

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
FACULTY SENATE
<http://www.facsenate.utoledo.edu>
Minutes of the Senate Meeting of March 14, 2006

Approved @ FS mtg. 4/11/06

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.

Chair Jorgensen called the meeting to order. **Senator Barbara Floyd**, Member at Large called the roll.

I. Roll Call –2005-2006 Senators

Present: Barden, Barlowe, Barnes, Barrett, Bischoff, Bopp, Bowyer, Bresnahan, Cluse-Tolar, Edwards (Sullivan), Floyd, Fournier, Hoover, Hudson, Humphrys, Jorgensen, Kennedy, Komuniecki, Lambert, Lipman, Lipscomb, Lundquist, Niamat, Olson, Piazza, Poling, Pope, Reid, Ritchie, Schultz, Sherman, Skeens, Stoudt, Teclhaimanot, Templin, Thompson-Casado, Traband, Tramer, Tucker (Hottell), Wilson, Wolff (41)

Excused: Fridman, Martin, Morrissey, Suter (4)

Unexcused: Ahmed, King, Kunnathur, Spongberg (4)

A quorum was present.

II. Approval of Minutes – Minutes of the February 28, 2006 meeting were not ready for approval, they will be presented for approval next time.

III. Executive Committee Report by Chair, Andrew Jorgensen: The Chair noted that the approval of the minutes will be delayed. Due to some changes at the University some positions have been eliminated. Our full time secretary, Betsy Welsh has been reassigned to the Registrar's Office. Kathy Grabel has taken over the position of Senate secretary. She has been with the University over 20 years and will be carrying on our secretarial duties in the office.

Let me also introduce Peter Kay, our new Director of the Toledo Science and Technology corridor. He has worked in the State of Pennsylvania at the Governor's Office, and also as a President and a CEO of the Erie County Pennsylvania Development. He has now been with us full time for only a few weeks. Welcome. We will expect a full report from him later.

Deb Stoudt wanted me to remind you that elections are going on right now. The final ballots are being prepared. The Elections Committee had a hard time to get enough candidates from some colleges. Encourage your colleagues to vote and to serve if elected. I can't think of a more important year for shared governance than next year.

The Executive Committee has a monthly meeting this Thursday morning with President Johnson. If you have any ideas and comments for this session, please email me by tomorrow. As far as some of the merger material you will get reports from sub-committee co-chairs as indicated on the agenda. The UT-MUO Joint Faculty Synergies Committee had its second meeting today. On the web under Merger Committees there is a complete list of the membership of all merger committees. The Executive Steering Committee is set for tomorrow morning. The Senate Chair serves on that, as does Larry Elmer, Senate President at MUO. My successor as Senate chair will replace me on that group. The merger bill should pass the Ohio

State Senate tomorrow (3/15/06), and on March 31, the Governor is scheduled to be here to sign the merger bill.

There are only 3 (three) Senate meetings left this year:

- Two weeks from today (3/28/06) Dan Johnson will make his last presentation to the Senate,
- April 11
- April 25 will be our election of officers meeting. Also, President Jacobs will be speaking at the end of the session.

Senator Bopp: The T&P workshop - can you give us an update?

Chair Jorgensen: It is March 31 Friday afternoon. We will get this information out ASAP. (Note added later: this has been changed to April 13th.)

IV. Reports:

Thomas Crawford, Student Gov. President and Camie Carrigan, Chair of External Affairs, Think Ohio

Tom Crawford and Camie Carrigan from Student Government reporting on **Think Ohio**. There are several hand-outs here available to you.

- Grass roots campaign – goal is to educate citizens of Ohio about rising cost of public higher education. The Student Government lobbied in Columbus, proposed many solutions, i.e. **The Power of a Penny** initially proposed by Pres. Johnson.
- Target audience – high school students
- Presentations to high school students
- Sent brochures to 1,200 high schools in Ohio
- Brochure directs students to website www.thinkohio.com
- Downloadable PR material
- Online petitions – think team resources
- Legislator contact information
- Forum
- Testimonials
- Received good press coverage and good reviews
- Holding legislator visits across Ohio
- Continues to work with IUC Student Governments
- Train future Think Leaders

Senator Barden: Congratulating them on their efforts. Recommending to add to their website legislative initiatives.

Senator Barrett: Recommended expanding to a referendum area, rather than targeting people.

T. Crawford: Political referenda are extremely expensive. Would have to find a body that would want to help with that. Presently there is no budget or resources for that.

Senator Hoover: Expressed concern that older people, who vote in large numbers, may not have internet connections which may cause them to be overlooked by appeals that depend primarily on the internet.

T. Crawford: According to the OBOR, for every \$1.00 invested in higher education in the State of Ohio, \$3.05 is returned to the economy. Graduating students are in more debt today, than their parents when they purchased their first house. Asked everyone to take some brochures and pass them around to faculty and students.

Report on Diversity Commission

Vice Provost Bresnahan:

- UT Strategic Plan written several years ago, recommended to the President a commission or committee to be set up to give recommendation on improving University diversity. The President in 2002 appointed the present Commission on Diversity. It was also prompted by the UT Mission Statement which talks about celebrating human university, and the “critical importance of diversity to the University’s aspirations.”
- Co-chairs of this commission are Provost Alan Goodridge, and Dean Johnnie Early.
- Previously Rob Sheehan convened the Commission. When she became the Vice Provost she took over that responsibility. The Commission has 25-30 members and they were drawn from university constituents, students, and the community. It continues to meet about every five weeks.
- It was charged by the President with several tasks:
 - To compile data
 - To inventory and assess current initiatives
 - To make recommendations to the President and the administration for ways to improve UT’s diversity.
- A plan was presented to the President last month, please visit the Diversity Commission’s website and read the plan. An undergraduate student is the webmaster. If any of you or your constituents have announcements regarding diversity, let Sheila Doles, the web designer know. The website is: www.diversity.utoledo.edu.
- The Commission believes that excellence and diversity are intertwined - cannot be separated.
- In November first version of the plan was brought to the Commission, in February the plan was approved formally, and Provost transmitted the plan to the President last month.
- Several goals the Commission addressed:
 - To improve the diversity of faculty, staff and students,
 - Restructuring administrative offices charged with diversity. Provost works in her office with Vice President for Student Life, Kaye Patten Wallace in doing just that,
 - Resources need to be devoted if diversity is a priority and accountability be assigned,
 - Reiterate, review and communicate University’s commitment to diversity.
- If you read the plan, you will see the full list of recommendations, highlight a couple of them. Commission recommended to the administration creating an office charged with overseeing diversity on campus.
- Kaye Patten Wallace is initiating the reorganization of the Multicultural Center.
- A project to diversify the portraiture here on campus. Images we see around the campus are not very diverse. When Libbey Hall was renovated all portraits were of white males. After a great deal of searching, now there are three portraits of women. The President endorsed a study of diversity or the lack of diversity in the public portraiture here on campus. Prof. Britton, a public historian, using her class to do inventory of all the portraits, they will make recommendation as to how to diversity the portraiture. This will began making changes in our culture.
- Another project: diversity assessment. The Commission made this recommendation, requests for proposal went out, a small sub-committee working with John Nutter, director of Institutional Research to get the proposals completed; have identified a dozen potential vendors for this outside study.
- Purpose - to get an outside view and assessment on how we are doing on diversity, and to make recommendations to improve.
- Beyond the diversity plan, other steps the Commission is taking. The University strategic plan calls for each college to write its own diversity plan. Next step will be to read and report back to the colleges on their plans.

- Also working on implementation part of the diversity plan; identifying various steps they recommended, identified vice presidential officer responsible for implementing those and are in the process of getting the plan to those offices.
- The Commission is calling this plan organic. If it does not change and grow as resources and needs change and grow, it will not serve the university well. So no one on the Commission feels the work is done because the plan has been sent to the President. This is just the first step of ongoing implementation of a real effort to get the University to pay attention to these issues.
- If we do this right, we will be able to change the culture.

(Hand-out)

Highlights – University of Toledo Presidential Commission on Diversity

Carol Bresnahan, March 14, 2006

I. Background and context

- A. Relation to UT Strategic Plan and Mission (celebrating “human diversity;” “the critical importance of diversity to the University’s aspirations”)
- B. Creation by President Dan Johnson, 2002; membership and chairs (Provost Alan Goodridge; Dean Johnnie Early)
- C. Charge: compile data; inventory and assess current initiatives; study “best practices;” recommend assessment methods; recommend to the President and administration
- D. Commission’s assumption (“Excellence and diversity are inextricably intertwined.”)
- E. Definition of diversity (excerpt): Human diversity...includes, but is not limited to, age, color, ethnicity, gender, religion, disabilities, socio-economic status, sexual orientation, gender identity, and national origin. In promoting diversity, the University pledges to...attract and retain diverse faculty, staff, and students.... The University understands the value that a diverse student body, faculty, staff, and administration bring to its educational environment, the metropolitan community and beyond.

II. Plan for Diversity: overall goals

- A. Improve diversity of faculty, staff and students
- B. Restructure administrative offices charged with diversity
- C. Provide resources at a time of prioritization and budget constraint
- D. Reiterate, review, renew and communicate a commitment to diversity

III. Plan for Diversity: examples of recommendations

- A. Create an office charged with overseeing diversity on campus
- B. Diversify public portraiture
- C. Create a diversity lecture series
- D. Commission a diversity assessment
- E. Various action plan steps (e.g., initiate a pay equity study)

IV. Beyond the Plan

- A. College-specific plans (called for in UT Strategic Plan)
- B. Implementation matrix, with responsible offices identified
- C. Plan as organic
- D. Continual updating of website: www.diversity.utoledo.edu
- E. Change the climate

Chair Jorgensen: Any questions?

Senator Skeens: How do we plan to change the climate?

V.Provost Bresnahan: It will take a long term commitment. In the 90's there were a couple of attempts to do something with the diversity here. But there was no will to implement them, and there were no resources for them. If we make a vice-presidential level officer responsible for implementing this plan, then we will get it done. A huge responsibility is assessing and assigning responsibility and taking accountability. She talked briefly with Dr. Jacobs and hopefully he will carry on Dan Johnson's commitment to diversity.

Senator Skeens: That was not a negative question, I am all for it.

V. Calendar Questions

Log Item 0506-04 and 0506-05

Chair Jorgensen: This report is by John Barrett, Chair of the Constitution & Rules Committee. There are two hand-outs related to this. The second document has an additional appendix on the situation at other institutions. Because it is quite lengthy, it will be sent to you electronically.

Senator Barrett: We were charged with two items on the Constitution & Rules Committee, the merger put us all in a quandary as to how we should proceed. First issue:

- The election procedure for UCAP. The collective bargaining agreement governs most of the colleges. The index and the policy manual are not consistent with the current bargaining agreement.
- Conforming changes need to be in line with the collective bargaining agreement.
- College of Law is not in a bargaining agreement; so we need a procedure for it and for any other college that is not part of the collective bargaining agreement.
- Committee recommends moving away from FS electing UCAP, or to having each individual college's bargaining unit do it, for conformity and consistency any college without a collective bargaining unit, should have its Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty elect UCAP representatives. Neutral language was inserted in the proposed changes to accomplish this.

Number 0506-04, it's a motion at the bottom of first page from a committee - needs no second. Before we go to the motion, the merger issue needs to be discussed now. Do we want to deal with this now? UCAP is basically elected this way anyways.

- Constitution change will require University wide vote.
- Will have a number of constitutional changes next year.
- Do we want to keep this report on file for next year? The language works with what we need to do.

Chair Jorgensen: We have to pass it by more than the Senate.

Senator Floyd: If this is a change to the appendix, it does not require a university-wide vote. We changed the appendix a couple of years ago to clarify the voting, when there was some confusion in the election process.

Senator Barrett: The appendix has a policy manual that has to be changed.

Senator Floyd: I don't think the appendix requires a university-wide vote.

Senator Bowyer: Collective bargaining unit applies to Tenure track faculty and lectures. We have this issue in our college, as to who could vote on certain things. If someone is a full-time instructor but not on a tenure track, then they cannot vote.

Senator Barrett: I am at a little bit of a disadvantage here since I am not in the collective bargaining unit, but the language referring to schools who don't have one is listed pretty much word for word from the collective bargaining unit agreement itself, that governs tenure and tenure track faculty.

Senator Bowyer: This would imply that when you send out a ballot from FS, it can only be sent to people who are tenure track or tenured and not lecturers.

Chair Jorgensen: Yes.

Senator Barrett: That's the way the contract requires it to be conducted for you all.

Senator Olson: Modifying the appendix to the Constitution depends on the way the appendix was formed to the constitution. If the Constitution recognizes the appendix in such a way that it is a part of the Constitution, then it requires the full constitutional amendment procedure. If the appendix is like the by-laws that may be formulated later, then it can be modified as Dr. Floyd indicated. So, it goes back to how was this appendix created in the first place.

Senator Barrett: I can't answer that. I was told this was going to require a full faculty vote. Have not investigated it one way or another. I am not sure it affects how we are going to proceed. Do we want to change our constitution right now? We will be making a lot of changes next year.

Senator Olson: I support tabling any action on the constitution itself.

Senator Bowyer: If we are just following the collective bargaining agreement, when the agreement changes, we would have to change the constitution again.

Senator Wolff: People who are not members of the bargaining unit like the Law School are not governed by the collective bargaining agreement, so the question is how the Law School will deal with the issues of UCAP elections is up to the senate.

Senator Bowyer: It would make more sense to say, we are abiding by the contract.

Senator Barrett: This says for those under the contract, we're abiding by the contract; for those not in the contract, here is the procedure. Not entirely clear why the voting procedure was changed either, but made the changes because was told to make them. The collective bargaining agreement had been done, not sure as Senate that we should be in favor of that.

Senator Olson: Only resolution is to indicate in the constitution that the bargaining unit shall constitute the UCAP for the bargaining unit members separate from this constitution. UCAP under this constitution only applies to those members not in the bargaining unit.

Chair Jorgensen: We could pass the change to the appendix today, but we couldn't change the policies and procedures manual, which is somewhat outdated.

Senator Stoudt: I would like to weigh in on this as Chair of the Elections Committee. The Elections Committee needs clear, unambiguous guidelines and should not be put into the position of having to interpret the Constitution or the Rules, as was the case several times this year. The entire Faculty Senate should vote on this matter.

Senator Wilson: I agree with Senator Stoudt 100%. This resolution will not change what we do. It will legitimize what we already do. And for this reason we need to vote on it.

Chair Jorgensen: Looks like we would be making other changes on continuity. Should we hold off, so that we only do one vote?

Senator Barrett: Our approach was that this included a second form of changes for how to deal with people that fall outside of it. Assuming that the collective bargaining unit agreement isn't going to change.

Chair Jorgensen: So, then it is a motion on Log #0506-04, motion from the committee to change the appendix to the FS Constitution and the University Policy Manual, which is all on second page. Motion needs no second from the Committee, discussion of the motion deferred.

Senator Wilson: I move the previous question.

Chair Jorgensen: No further debate is allowed before we vote on the question. All those in favor of calling the question of whether to vote or not, please say "Aye" if you are in favor of calling the vote

right now. The call for the question is passed. Now we will vote to approve the amendments. All those in favor please say 'Aye',. **Motion passed.** All those in favor raise your hand, so that Senator Floyd can get a count of hands. Counted 39. All those opposed please raise your hand. It's unanimous. Next item – 0506-05 is a little more complex.

Senator Barrett: Second charge for the committee: to look into ways to provide more continuity to FSEC. Year to year we have an almost completely different FSEC with the way it is elected. The only continuity we have – the former chair of FS who is on the FSEC is a non-voting ex-officio in the following year. Surveyed approximately 40 Ohio institutions to see what they do, that appendix is not here. We will be working closely with MUO in the future, so we considered their approach carefully. MUO has opposite problem of us - too much continuity in the form of one person, their president, who serves an interminable amount of time on the Executive Committee. They serve both as president elect, past president in voting capacity. Each being a multi-year term. With 40 different schools examined, we encountered 40 different approaches. The best way to achieve continuity is to have as many perspectives as possible. Having two people provides best continuity, instead of one. Going in to overly long period is a mistake; if you get the wrong person, you're stuck. If you rely on one person, and that person leaves or retires, etc., you lose continuity. Two people for a slightly long period made more sense. Discussed which term – could be a person elected at-large; two-year term or staggered; could have a president, chair and vice-chair. What if the vice-chair becomes the chair, then you lose one of the two. Without a strong endorsement of this as the only way to get continuity, our committee recommends, having the chair continue as a past chair, and the secretary continues as the past secretary in the voting capacity as the best way. Secretaries rarely will move to become chairs, so it's unlikely to have that voting problem to lose a spot, the ways you might with a vice-chair. In our situation, the chair, secretary and the vice-chair may not be senators the following year. Made provisions in the recommendations to allow the past president, or the past chair and past secretary to serve on the Executive Committee only in the subsequent year, regardless whether they remain senators. Decided to have the vice chair act as OBOR representative to make them aware what is going on in the FSEC. We don't have any requirement for that. Do we want the chair to do that. The chair has a lot to do already, vice-chair should be the representative to OBOR.

Chair Jorgensen: Right now we have two at-large reps to the executive committee who each serve one year. We could think about at-large reps elected to two years for the EC with staggered terms, so they would overlap. That's another option. Right now you are not suggesting official change?

Senator Barrett: Right now - no major change in this area, given that there is a merger, and that we will probably move forward with some combined policies. How to have continuity in the new regime - we can accomplish this next year in a more flexible means by electing the appropriate people to various spots and getting this in place informally rather than formally. It seems awkward to make a major change now before a merger.

Chair Jorgensen: There will not be one Faculty Senate next year, and highly unlikely there will be one Faculty Senate the year after that. Our Faculty Senate will exist in this general form for a couple of years. Their Faculty Senate is very different and their leadership could be 6 years Their Senators are elected for two years terms, not staggered. Their executive committee is appointed by the president. Our Executive Committee meets with Pres. Johnson once a month, we also with the Provost every two weeks. This is an important representation for faculty.

Senator Barrett: Talking to Larry Elmer of MUO, their sense is that they need changes, some things are broken. We have things we need to improve on. What's needed is a move on both sides toward a more middle position.

Senator Olson: I'm in favor of this. As a new member joining the Executive Committee in May of last year, I had no concept of what happened with the senior leadership of the University in the previous year. We were asked to make several decisions over the summer that we had very little basis to go on. It will be useful to have at least 2 people to give this continuity. It will be helpful to train new members that come to Executive Committee and what is expected. I had a total different assignment of duties than expected. I speak in favor of what Senator Barrett has done here, and I agree to make the vice-

chair the OBOR rep. Things that go to OBOR should come out of the Executive Committee. Things that go on at OBOR should come back to Executive Committee. They should not operate independently as they had for a number of years.

Chair Jorgensen: You are in favor of the 2-year term?

Senator Olson: Having that as a part of the Executive Committee should improve our operation. I speak very much in favor of what has been proposed here.

Chair Jorgensen: The new chair as a courtesy has invited the immediate past chair to be a member of the Executive Committee, but not an official member. Mike does attend the EC meetings.

Michael Dowd: It is less important whether we formalize the change, given the environment of the merger continuity issue will be very important. At least two members of the Exec. Committee should continue to next year.

Chair Jorgensen: The issue then is should we make a formal change now, or when elections come up, for example when two people are elected to one-year terms of the EC. One present member is going off the Senate, but the other is available for re-election to the EC.

Senator Ritchie: Has the Executive Committee given thought to electing a Chair-elect who would then serve a year on EC before their year as Chair?

Senator Barrett: We are a little concerned as to when people are being elected and how much experience they have as senators. Understanding that you cannot be elected to these positions unless you're in Senate. You have to elect somebody either in their first year of Senate service, (and it seems way too early), or restrict it to after the first year of service, then you are eliminating the pool to the second year senators. Having your average chair three-years of Senate then you get an extra year of them afterwards, was the better approach then getting somebody potentially more junior in their overall experience. You could go either way.

Chair Jorgensen: You would be electing from a pool of only 16 people in their first year. Then as your chair, you select from the 16 who were second-year people.

Senator Barrett: Our committee felt strongly that continuity was a pressing issue with the merger. Keeping this institutional history going next year is valuable.

Chair Jorgensen: What's the bottom line – make formal changes now or when elections come up with the explanation of the situation for who should be re-elected?

Senator Bowyer: Is your recommendation that we should vote on the motion?

Senator Barrett: That was our recommendation.

Senator Edwards: Somebody should move and second it as we did with the other item, a change in the appendix not requiring a University wide vote. Your committee did not approve this formally as I understand, so this would be the procedure.

Chair Jorgensen: After voted on by faculty?

Senator Olson: Looking at the motion, they both are appendixes.

Senator Edwards: I make a motion that we vote to accept the changes in the appendix that the Committee suggested for continuity on the Faculty Senate Executive Committee

Senator Olson: Seconded it.

Chair Jorgensen: Mary Ellen Edwards made a motion, Walt Olson seconded it.

Senator Traband: If we went with the new procedure for this upcoming election, we could elect new people and it could possibly hinder our desire to insure that there was continuity during the upcoming year.

Chair Jorgensen: What you are saying is that when people are elected this time, when I was elected chair, there was no assumption I was going to continue. So in an informal way make it clear we want some continuity.

Senator Wolff: For OBOR, MUO has a representative, and we have a representative. What will happen when we are a merged university?

Chair Jorgensen: Does anything come to a vote at the OBOR group?

Chair Jorgensen: You can still have this continuity for next year. In the following year it could be as voted as we talked about, and the past chair could be invited as a courtesy on Executive Committee. The group elected in April could be in the following term.

Senator Olson: The exact point I wanted to make, I don't believe voting on this limits us from doing the informal first, and this one formally thereafter.

Senator Komuniecki: This answers my question and I agree with Walt that it's a good idea to have that continuity.

Chair Jorgensen: When I was a Senate chair about six years ago, I was automatically the OBOR rep.

Senator Barrett: If it's acceptable to people, I would alternatively draft up a proper set of actual language amendments that we could vote on at the next Faculty Senate meeting. That way if there is something in the Constitution itself, it needs to be dealt with, and we will know at that time.

Senator Bowyer: Made a motion to table it.

Chair Jorgensen: Asked for all those in favor to table the motion to say "Aye". Unanimously tabled.

Senator Barrett: Will get more specific resolution for the next Faculty Senate meeting.

VI. Other Business

Chair Jorgensen: Under Old Business

Old Business:

Chair Jorgensen: I asked co-chairs of the Merger Task Force to give an update. There are five sub-committees of the UT/MUO Synergies Task Force with faculty from each campus. Each has two co-chairs two alternates. Larry Elmer, President of Faculty Senate and I serve as co-chairs, and one administrator from each campus, serve as ex-officio Nagi Naganathan from here and one of the deans from over there. Graduate Council Chair Tom Barden is also ex officio. Minutes are being sent to the co-chairs, and task force. Task force met for the second time today. Nick Piazza is Co-chair of Student Affairs and Deb Stoudt is his alternate. Nick will speak first updating on student affairs. Also on that sub-committee are Tom Dunn and Tracy Szirony.

Senator Piazza: Looking at student life and a number of issues related to that, the concern is on how the merger will affect the students and the quality of life; academic and social experience; how the curriculum will be affected by the merger if part on the Bancroft Campus and part on the MUO Campus. We don't have a student representatives present today. Would like his committee to solicit some folks involved in Student Life and get their prospective. Any questions?

Senator Lipman: To be on a campus that is potentially off the map for students it's really a shock. The economics of Auxiliary Services that seems to drive a lot of students away that were used to have real issues with respect to getting services, such as bus service for example.

Senator Piazza: That is a real concern. The committee has to have a real model and what it means – student senators – to provide the services that merit that designation. We're getting a non-named campus.

They do have a good banquet facility there.

Senator Lipman: That's a good start.

Senator Bowyer: Transportation issue is a real concern. The issue such as the 15 min. between classes, is that sufficient, now that we are geographically expanding campuses. At times to get from Bancroft to Scott Park takes more than 15 min.

Chair Jorgensen: Technically there is only 10 min. between classes.

Senator Bowyer: On Monday, Wednesday, Tuesday and Thursday it's normally 15 minutes.

Chair Jorgensen: Some odd schedules are like that, but the standard is Monday, Wednesday and Friday with 10 min. between classes. There is regular bus service to Scott Park Campus and to the Art Campus. There are three buses a day to MUO, and they are getting reduced because students are not riding the buses.

Senator Bowyer: There might be in the future at some point some program and the students may not have enough time to get to the class. Ten minutes is insufficient, as is fifteen if you have classes at Scott Park or MUO.

Chair Jorgensen: Students don't schedule classes back to back. Some universities schedule classes at the half hour and not the hour.

Senator Piazza: Discussed doing the first two years on the Bancroft Campus and the next two years on the MUO campus to avoid those kinds of problems. Other issues such as Bancroft Campus has all the dorms, then taking classes at MUO, there will be some big things to deal with.

Senator Olson: We have lived with all of the issues heard here since my arrival, and probably before. All the lack of vendor services, the scheduling of classes, the 10 minutes between classes, and that students have to cross totally different campus to get to Engineering, have been lived with for years. It could be rectified.

Chair Jorgensen: Report from Barbara Floyd, Co-Chair of Shared Governance Committee. Her alternate on that is Curt Black

Senator Floyd: Curt Black and Vijay Goel are the other UT representatives on the committee. The charge of our committee is to look at the unique culture and history of each institution and how that has affected the development of shared governance on each campus.

- Decided on two-prong approach:
 - To assess the informal ways governance is shared on both campuses
 - To assess the formal ways through written policies, procedures and constitutions.
- As to perceptions of shared governance, we would like to have had a survey, and assess scientifically the perceptions, but we don't have that kind of luxury of time required to do so.
- From the experience of the people on the committee who have a sense of these things, we asked each of the respective faculty, UT and MUO, to draw up one page assessment of how they feel governance is shared on their campuses.
- We came up with a list of about 30-40 ways in which the two campus differ in regards to faculty's perceptions of shared governance.
- We summarized these to about 10. If you don't agree with those perceptions, please let me know:
 1. At **UT** there is a long history and tradition of shared governance.
 2. There is expectation that faculty will be consulted on decisions even on non-academic matters.
 3. The nature of decision making, that results from faculty consultations is different from a traditional business model of management.
 4. The diversity of academic interest among our faculty including the important role of Arts, Humanities and the Social Sciences on this campus
 5. The existence of a collective bargaining agreement that describes processes for making personnel decisions
 1. For **MUO** the difference is the fact that their individual colleges are autonomous.
 2. There is a lack of a faculty union and that has resulted in lack of uniformity in the way personnel decisions are made.
 3. Lack of long history of the institution. There is a sense that the institution is still evolving and trying to find out what it is as a University.
 4. There is a large business attached to their academic institution.
 5. Many of their faculty are clinical faculty, which colors the way they think governance should be shared.
- Next we will look at policies and analyze their culture, and see where the differences lie.
- Lastly, we will look at the two faculty senate issues and come up with suggestions if we want to merge the two senate, and how it might look, as it is decided on what we want to do with this information.

Chair Jorgensen: Any comments?

Senator Olson: Part of the charge of this committee was to set up a central point of communication. Has that been done?

Senator Floyd: No. We haven't had an opportunity to look at procedural issues. It was more of a collective discussion. Once that is addressed, we will figure out how the sub-committees will communicate to the other merger committee through our committee. Also, I want to point out Tom Barden is ex-officio member of the task force.

Senator Komuniecki: I would like to comment on some differences between the two campuses. On our campus we have an elective body, Graduate Council, that oversees graduate curriculum, policies and programs. On their campus, they have a Graduate Executive Committee comprised of Associate Deans of the Colleges and Program Directors responsible for those functions.

Senator Floyd: The curriculum issue is really big-one because at UT curriculum is approved by a faculty body, either this group or Graduate Council. At MUO, curriculum changes are decided within colleges themselves. This is because graduate colleges don't have a core curriculum issue, so what one college does, doesn't have to be approved by another.

Chair Jorgensen: A question has been posed: does the UT Faculty Senate really represent the faculty? We all would reply a strong 'yes'. We are elected by officials, we have regulations. We want to make sure that we maintain that role of official representative of faculty.

Vince Mauro, from the College of Pharmacy, will now report as the Co-Chair of the College Alignments sub-committee. Julie Thomas of MUO is the other co-chair, alternates from here are Chuck Armstrong from HHS, and other members from UT are Debra Boardley and John Cryan.

Vince Mauro: We asked Nick Piazza to be a guest at all our meetings to make sure we got good representation of HHS, Julie Thomas is a co-chair at MUO, she is in Occupational Therapy with Health Sciences. The three other MUO members are in the College of Nursing. We met on March 3, 2006, and we addressed the charge brought to us by the General Faculty Synergies Task Force to identify issues relevant to our sub-committee.

- First, our committee is on a various work groups at the University level. Julie Thomas and Nick Piazza are in the College of Nursing Health & Human Sciences.
- With respect to the College of Pharmacy work group, I am on that committee. Within that committee there is a good representation.

We felt comfortable with representation of work groups at the University level. Then we tried to identify issues that we foresaw relative to our charge. One of them, if there is to be relocation, that it won't interrupt any educations programs, or ongoing research, and that any space is at least equal or better than we have now. That has been shared with the Pharmacy work group. We wanted to share this with the College of Nursing.

- Other issues – is there any talk regarding logistical issues; any possibility this college could be split up by departments, within departments there are logistical issues, if a college was split between two campuses.
- Question was also raised whether a merger would have an impact on two-year degrees.
- Other issues – UT, BGSU, MUO have a consortium, what implications would the merger have.
- Owens Community College conducts classes at MUO, UT's competitor.
- With merger, any programs or departments that would have a diminished perception.

Chair Jorgensen: Very complex issues, with College of Pharmacy and the collective bargaining unit on this campus. Very interesting case.

Senator Lipman: With so much buzz about college structure, keep us current, so that what is a rumor is relegated to the rumor file, and what is of substance that has been evolving discussion of merit that we simply recognize. Everyone is keenly concerned about that.

Vince Mauro: Some issues just raised with Nick about the bus service was brought up to the Pharmacy work group. If we are cutting bus service, then Pharmacy students being at MUO will be affected. Administrators caught wind of that and will look at that in hopes to reconsider this plan.

Senator Lipman: The students that ride the UT buses or TARTA buses are those students with special needs and do not drive their own cars? We have to realize there are substantial cohorts of students that will be affected.

Senator Bowyer: Ideally, we can solve the issue and have the first two years on the Bancroft Campus and the last two years, or four years, whatever, on the MUO campus. I have students monitoring in business, who are seniors in the Pharmacy program, it isn't a simple thing. If you stay at MUO and want to take a minor of other courses in any of our fields here, it isn't as simple as just subdividing, and say you spent two years here and two or four years there.

Vince Mauro: I concur and that issue has been raised.

Chair Jorgensen: We have a large group of undergraduate students in the College of Pharmacy - about 550 of 3,000 first year students. We want to make sure we continue to recruit them to the University of Toledo.

Senator Lipscomb: I presume the committee will be assessing potential restructure. Where will the ideas of restructuring going to come from? Will they come from faculty or administration?

Vince Mauro: Can you be specific on what you mean by restructure?

Senator Lipscomb: Potentially splitting a college, or combining, or relocating from one location to another.

Vince Mauro: First we identified issues; we wanted to have faculty representatives of the work crews that would be involved in such discussions. Nick Piazza, Julie Thomas are with College of Nursing. What's the official title of College of Nursing group?

Senator Piazza: Official title is UT/MUO College of Nursing, College of Health Sciences, College of Health and Human Services Work Group.

Vince Mauro: There are representations, "bird dogs", and our administration is on that work group. They will be the "ears" for College of Pharmacy. Will stay in touch and bring back to the FS in general, anything that we need to address. From Pharmacy stand point, there is nothing of alertness at present.

Chair Jorgensen: Any senator has the floor during Senate. Six weeks from today it's our last meeting of the year for us as representatives of the faculty. There will be an opportunity for us to make a statement regarding our review of the merger process to date. The sub-committees have been monitoring what has been going on. Our sub-committees are not going to make a decision on college alignment, but they may make recommendations on process and principles.

Michael Dowd: Last time a major change was made, the Provost brought the change to the Senate and Graduate Council for endorsement. There should be a very strong expectation that any proposed change would also come to Senate and Graduate Council.

Chair Jorgensen: I have made that statement and noted that that was the model.

Senator Edwards: I do want to make sure that the College of Education is represented in these discussions about programs in the College of Health and Human Services as we have several programs like health ed., and school counseling that are in both colleges.

Chair Jorgensen: We put everyone on sub-committees who wanted to serve, and there was no limit. No one was turned down for sub-committees. Next, is John Barrett, John is the co-chair of the Non-Personnel Policies and Procedures. The other co-chair from MUO is Joseph Margiotta. John's alternate is Ron Fournier. Also on the subcommittee from our campus is Wes Bullock, Patsy Komuniecki and Anand Kunnathur.

Senator Barrett: Our committee is in the data collection phase. We received only one submission outside the committee members of any ideas or concerns. People want addressed on the non-personnel policies and procedures. It is my sense there are multiple levels and stages in every merger. We won't get all the details worked out in the next few months. Key point of this committee is to identify major issues that need to be addressed now, and to identify those that may come down the road, such as

moving research labs, coordinating parking between two campuses, and how do we want this to work; to establish a process for approval, whether it's by the Senate or another body. We need to develop reasonable, well thought-out suggestions and a solid set of procedures.

Chair Jorgensen: This will not end when the school year ends, the Senate should monitor this through the summer. It is my view that the new Senate chair will replace me on the Executive Steering Committee.

Harvey will now speak for the Personnel Issues Subcommittee. The co-chair is Jeanne Funk with Bill McNerney, from Education as the alternate. The other UT members include Harvey Wolff and Mylo Jennings.

Senator Wolff: From the draft of the report of the university we discussed possible tasks for the personnel sub-committee, however, the charge issues as areas of concern by the UT AAP contract, are a subject to the negotiations process that is specified in the contract.

MUO representatives identified issues:

- Benefits; length of contract; difference between the nine, ten, and twelve month contracts; shared governance; some departments could be combined and could have bargaining unit and non bargaining unit faculty members in the same department,
- Tuition forgiveness for children of MUO employees attending UT; MUO faculty faced with a UT contract; academic freedom/faculty rights and responsibilities; mechanism for representation from both entities,
- We have an electoral representative and FS chair on the Board of Trustees, they do not have that at MUO,
- When combined, would there be a separate representative from MUO; sub-committee members could not reach consensus on whether or not the faculty at UT and MUO would want one voice on most issues, or whether the difference would make this non-viable,
- Discussion on whether there should be two faculty senates or one. Further meetings under discussion if needed.

Chair Jorgensen: Any comments for Harvey? The subcommittees can't resolve bargaining issues, but they can do things like research what goes on. For example, I would like to see a summary of issues at MUO. They would like to see a summary of ours. I suggested that the co-chairs look at Wayne State and the University of Cincinnati, both universities with medical school and with collective bargaining. MUO faculty are in some aspects are envious of our Senate. They would very much want to be like us in some ways.

Senator Komuniecki: I might comment that there is a medical school culture that is different for our culture of shared governance. There is this disconnect between what they think is important and what we think is important.

Chair Jorgensen: We are alternating campuses, 50 % of the meetings here and 50% there, and I did request a one-on-one appointment with President Jacobs, as I have with President Dan Johnson. I will be meeting with him in two weeks.

Senator Lipscomb: There is a difference between clinical faculty and basic science faculty. Basic science faculty is more like us, clinical faculty are patients. Some of their salaries come from the university but a lot of it comes from seeing patients. Their colleges are different too, not clear at this point how. There was some discussion as to the difference between school of nursing and the way they operate.

Chair Jorgensen: I believe that approximately 40% of their faculty are clinical people.

Senator Wolff: There is an interest at MUO about forming a union, they had an organizer come in. Once the merger is done, there will be some determination about this question of community interest to decide whether they are separate, or not, then we will see how are we going to proceed after that.

Chair Jorgensen: No policies are changed until after the merger.

Chair Jorgensen: I sent in the minutes of the task force, that went to Penny Poplin Gosetti and that will be on the web. On the web you will see the membership list of all 16 groups. Don't look under *Transition Team*, look under *Documents*.

Senator Komuniecki: Where does research fit in on the org chart, I noticed there is no longer a V.P.?

Chair Jorgensen: We don't have a V.P. for Research, we have associates.

Senator Komuniecki: Right, so then do we have a Vice-Provost for Research?

Chair Jorgensen: What is Frank Calzonetti?

Michael Dowd: He is a Vice-provost.

Chair Jorgensen: You will note that Larry and I are both listed as direct reports to the president. There are a lot of questions, including the enrollment management and integrated marketing. Any other questions or comments?

New Business: None

VII. Adjournment: Chair Jorgensen adjourned the meeting at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven J. Martin
FS Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Kathy Grabel
Faculty Senate Office Admin. Secretary