

**THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO**  
**Minutes of the Senate Meeting of February 2, 2010**  
**FACULTY SENATE**

<http://www.utoledo.edu/facsenate> Approved @FS mtg. on 2/16/10

---

**HIGHLIGHTS**

**Lesley Vogelsong, Student Executive Board**  
**Dr. Dorothea Sawicki / Dr. Thomas Sharkey**  
**Dr. John Gaboury, Interim V. Provost for Faculty & Organizational Development**

---

**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 John Barrett** called the meeting to order, **Nick Piazza**, Executive Secretary, called the roll.

**I. Roll Call –2009-2010 Senators:**

**Present:** Anderson, Ankele, Barlowe, Barnes, Barrett, Baumgartner, Brickman, Chiarelott, Coventry, Crosetto, Denyer, Dismukes, Dowd, Dupuy, Fink, Gunning, Heberle, Hoblet, Horan, Hornbeck, Humphrys, Jenkins, Jorgensen, Kennedy, Kistner, Laux, LeBlanc, Malhotra, McSweeny, Metting, Moore, Nandkeolyar, Niamat, Nims, Olson, Peseckis, Piazza, Plenefish, Powers, Powless, Randolph, Regimbal, Rouillard, Sheldon, Skeel, Stepkowski, Teclhaimanot, Thompson-Casado, Wedding, Wolff,

**Excused absences:** Duggan, Elmer, Giovannucci, Marco, Tietz,

**Unexcused absences:** Caruso, Fournier, Grothaus, Hottell, Lee, Shriner, Solocha,

A quorum was present.

**II. Approval of Minutes:** Minutes of 1/19/2010 were approved as distributed.

**III. Executive Committee Report:**

**Executive Secretary Nick Piazza** is asking the Senators and guests to introduce themselves before speaking to get the speakers' names recorded accurately in the minutes.

**President John Barrett:**

**President's Report 2/2/2010**

As I hope you all noticed from the email of FSEC activities, we have had a relatively busy couple of weeks. I hope the format is acceptable to everyone, but if you have comments or suggestions, do not hesitate to contact me.

We also have what I expect will be a full agenda, so I will try to keep my comments brief. In addition to the scheduled speakers, Dale Dwyer, chair of the Assessments Committee will be making a presentation on the current status of the assessments process, and we will then have a matter to vote on regarding how to proceed. Given the importance of this issue, he will be speaking after the report on our self study, and if we are unable to get to John Gaboury's presentation on the conversion of library space, he has graciously agreed to come back at our next meeting.

I want to remind everybody that there will be a Getting to Professor Workshop this Friday from 2-4pm in Gilliam Hall Room 5300. The Promotion & Tenure workshop a week and a half ago was very well attended and feedback was very positive. I want to thank Barbara Floyd again for arranging this and Jamie Barlowe for arranging this Friday's workshop.

The Strategic Planning Committee had an all morning meeting last Friday to receive reports from each of the working groups. At the end of this meeting, most of the working groups were disbanded and new groups were formed along various themes. The current groups are Undergraduate Education; Graduate and Professional Education; Research and Technology Transfer; Student Centeredness and Campus Directions; Health Care Access and delivery Directions; Community Outreach and Global Engagement; Points of Distinction, Finance; and Land Use.

I wanted to call everyone's attention to a recent resolution passed by the Board of Trustees. This resolution charges the President to work, as appropriate, with administrators, faculty and staff to accelerate fundamental, transformational and sustainable change to elevate the stature of undergraduate and non-professional graduate programs during fiscal years 2010-11 to create a vibrant institution thriving into the 21<sup>st</sup> century. I have spoken briefly with President Jacobs about this, and it is clear that the board would like to see this institution continue to improve, but at a somewhat faster pace. I think it is fair to say there will be numerous discussions both inside and outside of the strategic planning process about ideas for moving this institution forward, and I encourage all of you to bring your ideas forward. Olivia Summons has been invited to our next meeting and may offer some additional insight on intent behind this resolution.

We also received a log item asking whether people's computers are being monitored. I discussed this with President Jacobs and Provost Haggett. I was told that there is no general program of monitoring computer usage of which they are aware. However, there are two important caveats to that statement. First, these are work computers and the university has repeatedly stated that it has the right to monitor their usage. Second, if circumstances come to the attention of the administration regarding potentially inappropriate conduct by an individual, the administration can look into the past and current usage of that person's computer, and this has happened in a handful of instances in the past. However, I have not seen Godfrey Ovwihgo, VP of IT since becoming aware of this log item, so I will ask him about this when I see him later this week and report back any additional relevant information.

Finally, we have an action item to address. In connection with preparing the ballots for this year's senate elections, an ambiguity has arisen with regard to who is eligible to be elected. We will be discussing this ambiguity under action items and voting on a proposed resolution.

I now turn the podium over to Provost Haggett.

**Provost Haggett: Faculty Senate Report 2/2/2010**

- Ben Pryor's appointment as Assistant Vice Provost for Learning Ventures
  - Combines the former distance and e-learning – now called online learning – and the CTL
  - Ben will be working with faculty and staff of the LV to support innovative, inquiry-based approaches to online and classroom learning
  - LV foster the use of technology in the classroom, computer-assisted learning and academic innovation; development of enriched learning environments
  - Starts Feb 15
  
- Last week's strategic planning meeting of the whole – all invited to get involved -

- Led by Jamie Barlowe and Chuck Lehnert
- On the UT homepage

**Get involved with shaping the future of your University of Toledo.**

**Participate in the recalibration of the University of Toledo Strategic Plan - Directions**

**2010.Ways to be involved.**

- Volunteer to participate in a workgroup.
  - Offer suggestions or to participate in discussions on our Facebook or Twitter pages.
  - Email the Strategic Plan Points of Contacts with suggestions or ideas.
  - **GOAL WORKGROUPS**
  - [Goal 1: Undergraduate Academic Programs](#)
  - [Goal 2: Graduate & Professional Academic Programs](#)
  - [Goal 3: Research](#)
  - [Goal 4: Student Centeredness & Campus Directions](#)
  - [Goal 5: Health Care Access & Delivery Directions](#) [Goal 6: Outreach & Engagement](#)
  - [Directions](#)
  - [Land Use Plan](#)
  - [Distinction](#)
  - [Finance](#)
- 

- Fall-Spring Retention data
  - Fall 2005-2010 Fall-to-Spring Return Rates by College
  - Good news is that more students were retained (3408 in 2009, 3262 in 2009)
  - bad news is that the % has decreased (86.5% in 2008, 84.3% in 2009)
  - looking at different ethnic groups in this year's data, Blue and Gold Scholars have a better retention than the population at large in some ethnic groups, particularly African American (81% vs 70.1%), multiracial (91% vs 72.7%) Hispanic (94.7% vs 79.1%)

Any questions?

**Senator Fink:** How much of this is due to simply they just don't have the money resources, or is it simply they just don't like us?

**Provost Haggett:** We've tried to get at some of that data by using a non-returning student survey but the response to that survey was very low. We sent out this survey to 500 students who were here last fall (2008) but didn't return this fall semester (2009) and 20 people responded. From those twenty people finances was one of the major things that kept them from returning. We have trouble collecting data from people who have left.

**Senator Fink:** One of the things I would like to see in the future is if you could break it down by GPA to see if the weak students are the ones not returning or transferring.

**Provost Haggett:** We do look at that and we know that about half the students who leave is because of GPA, but many non-returning students were students who left in good academic standing. The 500 students we surveyed were all in good academic standing when they left UT.

**Senator McSweeney:** The new facility attached to Savage Hall will it be available to faculty members on both campuses?

**Provost Haggett:** No, I don't believe so, but I am not the right person to ask this, but it is a practice facility for our athletic teams.

**Senator Niamat:** Do you have retention rates for the College of Engineering?

**Provost Haggett:** I do. The fall to spring retention rates for the College of Engineering this year was 93.7%, it's actually up from 93.6%, its overall five year average of 92.3%.

**President Barrett:** If I may suggest that you include the retention rates for each college in your report for the minutes.

**Provost Haggett:** I will be glad to do that.

SUGGESTED CITATION

*Fall-to-Spring Return Rates*

Institutional Research: The  
University of Toledo, 2010.

## **Fall-to-Spring Return Rates for First-Time, Full-Time, Baccalaureate-Degree-Seeking Students**

### **Fall 2005 - 2010**

Contents:

1. University Return Rates by College, Includes  
University Average



**Lloyd Jacobs**  
President

**Rosemary Haggett Jeffrey Gold**  
Provost & Executive Vice President Provost & Executive Vice President Academic Affairs Health Affairs

**Bin Ning**  
Director Institutional Research

## **Fall-to-Spring Return Rates by College**

### **First-Time, Full-Time, Baccalaureate-Degree-Seeking Students**

#### **Fall 2005 to Spring 2010**

				<b>Fall-to-Spring Return</b>
<b>Initial College</b>	<b>Fall term</b>	<b>Cohort Size</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Returning Rate</b>
<b>Arts &amp; Sciences</b>	<b>2009</b>	818	708	86.6%
	<b>2008</b>	724	627	86.6%
	<b>2007</b>	760	647	85.1%

2006 618 539 87.2%  
2005 632 534 84.5%

**Business** 5-year average 710 611 86.0%  
2009 358 328 91.6% 2008 414 375 90.6% 2007 416 373 89.7%  
2006 421 371 88.1% 2005 426 360 84.5%

**Education** 5-year average 407 361 88.9%  
2009 271 228 84.1% 2008 301 246 81.7% 2007 258 226 87.6%  
2006 232 197 84.9% 2005 213 193 90.6%

**Engineering** 5-year average 255 218 85.8%  
2009 558 523 93.7% 2008 547 512 93.6% 2007 501 459 91.6%  
2006 456 411 90.1% 2005 457 422 92.3%

5-year average		504	465	92.3%
<b>Health Science &amp; Human Services</b>	2009	449	377	84.0%
	2008	423	367	86.8%
	2007	356	315	88.5%
	2006	330	284	86.1%
	2005	295	262	88.8%

**Nursing** 5-year average 371 321 86.8%  
2009 376 297 79.0% 2008 333 280 84.1%  
2007 303 262 86.5% 2006 181 157 86.7%  
2005 182 163 89.6%

**Pharmacy** 5-year average 275 232 85.2%  
2009 417 383 91.8% 2008 401 369 92.0%  
2007 460 409 88.9% 2006 409 368 90.0%  
2005 416 374 89.9%

**University College** 5-year average 421 381 90.5%  
2009 798 564 70.7% 2008 630 486 77.1%  
2007 533 450 84.4% 2006 489 403 82.4%  
2005 467 386 82.7%

	5-year average	583	458	79.5%
<b>University Total</b>	2009 2008	4,045 3,773	3,408 3,262	84.3% 86.5%
	2007	3,587	3,141	87.6%
	2006	3,136	2,730	87.1%
	2005	3,088	2,694	87.2%
	5-year average	3,526	3,047	86.5%

**SOURCE:** Institutional Analysis System (IAS), 2008 and BANNER ODS.  
**PERSISTENCE CRITERIA:** First-time ever college students (during the fall term or previous summer) enrolled for at least 12 credit hours in a baccalaureate- or undecided-primary degree program as of the 15th day census point who were enrolled for at least one credit hour on the 15th day census point the following spring.

**President Barrett:** Thank you Provost Haggett. In connection with preparation of Senate ballots for this year's elections, an ambiguity has arisen with regard to who is eligible to be elected. I am going to go over some of it that I don't think is ambiguous because I want to disclose fully any potential area where there might be any confusion or ambiguity. Article III of the Constitution

states, "...Except as may be expressly provided herein, only continuing, full-time members of the University Faculty shall be eligible for membership in the Faculty Senate. Such persons shall not include faculty emeriti, faculty on superannuate status, or faculty with visiting, adjunct, or non-renewable term appointments."

Based upon our recollection at the time this was drafted, and as a drafter, I feel the Faculty Senate Executive Committee has interpreted this correctly to mean that all full-time teaching persons with tenure, tenure-track or renewable term appointments are eligible for election. This includes lecturers, College of Law clinicians, and other non-tenure track personnel. We do not feel this issue requires clarification but I mentioned it for the sake of completeness. This is my understanding of a deliberate change that was made when we were merging our senates, and the Executive Committee agreed. At the other end, the issue is whether the University President, the Provosts, the Vice-Provosts, the deans and the associate deans are eligible for election. Each has an appointment in the college and could be included in the ballot for said college. Some of them have not been included in the past. The FSEC feels that the situation is currently ambiguous given the language of the Constitution. Article XII provides, "... in the event of an ambiguity in interpretation of any provisions of this Constitution, its Appendix or its Rules, the meaning of such provision shall be determined by a majority vote of the Faculty Senate." In other words, we don't need to amend the Constitution. Therefore, the FSEC is asking the Senate for a vote to clarify this ambiguity. The FSEC proposes the following motion:

***Resolved that Article III of the Constitution be interpreted to mean that any administrator holding a rank of a dean or above shall be ineligible for election to Senate.***

We can move that line if you desire. So, associate deans and assistant deans with faculty appointments would be eligible. It is also our intent that no one be removed who is currently above that line, so this motion would just affect who is eligible to be put on ballots going forward. So I open this for discussion and then we will need to vote on it.

**Senator Jorgensen:** It is my recollection that everyone holding a faculty rank including the President and Provost were eligible. I know we had a dean in the senate before. If they are faculty members, they should be able to vote.

**President Barrett:** Since I have been here, the President of the University has never had an appointment in the College of Law, so my personal knowledge is limited. I do not know for certain whether the ballots in the College of Medicine last year or the ballots in Arts & Sciences when the President has been appointed in A&S included the President's name. My recollection, as far as I know, is they haven't been. The line is wherever we chose to draw it. But if you want to go all the way up and say everyone is eligible, we will list them all.

**Senator Dismukes:** What does the Constitution say, is it listed they are full-time faculty members? According to the Constitution does that make them eligible for Faculty Senate?

**President Barrett:** I don't think the individual colleges' Constitutions should govern how we interpret the Senate Constitution. I think Senate as a body needs to decide where it wants to draw the line. Many administrators have a faculty appointment in a college and we could potentially include them if we wish to. But historically at least some of them have not been.

**Senator Anderson:** I am a little concerned about simply resolving the issue as an interpretation by resolution. Then you would always have to go back to previous minutes to remember what happened. I strongly suggest that the by-laws or constitution of the Faculty Senate be changed.

**President Barrett:** We can take this to the Constitution & Rules Committee for an amendment, and go through the amended process. That would likely be on a slow side, but I will be happy to send wherever line we draw to the Constitution & Rules Committee to formalize this, and you won't have to worry about institutional memory.

**Senator McSweeney:** I would just argue with the form of inclusiveness at this point given that we had at least one vice-provost to advocacy for faculty members and connection to this. The numbers of these people will be relatively small. And that these people would be best to represent them, why shouldn't they be eligible for election.

**Senator Dowd:** This is a faculty senate. Some other university have a university senate with members from the faculty, administration and staff. However, our senate is a faculty body. Drawing a line regarding eligibility at a particular level of faculty administrator such as dean is a reasonable position to take by a Faculty Senate.

**Senator Heberle:** I think it's common sense that if you are a dean or above and think like an administrator not like a faculty member, it does seem to me it's common sense that if they chose to leave this position and come back and act as a faculty member and teach in classrooms and do what we do, then I think they would be good representatives. I think keeping it dean and above.

**Senator Jorgensen:** So vice provost would be above.

**President Barrett:** Yes.

**Senator Jorgensen:** What about assistant vice provost?

**President Barrett:** Anything with a provost title would be above.

**Senator McSweeney:** If we vote on this, I know at least one person that I know of that may no longer be eligible for service.

**President Barrett:** We said we wouldn't remove anybody. This is a resolution from the Executive Committee so it does not need a motion or a second. If you want the line higher or lower, you can vote against this and then we can entertain motions for a higher or a lower line.

Vote for either A – yes, or B-no. C is abstain.

*Resolved that the article of the Constitution shall be interpreted and remain that any administrator holding the rank of dean and above shall be ineligible for election to faculty senate. Voting results 35:8. Motion passed.*

Our first report is from Lesley Vogelsong of the Student Executive Board for Dance Marathon.

**Cameron Caryer:** I'm the director for Dance Marathon, Leslie is on my committee and she is actually on the Faculty and Staff Relations, and Cheryl is passing out the forms and flyers.

If any of you don't know what it is, it's the biggest annual University event, we raised last year over \$50,000, it's a sixteen hour event where you stand on your feet the whole time and it raises money for the Mercy Children's Hospital in downtown Toledo. All the money stay in Toledo and it's all for the kids. Leslie will talk to you about how you can get involved.

**Lesley Vogelsong:** We wanted to introduce to you what this event is all about. In those flyers there is information for you as well as my contact information. We are trying to increase faculty involvement this year, so if you are willing to donate financially, or donate your time, or any other donation is very much appreciated. Or if you are interested in taking a tour of the children's hospital, you can let us know and we will make the arrangements. Any questions for us?

**Cameron Caryer:** If you would like to get involved, just put your name down and your email on the sheet Cheryl is distributing. It's all for a good cause.

Thank you very much.

**President Barrett:** Next we have Dorothea Sawicki and Thomas Sharkey to give us a report on self study for the HCL (Higher Learning Commission).

**Prof. Thomas Sharkey:** Dr. Sawicki is passing out copies of this presentation. She and I will be talking to you about the Higher Learning Commission and their site visit to review UT's self study that is coming up in 2012. It's a very important process for the University overall and the faculty overall and all the constituents. Our, self study is a University mission driven process. I will talk about The North Central Association and the Higher Learning Commission, who they are and the fact that they represent 19 states, and they have a peer reviewing board that goes around every ten years and reviews the different universities. What is accreditation? It is an external peer-review

process that basically guarantees quality and continuous improvement. Our self-study is evaluated by HLC peer-reviewers and the outcome determines continued accreditation. It's a very intense and long process. On the next slide you can see the accreditation history of the two institutions – The University of Toledo and the Medical College of Ohio. For UT it goes back to 1922 and for MCO to 1980. We are aiming at the date of February 27-29, 2012, which is when HLC comes here for its site visit. An effective self-study evaluates the whole university – all undergraduate and graduate programs, engages all constituencies and builds on processes in place or identifies processes to add. Shows effective leadership and communication and presents evidence of fulfilling the accreditation criteria. The UT self study goals are to:

- Confirm UT's practices and actions are consistent with its mission and strategic direction
- Provide evidence of UT's strengths, identifies areas for improvement
- Recommend improvement
- Foster a strong sense of community
- Position UT's future advancement as a leading academic institution
- Achieve continued accreditation from the HLC

The last time we did this on both campuses there were challenges identified by HLC. At the 2002 UT site visit, HLC noted there was no approved plan for the assessment of student academic achievement and there were issues with the strategic planning not aligning with the mission. The former challenge was also noted in 1992 and led to a follow up focus visit in 2004. Similarly on the Medical College of Ohio campus in 2001, strategic planning did not drive decision making or have measurable goals, scholarships were limited to the School of Medicine, and the campus lacked a cohesive institution-wide student recruitment plan.

There are five criteria:

- Criterion One is mission and integrity. The organization operates with integrity to insure the fulfillment of its mission through structures and processes that involve the board, administration, faculty, staff, and students. Dr. Charles Blatz, College of A&S, is Criterion One Team Leader.

**Dr. Thea Sawicki:** I first would like to introduce myself, as many of you don't know me. I'm Thea Sawicki from the Health Science Campus, a Professor in the Medical Microbiology and Immunology Department in the College of Medicine and I have been here on the faculty since 1977. It is my pleasure to serve as one of the co-chairs with Tom Sharkey. We really appreciate the opportunity to come to the FS. This is our chance to inform the faculty and ask for your help to do so.

- Criterion Two is preparing for the future. This criterion is geared toward ~~the~~ strategic planning. What is the process that the institution uses to formulate its strategic plan and to decide where resources are applied, and it has four core components. There are a total of twenty-one components in the 5 criteria that the self-study must show the institution has met. The Team Leader is Mr. Bryan Pyles, and the liaison is Dr. Bin Ning Director, Institutional Research. Faculty and others with expertise in this area serve on the team.
- Criterion Three is Student Learning & Effective Teaching. This is asking: What is the outcome of our teaching and how do we know students are learning. Do we do pre-testing and post-testing? Do we actually look at the outcome and implement assessment plans we have for student learning. Using the outcome, do we feed back to improve our learning opportunities for students. So it's outcome based education – goes beyond assessment plans and looks at how the results feedback to improve student learning and competencies. To do this, we need direct evidence, such as student surveys, that the outcomes of assessment actually changed the courses. For example, some programs on HSC do assessment and outcome based reviews with feedback but they don't have formal records showing that over time that they have actually done that. The core curriculum is a big part



of this criterion. Self-assessment covers all programs, undergraduate and graduate. Steve LeBlanc, who is a wonderful member on this Team, has constructed an assessment tool (matrix) to be used to assess all of the core curriculum courses for outcomes. Connie Shriner is Criterion Three Team Leader, and Marcia King-Blandford is the Liaison. She is well known to you for her work with the undergraduate core curriculum.

- Criterion Four is Acquisition, Discovery and Application of Knowledge. How do we actually know we value learning, that we actually instill in students, faculty and staff the means by which they can develop a life of learning? How do we know they are actually using this information in a responsible way and that the curriculum is actually useful for students in a global and current world? How do we know our students are positioned well? Dr. Charlene Czerniak is Criterion Four Team Leader, I am the liaison. You will notice that a student representative is to be announced for all teams. We did a Facebook student appeal a month or two ago calling for students to volunteer to serve, we have three nominees so far. Please help us identify other undergraduate and graduate students who might be interested in serving on the teams. We also will do another announcement across campus to try to increase that pool.
- Criterion Five. Engagement and Service. This is our local community and constituents. What is the evidence that UT services are of value to internal and external constituencies? The core components address how we learn from them, how we respond to them and show we value their services. Dr. Mojisola Tiamiyu is Criterion Five Team Leader. Dr. Tom Sharkey is the Liaison.

UT also has an opportunity to do an additional, special emphasis study as part of the HLC 2012 self study. Dr. Taylor, who is a vice president for the HLC and our liaison with the Commission for 2012, is very experienced on accreditation. When he came to visit us in October during our official kick-off for the self-study, I think he was quite impressed with our preparation and with the history of accreditation of the University of Toledo and MCO, both of which are long standing, and continuous. UT since 1922. MCO was approved by the OBOR in 1972 for graduate programs, they received their first HLC accreditation in 1980 and this was continuous after that. So we've merged two strong accreditation histories. He suggested that we as an institution could take on an additional self study in an area that the institution picks. And he suggested we consider as an area for special emphasis our recent merger. He felt that this post-merger period was an opportunity for the new institution to go forward in new directions, and to learn from what made our merger successful. The self-study group is working with the Provosts and the President to prepare a draft document to go back to the Higher Learning Commission who must approve this. We are suggesting the self emphasis focus on how the new UT looks forward as a changed and merged institution. And that's what you see outlined on this slide. It will focus on three areas: merging cultures, teaching and learning synergies, and economic viability and where that positions the University.

In one of his communications to us, Dr. Taylor said that he was reading an article in "Inside Higher Ed" about Rice University that was entitled "No medical school for Rice", and he wanted us to know that the article mentioned the merger of UT and MUO as a success story. So we have a strong beginning on which to move forward.

The Outcomes of Site Visit – this is the sobering aspect of our presentation to you. There are four major outcomes; we are aiming for the first one, which is that we have evidence that every criterion and all 21 core components have been met. The second outcome is that we have evidence that every criterion is met but something requires institutional attention. The third outcome is that we are meeting every criterion but the institution should pay significant attention to something, that what we are missing is significant enough that it could require additional study, written reports or focused site visits. UT had a focus visit in 2004 dealing with assessment. The fourth outcome is

that evidence is not present that we have met one of the criteria or even 1 out of the 21 core components. If so, this will lead us to not receive re-accreditation but to be put on probation. That's why this self-study is a serious event.

What is your role in the self-study if you are not a member of the teams? Teams are responsible for gathering and assembling evidence to meet the five criteria. They will need to go to you to get evidence of research, teaching objectives and outcomes, and engagement and service. So please help them when asked. If you wish information on assessment or how to implement this, or on other issues related to the self study, we will be happy to put you in contact with people who can assist you. There is a self study website:

[www.utoledo.edu/campus/about/accreditation/index.html](http://www.utoledo.edu/campus/about/accreditation/index.html) . On the website are the 2001 MCO and 2002 UT self studies and the summary reports from the HLC site visits, the 2004 focus report, the description of the 5 criteria and the teams, minutes of the co-chairs meetings and the steering committee (co-chairs group and team leaders) meetings and this presentation as well as our other presentations There is also a self-study email address ([UTSelfStudy@utoledo.edu](mailto:UTSelfStudy@utoledo.edu)) if you want to send anything in, please do contact us. You may have a great idea about something we may not know about or the University may not know about. In terms of activities, especially where your programs or colleges reach out to the community, or interact between colleges, please let the self-study people know. Thank you very much.

Any questions for Tom or me?

**Senator Olson:** I am from the College of Engineering and there is not one faculty member appointed on the committees. The three members from the COE are working directly for the dean, or are associate deans. Is that an intentional oversight?

**Dr. Thea Sawicki:** No, absolutely not. As I mentioned, people were selected for their expertise and knowledge in the core and criterion areas.

**Senator Olson:** The faculty in the Engineering do not have the knowledge, is that what you are saying?

**Dr. Thea Sawicki:** No, the self study looks at the university as a whole, not at individual colleges or programs. This process started in 2008 when Tom and I were invited by our respective provosts and deans to take on this job. The five criteria team leaders were identified. We spent a year going through the criteria and brainstorming for which people on both campuses would be ideal to be invited as team members. For some people, their teaching obligations or other services would not allow them to serve.

**Senator Olson:** Faculty in Engineering, other than administrators, are not capable serving on this committee, is that what you are telling us?

**Dr. Sawicki:** No, you are saying this, not I.

**Senator Olson:** That's what your explanation is saying.

**Dr. Sawicki:** Steve LeBlanc is here, he is in Engineering.

**Senator Olson:** He also works directly for the dean, he is not a faculty member.

**Dr. Sawicki:** Steve has been an amazingly helpful person on the core curriculum and criterion 3 issues. There are 78 members on the teams, 37% are faculty, and 28% are faculty administrators, so almost 40% of the team members are faculty. (Note added to clarify: they do not represent their college but rather bring faculty input and knowledge to institution-wide issues relevant to the 5 criteria).

**Senator Olson:** You are still ignoring the key point I am trying to make here that there is no faculty members, just administrators from the College of Engineering.

**Dr. LeBlanc:** Defne Apul is a faculty member in the COE and she is on a criterion team.

**Dr. Sawicki:** The special emphasis committee will be made up of people active in the strategic planning and the self study, as well as other faculty, staff, and administrators who can contribute knowledge and expertise. What I did not include and should also tell you about is the self study time line. The first draft from each of the criterion team and everything they have found in response to the core components is due early in December this year. At that point the first drafted

full self study will be prepared. This will be revised and reviewed and then it will go campus wide. So everyone on this campus, students, staff, faculty and administrators will have a chance to comment. Then there will be a second campus review before the final document goes forward. There are lots of opportunities for people who may not serve on committees. If you want to act as a resource please contact one of our team leaders. We would be happy to come back here and tell you what the findings are. Maybe even have the team leaders join us when we visit again with the Senate as this is very much a faculty driven process.

**President Barrett:** As I indicated in my report we are going to deviate from the agenda and bring Dale Dwyer, Chair of the Assessments Committee up to give us a report on where the assessment process stands.

**Dr. Dale Dwyer:** Before I begin, I would like to acknowledge the people who have been dealing with this issue with me, Drs. Roland Skeel, Don White, Nick Piazza, and Patricia Case. I also would like to thank very much the contribution and the collaboration that we had with Drs. Rosemary Haggett and Jeffrey Gold and President Jacobs. One of the things that we were charged with is to do a couple of things. One was to develop an instrument that the administrators and their direct reports could use to provide feedback to the administrator about performance, criterion improvement, etc. For those of you who may not be aware, performance management is really a process, and it is not just focused on an instrument. Therefore, the second part of our charge was to come up with a process that would allow valid feedback to the administrators and to be able to be used to help the administrator develop his or her performance. One of the things we were hoping to accomplish in the Assessment Committee was to get a joint cooperative process in place so that the Provosts and the other administrators could evaluate their direct reports using the input from people, constituencies and stakeholders who were dealing directly with administrators being evaluated. I am pleased to say that today we are going to bring forth for you to vote a resolution, a process, and an instrument that accomplishes those goals.

First I would like to tell you that about two years ago I was on another committee which was chaired by Dean John Gaboury to come up with a generic administrator evaluation. Our committee came up with this instrument which was a behaviorally and competency-based performance evaluation. Since that time, I believe it had been used once. Like any survey instrument, it needed some tweaking. One of the first things the committee did was to look at that instrument and made a few little adjustments. One of them was to include the competency of diversity and inclusion, which was suggested by someone from the faculty that it would be a helpful thing to know about our administrators, and evaluate those administrators on how well they performed those duties. That was fairly simple. The not-so-simple part was that we also did a number of things. One of them was to provide protection for those being evaluated. At the same time we wanted to protect the confidentiality of the person doing the evaluation, so that there would be some protection of who said what of whom. To that end we have solved that problem as well. The third goal was to be able to provide this process so that it could be sustainable. One of the things on this campus is we develop something, then we discard it. Then we re-develop it all over again. So we were trying to develop something that could be used over and over again. I think we have also accomplished that as well. I want to share with you the process that we have come up with that I believe you as well as the provosts and the president will be pleased with.

First thing is we wanted to establish who is eligible. All full-time faculty have some stake in what the dean does in their respective colleges. So all full-time faculty can evaluate their dean. Second, the provosts and the president need to be clear on how this feedback from the faculty is going to be used to inform their overall evaluation of their deans or other administrators. One of the things that we think is important is that the faculty receive some clear statement on how their feedback is going to be used.

One of the things that we debated quite a long time was how to deliver this evaluation, and we faced a couple of different challenges. One challenge that we had to deal with was the confidentiality issue. The second challenge was the convenience and the response rate that was useful. We came to the conclusion that to maximize the response rate and at the same time to protect the confidentiality of the evaluated and the evaluator, that we would be able to put a web-based evaluation that the CCI (Center for Creative Instruction) could develop, and at the same time, be able to protect the identity of the person evaluating by having the CCI give the faculty a random number, so that even though they have to log in with their UTAD I.D. and password, we want to make sure a person evaluates someone only once. Once you log in, you would be using a different number that would go directly to your responses. Then we thought that people may not want to use their own computers that were issued by the university, so we needed to overcome that. So what we are proposing is that we will have a few stations on the Main Campus and on the HSC, so people who do not want to use their own computers could go to those assigned stations and put in their own number and it would not tie them in any way to those computers. We think this will be a pretty solid process. Once all the information is gathered, then the CCI would take all that data, strip all the numbers away, aggregate the data, which would include the ratings for each dimension of the evaluation form, and they would also aggregate all the individual comments associated with individual dimensions or general comments about that administrator. All that aggregated data would then be forwarded to the person being evaluated and the person who is conducting the face-to-face evaluation. That is very important, because if you are the person being evaluated, you should be the first one to see it. Once that is done and the evaluation feedback is given to that person, the overall evaluation of that person is done. Then all the comments and all the ratings, the aggregated information that was sent originally to the provosts, the administrators and the person being evaluated, would be forwarded to the faculty of the deans in the college. So that all the faculty can see how their dean came out in the evaluation. That was the process. One of the things that we were also concerned that we wanted to take into consideration, was that like any good study that is testing instruments and testing process we thought it would be wise to do a small pilot first on the deans. Once that is a successful process and we have reliable data, then we would ask President Jacobs if he would be interested and willing, and I think he will be, to use this instrument on administrators higher than the deans, as well as for the Trustees to evaluate the President. We didn't want to say that it is a done deal until we know we've got the process and instrument right. We are somewhat cautious here but we think it's the best way to approach it.

One of the concerns that we had was, what happens if we don't get enough data? What happens if faculty don't necessarily respond. We also built in the possibility that if we don't get enough responses that we may request re-sampling of those faculty in the college in which we didn't get sufficient responses. If we get at least a third of the faculty in any college participating than we are okay. Anything less than that is not sufficient. So this is the process that we would like the faculty to adopt, we think it is well worth trying. We think that we have come to a reasonable collaborative effort by taking into an account all the concerns of all the constituents that would be involved in the process. By the way, the original instrument, not the revised one, was all blessed by the deans a couple of years ago. So we have people on board and we are asking for you to adopt this which would mean, from a procedural point of view, that I understand you have passed a resolution previously authorizing a separate process which would require you to adopt this process and rescind the one that was adopted previously. That is our resolution we bring to you today, I am happy to answer any questions that you might have about the instrument, the process or anything else.

**Senator Jorgensen:** You envision this to be done soon enough so that the provost and the president would be evaluated in the next twelve weeks before the end of the semester?

**Dr. Dwyer:** I can't answer the time but I can say that this process can be up and running in a very short period of time.

**Senator Olson:** I have the minutes from November 10, 2009. The motion that is in question here, I think your process does fulfill most of it here with some exceptions.

*'The Faculty Senate shall conduct its own assessment of the president, the provosts, the vice provosts, and any deans who have served for two years or more, and have not been assessed in the last two years, and joining with the president, if he is willing, to assess the president, provosts, vice provosts and the deans, or whomever else he may chose to include, by hiring an outside evaluation company to perform a 360 degree assessment.'*

That's the exact wording of the motion. Where I find fault with your recommendation is in the assessment of the president, provosts and vice-provosts. That's exactly what Senator Jorgensen was referring to.

**Dr. Dwyer:** I am not saying we are not going to be able to do that, what I am saying is that we make sure that the process is correct before we advocate that is done.

**Senator Thompson-Casado:** Can you answer why, because the processes done for deans, why can't the provosts and the president be assessed in the same process?

**Dr. Dwyer:** I am not saying they can't be, I am just saying we want to try this and make sure all the problems are worked out, if any, before we do that.

**Senator Anderson:** In the College of A&S the dean has a very limited period of tenure, would this be for all the deans irrespective of what requirement Senator Olson mentioned?

**Dr. Dwyer:** I don't believe so.

**President Barrett:** I want to clarify something, there has never been any discussion of evaluating deans who have been here less than two years. If we potentially want to add that, we could go to the provost and ask for that. The part I want to focus on is, as I understand it, this process and this instrument have been vetted with the President and with the provosts. It has been discussed that they would like to do a trial run. Although there is no firm agreement definitely to do the second run of the administrators, provosts and the president, the intent is to go forward with that if this works in an efficient smooth way, or if there are some kinks, they can be worked out. So it is designed to create an instrument and a process that does one evaluation as opposed to two, and the evaluation would be used and listened to by all the different stakeholders. I believe that meets our goals of having a Senate and faculty driven process. But this is what they are willing to agree to. If you don't want to do it, we can just proceed with our own thing. But if we want to have a joint process, at some point the upper administration would like a test run to see if it works okay. Is that a fair statement of where the committee and the administration are at?

**Senator McSweeney:** Since our dean is also a provost would he be evaluated twice or just once?

**Dr. Dwyer:** That I can't answer. I assume he would be evaluated as a provost and also as a dean.

**Senator Anderson:** If it is a trial run, and those are the words you are using, it would seem to me that the results would not necessarily go further.

**Dr. Dwyer:** The results of the evaluation of the deans will be used in the deans' formal performance evaluation by the respective provosts.

**Senator Anderson:** Those of us in a non-participating college would at least get to see the instrument?

**Dr. Dwyer:** Absolutely.

**President Barrett:** Kathy will send it to all of you by tomorrow.

**Senator Dowd:** President Barrett stated that if we evaluate the deans, and the process runs smoothly and efficiently it will be used to evaluate the big shots such as the provosts and the president. Who will determine whether it runs efficiently? Your group? The provosts? The Faculty Senate Executive Committee?

**Dr. Dwyer:** It will not be only the assessment committee, whoever uses the instrument and participates in the process.

**Senator Dowd:** I am asking for a specific answer because you are asking us to nullify a resolution that was passed by this governance body. In order to do that, we must first address the issue raised by Senator Jorgensen. I would like to know who is going to make the determination. Who will make the determination as to whether this instrument will be used to evaluate the provosts and president? This needs to be addressed before the Senate could consider nullify a resolution that was previously passed.

**Dr. Dwyer:** I don't want to put words in anyone's mouth. I would think that on any kind of evaluation that runs the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, provosts, the president, would want to ask is this useful, did people seem to like it, did it provide good feedback, were you able to use it well? I think to be collaborative, you want to sit down with people and say, 'what did you think of this?' I would say, personally, before I would want someone to say, go, or it's not a go, you would want to talk to people who used it, and look at the results to see if it made sense to them.

**Senator Rouillard:** We talked about the evaluation of provosts and deans, in the last slide of this the last sentence says, "... The President may adopt this process for all administrators who directly report to the President." It doesn't say he may chose this for his assessment.

**Dr. Dwyer:** He has indicated he, himself personally, is not opposed at all to having this used.

**Senator Olson:** I don't have a problem with doing a trial run. I do have a problem with the fact that we are not assessing the President and the provosts and vice provosts. What you are suggesting is, we will run this to see if it works, then we will ask the President if we should proceed with this. That's not the right answer. I think this is absolutely a Senate process. The motion was made on the 10<sup>th</sup> of November, it was very clear that this was a Senate process. I think it is very improper to ask the motion to be repealed.

**Senator Piazza:** As a member of the committee, what we propose is a process that results in the inclusion of faculty data in the evaluation process. That's what we are proposing here. If this goes well, what we have is a tentative understanding with the President that assuming that things go well, this would be enlarged to a point where Senate data would be included in the evaluation of the provost as well as the president. If the process for one reason or another does not go well, if the President decides he does not want to participate in this, we are not asking that you rescind those parts of the previous motion that essentially would put us in a position where we have to ask the president permission to do this evaluation. Our understanding is we will go forward to do this evaluation ourselves. What we are trying is to put a process together that for now and in the future will guarantee that faculty data, faculty feedback, will be incorporated into any administrative evaluation done at The University of Toledo. This is not something that we have seen on a regular or consistent basis at least on the Main Campus in the twenty some years that I have been here. And if we can establish this precedent where faculty voices are just assumed to be incorporated into the evaluation process and are just one piece of the data that you expect to collect, we think that is a much better outcome than the processes we pursued in the past where we've collected data that no one would accept or receive or use. If we can put together a process where the data would be accepted by the Board and used in the President's evaluation, accepted by the President and used in the evaluation of the provosts, accepted by the provosts and used in the evaluation of the deans, our recommendation is let's do everything we can to do that. If they will not play with us then we will do it ourselves. That is what we are proposing.

**Senator Olson:** What you said is completely within the third motion that was passed on the 10<sup>th</sup> of November where you were to coordinate this with the President and I commend you for doing that. On the other hand, I still do not want to see this process go to a point where we do not conduct the evaluations, regardless of whether or not we use on the President, provosts and vice-provosts. That's really the question I have. I think it's excellent that this be used in future evaluations by the administration. I think that's an outstanding outcome. But at the same time I don't want to see it be used as a foil to prevent assessment from taking place of the upper administration.

**President Barrett:** I want to clarify a couple of things. Practically speaking, if we go down this road, once the trial run occurs, the provosts and the President can say, "oh, it didn't work." Then we have wasted a little time. That is a risk. But we have, as I understand it, a conceptual agreement on the frame work that it is hoped will work that will lead to an improved process that can be used for everybody, with data and input to be created and gathered from faculty that can actually be used. This is a major step forward. If the president and provosts block this after the trial run, we will do our own thing. We will use our instrument and the instrument is being created.

We can do a paper balloting, or a computer balloting. If we are happy with the trial on our own, we can use it, we don't need their permission. But if it works, we will get something great out of it.

What do we risk? We risk some time here. But I think we have to address the resolution, the resolution contemplated us doing our thing, doing it all at once, and working with the administration on an outside evaluation. That is not what is being proposed right now. I think this is the right way to go. I am willing to risk a little bit of time here for what I see a huge upside. I believe, having worked with the President and the Provosts, that if they made a good faith commitment and the trial run works they will stand by it. I don't see a reason not to do it.

**Senator Skeel:** There is absolutely nothing prohibiting us adopting the resolution now and making a new resolution later if we have a problem with how this transpires.

**Senator Olson:** You are absolutely right. There is no need for revocation of the present resolution.

**President Barrett:** Yes, there is. You have to at least vote to put it on hold. I was chewed out at a meeting in December for proposing putting half of it on hold for a while. I am tired of that.

**Senator McSweeney:** This is a Senate process.

**Senator Hoblet:** I really appreciate the conversation, Nick, thanks for the clarification. John, thank you. I like this process, I move that we go forward with the process as proposed. I think it's doable. I think it's user friendly, it's sustainable. We can set this up as a precedent to be done on an annual basis with those that are to be evaluated. Thank you.

**Senator Rouillard:** Is there a time period for this?

**Dr. Dwyer:** I would like to ask Provost Haggett, what timeframe are we talking about, we get it up, people evaluate, and you have your meetings with the respective deans?

**Provost Haggett:** I would imagine that if you get this up, there is a two-week time frame, then you need to decide whether or not you need to re-sample, let's add that up to a month, assuming you get it up in mid February, mid March, conversations with the deans end of March or April.

**Dr. Dwyer:** Okay.

**Senator Dowd:** Please be more specific as to what you're talking about when you speak of aggregating the data. Also, who owns the data and will Faculty Senate get a copy of the raw data? These issues are important because part of the discussion that led to that resolution was that Faculty Senate would get all the data.

**Dr. Dwyer:** Let me clarify. Aggregating meaning there are no individual identifiers in the data. You would get all the comments written about deans, there would be no distinction about who wrote about a certain dean, who wrote the comments.

**Senator Jorgensen:** For deans this would be less than every five years, correct?

**Dr. Dwyer:** Yes. That's why we didn't specify a timeframe because some are on four-year, some on five-year, some came in a year ago. So it would be what is a reasonable interval for giving them feedback.

**Senator Jorgensen:** Also I do not see the reason to rescind the previous motion. I would be fine with a resolution stating I'm pleased with the process, I'm pleased with the survey, that you got this far is a great accomplishment. To say that this process meets the requirement of previous resolution with respect to the deans and still keep open the situation for those above the deans is appropriate. If you rescind the resolution, we have nothing on record saying that the Senate has decided to carry out reviews. The commencements are May 9<sup>th</sup> this year. We don't have much time if decisions have to be made.

**Dr. Dwyer:** I have to leave, so John, or Nick or Roland can answer any more questions. I appreciate your trust in our committee. Thank you very much.

**Senator Olson:** I quote a remark that was made either advertently or inadvertently, "The sense is that the "President would run the assessment of any other administrator," at the Faculty Senate meeting on the First of December. That process would not meet the resolutions passed, but this process, today, does meet the requirement of our previous resolution. I certainly do not wish the previous resolution recalled.

**President Barrett:** We have a proposed motion. We can entertain other questions, but we want to put the motion up and start thinking about the language and whether we want to tweak the language. I have heard Dale Dwyer's full report. If we wish to proceed with the approach he has

outlined, we can say put on hold or meets this element, we will proceed with this for the time being, or however we want to do it. Other questions, comments?

**Senator Nandkeolyar:** Would they consider printed questionnaires in place of a computer?

**Senator Piazza:** We discussed the possibility of making that an option. If enough people feel they would rather submit a paper questionnaire we thought we could make paper evaluations available and they could use the same two-envelope system that is used during elections. One of the reasons we proposed the process that we have is we are fairly confident that, at least we were told by CCI that with a high degree of certainty they would be able to script out any identifying information in such a way that it should not be possible to track back evaluation, even to the computer being used, let alone the person using it. And that was key to us.

**President Barrett:** We discussed the paper evaluation system, and the computer system. If you don't want to use your own terminal, go to your friend's terminal and use theirs, or the library and use a student's terminal. There were two reasons pushing for this direction, one reason was speed. We can aggregate the data collected and turn it around a lot faster. The other thing is having a bifurcated process creates a much bigger issue with regard to keeping things confidential with avoiding the risk of dual reporting. Because with the paper process, it's anonymous and the computer process anonymous so someone could fill out an evaluation one way and then do it again the other way. Thus, there is a bit of a push to go one way or another and speed aggregation favored this as long as we can create a confidential process, which seems to have been done.

**Senator Olson:** With respect to the resolution, we can take the words that the previous resolutions remain in affect.

**President Barrett:** I don't know what that means relative to what I'm supposed to do with those resolutions. They say to pursue an outside evaluation with the president and that we say we want to do our own thing. You can vote for whatever resolution you want but I'm encouraging you not just to say they are in affect. Say it provisionally meets it until we see how the dean process goes, but just to say remain in affect, leaves me hanging.

**Senator Olson:** We can say at this time we are satisfied with the resolution

**President Barrett:** For the time being is satisfied by the resolution.

**Senator Barnes:** Aren't we saying that if it does work we are going to continue?

**President Barrett:** Yes. It will be totally satisfied if the process works out.

**Senator Dowd:** There is nothing in this resolution that says that the process would have to stop.

**President Barrett:** My view is that the committee is still charged with, while this process is going on, tweaking the instrument as necessary in an anticipation of the next step up.

**Senator Piazza:** While this is going on I would encourage you not to confuse the process of how the evaluation is collected with the instrument being used. The instrument being modified while this is going on. The assessment committee is not going to stop work just to watch this thing go on.

**Senator Barlowe:** Call the question.

**President Barrett:** All those in favor of calling the question, please say "aye." Opposed? A couple of "no's". *Motion passed.*

The resolution reads:

*The deans' performance review instrument and collaborative assessment process outlined by Dale Dwyer at the Senate meeting on 2/2/2010 should be adopted and the previous resolutions regarding administrative assessments adopted by the Faculty Senate regarding administrator assessment are for the time being satisfied.*

All in favor vote A - if yes, B if opposed, or C if you abstain. The results, 37 in favor, 2 against, no abstentions. *Motion passed.*

Due to the lateness, I am going to defer Vice Provost Gaboury to a future meeting.



Any items from the floor?

Calendar questions?

**Senator Anderson:** I would like to have a discussion of the furlough policy at a later date and learn who is on the furlough committee.

**President Barrett:** I have a list of the committee members and I will ask Kathy to send it out to all of you.

**Senator Jorgensen:** The furlough policy is on the website and there is a recent statement that you can be fired if you work on those days.

**President Barrett:** As I understand it there will be some sanctions, I don't know if firing is currently anticipated.

**Senator Jorgensen:** Sanctions regarding furlough day? Why would you agree to that? There are other possibilities.

**President Barrett:** We are going to have a presentation on furloughs at a future meeting so hopefully this will be addressed in a formal manner. As a general matter, if you do any work on a furlough day, you are entitled to file for pay on that day by state law. This raises the issue that if you are using the email, which is a work resource, it may trigger liability for the university thereby defeating the purpose of the furlough. That's why we are going to bring someone in to make it clear on how the process will work. I don't think they will be monitoring everybody's email usage.

Any other business?

Any old business? New business? Is there a motion to adjourn?

*Motion was made and seconded.*

**VII. Adjournment:** Meeting adjourned at 6:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Nick Piazza  
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Kathy Gabel  
Faculty Senate Office Administrative  
Secretary

