

**THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO**  
**Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of November 18, 2014**  
**FACULTY SENATE**

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

Approved @ FS meeting on 1/20/2015

---

**Summary of Senate Business**

Presentations By:

Rhonda Rene Wingfield, Director, Office of Financial Planning, Analysis & Budget, Interim  
CEO UT Innovation Enterprises- update on UTIE

William Pierce, Director of Undergraduate Admission, Student Recruitment

Mike Dowd, Faculty Senate Executive Committee- At-Large-Member, Introduction to the  
possibility of FS policy on centers and institutes

---

**Note:** The remarks of the Senators and others are summarized and not verbatim. The taped recording of this meeting is available in the Faculty Senate office or in the University Archives.

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

**I. Roll Call: 2014-2015 Senators:**

**Present: Present:** Bailey, Barnes, Black, Brakel, Burnett, Cappelletty, Compura, Denyer, Devabhaktuni, Dowd, Duhon, Edinger, Ellis, Giovannucci, Gohara, Gray, Gunning, Hasaan-Elnaby, Hoblet, Humphrys, Keith, Kennedy, Kistner, Krantz, Lundquist, Malhotra, McAfee, Molitor, Nathan, Plenefisch, Porter, Prior, Quinlan, Quinn (L. Anderson), Randolph, Relue, Rouillard, Slantcheva-Durst (N. Piazza), Springman, Srinivasan, Teclehaimanot, A. Thompson, G. Thompson, Thompson-Casado, Van Hoy, Weck-Schwarz, Den White, Don White, Williams

**Excused absences:** Brickman, Elmer, Lee, Nigem, Sheldon, Wedding

**Unexcused absences:** Boardley, Caruso, Crist, Duggan, Farrell, Hammersley, Monsos, Ohlinger, Schafer, Federman, Harmych, Skeel

**III. Approval of Minutes:** Minutes from the September 16, 2014 Faculty Senate meeting are ready for approval.

**President Hoblet:** Thank you, Senator Duhon for calling the roll. Did everyone receive the September 16<sup>th</sup> meeting Minutes? Do I have a motion to approve/edit? All in favor of approving the September 16, 2014 Faculty Senate meeting Minutes as distributed please signify by saying aye. Any opposed? Any objections? *Minutes are approved.*

The Executive Committee report: We've been busy. The Faculty Senate has continued to work with administration, Student Government, and faculty throughout the university in the last two weeks. We are very involved in trying to address compliance with the Americans<sup>2</sup> with Disabilities Act (ADA) within the university. A taskforce has been formed as you know. We brought it up at the September meeting on note taking and we are working very diligently with Kelly Moore out of the Provost Office to make sure that we can address a smorgasbord of compliance issues and accommodations for our students,

compliance issues for our organization, and the respect for faculty intellectual property. We are still working on that and we are coming up with some really good output. Then it will be taken to each individual college to determine how the college wants to address it. Maybe take it down to the department and the department may want to address it in a variety of fashions. It could range from paying an outside note taking service to actually take notes to looking at graduate assistantships. We know, we did a calculation and we know that compliance with ADA has a cost associated with it. How we use that cost internally within each of our colleges is very individualized, so that is being formed right now and we will be hearing much more about that. Along those same lines, thanks to Sibylle Weck-Schwarz who brought to our attention the IT policy that I distributed two weeks ago- we met with the Provost Office and we are going to meet with David Cutri. We are looking at pretty much dissecting that policy from faculty standpoint to say again, doing the same type of thing. What is the actual cost for the organization associated with compliance with ADA along the lines of IT? If you are posting something on your Blackboard side, how much is it going to cost to get that handled from the institution technology platform to accommodate a variety of student types? So again, we are looking at all these issues and we will continue to report back as developments are made.

Over the past month-and-a-half Faculty Senate members have also been working with Terry Romer to use demonstration software on curriculum tracking. I think the consensus of this group is pretty much that we are really behind the eight-ball when it comes to curriculum tracking. This home grown curriculum tracking system that is very faculty and human resource intensive to move it through each stage of the process internally and get it to the approval process at the state is absolutely archaic here at the University of Toledo. So, that group continues to meet Terry Roemer and I think that it is not going to be an overnight decision, it's going to have to be budgeted for. But they are looking at that to help us so that faculty and department chairs don't have to spend hours upon end looking at, "oh, students registered for this class, have they completed all the prerequisites and have they passed all the prerequisite courses, should they be promoted to the next level? And are approved to take these courses?" This has taken faculty and department chairs an enormous amount of time, so hopefully some of those issues will be addressed as well. Faculty Senate have all been included in, which is the first time since I've been on Faculty Senate Exec in Dr. Naganathan's All Day Leadership meetings. And I don't mean just myself and the president-elect or the past-president which has been a lot of times in the past, but every Faculty Senate Executive Committee member has been invited to those meetings and I think that is so important because it helps for administrative leaders to sit at tables with faculty leadership and hear our ideas and hear us refer to experts within a variety of colleges within the university instead of having sort of a narrow perspective on how to get things done. So, my big motto is: one mission, one vision, one UT. And I think those types of activities that are being initiated then are helping to get us to that place again where faculty feel comfortable with reengaging with the university. The process for defining general education and specificity about inclusion in the Ohio Transfer Module appears to be almost at a final point for approval at the state level. The requirement by the state for general education course approval to be in the OTM continues to plague us from a variety of perspectives. The University of Toledo has submitted courses for inclusion in the OTM that have not been approved at the state level. These courses are unique specifically to the university Honors program. As a Faculty Senate we feel strongly that these courses are only one example of how education in Ohio is being put through sort of a "cookie cutter" approach, particularly gen ed. and the Ohio Transfer Module and it really limits universities, particularly public universities having the ability to distinguish themselves. So again, we, past-president Rouillard and Senator

Humphrys composed a wonderful message to the Ohio Faculty Council about this very issue and laid out in a wonderful order about how we are really limited in Ohio by this process and that we are going to have difficulty distinguishing ourselves. The same type of thing looking at APA- because our requirements to accommodate students, especially from an IT perspective is it is going to force faculty to limit what they put online because we don't have means to help students with accommodations for those courses. We continue to address these issues and will continue. We've been working with the Provost Office during this time and we are all aware of the transition to the 36 hours of general education and a move towards a minimum of 120 hr. program requirement so that every course doesn't require adjusting to more change.

Faculty Senate has also been working with the Provost Office on the current grading policy. That policy was altered in 2011 and now the comments from faculty are incorporated into our policy. It impacts us being able to individually work with students over the course of more than one semester to complete course work. And we know that some students, I have a son who is one of those wonderful examples of brilliance, but has a hard time organizing and so it can take him two semesters to finish work on an "Incomplete." So we don't want to automatically fail those students, so we have members engaged with the Provost Office to actively look at that policy. It allows faculty the flexibility to work with their students to retain students and to move them forward.

Faculty Senate continues to work with Student Governance on the issues and concerns. Student Governance has a big concern about the updated Student Union. We've seen lots of improvements. Hopefully members don't mind, but I was at a meeting the other day where a fellow faculty shared why a student didn't want to come here and one of his big concerns was because of the lack of upgrades to the Student Union with student services in this institution- that's a concern for all of us. Student Government is also concerned about meaningful evaluation processes for courses for faculty within the university. They are very worried that Rate My Professor is becoming a tool of choice for students to take courses. And when a student looks at Rate My Professor and a course is rated at a high level, it doesn't mean a student is going to get the most from that course, often times that is an easy A, whereas, you talk to some serious students they don't necessarily want the easy A, they want to learn about the content in that course. So our Student Government realizes that which is very refreshing, so hopefully we will be able to have a task force in the Spring semester to work with some students on doing something to move our evaluation processes forward.

The Faculty Senate has distributed the deans' evaluation tool to all deans within the university for their review and feedback and that is a coordination process and effort to have a smooth evaluation process occurring in the Spring 2015. The Faculty Senate continues to attend all Board of Trustees meetings and there are a lot of those. Yesterday was great- they approved the Institute on Human Trafficking at the Board meeting and representatives were both there as well as our district attorney, Julia Bates. Faculty Senate has participated as requested in the president's holiday reception. Faculty Senate has invited the Board of Trustees chairman and Vice chairman to come update Faculty Senate on actions and initiatives and their perspective on the state of the university. Unfortunately, both have declined due to as they say, "scheduling conflict." In a response the Faculty Senate Exec has sent the calendar meetings of the 2015 semester to them requesting that they come to the first meeting in January and they are able to un-conflict; if they are not able to solve and resolve conflicts to attend that meeting I have requested that other Board of Trustees members be contacted to see if they can attend.

All Faculty Senate Committees, except for the Constitution and Rules Committee have been notified and seated. I am confirming chairmanship of every one of those committees so they should be calling those meetings. Other new issues and items have come up to Faculty Senate Exec pretty much on a weekly basis and we try to troubleshoot and do our best at those.

It seems appropriate this time of year, particularly with all I've gone through and some of the things I know you all have gone through this year to tell you how thankful I am for my Executive Committee, my senators, my peers- you make my job easy and I am honored to serve. With that, I respectfully end my Executive Committee Report and introduce the next speaker to report. President-Elect Keith will shoulder the microphone so please wait to make sure Quinetta has an easier time listening to those recorded Minutes on our antiquated system. I would like to welcome, Rhonda Renee Wingfield. She is the Director of the Office of Financial Planning Analysis and Budget. She is also interim CEO of UT Innovation Enterprises and she is going to give us an update on UTIE. Can we give a round of applause for Rhonda?

[Applause]

**Mrs. Wingfield:** Hi everyone. I've met some of you. I've been at the university a little over four years now. My background is in finance. I came here through Treasury. I spent the last four to four-and-a-half-years working on due diligence and financial preparation for UTIE so I am intimately familiar with the finances of UTIE such as wire transfers, funding, tax returns etc. With the departure of Rick Stansley, Dr. Jacobs asked me to step in as an interim. My day job is actually financial planning here at the university. President Hoblet, Senator Dowd, and some of the others asked if I could come and talk about UTIE's current state. I know there were a lot of questions. Actually, an interesting thing - the last six months that I've been in this role I've had the same kind of conversation so many times that I actually have a presentation, which I presented to the Board of Trustees yesterday to give them an update of historically where we started and where we are at currently. There are some really cool things going on. We are working towards much more faculty enrollments and student enrollments.

Okay, back in the beginning when I was brought here, our mission was to create a culture of entrepreneurship and fulfill UT's community engagement mission by leveraging our resources here on campus. I am not going to read the slide, but this is the "meat and potatoes" of the questions that I got. I will just start at the beginning: UTIE began with a \$10 million cash investment and also a \$5 million equity transfer. So when you hear and see in *The Blade* that it is \$15 million or \$10 million, it was \$10 million in cash and \$5 million in equity. The \$7.38 million has been invested to date. All these numbers are of our year-end financial statements, June 30<sup>th</sup>. Two million dollars has been written off, and that was over four companies. And \$5.3 million is our net cash investments. The cost to operate the fund is about \$200-250,000 ? per year. The...is legal which covers administrative costs, general liability insurance, due diligence costs, and prototype grants. At the end of our fiscal year, our cash balance was \$1.5 million. Of that \$5 million that was transferred to us, there was \$719,000 remaining because \$4.3 million of that was MWOE and that was written off somewhere.

**Senator Dowd:** Rhonda, I have a real quick question. It states \$700,000, but the \$5 million was received when?

**Mrs. Wingfield:** That was actually...by the Foundation. I believe back in 2006, it was before I came on.

**Senator Dowd:** That draw-down is not something that has occurred recently. Isn't it so that this has occurred over the course of many years?

**Mrs. Wingfield:** Yes, It was over the course of many years. This is what the Foundation received through equity back in 2006 and this is a current value. Thank you, Senator Dowd.

**Past-President Rouillard:** So you have a \$2.04 million write-off and a \$4.3 million write-off, are those two separate write-offs?

**Mrs. Wingfield:** They are. The top one, I am looking at the cash value, so you will see the \$10 million cash and of that \$10 million in cash, we invested \$7.4 million, and \$2 million of that \$7.4 million was written off. And then at the bottom- the non-cash, well, that \$4.3million was the non-cash.

**Senator White:** What do the initials "MWOE" mean?

**Mrs. Wingfield:** Midwest Optoelectronics. It was the company that owned the patents presumably, and with everything that's gone on that you all read, there is no IP any longer.

The history of UT Innovation Enterprises – The current book value is \$6.06 million and that was just from that slide that we just looked at, which was the net value of cash investments and the net value of equity transfer. So the potential upside is \$10 million. The potential downside is \$4 million. I do want to point out -- both the upside and the downside includes the remaining write-off of Xunlight - we still have \$2 million from Xunlight. We are waiting for award policies and we are waiting for events before we write down any of our investments. Xunlight just filed bankruptcy.

**Past-President Rouillard:** So in other words, we are going to have an initial \$15 million in cash and \$5 million in equity; you will have written-off about \$8 million?

**Mrs. Wingfield:** Yes. Now, \$6 million of that being non-cash investments. This is what our portfolio looks like. There are 16 companies in our portfolio and many of these are actually faculty spin-offs, actually most of them are faculty spin-offs. The far right column is our percent ownership in the company. You will see we are a minority owner in all these companies with the exception of IRISense which we own 100%. We are in the process of signing a term sheet with a large venture capital from Ann Arbor, so their evaluation is looking good. These are some of our faculty members whose technology has been commercialized through UTIE /Rocket Ventures. Most of these Rocket Ventures have partnered with us and you can see it is throughout all disciplines across the university. This is a look at our balance sheet as of June 30<sup>th</sup>. These are the same numbers you have seen. You can see our cash value at the top is \$1.6 million and holding that cash for investments is \$5.3 million. Net equity is \$719,000, so our total portfolio book value is \$6.06 million, plus the cash which brings us to a net available asset of \$7.64 million.

The annual cost to operate UT Innovation Enterprises: historically, you can see the former CEO salary (\$300,000), administrative supportive cost (\$75,000), and operating cost (\$200,000). These are the prototypes, the legal expenses, and due diligence. The total cash outlay is \$575,000. The cost going forward – and this is what we shared with the Board of Trustees yesterday – it will be \$375,000. The executive director salary is \$150,000, administrative support is \$75,000, operating cost is \$150,000, and cash outlay is \$375,000. That salary, by the way, is not my salary <laughter>.

**Past President Rouillard:** Whose salary is that?

**Mrs. Wingfield:** It is no one's, this is a proposal. When they hire the next "me," that is the proposed salary.

**Past-President Rouillard:** What fund does that salary come out of?

**Mrs. Wingfield:** The UTIE agency account from the remaining cash balance that you saw.

**Past-President Rouillard:** It is important to know that that previous CEO salary of \$300,000 was what was paid to Rick Stansley and that was paid out of the president's pot of funds.

**Mrs. Wingfield:** Yes.

**Past-President Rouillard:** It was not paid out of UTIE funds.

**Mrs. Wingfield:** No, it's not. When I put this together I wanted to show actual cash outlay that had to do with UT Innovation Enterprises, so the \$300,000 did come out of the president's fund, but it's not going forward.

**Senator Dowd:** \$300,000 for how many years?

**Past-President Rouillard:** For three years at least.

**Senator Dowd:** [Inaudible]

**Mrs. Wingfield:** UTIE didn't receive Rick Stansley's full time. Rick worked on a number of things for Dr. Jacobs in that role. His full-time salary was not attributed to UT Innovation Enterprises so it would be hard to tell how much time he spent on that. We, UT Innovation Enterprises, also have a full board and they are all volunteers and they often do quite a bit of work also.

**Senator Edinger:** Presumably, if you are billing by the day you would have all that outlined.

**Mrs. Wingfield:** I would assume, but they never went through UT Innovation Enterprises. They had never got a line to UTIE; it went directly to the president so I was never privy to that.

**Past-President Rouillard:** I can tell you that I've seen the records and there is no indication of what he made on any of those days.

**Mrs. Wingfield:** Okay.

**Senator Molitor:** I have a question- UTIE provides support for startup companies based on technologies developed at UT. Your support includes facilities, business and administrative support. What about support for intellectual property and the patent process?

**Mrs. Wingfield:** That is part of Tech Transfer.

**Senator Molitor:** So that is completely separate?

**Mrs. Wingfield:** Yes, that is completely separate. What happens is sort of a balance stream- faculty and students come to Tech Transfer for an idea and Tech Transfer looks at it and helps them to decide if it's something that is commercializable; they do that work, the IP Search. If it has any kind of market studies, they do it within Tech Transfer long before it would ever come to UT or UTIE. They do a quite a bit of work that would never even come to UTIE.

**Senator Molitor:** So how does the budget work for that, if they do all that leg work and then something comes to UTIE from that process, is there some kind of reimbursement from UTIE?

**Mrs. Wingfield:** No, there is not.

**Senator Molitor:** How do they recover the cost?

**Mrs. Wingfield:** That's a good question. Typically, they have license agreements, royalty agreements. So if they think that something is commercializable, they would have that proposal and sign it before it comes to UTIE. That is completely separate, that is a university license agreement so UTIE never receives royalties or anything.

**Senator Molitor:** All of those products that you showed earlier from UT faculty and staff, are those coming through the Tech Transfer Office?

**Mrs. Wingfield:** Oh, yes, but they are not funded through Tech Transfer. Tech Transfer would say, "great idea. I think it is commercializable, but we don't have any money, so go see UTIE" and then UTIE would say, "let's do some market research and let's do some due diligence; yes, we will fund you." Tech Transfer is doing the labor, but they are not funding and they are not investing in any of these companies.

**Senator Molitor:** So how is the split between UTIE and Tech Transfer, in terms of some of these valuations that you have in your table?

**Mrs. Wingfield:** I am sorry; I am not sure what you mean.

**Senator Molitor:** Well, if Tech Transfer is doing the legwork, and if there's a licensing agreement through the university, right?

**Mrs. Wingfield:** Yes.

**Senator Molitor:** Then they are getting that money back whatever the licensing agreement is, right?

**Mrs. Wingfield:** If it's commercializable.

**Senator Molitor:** Yes, if it's commercializable. Things they say are not commercializable they say send to UTIE, right?

**Mrs. Wingfield:** No.

**Senator Dowd:** As I understand it, when a faculty member has an idea with the potential for commercialization, Tech Transfer will work with faculty to try to move that idea along the process. Once it reaches a level where it can be applied in industry then that idea is turned over to UTIE. Tech Transfer

is just one of the services that the university provides faculty. Tech Transfer is a separate from UTIE and it is involved in different set of actions.

**Senator Molitor:** So Tech Transfer does not receive any funding from the license agreements? That money is separate and that money does not come back to the university, does that happen?

**Senator Dowd:** I am not aware of funds flowing back to Tech Transfer. But maybe to the university.

**Mrs. Wingfield:** Only if they have a product that goes to market, so it will be years down the line. And sometimes that happens when they are getting some licensing and royalties coming in, but Tech Transfer works in tandem with UTIE, so it's not Tech Transfer or UTIE, if it goes to Tech Transfer first. If it looks like this could be a company that could be commercializable, then it would go to UTIE, but it never goes to Tech Transfer or UTIE. It is either Tech Transfer and UTIE, or it stops at Tech Transfer. Does that make sense?

**Senator Devabhaktuni:** I have a couple questions. My first question is if the mission that is defined that unites the mission of UTIE, what is the mission of the university? I think that is a fundamental question that I have, but I don't know if anybody has an answer to it. The second question that I have is when we are looking at the cash net total of the \$10 million, it was probably \$1.5 million or slightly more, and a proposed budget with an expense of \$1.5 million is \$400,000, so how many years can this go longer with the leftover money unnoticed? The university leadership actually has an answer for my question, number one and they do have a ... where they pump money into UTIE. So has that been discussed in general or is there consensus in the leadership team?

**Mrs. Wingfield:** I hope I understood you. Yes, there's been constant questions from people on the UTIE Board such as, what are our next steps and where do we go from here? The \$375,000 cash outlay that you saw, that is to operate a fund- that is not to invest in any company. If we stop right now and we do not make another investment for the life of this portfolio we will still have legal services. Obviously, you wouldn't pay \$150,000 for an executive director to maintain a fund, so that would be less, so that is the decision at some point that will have to be made. Does the university support economic development through innovation and through an arm like UTIE? Is it a budget line item or is it something that the university is not interested in? That is not a decision that I am going to make and it is certainly not a decision that we need to make now. One of the slides that I will get to talks about a proposed direction at UT Innovation Enterprises. It actually has a new name, so we will get there.

Some of the related benefits for UTIE and this is also with our incubator: Student employment over the past three or four-years-- there's between 12-15 students and there are actually more that are part-time that are pretty consistent. I think everyone would agree that experiential learning is really the key- it is the students that are actually not answering phones, but sitting there working with companies and doing market research and some IP work, and just getting their hands in real companies. I know this because my son graduated from college and he is still wandering around looking for a job that he wants to do, so that kind of work is fabulous and it builds a résumé as well, while they are still in school. Job creation: 33 current jobs in Northwest Ohio--there at one point a total of 140 and that was when Xunlight had a full working force. There are eight start-up companies from faculty technology and five from community technologies. We also played a key role in the Ohio Third Frontier and ESP which is a Third Frontier grant to Rocket Ventures. And then through Rocket Ventures because we are one of their major



shareholders in the Rocket Ventures fund- Rocket Ventures had invested 17 startup companies here in our region.

Back to that original slide several slides ago- cash available is \$1.6 million. These are the things that we have pending that the Board has already approved. As of June 30<sup>th</sup> financials they were pending and some of these have happened already. Rocket Venture fund has \$307,000, which was a final tranche of a multiyear funding. IRISense is a faculty startup which is Dr. Cameron's technology. OsteoNovus is Dr. Agarwal's and Dr. Vijay Goel's, they are also in the incubator. We have \$200,000 which we actually did fund in October. So that brings that \$1.6 million down to \$993,000 remaining. As I stepped in and started talking to so many people about the history of UTIE and what we have done well and what we have learned along the way, I started really reaching out to the other innovative universities. I actually went out to see some. Some of the ones I talked to and studied was University of Illinois, Michigan State, Baylor, Cornell, University of Michigan, and University of Chicago- these are the overlapping trends. These are the things that they all do: They create a culture of entrepreneurship among faculty, staff, and students. They focus on university technology; so not as much from outside unless it can be funded back through research through the university- reaching in the university for resources, collaboration, and opportunities for students, faculty, and staff. They collaborate and participate with community partners. They create an environment of experiential learning for students of all majors, so not just business and engineering but across all disciplines. And then smaller investments- most of these innovation setups actually have a cap on their investments whether it's \$100,000 or \$200,000. I am an accountant so \$100,000 to me is conservative and that is what I would prefer. They have an extensive use of professional EIR's – "entrepreneurs-in-residence"—and student EIRs and these student EIRs will be scholarship students sitting and working in our incubator and working out business development, business plans, and market research. In all of these cases the incubator is the primary hub of their innovation.

Our proposed mission statement: *Promote entrepreneurship at The University of Toledo through active student and faculty engagement in research, technology commercialization, and economic development, with favorable impact on our region.*

So it is very similar to where we started; it is much more focused on the university resources and our own faculty and looking inward rather than outward. So this is new. You will see at the top it does not say "UTIE," it says "Rocket Innovations." As a board and as a CEO we all agreed that the UTIE name does not conjure up the best positive responses within the community both outside and inside. Most of us that have been involved with UTIE from early on will tell you that there are so many good things going on, it's the misconception in the papers and in the community. It is not a fair representation of what's been happening. In our opinion, it was best to shed that name and move on to something more UT-focused so Rocket Innovations is what we are proposing. Also, you will notice that the Rocket Ventures' Fund has the same name; we had long discussions with them and they are changing their name from Rocket Fund to something different so we will have a true separation. And by the way, they cover all Northwest Ohio so they were also getting some slack for having that UT name on their fund. So the biggest change here is that the executive director of Rocket Innovations is no longer CEO. The executive director will now report up to the new VP of Research. It makes perfect sense because as you (Senator Molitor) kept asking about Tech Transfer – Tech Transfer really works in tandem with the fund, so to have them under one umbrella makes perfect sense and we have absolutely been living along...but this gels it.

**Senator Dowd:** I remember when they split those offices, with resources transferred out of the Office of Research. Having the executive director report to the VP of Research is a distinct improvement over what existed over the last few years of the Jacobs Administration.

**Past-President Rouillard:** No, everything does not, the Board does.

**Mrs. Wingfield:** The board of directors doesn't, they are not UT employees. These are all volunteers from the community who have a dotted line to the president in oversight.

**Senator Dowd:** They will have a direct report to the administrator and a dotted line to the board. And, again, the fact that it is moving back under the Office of Research is a significant improvement.

**Mrs. Wingfield:** Exactly. Research is where it all starts. Then it goes to Tech Transfer, so this is where it belongs.

**Senator Dowd:** What about budgets? The Office of Research took a significant hit to its annual budget with the earlier split of activities. Will those financial resources be restored to the Office of Research? And specifically, will funds provided for faculty development for research projects that can take the form of additional money for URAF and other internal grants? In other words, will the money follow this reorganization? In my opinion, if this is just reorganization without restoration of funds, it is going to fall far short of its goals.

**Mrs. Wingfield:** That's a good question. Anything that has to do with Rocket Innovations – most likely those funds will follow the new VP of Research. As far as any additional funding that may have been lost years ago, I don't know what that is, but I am not saying I can't look. If you have that information you can send it, so we can see what has been lost in the last couple years. I am just not aware.

**Senator Dowd:** Okay. Thank you.

**Mrs. Wingfield:** But it makes perfect sense. This meeting is what we've been talking about for some time now. We need our faculty to be involved. We need the right students. We have some great students who are very innovative and entrepreneurial-minded; we want to scholarship them and bring them over to the incubator a couple days a week and get them some hands-on experience. Anytime you want to come visit the incubator you can. We've got some really cool company and new stuff happening. We really can produce one mission and one university. I am a UT employee so this to me makes perfect sense; we need to all be in this together. Innovation is the key and we've got to keep the innovation and the entrepreneurial. President Hoblet, you got to see one of our students - he presented yesterday after I presented, and he talked about how UTIE, our incubators, helped him through this process and it was powerful. It was just so positive and we are not talking hundreds of thousands of dollars, we are talking \$5,000 and maybe another thousand at another time, just more mentorship than money.

So of that \$993,000 remaining cash that I've shown - what we are proposing is to scholarship five part-time students in the incubator and continue with the operating cost of \$150,000 so that would leave us with about \$500,000 to invest in five to ten companies. However, it doesn't mean we will invest in five to ten companies; we may hold onto that for another two years, but that is what we are saying, we can spend up to \$500,000. The executive director salary will now be part of UTIE's Rocket Innovations' cost instead of the president's. How will this replenish? Hopefully, we will have some companies that actually

have some exits and it replenishes itself, that's the idea. We still need to have a return. Their one-way is pretty long. It is typically 6-8 years of VC [venture capital] fund, but, with us, with the university jumping in so early, often before technology is proven, it could be ten years. So there have to be some other ways to create value besides holding onto the portfolio. This is one way you'll see it creates tremendous value, investing in our students, and having more faculty participation. By the way, we are not asking for more money. We are saying, "oh, this remaining money – here's how we would like to use it." That is it, are there any questions?

**Senator Edinger:** When you looked at those 600 universities, did any of them have a 50% write-off of their investments?

**Mrs. Wingfield:** That is a good question. Typically, the write-off is 70-80% because we invest before Rocket Ventures would even invest. So in a VC world, it's precede and then cede, we are precede. We jump in before the technology is proven because that is our mission to help faculty, to help staff, and help students through innovative ideas. So if we change that mission, we change who we are and there is a risk involved. It needs to be more measured in my opinion and that is why I am recommending there be a cap. Had we not invested \$3 million in Xunlight, this fund would look entirely different. Had it been a \$500,000 investment, we wouldn't be having this conversation because our portfolio would be tremendous; I mean we would have some real value. One way to mitigate that is by making smaller investments and more measured risks. If you lose \$500,000 that is tolerable, but if you lose \$3 million it is a big deal. I am the Director of Financial Planning and Budget; I know what our budget looks like, it's a big deal.

**Past-President Rouillard:** I would like to thank you for coming to speak with us. I hope that you understand that we know that you had inherited a difficult position with a university that has a problematic appearance that you didn't create. We appreciate you coming here to answer questions and some difficult questions. Can you describe for us what the due diligence process is now, as opposed to what it was previously?

**Mrs. Wingfield:** Yes. When I was hired four years ago I was actually hired to do the due diligence work. I looked at their tax statements and their financial statements etc., I was working quite a few hours on that. Of course, at UT as soon as you do something well you do something else, so in addition to that, I got student accounting and I got treasury. It came to a point that I could not spend 30 hours a week on due diligence, so that was when we stopped doing it in-house and started pushing it out to professional EIRs and started using Rocket Ventures services. We are back to that old model. We rely on Rocket Ventures services quite a bit to do that due diligence work for us. A couple slides back it showed professional EIRs, a line right under the executive director- those professional EIRs are seasoned executives who retired and will work for Rocket Ventures for free because we are major shareholders. They come and they sit in the incubator a couple days per week and do that work in partnership with us - they are also invested.

**Past-President Rouillard:** It seems a little bit of a conflict of interest.

**Mrs. Wingfield:** Yes. There are often times Rocket Ventures would say this is way too early on, we won't mess with it, but UTIE or Rocket Innovations would say, well this is a faculty member and we are willing to support it and we are going to invest anyway. Rocket Financials would say, well, here's the due

diligence you came up with, come see us in a year if they have some revenue. This is often the exchange that we have, it's normal. We know we take a higher risk than Rocket Ventures or any other VC.

**Past-President Rouillard:** I would also like to follow-up on Senator Edinger's comment about the other universities. One of the important differences is that those universities can afford to make 80% write-offs. We can't even afford a 50% write-off, not when we keep having these huge budget shortfall discussions. I think that is what antagonizes or concerns faculty when we hear about these kinds of investment programs.

**Mrs. Wingfield:** Yes.

**Past-President Rouillard:** Yet again we are facing another budget shortfall, yet we are talking about offering money to companies that may or may not succeed.

**Mrs. Wingfield:** That is very true and I do understand it. I will say taking a measured risk is necessary in a university setting, especially if you are trying to encourage economic development. I think if the investments were \$100,000 and we lost 80% of it, that is not a \$3 million, \$4 million, or \$6 million loss; it is a cost of doing business; it is something that the university is investing in; it is a budget line-item thing. If we are going to spend \$1 million on economic development through faculty then that is fine -it is something the university is willing to do. I think it is hardest – and I agree –when you invest in companies \$3 million...and they end up writing them off three years later. I get it. It is not the direction we want to continue to go, and that is why the polls talk about scholarshiping students and bringing students in to create these opportunities with student EIRs and working with people who have successful exits to create some real value.

**Senator Thompson-Casado:** I hear you keep saying \$3 million to Xunlight, but I thought this whole line said it was \$4 million, then the \$1 million part of the \$2 million, and then there is \$2 million more with that, so is it supposed to be \$7 million?

**Mrs. Wingfield:** The \$4.3 million was not a company called Xunlight, it was a company called MWOE that housed IP that was written off (that was almost the entire equity transfer). We had already written off \$1 million from Xunlight and there is \$2 million still sitting on our books which we will write off. Our board policy is we have to wait for a taxable action- they actually just filed bankruptcy so now we can write them off.

**Senator Molitor:** So what you showed us is essentially a one-year plan to use the remainder of the cash fund and you are hoping that your investments will pay off, correct?

**Mrs. Wingfield:** Absolutely.

**Senator Molitor:** In future years, what happens if that doesn't happen, do you guys plan on closing up shop and just go away or is it our plan for the university to continue the funding this program?

**Mrs. Wingfield:** That is a good question. It depends on the leadership, whoever is in place. Do they think that this creates enough value where it is a budget line? That is not my call. My opinion is it does. What it means in a dollar is not up to me. If we stop today, those expenses will go down- we will have due diligence in salary or things like that, but you have to manage a portfolio. These companies are operating

and anytime they have an A-round or a further round or anything where you have to do legal work, you have due diligence and it has to be done. So it is always going to be some cost. We can take that portfolio and go sell it to someone and they would say those are all university's spin-offs anyways. That is the intent of a portfolio owned by a university for faculty spin-offs. Their value is to us and not to someone else. Are there any other questions?

**President Hoblet:** Our next presenter is William Pierce, a.k.a Billy. He is the Director of Undergraduate Admission at The University of Toledo and Student Recruitment. And he's going to come up and present on recruitment efforts and admissions efforts... Welcome.

**Mr. Pierce:** Good afternoon everyone. My name is William Pierce and I am the Director of Undergraduate Admission. More importantly, I am a two-time graduate at UT and I just began my journey on what would be my final degree ever in life <laughter>. Keep me in your good thoughts <laughter>. I appreciate the invitation to come and speak with you today. My time here at UT as a director since 2006 minus two years I was gone, this is the first time ever that I've actually had the opportunity to speak in front of Faculty Senate.

I see many of you around campus. I wanted to center the discussion around some questions that I received in the invitation to come and speak with you today regarding our overall recruitment plan. However, I will state up front that there is no way humanly possible I can share our overall/entire recruitment plan in ten minutes. What I will draw your attention to if you want more detail and I am not sure if you all have seen this or have a copy of this, but there are some folks in this room and many folks around campus that play a role in our strategic enrollment management plan. I brought a couple hardcopies; once these are out if you'd like a hardcopy please let me know and I will be happy to give one to you. This gives a very nice, high-level overview of our strategic enrollment management plan, but also gives some information on the art of science level and it's also an educational tool. Please feel free to ask for a copy and please engage me afterwards with email. I will also make sure that President Hoblet has a hardcopy of that document.

I was also asked to speak about the language we use in Admissions to recruit students to The University of Toledo and also talk about the market of the Honors program and experiential learning opportunities. So, based upon that, I drafted a discussion online and I wanted to share the structure of the office so everyone knows how we recruit students: by student type, the enrollment mission staff, how we talk about curriculum when students ask a question, talk about the college search and selections online for the different types of students that we serve and ultimately wrap up with talking about some publications that we use in our recruiting message. This structure was implemented a little over a year ago. Once upon a time we were one large admissions office. We now centralize our admissions efforts- each office has a director where each is responsible for recruiting a specific student type. My type specifically is the direct-from-high-school market and that is the traditional high school group. When you look at enrollment in the fall, this group constitutes about two-thirds of the new incoming class of students, so there's a huge responsibility placed on my team to recruit more well-prepared students who we will ultimately retain and graduate from UT. Again, we do have three other admission offices that service these types and you see them listed here (PowerPoint) and we all four work directly with Dr. Cruickshank. We in essence in many cases are the point person for prospective students, their families, guidance counselors and other key influencers in the decision-making process for an incoming student. We are responsible for building relationships with those students and a key aspect for students making decisions to ultimately enroll. The

feedback we get consistently from our students who come here is that we go far above other universities in terms of communicating with them, getting them information about their program of choice, and making sure they feel UT is the right fit for them. And a lot of it has to do with relationships that we build, sometimes over a year in length to ultimately get them to come to UT. We also build relationships with key influencers. As many of you know, the research shows that in many houses it is the parents who are ultimately driving the decision of where the student may ultimately go. It is important for us to understand who those key influencers are and find out what other decisions they are considering as they are learning about other universities that their student may ultimately enroll in. School counselors still play an important role it shows; numbers show that their roles are somewhat diminished compared to parents, but they are still a piece of the process. We need to make sure they are working with them because they are a big piece of the puzzle when it comes to completing documents and getting things in on time, transcripts and test scores so we can do admission review. We are responsible for a lot of knowledge, but there is no way to think you know every single thing about every program, so most of our conversations are very high level- we talk about the programs that we offer, we talk about the UT student experience, and the extracurricular activities. But when it really gets down to the nitty-gritty details of classes that need to be taken, we really rely on the academic prowess of staff, faculty, and advisors and allow those students to connect with those folks, so they can dive into the specifics of a program and what the experiences is true... within that particular college. When students ask about curriculum, a lot of our conversation is centered around the information that you provided for us to use on the main UT page that talks about particular programs. And it actually maps out a four-year curriculum for that student to see, based upon their major. But the graph you will see here is what we feel is the point of contact. They rely on some of these other areas to help support the recruitment message, where we use current UT students which is a huge impact on the recruitment process, because they look at me as a person that's standing in front of them that is paid to talk about UT. But to interact with a current UT student and ask them what it is like to be a current UT student and why they chose to come here is really a powerful message and we don't want to overlook that in the recruiting process. And working with the faculty and staff providers- you may be familiar with the 1:15 p.m. appointments that we had in place for several years. Those are all highly effective and students more and more are requesting those. We use them as a pitch to continue to assist in working with us to accommodate as many students as possible. We are seeing that go up more and more each year. Students really want to meet with you and talk about your program and what it is going to be like to be a student in college.

We also partnered with the Jesup Honors College so the students will also have the opportunity to talk to Honors faculty and Honors' students about the Honors program. Students who are also interested in some auxiliary programs the marching band is a big recruiting initiative event we did last year, but again, it is about a full experience for a student. They want to know beyond the classroom, what else can I get involved with at UT to make those connections as well? Obviously, some of the bigger ones that you hear particularly around the first of the year is the financial aid discussions for parents and students making final decisions based upon financial aid packages. I mentioned earlier when we talked about curriculum, if students have questions about a particular major, this is available on the UT main website. If you click here, there is a list of our undergraduate page. The example that I chose for this meeting was Accounting - it lists the curriculum for the four years a student is at UT. There is no guess from our part; it is the information that you provide and we direct it here and we walk through them to show them what it is like and there are only "ha-has" when the students see they can do this. In time you will see this mapped out in

four years so they will know what to expect for the most part. The college search process varies based upon the type of student we are recruiting- well-prepared students have their act together, they start the process early, and they get admitted earlier than what we call our next line, our typical students; they will engage us in many cases during the summer prior to their senior year if not earlier. We do have events that are designed to cash for interest and to get them on our campus. Some of you are familiar with “Sunday through Friday.” They are engaging us earlier and getting the candidates earlier and asking to see you earlier because they are making the selections a lot earlier than our traditional students. September through December they are coming back for a second visit and they are meeting with our admission staff and they are applying for admission. In January they are coming back for a second look to meet with you again for “Experience Days” and “Scholarship Days.” I want you to know that 95% of our students are enrolled by January, so that is a lot that does go on from the start of their senior year to mid-way their senior year. They got everything in and they are on the ball with trying to get information in, and getting all they need so they can line up all their college selections. Typically, April through June they are on cruise control, they already decided where they are going and they already made their enrollment deposit. They will engage us at our regional...student reception...that operates in Rocket Launch. Per PowerPoint, some of these questions are the top questions we receive- well-prepared students, what’s their curriculum is like? What is their experience like in college? What are the options after graduation? What are the graduation programs like etc? This is not an exhaustive list. These are some of the things that are top-of-the-line for our well-prepared students. When we are looking at our typical students they are really all over the board. You will have some students that will apply early and you will have some students that will apply when Rocket Launch is starting, it is just the nature of that particular population- they apply throughout their senior year. Some students don’t take their ACT or SAT until mid-way through their senior year- this is the reality of this group of students. We still recruit them and they are important to our enrollment efforts. September through January we are also engaging our staff to our Direct from High School and College Fair. The students come to for the first time in October for our recruiting days. Then February through April, they are back on Campus for Experience Day. Mainly students are waiting for their financial aid packets to come in which is typically the first week or the second week in March, because it really comes down to that financial decision. These students aren’t necessarily receiving our top academic awards so they are waiting for the FAFSA results to come back to see what other institutional federal and state aid will be added on top of any other aid they will receive. This really becomes a huge discussion for this group, February through April, and then they are making their decisions in the Spring timeframe, engaging us to sign up for Rocket Launch and submitting enrollment deposits. One of the top factors for their decision is the cost, no secrets there. They also stream curricular and extra-curricular activities and then we are the support sources. Our typical students are a 3.2 and maybe a 22 ACT. They may not be as strong in certain areas so they want to know what are the core services that the university provides that will help me or my son or daughter be successful and ultimately graduate.

Some of the publications that we use, I brought some so you can take with you. Keep in mind that there is no way we can know every single thing to know in every single program. Most of our publications are very high-level, so we have our admission view book which is really our piece that really covers everything from top to bottom. We do have a list of majors which is probably the most popular page in this book. There is scholarship information and tuition information listed in here as well. What’s going around now is the view book for the Jesup Scott Honors College and we use that as a guide as we are

talking to students about our program. We also use the Honors' website that lists many of the attributes of the Honors' programs. A lot of what we talk about is directed by what the colleges tell us and what the Honors' College tells us. In many cases students already went to the website if they have specific questions and that is when we rely on the academic conversations. I brought this one so you can see. I know I talked quickly. Again, I just wanted to give you a quick overview. Are there any questions?

**Past-President Rouillard:** What is the average GPA for a typical student?

**Mr. Pierce:** Our average GPA for incoming students is around a 3.2. Average ACT is around 22 or 23.

**Past-President Rouillard:** What is the average for a well-prepared student?

**Mr. Pierce:** The floor for that is typically 25 ACT and above and a 3.5 GPA; that is typically the floor we look at when we start looking to recruit students to the Honors Program.

**Senator Donald White:** We have fractions that are preventatives' on the number of those two groups that express an interest and get admitted and then come?

**Mr. Pierce:** That is a great question. Off the top of my head I have the percentage for each of those groups. I will tell you for example, last February we invited all of our students who received the Honors award and there were about 650 students that showed up, about 76% of those students want to enroll at UT.

**Senator Dowd:** I was under the impression that you were going to give a different presentation than what you gave today. In fact, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee specifically asked if you would provide current information and data on our students. Perhaps you can meet me halfway. When talking about the Honors College, how specifically do you describe Honors at UT to prospective students? Then, how have you described "honors activities" at UT as compared to "honors activities" at other universities? Last, for prospective students, how do you differentiate between students pursuing the University Honors designation and those students who are merely administered by the Honors College?

**Mr. Pierce:** Sure. Well, there's the Honors' curriculum component where students are accepted.

**Senator Dowd:** I need to be clearer. There is the honors program with academic activities that lead to the University Honors designation on student transcripts. Then there are other students admitted to the university who are merely administered by the Honors College and have no connection to the honors program or the University Honors designation. How do you differentiate between these when addressing prospective students?

**Mr. Pierce:** So you are referring to the Honors course structure?

**Senator Dowd:** When addressing prospective students, how do you differentiate between the honors program and its University Honors designation and the Honors College which merely serves as a portal college for other students? Then, what I asked before was how specifically do you describe honors at UT to prospective students?



**Mr. Pierce:** So if I understand your question correctly, you are talking about the difference between a student who chooses to pursue an honors curriculum and a student who is in the Honors portal College, is that answering your question correctly?

**Senator Dowd:** Yes, because both groups of student are described as “honor students.”

**Mr. Pierce:** Okay. I don’t use that term as in “honor students.” We talk about the services that are provided because they are serviced by an honors success coach. Now, the honors students are the ones who come here and are ultimately enrolled in honors courses but they ultimately receive some of the same services that a student will receive in terms of support than a student who is in the Honors Portal. So we talk about success coaching, we talk about opportunities for research, we talk about opportunities for internships and study abroad, those types of co-curricular activities, but when we talk about the true honor students and the students who graduate with the true honors designation- those are the students who when we talk to them we talk about the honors level courses that they will take based upon their academic program.

**Senator Dowd:** Thank you.

**Mr. Pierce:** You’re welcome.

**Senator Porter:** If I’m a student who wants to come here and go into engineering, why would I go into the Honors College? And if I want to be an honors student, why wouldn’t I go into Engineering?

**Mr. Pierce:** And that is a great question that many students will wrestle with with understating. Some students who come from an honors background do not want to pursue an honors’ curriculum while they are in college- they opt not to and they do not want to pursue it. Then there are some students who do- they are students who welcome that challenge, who want to engage and excel, who want to be around other students who have the same honors’ mindset, they don’t have to pursue it, they choose to. Some students who are academic and want to be able to graduate with the Honors designation-they’ve been at the top of their class since they’ve been in high school and they want to continue pushing themselves academically so they welcome that challenge to go through an academic experience in Engineering. It is the student’s choice, they don’t have to.

**Senator Molitor:** If I can follow up on that. It seems to be somewhere along the line we pivoted to essentially promoting Honors and not promoting individual degree programs. That is the context of Senator Porter’s question. I think that’s a legitimate concern- students come here to get a degree in the academic program that they are going into and not necessarily to get an honors degree, so why the emphasis on the Honors program in terms of the recruiting efforts?

**Mr. Pierce:** Again, you talk about those aspects. It ultimately comes down to students wishing, “I want to pursue the Honors curriculum in a particular college, but I also want the other aspects of being in the Honors portal.” Then we have some students who say, “I want the aspects of the Honors portal, but I don’t want the Honors curriculum.” Part of it has to do with how we service the different learners-their approach is different and their attack to classes are different and that is why we had broken it up into students who are honors caliber will receive “this type of attention” and students who are more of your typical prepared or underprepared students will need additional services than what your typical Honors student will need. So, when we talk about a portal college type structure, in our minds in Admissions we

look at it that each student type has a different set of need that they want and a different type of experience that they want and that is really how we then look at our message. When it comes to the curriculum piece, we do talk about that, but again, it really comes down to the student wishing to take on an Honors curriculum versus taking on the honors type services that are provided to the student of that caliber.

**Past-President Rouillard:** What about the experiential learning that is part of the new Honors' package if you will? What kind of information do you have to offer students and tell them about experiential learning?

**Mr. Pierce:** Much of what we talk about is taken directly from the Honors College website where we talk about the internship opportunities and we talk about our partnership with CEELIO. The way I talk to students is to really get that experience outside the classroom, so you are engaging faculty in the classroom and online, whatever meaning you choose to pursue the coursework, but then we also talk about experiential opportunities and going out into the field and taking what you learned in the classroom and applying it to the internship such as study abroad opportunity and undergrad research which is a really big conversation that we had with Honor students who really want to dive into research, particularly early on in their academic career. So when we talk about experiential learning that is how we frame it when we talk to prospective students.

**Past-President Rouillard:** And then how do you portray the general education requirements and potential honors courses that have to be taken?

**Mr. Pierce:** Well, that is a conversation we rely on the Honors College and the academic side to have that type of curriculum conversation because again, that is the piece that we don't know every detail about so we would rather have you answer that. We direct them to the documents online so it is a pdf. that is dated "March 24" that talks about how the Ohio Transfer Module and some of the general ed. courses. There is also a document online that is pdf that is dated March 2010.

**Past-President Rouillard:** And that is on the Honors College website?

**Mr. Pierce:** That's on UT's website. If you go in and type "general education" it is in the top five search results. There is the one that is dated March 2014 and there is one just above that that is dated March 2010.

**Senator Dowd:** I have a follow-up question. You are saying you rely on the information contained on the Honors College website for your communication with prospective students. So any material put onto that website you could potentially use to describe to incoming students as being part of their academic program?

**Mr. Pierce:** That is correct.

**Senator Dowd:** So when erroneous material has been posted on the Honors College website, for example, descriptions of academic activities that have not been approved by Faculty Senate, you could have inadvertently passed that information on to students - not knowing that the material was erroneous?

**Mr. Pierce:** I will expand that on UToledo domain. Student themselves are going out and searching that before they even get to us, particular, your high ability students-they done their research before they get to us and they are coming in with very targeted questions. So are web-presence is extremely important to make sure what's out there is accurate and it is worded in such a way students will understand what that experience will be like- we do rely on that heavily because that is where our students are. We have to be able to know where they are looking to be able to address their questions because in the meantime they've gone out and scholared our websites, parents included. In many cases the conversations are dominated by the parents and the students will have very little because the parents are the ones out there doing their homework. So again, we rely heavily upon our web-presence; not only from an overall UT standpoint, but for the program, we rely on that information to be accurate.

**Senator Dowd:** Thank you.

**Senator Keith:** Can we go back to the portal colleges?

**Mr. Pierce:** Yes.

**Senator Keith:** The different portal colleges offer different services to the different students' needs, who provides these services? What are the different needs in terms of the different services?

**Mr. Pierce:** So for instance, if I can use the Honors College for example. One of the things that was used was a market study that was done around the state of Ohio where we actually went out and surveyed and talked to current UT students who decided not to go to UT and asked them about what would they want in an Honors College and what would they want with an honors experience? So we learned first-hand what those students wanted in their experience. Conversely you look at the portal College CALL, they are not traditional students and their needs are not necessarily focused on wanting to come in and...on campus. They want to know how quickly they can get their degree done. They've taken credit elsewhere and how does it transfer in? So first they want to come in and meet with an academic advisor and talk about their prior credit and course work- how does it transfer, what program does that relate to, how quickly can I graduate, and how much will it cost me? Traditional students are not necessarily focused there. They are bringing credit because many students have taken courses in high school through post-secondary programs, AP credit so they are concerned about what is going to transfer in. But those students know coming in that they are going to be here at least 3 years if they are in an accelerated program if not longer. So it is understanding those student types and what their needs are to ultimately get them here at UT.

**Senator Keith:** So once they declared a major, do they move out of the portal college to the college of their major?

**Mr. Pierce:** The portal college structure is not based upon major.

**Senator Keith:** Okay. It's based upon...the students who need extra preparation?

**Mr. Pierce:** Correct. You have your prepared students and your underprepared students will be serviced by U-College and the unprepared students are serviced by the Honors College portal, the non-traditional students are serviced by CALL- you have a portal college for graduate students and again, each student type have their own needs.

**Senator Keith:** I guess I am trying to understand, how long are they staying in the portal college? Is it until they declare a major and then they go into the college of their major or are they always in the portal college?

**Mr. Pierce:** Well, I think collectively we can make an effort as an institution to better define. I think we are matching up a portal college and an academic college and they are not one of the same. So even though a student declares a major it doesn't necessarily change that they're Honor College students so they move are out of the portal college. You can be in the Honor Portal College and be an engineering major, but you will still maintain the services of the Honor Portal.

**Senator Van Hoy:** Because in CALL you can graduate with degrees from CALL. It's pretty mixed up, isn't it? You call it a portal, but it is---

**Interim Provost Barrett:** It really depends on the portal of the student. We have a college of graduate studies which is the portal for all the graduate students coming in other than the professional programs. If you are getting a Masters in History you are going to come in through CALL and you are going to be serviced through DROGS and when you apply for graduation you are going to apply through them, but your degree is going to be from LLSS and the History Department. The portal colleges kind of serve several different layers and functions depending on which college you are talking about. The Honors College has a dual- as a portal and as a program in a sense. CALL has some degrees in it, so it is really which one you are talking about.

**Senator Molitor:** Just to follow-up on that. There are many students in the Honors portal who are not in the Honors College.

**Mr. Pierce:** Correct.

**Senator Molitor:** That is causing a lot of confusion, particularly for the students.

**Mr. Pierce:** I would be the first to say, if we can work together to better determine, particularly defining to the students what the differences are. But at the same time too, it is a very nice recruiting piece to talk about the services of an Honors portal and what that provides to the students because they are...what they are looking for and in many cases what they are used to up till this point.

**Past-President Rouillard:** I think the part of what we are getting at is the confusion this causes when we are looking at how to attribute resources to colleges and what this does is it seems to skew the numbers so that LLSS this Fall looked like it took a nosedive and so it looked disastrous in my opinion. I expect the unspoken fear of other people is that this could have a lot to do with the granting of resources and the...of budgets.

**Senator Dowd:** May I jump in? To be fair, perhaps this is not his decision. It's the "big" man down the aisle from me, Provost Barrett <laughter>.

**Past-President Rouillard:** I am not saying that this is your decision, but what I am saying is that is why we are concerned.

**Mr. Pierce:** Sure.

**President Hoblet:** My question is just a general one. In the general realm for recruitment and admission, how do you see growing utilization of faculty as a key in the recruitment efforts for the university? I got to tell you, I would love to get my hands on some students right up front and let them know what the expectations are. In my college I know we had several “meet and greets” with some of the Health Science students and in health professions. It is just a delight to have time to meet with them and talk with them and answer some of their questions. I try to recruit them away from other health professions to be honest with you <laughter>. I just think that faculty are such a valuable tool in the recruitment efforts so I would like to know how we’re included in the circular master plan.

**Mr. Pierce:** I agree whole heartedly. The conversations students have with faculty needs work. A lot of it does take place at those 1:15 p.m. appointments. When students come for instance on Experience Day, they spend a half a day in colleges with you, looking at and engaging with faculty and staff to learn more about the programs. Remember we used to have a recruiting...council and that has been revived now to be retention and recruiting coordinating council. We meet monthly. In fact, the group meets on Thursday where it is an all...with key leadership in the academic colleges to talk about how we can partner to work to grow together. One of the pieces of the conversation that we had was talking about an integrated communication plan that involve a message from the dean when a student apply, that involves a call from faculty when a student is admitted. I hope this is in the Minutes so we may be calling on you <laughter>. From our prospective we want to work with the college and we want to get faculty that are willing and ready to talk to students because in many cases you can be the reason why a student come here. Not every institution offers the opportunity to meet with faculty. I will acknowledge we have great faculty here and every chance that I get I would love to have a student in front of me. For those of you who are willing to volunteer your time to meet perspective students by all means we would love to work with you.

**Interim Provost Barrett:** I would just like to follow up on that. I apologize for being late for today’s meeting but I was meeting with the president and Dr. Cruickshank to talk about enrollment and where we are at and particular efforts we can make to improve retention for the Spring semester, as well as the current status of new students for the Spring semester. There is no stronger recruiting tool than the faculty of this university. The more you are willing to get involved the more success we will have. There is nothing that sells a prospective student and their family more than seeing a professor that is taking a personal interest in them from the get-go. The question is, how do you want to be engaged? Do you want to spend time talking with a student when they come in? Are you willing to attend a preview day function? Are you willing to send some emails or pick up the phone and call a student when they have been admitted? One of the things we talked about is how we do a lot less secondary mailing and contacting the students than some other schools out there and that can be a powerful tool. I am going to be talking with the deans tomorrow about what efforts they’re going to undertake to help move forward with the Spring retention recruiting efforts and I would encourage any and all of you to talk to your chairs and to talk to your deans and to talk to me and talk to Cam and say how you as an unit or you as an individual is willing to get involved. It will pay huge dividends. I will also tell you it was very striking to me in a meeting that I had with some of our finance people that if we got our enrollment back up to what it was in 2009 and 2010- which I think we got up that way in a bad way through bringing in some students we couldn’t fully support with the Blue and Gold scholarship- but if we can get back at that level we will have no deficit and we will be in a surplus situation. Growing enrollment is the path for it. It is the way to make this place great and have the resources to do what we want to do and if you guys will get involved that will happen.

**Mr. Pierce:** It is impressive when a student has an opportunity to request to meet with faculty and actually have a chance to sit with you. You are a very important part of what we do and we want to partner with you to ultimately get that student enrolled.

**President Hoblet:** I know that I speak for myself, I love being involved with the students and meeting with them. I would say that 90% of faculty in the university really would like to have that opportunity.

**Senator Teclehaimanot:** Do we have a strategic marketing plan to recruit high school students from the Toledo Metropolitan surrounding areas?

**Mr. Pierce:** Great question and my response is we are...so I am asking, where exactly are you looking? I personally signed off on an agreement with Selana last year when we had...basketball...one of the symbols that rotates is the University of Toledo. If you go to Ottawa Hills and look on their football scoreboard you will see the University of Toledo on the basketball realm. There are a handful of schools, probably nine or ten we partner with that we are doing just what you mentioned. We did not partner with Southview football field because the cost to get in was prohibited, but we have UT marketing in nine or ten schools. You are exactly right and your point is well taken, we need to take care of that. That is something Dr. Cruickshank and I talk about all the time, we have to recruit students here in Toledo and we have made some investments. Unfortunately, we can't be everywhere because the final resource that we have, but we do our best to invest wisely to try to get in some of the key schools that are near.

**President Hoblet:** Just to follow up with what Senator Teclehaimanot was saying, do you work with Larry Burns and Marketing and Communication and Branding to...some of the gaps that we have in our own backyard?

**Mr. Pierce:** We work closely with Larry and... Larry focus is marketing and branding and getting UT's name out there. When it comes to the high schools and specific recruitment pieces that falls in our area. When it comes to the...that are in the high schools, we are doing advertisements and hanging brochures we work with Larry. Their efforts are extremely important to what we do.

**President Hoblet:** Thank you, Billy. Last, but not least. We have our very own Mike Dowd and he is going to introduce the possibility of the Faculty Senate creating a Faculty Senate policy or guideline on senators and institute.

**Senator Dowd:** Thank you, President Hoblet. Last week I worked with Barbara Floyd, Marthe Howard, and Patty Relue to begin addressing an issue concerning Research Council. The issue is the review of proposed centers and institutes whose primary focus is not research. University policy [#3364-70-16] states that ALL proposed centers and institutes must be submitted to Research Council for review and potential approval. That is, Research Council is the initial "gateway" for all proposed centers and institutes. University policy states that Research Council has authority over who gets to use the designation "Research Center" or "Research Institute."

The same university policy states that if the primary focus of a proposed center or institute is not research, then Research Council needs to refer the proposal to another faculty governance body such as Faculty Senate. That part of that policy makes sense. Appointments to Research Council are based on detailed knowledge of environments within specific research areas. So, in my opinion, the composition of the Research Council is not the first-best choice of individuals to review non-research related centers and

institutes. As a long-standing member of Research Council, I include myself in that characterization. Instead, such proposals should be reviewed by a broader faculty governance body such as Faculty Senate. That was my intent when I helped construct that university policy several years ago.

But a problem has existed for several years that Faculty Senate should have addressed long ago. Over the years the Research Council would periodically received a solid proposal for a center or institute whose focus was not research. Their foci would be educational, or community outreach and engagement, or any number of non-research activities. And Research Council could not approve such proposals because they were not either a research center or a research institute. That left the proposal in limbo. Research Council could not approve the proposal and Faculty Senate had no mechanism to review/approve such proposals.

That brings us today – to the result of the meeting I mentioned earlier with Barbara Floyd, Marthe Howard, and Patty Relue. I first want to propose to the Faculty Senate a university policy that would grant the Faculty Senate the authority to govern the designation of “Academic Centers” and “Academic Institutes.” By that I mean governance over all centers and institutes whose primary focus is not research. Second, if such a policy is endorsed by the Faculty Senate and subsequently approved by the university, I want to propose a document for approval by Faculty Senate containing guidelines for establishing “Academic Centers” and “Academic Institutes.”

I am speaking to you today simply to give you a “heads-up” on an issue I will begin to address in the Spring semester. I am not asking for any Senate action today, other than to answer any questions you may have on these issues. Given my existing FSEC commitments of deans assessments and Senate elections, I am unlikely to turn to these proposals until February or March of 2015.

**President Hoblet:** I think one of the examples is what the Board of Trustees presented yesterday, the institute on human trafficking- that is not primary a research institute and it does happen, but a lot of community education and now partnerships with...across the country and now internationally. So those institutes do a number of things and that is just one of the examples that I know and there are others that exists.

**Dr. Anderson [substitute for Senator Quinn]:** There are also institutes that do everything, like Lake Erie Center.

**President Hoblet:** Correct. Thank you. Any other questions or comments? None. May I have a motion to adjourn? Meeting adjourned at 6:01 p.m.

V. Meeting adjourned at 6:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Lucy Duhon  
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard  
Faculty Senate Office Administrative Secretary