do a coursework-only program, they want support and that is something we have to empathize and sympathize with the students on. I think that is an opportunity if we can create programs without coursework-only Masters in particular, which also benefits in the subsidy scenario. It helps the faculty and it helps research programs; it helps, bottom line.

Unknown Speaker: I would like to add something that Senator Molitor was saying. I think for the graduate side the diminishment that present half or whatever it was may also be increased workload and also just federal funding is contracted and so those stresses a lot of times I think enrollment boost students up, but we also graduate a lot of students in the undergraduate programs. That may be reflected by recent stresses on those programs.

UT Interim President Naganathan: Particularly, in terms of taking students and...students into research groups in complicated...the reality does exist. But one of the challenges I see is we are also losing applications in some areas, so I think graduate students are going to come because of faculty, not because of attractive brochures and not because of our website; however, those are all important in their own way. But when I picked my PhD site I had no idea where Oklahoma State University was. I went to work with Dr. Sony and that was all I knew. I was told he's one of the top ten people in this world and if you can work with him that was great, so he is the one I went to work with. That happens even today. I know we get a lot of emails that are much easier to copy, paste, and send, but ultimately, when they choose to come here they come because of faculty. There are opportunities in terms of coursework-only Masters where we can add additional students in the same class with no significant burden added to the faculty that supports the research programs at the same time. I agree, the funding model is hard. Believe me, I have done it and I have been there so I know what it takes.

Senator Anderson (Senator Quinn): Just a cautionary note about tracking the graduate enrollment and that is, at least in our department, no student enrolls until they are paid. So the enrollment is right at the last minute if not beyond the last minute because the graduate salaries come in only at the last minute, so if there's some way to alleviate that problem a little bit there might be some advantage.

UT Interim President Naganathan: I think there are always two ways of helping the problem. First of all, I agree because I've seen it happen. Particularly, there are new students and new international students; it complicates the problem further. You've heard the story, you can't be paid unless you have a social security number and all these things happen. Many of us have dealt with this as administrators. With respect to the current students, I think there are things that can be done. Part of it is also a cultural

way of saying we can add a class very easily or we can enroll in a class without any consequence at the last minute. I think if we can...the continuing students who enroll earlier that will also help. Remember we are not talking always about registering students; I don't know how many students dropped this time. Patsy and Peg had conversations on it and I'm sure the provost is having conversations in his cabinet about it. We are looking at ways to get the students registered so they don't have to deal with the excess burden of paying for everything up front. We need to look at different ways. In some cases you can completely understand why the students are not able to register.

Senator Dowd: President Naganathan, I would like to return to the issue of capacity which you mentioned a few minutes ago. There are some graduate programs that are below capacity and could benefit from the judicious use of tuition waivers for graduate students. I hope that you would consider having a conversation with Vice Provost Komuniecki to determine if tuition waivers could be used to increase the graduate numbers for the programs that are below capacity. It would help us through fees and state share of instruction and it would also help so many students if we could provide them with a tuition waiver or a partial tuition waiver.

UT Interim President Naganathan: First of all, I agree; I have dealt with it in both extremes. At one point, as a department head I had 260 graduate students but I had 20 faculty members. It was a situation I would not wish on anyone. Plus, it was embarrassing to see 90 students in a graduate class, that is not good. Okay, now, with respect to the key phrase you used, "judicious" – that is where the deans and chairs have to get involved. One of the first steps I am requesting Interim Provost Barrett to consider is to identify college metrics. So that is a balance the deans and the chairs have done to come up with on what works within those colleges and those departments. These things are very difficult in my opinion and must not be dictated when deciding how many tuition waivers we should be getting. The colleges allocate them and then they come up with a process by which those things can consume. It is supporting the grant situation too. I have also seen those tuition waivers not properly placed in the past... clientele industry in some other colleges where they were invited to take advantage of. I don't want to go back on any of these things, but again, that is a case to be built. It is between the college offices and the chairs to come up with a workable solution so if you have goals in terms of headcount and in terms of student credit hours, then the balance has to be struck within the unit.

Senator Prior: I've heard the phrase which I hear the most, cautionary optimism. To me that sort of speaks in part to the nature of a relationship between administration and faculty and hopes that that relationship is changing. And so when I hear about a proposal that uses the term "blending" of a larger percentage of lecturers and when I hear you guys talk about don't fill faculty lines as a matter of course from one semester to the next, I am fearful that what that is code for is to decrease tenured faculty lines or to give opportunities for decreasing tenured faculty lines. Both of those terms sound like, don't just go with tenure faculty lines without thinking about it. And to me it feels like the relationship between faculty and the old administration.

Interim Provost Barrett: I'm sorry you heard what I said because it was me who primarily was talking about it in that way. You mentioned two things in specific and if I mischaracterize one of them, please correct me. You indicated one of the things you have heard was something about not filling lines immediately; I didn't say anything about that. I said, we are probably going to have some tricky situations this year in terms of trying to fill things before they even open up. I assume that we are going to be doing

some hiring this year based on people we “think” are going to retire and then we hope they actually do retire. That is quite the opposite of waiting a whole year after the retirement to get ready to fill the line. So I think we need to be prepared to do some hiring this year based on participated retirements. I think we need to try to get as accurate a vision of people who are likely to leave as we can to inform that, and it has to be done in the confines of the law because a chair just can’t go up to a faculty member and ask them are they going to retire because that is inappropriate. I want to be very clear that there is no intention of delaying things. I have suggested that departments and colleges should think about the right blend of tenure-track and lecturer, not something mandated from above. I would like to see us hiring lecturers not as automatically something that is a negative relative to a department. A department is a collective group of people with a mission- service, teaching and research. Given that we do not have an excess amount of money and given that this is not a growth era of higher education, a smart blend allows us to do all of those. What I don’t want to see is productive faculty researchers having very high lows that take them out from being able to do the research they do and bring a claim to the university as well as to themselves. If all we do is have tenure-track professors since we cannot afford lots and lots more than we have right now, you’ve got to make tradeoffs. Now one of the tradeoffs may be that you save enough with more expenses with senior people retiring than somebody who is younger and comes in at a lower price and maybe that saves you enough that you can pick up an extra line here and there of tenure-track. But I certainly wouldn’t take lecturers off the table as part of getting a proper blend. If a department doesn’t have any graduate-level courses and teaches primarily a gen ed. course it has very few majors of its own, that may be an appropriate place to consider bringing in a lecturer unless there’s some great growth opportunity there that hasn’t been identified yet, but we ought to be talking about. To me it’s not about mandating a blend or mandating a move, it’s about a college and a department thinking about what is a proper mix and seeing all of the tools as things that will help us accomplish our goal, and one of those tools is a smart blend in my opinion. It is not going to be a deliberate shift of moving a certain number of tenure-track lines and lecturers. It is going to be, what is the right course of action as envisioned by the departments and the colleges themselves. So I think that’s different, but maybe you disagree.

President Hoblet: We have time for only one more question.

Senator Wedding: One of the things that people don’t realize on this campus – faculty and sometimes I think even the Board of Trustees – is that the faculty actually represents a very small fraction of the total cost of running this institution. For example, just using the AAUP faculty as an example, we are about 15% of the total budget and that is salaries and benefits. So when you start talking about budget and how we hire faculty, we are talking about a small number. Going to the lecturers, I agree they have really carried the day for this university. What’s really disturbing is the fact that under Scarborough, he actually implemented/gave the deans the concept to put some colleges in a 5-5 teaching load. We really want to teach students and retain students and also be fair to these students, so I don’t think it’s good to have our lecturers teaching these high teaching loads just as an automatic thing and that’s going on in certain colleges and it’s certainly going on in my college. I think it is grossly unfair to the students and to the faculty. I think it’s due to the fact that all of this is a small piece so I don’t know why we are doing it. Thank you.

President Hoblet: Thank you. Do we have any old business? Any new business? Alright. May I have a motion to adjourn? Meeting adjourn at 6:04 p.m.

Meeting adjourned at 6:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Lucy Duhon
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard
Faculty Senate Office Administrative
Secretary