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**President Michael Dowd** called the meeting to order, **Lucy Duhon,** Executive Secretary, called the roll.

***I. Roll Call: 2012-2013 Senators:***

**Present**: Anderson, Ariss, Bailey, Barnes, Cappelletty, Cochrane, Crist, Cuckovic, Denyer, Dowd, Duggan Duhon, Edinger, Ellis, Franchetti, Gohara, Hamer, Hewitt, Hey, Hill, Hottell, Humphrys, Jorgensen, Keith, Kranz, Lee, Lingan, Lundquist, Molitor, Moore, Nazzal, Nigem, Ohlinger, Piazza, Plenefisch, Quilan, Randolph, Regimbal, Relue, Rouillard, Sheldon, Springman, Teclehaimanot, Templin, Thompson, Thompson-Casado Van Hoy, Weck-Schwarz, Wedding, White, Williams,

**Excused absences:** Cooper, Eisler, Gilbert, Hammersley, Hoblet, Moynihan, Wilson,

**Unexcused absences:** Giovannucci, Hornbeck, Rooney, Tinkel, Willey

***II. Approval of Minutes:*** Minutes from April 24th meeting are not ready for approval.

**President Dowd:** I am calling the meeting to order. Welcome all to the first Faculty Senate meeting of academic year 2012-2013. To start the meeting, I request that Secretary Duhon call the roll.

I hope everyone had enjoyable summers. The Executive Committee worked very hard on your behalf over the summer months. I am going to alter slightly the agenda for today’s meeting. I am going to waive the approval of the Minutes from April 24th because Quinetta is still waiting to hear from a few Senators to revise their remarks from that meeting. I will not chastise anyone who has yet to provide their remarks because I am one of the Senators that still have not responded to Quinetta. I am also going to delay the Executive Committee report and instead go right ahead and invite our first speaker to address Faculty Senate, William C. Koester, Chairman of the Board of Trustees. Before I ask Mr. Koester to speak, I want to add some personal remarks about working with William Koester over many years. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee extended letters of invitation to the president, provost, chancellor, and other key administrators to come to Faculty Senate and our Executive Committee meetings. In addition we extended an invitation to Mr. Koester. I sent him a land-mail letter to him and received a land-mail letter in response. He came to our Executive Committee meeting because he wanted to meet the leadership and it was a productive meeting that lasted about a half an hour or so; but he took the time to meet the Senate leaders. I know Mr. Koester takes the job of Chairman of the Board very seriously. I know that because I have witnessed his dedication to this university over the many years he has served on our Board of Trustees. Further, Bill is very active here on campus. I would be willing to bet that most of you have seen him on campus over the years, though you may not have known he was a Board member. He jumped at the chance to attend Faculty Senate’s first meeting to start the year off right. So, I now bring to you, Mr. William Koester.

**Mr. Koester:** Thank you, Mike. I have to comment on one thing, I did write Mike a letter and I did deliver it personally because the problem with delivering it personally was that I addressed it improperly and the mailman sent it back to me which was my first mistake. Before I begin, I want to say at UTMC we’ve experienced a significant problem that caused anguish, not only among our UTMC physicians and staff, but among all of us. At UTMC we have safely and perfectly performed approximately 1750 transplants within the last 30 years. But this one error, this one very serious error has caused all of us to reiterate our systems, our procedures, and our checks and documentation. Clearly, all of our good work has been brought into question by this one event. I want to assure you that we as the Board through our Clinical Affairs Committee has and will review in detail this situation and see that proper analysis is implemented to prevent such an error from occurring again. Our deepest sympathy goes out to the people and the family of the patient. It kind of reminds me of an old statement that is a cliché, “When the going gets tough, the tough gets going.”You can assure that our university family will overcome and still be the top kidney transplant operation through this region. One other thing that I would like to mention, I know you are people who love this place because you wouldn’t be here if you didn’t. But, sometimes things get said that are hurtful and it hurts all of us. I received a letter from Dr. Brickman, University of Toledo Chief of Medical staff that was signed by over one hundred and fifty UTMC people, doctors, nurses, administrators, and staff. I want to share their concern with the Faculty Senate: They stated that they were hurt by many statements from certain AAUP people, but rather than read their letter what I want to do is share in-part. I’m kind of paraphrasing the letter that I sent back to them. Basically what I said was, we are not restricted from saying things that can hurt one, but I would hope that it would encourage all of us to objectively research the facts and speak truthfully and build up its best accomplishments. We owe loyalty to this place and that loyalty should be expressed positively and not negatively. So with that said, I would like to say that I really appreciate being invited to speak to you today. I did immediately accept the opportunity to speak, but I don’t know if I am a great speaker or not and I hope that you don’t grade me on it. I was mentioning to one of the professors in the back that since I graduated from the university my grades have improved a lot. My wife found one of my transcripts which obviously solidified my marriage. However, I want to speak a little nostalgically because I remember the faculty that taught me during my undergraduate years. I graduated in December 1959. I remember Dr. Don Ewing. Don was the professor that had that magic key to my mind and he somehow knew how to deliver things that my mind would absorb. He taught me the knowledge and the skills to be an electrical engineer. I will also always remember too, Mrs. Ruby Scott. Ruby Scott was my English instructor and was probably the person that really helped me develop my writing and speaking skills. So, if you give me a bad grade hopefully Mrs. Ruby Scott won’t hear about it. Another person that I would like to recognize is Dick Berry. Dick Berry was the director of admissions when I was at the university and I didn’t realize it at the time, but he had raised a L.O.F scholarship which created scholarships for children whose parents were Ford employees; my dad worked at Ford for thirty-eight years. I received one of those L.O.F scholarships and my education at UT became a reality. So, “thank” them or “blame” them for me being here, but I thank them and I am really happy to be a Rocket. I have great appreciation for the job that you do and I believe that you have the best job in the world and that is being with, training, mentoring, and developing our young people. It has to be the greatest professional satisfaction to see these students develop to achieve the highest goals that are beyond their dreams and the dreams you have for them as well. I have four children, all of whom are college graduates and successful in their chosen professions. My second son, Dr. Steven J. Koester is a professor of the graduate faculty in the department of Bio-Medical Engineering at the University of Minnesota. I mentioned that because through him I have great appreciation of the effort it took to gain the degrees that both he and you have and I don’t have. I also appreciate the effort that it takes to carry out the responsibility whether it is in the classrooms, in research, or in publishing because I see that with Steve all time.

But today I want to talk a little bit about our mission. Our mission is to improve the human condition. I am a businessman not only an engineer. Being a businessman I worked with General Motors for ten years before I started my own business. When you start your own business you really become a salesman. And so, I am an engineer and a businessman, but probably at best (I hope) I am a salesman. Business people look at their customers as people we are to serve. Business is not just about making a profit. I remember having a chance to speak to the College of Business and I asked the students what is the purpose of a business. The first answer they usually give is, “to make a profit.” However, that is not the purpose of business, the purpose of business is to take care of our physical and mental needs whatever they may be. Making a profit is the rules in which we play. Customers do pay the bills, but what is really important in business and what is really important here is that we meet our mission and servicing our customer is meeting our mission. A satisfied customer is the highest honor that a business and institution can receive. Our customers are our students, graduate, undergraduate, hospital, clinical patients, customers of our sports enthusiasts that come to our athletic events, research grantors who are the people who gives us our grants, and our donors and our taxpaying Ohio citizens. These are the people in the institution that we have this mission to serve. These are the people who we are trying to improve that human condition for. It’s through these people and this institution that we are permitted to improve that human condition and when they are satisfied they reward our efforts by providing our university with more students, more patients, more gifts, more grants, and probably the best thing – the goodwill that allows us to market our programs that we are offering. UT is a large organization and by budget it is the third largest university in the state of Ohio. It is probably one of seventeen or eighteen institutions in the country that offers the broad spectrum of college programs that we offer here. The state of Ohio grants by law full authority to organize and operate the university through its Board of Trustees. The Ohio governor appoints all of the Trustees and each Trustee must be approved by the Ohio Senate. I started on the Board in 2004 and I am off the Board in 2013. Board members usually serve a nine year term. Although, there are a few appointees that will finish an unfinished term which means they weren’t able to finish up their term. All Board members serve without pay and all of us are subject to the Ohio…laws and we further commit and sign the UT ethical practice documents. We all care and are deeply involved in higher education. We all take the role of trustees very seriously. We spend a significant amount of time and effort on behalf of the university and we discharge our authority through the president. We charge the president to organize administration with hiring all necessary faculty, all medical and clinical staff, plus necessary administrators and operational personnel to complete and carry out all of our activities day to day. Even though we charge the president with organizing, the Board deals with strategic rather than day-to-day activities, but we do oversee administration to assure that the UT mission and vision is implemented by the administration. This is our responsibility and we do not shirk from it. And that’s why I encourage all of our stakeholders to focus on our people as customers in a business manner. Our student customers must receive the educational tools to earn a comfortable living by pursuing their chosen profession and by enjoying the reward that comes from a comprehensive and liberal education. Our patient customers must receive the highest technical and clinical hospital services that sustain and improve the physical and mental condition in their lives while it is at the same time controlling cost and improving quality. Our research grantor customers expect their funds will produce outstanding scholarly results. Our donor customers demand the university use their funds not only to meet the purpose of the gift, but also to enhance and improve the university.

I would like to spend a few minutes too to talk about our pending appointment, Dr. Scott Scarborough. The University Search Committee which consisted of faculty, staff, students, deans, and administrators recommended among others Dr. Scarborough’s candidacy to be our new provost. That recommendation among others was made to our president. Dr. Jacobs’ has chosen Dr. Scarborough among the recommended candidates to be our next chief academic officer. Dr. Scarborough will bring significant administrative talent experience. He has a PhD in strategic management. He has taught in a college classroom. He has published. He has worked as a senior higher education administrator for over fifteen years. He understands higher education finances as well as anyone in the business. And he led a remarkable two years at the University Medical Center implementing and completing a number of significant improvements. I’ve worked with Scott both in finance and clinical affairs. I consider him an exceptional CFO and I have a high degree of confidence in Dr. Scarborough. I believe he has the ability to be an outstanding provost on the Main Campus I am competent to offer my support due to my long experience working with him. Ever since I’ve been a Trustee I served on the Finance Committee on the Board of Trustees and was chairman for two years. Since the merger I served on the Clinical Affairs Committee and I’ve been chairman on that committee also for two years. I worked closely with Scott, particularly in finance and now lately in clinical affairs. I watched Scott move from vice president in finance into a completely new area, hospital administration. I watched him assemble and involve team leaders. I watched him work closely with the doctors and medical staff at the Medical Center. He led the development strategic plan at the Medical Center which we declared victory in 2015. Based on that plan the Board authorized $50 million dollars to make strategic investments based on and in support of that vision. Some of those issues include the new Cancer Center that we are currently working on an upgraded, clinic, care services, and improving patient satisfaction which include conversions from semi-private to private rooms. I believe that Scott can do the same thing on the Main Campus. With pending board approval Scott will work out a plan over the next few months developing a strategic plan for the Main Campus. He will consult with all campus constituents, and see that the plan is consistent with the overall university’s strategic plan. The Board looks forward to receiving such a plan with full participation of the Main Campus stockholders. Our vision is defined in terms of accomplishing each of the three main goals: (1) Teaching and Learning, (2) Research and Discovery, and (3) Engagement and Service. An upstanding program must be achieved within the parameters of the academic model if they are going to be sustainable. And that is where I think Scott will be most helpful on the Main Campus because he knows how to create sustainable economic models; he can produce excellence, I believe, in all of those three great missions. So, I ask you to give your support to Dr. Scarborough in his new role. I know that he will reach out to you in the way that he reached out to me and the Board. I understand that Dr. Jacobs has asked him to take the plan and implement it in his new university council and I ask that you work with him as he reaches out to you for your input in that area as well. I love this university, I can’t tell you how much. I believe it is my privilege; it’s our privilege and responsibility to promote this place. Andrew Carnegie in his Management course programs always stated…”praise publicly and criticize them privately.” That does not mean that we won’t tell the truth, but it does mean that we should be proud in promoting our university and what our university offers. When I worked at General Motors I drove a GM car and I still drive a GM car. When I required surgery I had it done here at UTMC. Wherever I am I promote this university as the best university. Any time a potential client comes to me and asks about services I would always say, “You can get it right here because we are the best place.” With that, it is up to us to improve the human condition. I thank you for listening to me. I will take a few questions. Go Rockets!

**President Dowd:** Are there any questions for Mr. Koester?

**Senator Jorgensen:** First, thank you for your willingness to serve on the Board. As chair of the Board I have known you for the entire time. I know the rule of the Board is not to micromanage the university, but as you said, this is the place where the Board is going to look over how things are done such as patterns for example. In case it is not obvious one of the patterns that was raised by the Higher Learning Commission before is the fact that we have a need to do external searches for positions. And just to give you a list that I’ve done on the top of my head, for the past two or three years the following positions were filled internally: two provosts, five deans, three vice presidents, a vice provost and even two former board members were hired in higher administrative positions. When you have an “external” search like we did most recently, but it is clear that external candidates are not going to be given serious consideration it is not a healthy situation for an institution and it hurts us in our professional area. We’ve tried some academic experiments over the past several years. The ones that I recall is the credit hour limit to some groups of students which was killed in less than a year. Also, the College of COIL which existed for less than one year and the extreme customization that I don’t think even lasted a year. Then, just last week we heard about a special roll- your-own degree program by students where they can get a significant fraction of their hours that are totally dependent on their own independent work . What I said to the president on a number of occasions is that the faculty can really help in these things. These experiments frankly failed and students have paid the price. But faculty can help prevent some of those things. But when the voice of the faculty, Faculty Senate and other places whether it is the searches or the split up of the College of Arts and Sciences the faculty voice is tentatively listened to, but has no impact on these decisions it is not a good thing for this institution. There are issues now at the institution that cause tremendous frustration. You may think that I don’t talk to very many faculty members, but as you know I was the head of Faculty Senate twice. I do talk to quite a number of faculty members and the frustration level is something that I have never seen before in this institution. We had problems in the past without a doubt before your time on the Board, but right now there are so many. So, what can we possibly do and how can we possibly change in the direction for improving this situation because in so many ways are going in the wrong direction. When a national publication reports…that we are doing something that is unheard of, a chief financial officer that has no experience in those areas is going to be the chief academic officer. There is a reason that that is not best practice. And we then face our professional community and say, this is what the University of Toledo is doing and it does not help this institution. Thank you for listening.

**Mr. Koester:** There were a lot of questions in there.

**Senator Jorgensen:** I guess my question is this, what is the role of the Board in looking at these situations and responding to these situations?

**Mr. Koester:** The Board looks at strategic issues. Basically, what the Board is trying to do and hopefully is doing is that it is trying to see that our mission and our vision are carried out. We delegated those visions to the president and we will review how we are doing. What we are trying to do is to develop metrics to see how that vision is carried out and hopefully we will start seeing more of those metrics shown. I think it worked out well that Mike is the Faculty Senate chair this year. For some reason and I don’t know why, Mike and I have gotten to be friends since I first became a Board member. I recognize that there is a certain disconnect with the administration and the faculty. I recognize that there is a certain level of animosity, so I want to lower that. I want to raise the civility and that is one of the reasons that I came here to speak to you. That is one of the reasons that I wanted to meet the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. That is one of the reasons why I spend probably more time than anybody else on the Board at the university. I have often said “If they are dedicating … or if they are cutting a ribbon.” I am there because I want to see what’s going on. I do want to increase that open communication. It kind of reminds me of the time when I started our business. We sold our home and we worked out of my garage and as we developed my father had retired and I brought him in on our board of directors and after about a year or two my dad said to me, “Bill, I don’t know why you have me on the board of directors because you are not going to do what I say.”I said “Dad, I don’t have you on the board of directors to do what you say, but I have you on the board to get your opinion. Maybe I was headed off in this direction or maybe something else was headed in this direction and maybe you can pull me back to the center.”Administration isn’t always going to do what the stakeholders say. The president may not always do what the students want or what the faculty wants. But, I assure you we do listen. And the more we listen and the more people can make objective arguments the more effective that will be. So, what I really encourage you to do for keeping our communication open is to make your presentations objectively and try to take the subjective out of it. I think you are doing a fine job. At least hopefully, during my tenure communication will approve.

**Senator Molitor:** I would like to thank you for your service. I would also like to echo what Senator Jorgensen said about faculty frustration against administration. I don’t think I could have said it better than he did. The only thing I wanted to add is in your role as chairman a number of these decisions that Senator Jorgensen did talk about were decisions that were treated as if they had to be implemented immediately. A lot of these decisions did not have to be implemented urgently. The administration could have taken some more time and they could have given faculty more time to discuss and provide our input. I think there were a number of things that the administration has done included a kind of urgency that don’t need to be there. I think as chairman of the Board I would hope that you can at least identify those situations and help the administration slow down because it needs to slow down. I think that will certainly help us.

**Mr. Koester:** I appreciate that. With regards to timing, timing is everything I guess. I have seen things take too long. For instance, when I first came on the Board in 2004 we were talking about redoing the core curriculum and it finally got done in 2011. I think it probably did take too long and there are probably some things that we did jump at too quickly. So, I will pass that on and I will keep it in mind.

**Senator Regimbal:** Mr. Koester, I too appreciate you coming here. To support what’s been said about Dr. Scarborough, I find it troublesome in the interview in the Collegian he stated that he doesn’t have skills that is expected for the job and one of them I believe was with dealing with tenure and promotion. His answer was that he would hire other people to take care of that. So, he is willing to admit where he doesn’t have the skills that are necessary to complete the job, but I would hope in hiring new people that we would consider their salaries because we are letting people go and things that needs to be done on our campus are not being done because we have let people go. So, bringing people in to help him do his job at extraordinary salaries I think it would be wrong from my point of view. I would hope that you would examine that for saying “yes” to new hires. Thank you.

**Senator Barnes:** I just wanted to offer a point of clarification in regards to revising the core. The revision of the core happened because somebody on the faculty, namely me, put in a request on behalf of students which I did when the students said to me, “Our diversity training is not good enough. We need more diversity training. We think that there is not enough high enough quality diversity training happening in our diversity classes: will you ask the Faculty Senate to look into this? ” Then a request was sent to the Executive Committee which created a process which led to that evaluation. Interestingly, through that process there was a reduction of the core that seems to be the Board’s agenda and we had to literally stand in this room and fight to keep the diversity that the students had asked us for into that new core that is coming up. I think that this is one of these cases where when we think about various entities of this university working, how we are not working together in the interest of the students. In my experience as someone who tries hard to listen to students not as customers, but as people that I am mentoring to be good humans in the world, really, we should be paying more attention to their needs rather than dictating in the other direction [from top down]. Because often they know what they want or need in a sense that folks at the other end of the spectrum do not know.

**President Dowd:** I just want to reiterate, the idea of revising the core did originate with Faculty Senate and I apologize to Senator Barnes for not being clearer on that point.

**Mr. Koester:** I just want to say that we do try to listen to the students. We have two student trustees that are serving on the Board. It is certainly my view as chairman to include those students in all of our activities and we also have the president of the Student Senate. Now, that is only three people out of close to twenty-thousand students, but we do try to listen. Also, as I was invited to speak to Faculty Senate I was also invited to speak last year to Student Senate which I did. I came to find out that I was the only chairman to accept and speak to Student Senate, so we do try to listen. We do appreciate what faculty did about reviewing the core. I remember about how I first came on the Board, Dr. Rob Sheehan, interim Provost, was working on re-doing the core and I recognized that it was a difficulty area and I also recognized that faculty worked on it by tidying up those areas. There is a point in trying to find the division of concerns in any kind of decision and to make the perfect decision it takes an infinite amount of time. So, somehow or another what you would have to do is you would have to try to work between trying to make the best decision you can, but also in a timely manner. I think I am going to take one more question.

**Senator Wedding:** About the last five years since Dr. Jacobs came we have heard annually about the finances of the university being in trouble with all of these pronouncements, most recently from Mr. Dabney. The AAUP has done recently a five-year analysis using an independent, outside CPA and we are going to make it available in a newsletter to the faculty and also Dr. Scarborough has asked to see it. The AAUP will do a cost study letter on the finances of the university to offset the negative information to equal out what is being put out by the university’s administration. We found that our information, provided by an outside, independent CPA, says that the finances of this university are the best in the state of Ohio. In fact, Dr. Scarborough since he has been the head in finances he should be taking credit for this and we will certainly give him credit. Thank you.

**Mr. Koester:** Thank you, Senator Wedding. I will make one last comment with regard to Dr. Scarborough. I think he has done an excellent job and I think Dave Dabney has too. Our finances are public and they are published so all can see them. We are referred to for being a state university, but I am not quite sure if that is a proper definition. I think if you take a look at our combined budget, our state subsidy, SSI or state share of instruction is about 17% of our total budget, so I guess we are a university with some kind of state assistance. We have been financially stable and all of us have been a part of that and you have too. It is a struggle. We sometimes don’t make the best decisions, but we try to make the best decisions. Generally, I think we done a good job. I hope and pray that in a year from now… I think Lincoln said this when they were trying to run him out of a county, “If it wasn’t for the honor I would just walk.” So, if it wasn’t for the honor I wouldn’t be here, but I will walk. Thank you.

**President Dowd:** Thank you, Mr. Koester. I will take this opportunity to invite Chair Koester to come back to Senate, perhaps at the end of the fall semester or the beginning of the spring semester. I now ask that Executive Committee members stand and introduce themselves, stating their position or positions and how to contact them.

**Senator Rouillard:** My name is Linda Rouillard and I am the president elect. I am from the College of Language Literature and Social Sciences.

**Senator Duhon:** My name is Lucy Duhon and I am the Executive Secretary. I am from the College of Innovative Learning and Honors.

**Senator Templin:** My name is Mark Templin and I am a representative for the Main Campus. I am from Judith Herb College of Education and Health Science and Human Services.

**Senator Cappelletty:** My name is Diane Cappelletty and I am a representative for the Health Science Campus. I am from the College of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences.

**Senator Williams:** My name is Frederick Williams and I am a representative for the Health Science Campus. I am from the College of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences.

**Senator Lundquist:** My name is Sara Lundquist and I am a representative for the Main Campus. I am from the College of Language Literature and Social Sciences.

**Senator Anderson:** My name is Lawrence Anderson- Huang, “dead president.” I am not on the Senate per se, I am just here because I am the dead president. I represent the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics.

**President Dowd:** There is another reason I asked the Executive Committee members to introduce themselves. I will be ``out front’’ in each of our meetings – giving reports, introducing speakers, etc. Although I preside over Senate and chair the Executive Committee, I’m not Senate or the Senate Executive Committee. Members of your Executive Committee have done a lot of work already and will be doing far more work as the academic year continues. Please make them do more work. But we all very much appreciate the time and effort they will be devoting this year to make this a better university. If you have issues you would like Faculty Senate to consider, please contact any of the Executive Committee members. After all, we work for you.

**Senator Anderson:** Dowd, you forgot one last person, Quinetta, who is our secretary.

**Senator Dowd:** The person who actually makes the trains runs on time and makes sure that I do the job that I am supposed to do, is Ms. Quinetta Hubbard. We are so indebted to you, Quinetta. Thank you,

I would the members of the Executive Committee that attended Board meetings yesterday to stand up and give a brief description of the issues that were discussed by the Board.

**Senator Templin:** I attended the Trusteeship and Governance Sub-Committee meeting and basically, two issues were discussed. The first, the development of a common format for presenting the benchmark indicators whereby the University of Toledo would compare itself to peer institutions, aspirational institutions, and other Ohio institutions. That was a very interesting discussion to me, a lot of details. Probably about the last ten minutes of the meeting was regarding the possibility to moving to a smoking ban on the Main Campus. The Board is going to draft a resolution and look at it at the next committee meeting.

**Senator Rouillard:** I also attended the external affairs sub-committee meeting. Doctor Dan Johnson gave an update on the university global strategy and UT’s current focus on China, India, and the Middle East, including the American University in Beirut. There was also an overview on a campus project developing parking and a pedestrian pass~~,~~ upgrade on campus and there was also some discussion on enrollment. We were told that we won’t have the latest figures on enrollment until mid September. Dr. Jacobs’ best guess is that we will see a 4.7% decline. Some of the discussion on enrollment referred to a Board’s request to specifically not enroll under prepared students and also this decline is the result of a deliberate strategy to raise UT scores on this campus.

**President Dowd:** I now will present the Executive Committee report. In fact, today's report will be more of a "President's Report," as the events of today did not permit me to consult the Executive Committee on the issues I will describe today. To be brief, I had a prepared report that I was going to present to you today, but given the events of today I am just going to "wing" it.

I went to a Clinical Affairs Committee meeting this morning at 7:30 a.m. Chancellor Gold gave a presentation dealing with ranking and rating of medical centers. Chancellor Gold, I don't know if you are interested in talking about that today or at a subsequent Senate meeting, but I believe all Senators would be interested in hear that report. Personally, I thought it was a very informative report.

Part of my responsibility as president to the Faculty Senate is to give the Faculty Senate report to the Board of Trustee's Academic and Student Affairs Committee. I tried to do that at the meeting today, but was not permitted to do so. I began with some preliminary remarks and then stated that I wanted to express to the Board comments about the appointment of Dr. Scott Scarborough as provost that I and other members of the Executive Committee received from faculty members, students, and community members.

The committee chair, Trustee Zerbey, interrupted my report and told me that he did not want to hear comments from me that I have heard from other people. I found such instructions quite disturbing and intimidating. I have presided over Faculty Senate previously and over the past 10 years or so I have attended most Board meetings and most Board Committee meetings. One of the Senate President's responsibilities as a member of the Board of Trustee's Academic and Student Affairs Committee is to report faculty views to the Board of Trustees. One would think that the Board of Trustees would be interested in hearing faculty views on the individual nominated to be Provost of the Main Campus. But apparently this is not so for some Trustees. At this point in the day I do not know the particular language I should use to describe what happened to me at that Board meeting today, and I do not want to incite Senators over this event by using language that is too strong. I think the most polite way of describing what happened at that meeting is that my speech was abridged.

I am appointed to that committee because I am President of the Faculty Senate. My first responsibility is not to give my own opinion on issues but instead to express the views from the faculty. I tried to do this and the committee chair did want to hear such views. So instead of reading from my prepared notes, I had to skim those notes, trying to pull sentences from here and there which I thought the committee chair would permit me to say. I am not happy to report this, but with such disjointed statements, your Senate President probably sounded like an “babbling idiot” today.

But then Trustee Hussain asked the committee chair to let me speak fully, something to the effect of "Faculty should speak and faculty should be heard." Good for him. I very much appreciate Trustee Hussain defending the faculty. But it was too late: I was completely rattled and my intended report was in tatters. I will submit to the Board a written copy of my intended report which will be included in that committee's minutes of that meeting.

For now, I will describe some of the comments that I made at the Board committee meeting and some comments I wanted to make but was not permitted, but before that please remember that I wanted to tell the Board that Faculty Senate will work with Provost Scarborough. Of course we will. We all want the same things. We want success for our students, we want success for the faculty, and we want success for the university and the community. But perhaps the Board committee chair didn't realize that when you abridge speech, you sometimes eliminate not only negative comments but positive comments as well.

I am going to summarize my intended report to the Board because I don't think you want four pages of text read to you. The overall concern that I received from faculty was that Dr. Scarborough has little or no experience in academic issues. He has little experience dealing with the issues faced by instructors, chairs, and deans. And he has no experience supervising such academic affairs. Over his career he taught fewer classes than most of our part-time instructors have taught in the past few semesters. He never faced a trade-off that every faculty member faces every week, every semester, every year and that is determining the time devoted to teaching, research and service. And now he is going to be the individual that will be evaluating that decision for every faculty member on this campus. This includes tenure decisions and tenure promotions decisions. President Jacobs has noted on numerous occasions that such decision are multi-million dollar investments. Yet in an open forum Dr. Scarborough said that 99 times out of 100 he would defer those decisions to deans, I hope not. As the Provost he has to make those decisions. We all hope that Dr. Scarborough will grow into the job and grow very quickly. We all want a strong provost, a strong advocate for academic affairs. But the committee chair did not want to hear our views.

I also raised a couple of other issues to the Board, and at least one was already mentioned today -- the search process. Was there a search committee or was there a search advisory committee? Was Dr. Scarborough interviewed by the full committee or only some of the committee? This is not clear. I also expressed to the Board a belief held by large number of faculty member that the four candidates for the Provost position did not face the same conditions and experiences when they visited our campus.

I also mentioned to the Board the issue Senator Jorgensen raised earlier in this meeting. The term I used was "musical chairs." That is, I stated to the Board that it seems we are playing musical chairs in that it is the same individuals who are routinely appointed and reappointed across several senior positions. This is not healthy for an institution. I was contacted by a national news organization and was asked a question I declined to answer because I don't know the answer. I was asked whether this administration not want to hire people from outside the university or is it the case that no one from the outside wants to come here? Although I don't know the answer to that question, I do know any answer is not good.

There are three issues. The first is that of a finance officer becoming an academic officer, the second is about the search process, and the third is the musical chairs played by the same senior administrators. I believe I said at the Board meeting that Dr. Scarborough is not responsible for the search process and he is not responsible for the "musical chairs" played at this university. He didn't create a search process he simply applied for a job. He doesn't "play the music" with our musical chairs. These are questions that should not be answered by Dr. Scarborough. Instead these are very important questions that should be answered by Dr. Jacobs. Dr. Scarborough was faced with only one of these three issues, can he switch from being a finance officer to being an academic officer. The whole point that I was trying to say to the Board is he got a tough job if he gets the provost position. He has to learn and the best people to learn from are the faculty. He has to learn what is involved in making a workload decision. And then there are any of the thousands of other decisions that he will have to make each day, week, month and semester. I believe that if Dr. Scarborough is appointed to this position then we, Faculty Senate, should help him. I wanted to say that to the Board, but I never got the chance.

I am not asking for any reaction from the Senate. I merely thought I should inform Senate of what occurred at the Board Committee meeting today.

**Senator Thompson-Casado:** One reaction from the floor is confusion; we just sat here and heard one of the Board of Trustees tell us that if we don’t have something nice to say about the university, we shouldn’t speak up at all; what about critical inquiry? We [Faculty Senate] were just told how to structure our language. You’ve been shot down [by the BOT] but, on the other hand, they say they want open lines of communication. They don’t want us [faculty] to speak, they want us to use their language.

**President Dowd:** That maybe so, but I want to say, none of the comments that were made about the meeting today should reflect on Bill Koester because he did not run the meeting. I have worked with Bill and there is trust between us. That said, the points that you are making, in my mind, correctly describe the attitude of some of the top people here. In this environment we do have to improve communication.

**Senator Thompson-Casado:** But he just told us how to structure our communication; and I understand that the Board of Trustees also passed a policy on how to structure their own communication within the Board of Trustees.

**President Dowd:** I do not dispute that. Better communication has to be desired by both sides.

**Senator Wedding:** Who is the chair of this committee? Do we have to go look it up?

**President Dowd:** No. The committee chair is Trustee Zerbey.

**Senator Wedding:** Do you mean from The Blade, First Amendment advocate?

**President Dowd:** Yeah, kind-of ironic, isn’t it. But I am not trying to make “big” statements here. I’ve had a pretty rough day and I’m too tired for “big” statements. The short version is that I tried to express to the Board what I believe are the views of the faculty through the comments I received.

**Senator Jorgensen:** I just want to say that I appreciate your effort and all the hard work you’ve done for representing us. Thank you.

**President Dowd:** That was not the most upbeat stuff that has been presented to Senate. I’d like to move on. I want to invite Penny Poplin Gosetti to talk about the HLC report. Over the past four years she has worked on continued accreditation. As a member of the Executive Committee I asked many questions over that period and she gave good answers to each question. I wanted her to come to Senate today because she deserves a victory lap. I want very much to express my appreciation for all the hard work that Penny did for our university and our students.

[Applause]

**Penny Poplin Gosetti:** Thank you, Mike for those kind words, but unfortunately it is not over and that is why I am here today. It is all good, but they changed their practices and HLC is ongoing now. We do not get six years off as before. This was not how I was going to begin, but I need to now because of what Mike said. I appreciate the “thank you’s,” but no one does this by themselves. It’s too big of a project, and it takes too long, and it takes too much time and you need to realize how many people worked on this in making it look good and it is always nice to have that. It includes people in this room. It includes people in the classrooms. It includes people on both campuses. It includes staff members, faculty members, administrators, Board members, and community members. At one point we probably had about 300-500 people participating in meetings and giving their time and being honest with the people who were here on campus, saying both good and the bad about who we are and what we do. The people who read the reports, Jim... who wrote the report and when I say, “wrote it,” he did not write it in his own words. He took the words from people and made them a beautiful single voice out of the work we did and every change he made was read by the people to make the change and approve it. Thank you to the committee members for those of you who were on it and the team leaders. There were people in my office, Heather Johnson Huntley which I had an opportunity to work with who is stupendous. It really was a group effort and it is a community that makes that happen, I learned a lot. Will I do it again? As sick as I am I will say yes. Because you met people, you learned about the institution, and you worked with people throughout the institution and it was actually an inspiring thing to do. I appreciate your thanks and I will always try to give as honest of an answer as I possibly can.; you may not always like them and I may not always like what you say, but they open more conversations. Let me go on to the news though which is what the report said and where we are headed. This is actually the presentation that I gave to the Board of Trustees this morning and I asked Mike would it be okay for me to present it to you. Certainly, if you have any questions I will be happy to answer them. How many of you had the opportunity to read the report? It is available on the Self Study website and it’s been up there since we received it back in July.

**President Dowd:** Forgive me, Penny. May I ask to interrupt your report and let Chancellor Gold make a few comments right now? I am asking this because of the length of your report. That is, when Chancellor Gold has completed his remarks, you may have the remained of time left to this meeting.

**Chancellor Gold:** Yes. Thank you for having me. First, I would like to say that I am available to you, the Executive Committee, and all members of faculty. I have no formal remarks to you except we extend a warm welcome and greet everyone back in the beginning of this new academic year. Also, I want to share some of the energy and excitement that I sense among you between faculty, staff, and students on campus. It’s been wonderful to walk in front of Centennial Hall on the Health Science Campus and see all the men and women who are back with us. I also extend you a very warm welcome on behalf of Dr. McMillen, he is not with us this afternoon, as many of you may know that he is actually in the hospital as we speak. I am very optimistic that they will throw him out tomorrow. I know that his thoughts are with you. I really don’t want to interrupt Penny’s presentation because that is really an important part of what you are here to listen to, but I would like to take your questions and comments. I would like to take a minute out and thank Mr. Koester for being here today. It sends an extremely important message to the faculty here at this university and having worked with Mr. Koester now since the merger he is a remarkable leader and I think we can look forward to a great year under his leadership. Mr. Koester commented very briefly on the clinical transplant issue that the Medical Center is currently dealing with. I am more than willing to answer any questions, but let me say that the materials that are being published in the media etc. are to some extent exaggerations of the truth, clearly to some extent, non-truthful. I am more than willing to answer questions within the limits of what I can say legally. But most importantly, we have a very close relationship with the family involved and they have a very, very strong interest in privacy with this matter and we are trying as hard as we can to be responsible to the media and the leaders of transparency communication…we are responsible to the strong wishes of this family to whom I almost speak on a daily basis, seven days a week. The aggressive review transparency outside an assessment was initiated by the University Medical Center has been highly commented on by the outside testimony. No one is perfect and I guarantee you that nobody gets up in the morning and says, “This is what I am going to do today, let me plan this out and make it happen.” The people involved in this all have been involved in prior organ transplantations which have been going on for over thirty years. They have dedicated their careers to this program and they are devastated. If you have ever walked into the Medical Center you have not seen a single staff member that has…and they shared that sincere with you this afternoon. Again, I do not want to interrupt Penny’s presentation, so if you want me to come back I would be more than willing to talk about the ranks and rating systems and various…and who does what to whom and what we need to think more as faculty and as a university. The more we understand that, the more we become connoisseurs to improve who we are and how we have to interpret this information that is discussed and publicized.

**President Dowd:** The presentation that you gave this morning at the Board’s Clinical Affairs committee meeting about medical centers rankings was very informative. Would you be willing give that presentation at a subsequent Senate meeting? I believe all the Senators would find it equally informative. Are there any pressing questions for Dr. Gold at this time? We will ask him to come to the next Senate meeting and give that presentation.

**Chancellor Gold:** I will take your best wishes back to Dr. McMillen who I will see this afternoon.

**President Dowd:** Thank you.

**Penny poplin Gosetti:** The report that you saw on the website has two parts; there is an assurance part and there is an advancement part and this is what makes up the total report. The assurance part is a presentation of the team’s evaluation. It provides the records of the visit. It provides information on every single person that they met with. It provides the evidence that they picked out from the self study report from the conversations that they had with people about this report whether it be criteria and the rationale of recommendations on accrediting relationship. So, in this section the team documented its judgment about how we went about fulfilling the criteria and the core components and then evaluating the extent to which those are actually fulfilled, the criteria. As you see, there are three options that they can do: (1) meets the criterion (2) meets the criterion but would benefit by initiating improvements (3) meets the criterion but Commission follow-up is necessary. That will be equivalent to what we experienced the last time when we had our site visit in 2002 and had a focus visit follow-up on assessment strategic plan. The team also provides its recommendations regarding the status of the institution. So, in this case, we are happy to say that all of the criteria and the core components were met; that is what allows us to move forward. If you do not meet one of the core components within a criteria you could end up with a focus visit, and that was not the case for us. So, this is a very, very good thing. Also, we have the advancement section. The advancement section is a workout peer review. The people who come in are called consultant evaluators and they are our peers. They are members from other institutions, we go visit their institution and they visit other institutions and we are all responsible for giving each other feedback. The advancement session is more about peer review related to quality management. In this case, what are we talking about is having them come in and giving us their observation consultation on things that we might look at in the future and issues that might have been raised in the assurance session that they might give us a feedback on how they saw it. In addition, there are areas deserving institutional attention and areas of accomplishment. I will be sharing those with you this afternoon and any other areas that you want to find about the team and/or the institution. As many of you know we wrote a special section on the merger and you will see some comments in here about their take of that. So, those are the two sections; the assurance section is about thirty-five pages and the advancement section is shorter, about twelve-fifteen pages.

Well, the outcome of all of this as I just said is continuing accreditation which is a very good thing. We have ten years until our next big comprehensive site visit, AY 2022. I think that was very helping thing that we achieved. What I would like to do is start with the accomplishments that they talked about: This was their introduction to the assurance section and in general I think this request the kind of comments that were made throughout the report is that “We are well run, we are well poised, and we are well placed with the challenges that were posed by the region and to take advantage of opportunities provided.” Throughout the document you will see the references to our positions within the state, the city, and the nation. Many of them are very good things that our faculty and students are doing. In terms of specifics, however there are a few things that I would like to highlight. One is the detailed self-study report that is actually 328 pages that indicated that it was one of the longer self studies that was ever received by HLC. From here on out we have a word limitation. The quality assurance cannot be more than 75-80 pages that are focused on evidence. They did not want to hear anymore about how “Lewis and Clark went down the river and planted an inner pole in the middle of a plotted land and there the institution became.”They said that they do not need to read that anymore because they got it the first time, so they are limiting us to 40,000 words which is about 75-80 pages. So, we will be a little more concise. If you can remember all the times I came and talked to you, it is really all about the mission. One of the things that HLC and all the regional accredited bodies do is work towards what their mission is going to be. Institutions do not have to do things the same way, but they have to have certain things such as a mission, and a strategic plan, and assessment plans etc., but they do not have to do it the same way. One of the things that they did say was that we are very consistent. We had a high level of consistency with our mission documents and in general “constituents believe in stated core values.” They wrote, “As UT invests in providing support to ensure that faculty, students, and staff inquire, discover, and apply knowledge responsibly UT leaders should have confidence that their constituents are walking in integrity in regard to embracing and living out the institution’s mission and values.” Again, that was a theme throughout their reports about the various topic areas and criterion. Another thing that they said again throughout was that they perceived that the institution appeared to be a stronger institution post-merger and that the president is providing great leadership and accomplishing that. Again, they were quite taken with the merger and part of that is because we wrote a special emphasis on it. But even our very first visit with John Taylor who is our liaison with HLC at the time came out; he asked us a lot about it and he said the commission and committee members will ask about it and from the feedback that I got is a common question of most of the meetings about what people thought about the merger. What they found is, most of the stakeholders were positive about the outcome of the merger and they supported it and they thought the merger created a stronger more effective institution. They felt in our current format we were better equipped to address the needs and serve our student population. Finally, in all of those conversations they felt very strongly that there was a strong pride and ownership of the institution in regards to who they spoke with, this was faculty, and staff, and students. Other accomplishments, they talked a lot in here about student learning being a priority. Again, an example, “an institution clearly values development and competencies necessary for graduates to see in rural workplace which articulates the value of student learning that it places on its global initiatives in terms of preparing well-prepared ambassadors.”Time again, they give examples throughout that these are the kinds of things that’s in student learning. They also talked about the great inroads that we made which established a foundation of an effective assessment. For those of you who worked with the Assessment Committee and with the assessment process within their college should know they are doing quite a bit of work for trying to get it up to speed in term of those areas; they indicated that the potential for developing and understanding what works and what doesn’t is really not the sole property of the university Assessment Committee. In fact, they noted that there were people involved in student services and those were the people who provides academic and non-academic support and athletics that see a value in how well their students are doing. So, that is not a conversation that they just had with the assessment committee people, but they sought throughout the university different groups doing that level of assessment using the feedback to make critical decisions about curriculum and activities related to student work. They noted our Resource Room and we had to put pictures up of before and after. We made sure that they got in buildings and were able to see. They also said that the infrastructure for enhancing experiential learning opportunities is commendable. They were very taken with the students that we do have. I will tell you that in almost every single meeting we made sure that we had faculty members and students because we wanted not only just the people who are functionally responsible for the areas, but we wanted to make sure there were users that are from the kinds of functions that we do. They also were quite taken of our undergraduate research program. They felt really good about our commitment to the wide range of opportunities that we have and they felt that that was a significant strength for this particular institution.

Then we go to what is called consultations of the team and these are the suggestions of what they have: what they wrote is a statement affiliation status recommendation. Even though there are no reports required the Commission recommends that the institution pays attention to issues that has been identified for institutional attention. The team feels comfortable, however with the ability of the institution to address those concerns that are listed under each section requirement for our institutional attention. They felt that there were things that we can work on, but they felt very good about the processes that we have set up and people who were placed who would be able to deal with those kinds of questions. One of the areas that they wrote about is assessment and this was not a surprise to us, we knew that there were some things that we still needed to work on. They noted that there were several questions related to assessment of student learning that could be made and they urged that we continue the institutional attention to understand the student learning to achieve the ongoing institutional projects. They also felt that our current and future strategic plans needed to be informed by student understanding by student learning and how the performance of our students relates to all of our continuances and partners, both inside the institution and out. They indicated that a permanent position from the provost’s office to oversee assessment was needed. They felt that it was in the best interest of the institution to have somebody oversee some of those practices and policies. Just of a point of clarification, there are three items in my title, program review, and assessment adequate, and … Also, evidence of formalized program review. As many of you know we were in the process for the past year or so trying to get that lab off the ground and they did note that we did have a plan in place, but they also said we have not done this yet. They really want program review as peer reviews driven quality assurance process, the results of which can be effectively in student inform strategy…program improvement long range plan and resource…allocation. This is one that they specifically said this process will be expected in the next HLC visit. They wrote about general education and they talked to a lot of people about some of the work we were doing noting that we did not have at that point the curriculum approved because it was in April and the report was in January. However, they did note that it is an “ambitious and reasonably sound plan for assessing general education, but it needs to be implemented” and they expect to see it on their next visit. They indicated, “A high level of… They also gave a little feedback about doing that by suggesting that we do not have any faculty member review everything every year because we are going to get burned out and there are some other processes for doing that. I think there were some really good recommendations throughout the report. Another area that they talked about was branding the student experience, and for those of you who did go to the meeting I don’t know if you knew what the question is, *what is a Rocket?* They found that few staff members could articulate that vision in a common way. Yes, everyone had an idea, but some were self paced learning and some others were extreme engagement, so there were lots of different viewpoints. However, they found that student leaders claimed a single vision in general, that Rockets are people who are connected with the world around them in meaningful ways who can refer what they learned in class and making the difference in their communities. One of the things that they found throughout that conversation was that there was a real strong student pride. They said, “Students are proud of this university and they take pride and know that they are going to make connections and a difference in their worlds. We encourage UT to leverage this pride in the distinctive opportunities and connections to help the greater community, state, nation, and world understand that these students are making a difference.” The last thing the branded student experience was a note that successful enrollment management will be the key to the university’s future fiscal health and success in achieving its goals. They indicated that we needed to confirm potential effects of selective admission process combining with the shift and state funding to a completion mission model and courses, so it will be internal and external influences that is going to make a difference. They also stated that we need to focus on UT’s curriculum and course design which has substantial impact on student achievement, persistence, and rates of progress to graduation. Again, I think they thought that we were doing some good things, but they really wanted us to be proactive in our thinking about some of those kinds of processes. We do have a lot of people that are working on those things, but they were saying that we need to do some more work in that area. Organizational structures and internal engagement/governance: One of the things they noted in their conversations among people was the unusual high numbers of matrix structures. When they reference matrix structures they were talking about the notion of schools, they weren’t really talking about schools though. But, we were bringing different types of groups together from different areas and they particularly noted the students experience on this where we had people working across divisions and they really applauded that and they felt that the current units were functioning well, but they encouraged us to do a regular evaluation of those to ensure that we were serving our students well because they felt that if the right people weren’t in the positions in a certain point of time we could have communication issues along the way because of the complexity of those relationships. They also suggested that we invest energy in re-visioning an institutional value of practices of shared governance. What they found in talking to people was that the assessments which affected shared governance actually fails very widely and that the data that we provided them indicated that there was a gap between the concept of shared governance which is about 80-90% of correspondence, but the limited perception of shared governance occurs was between 20-40%. So, they suggested that we need to get retention for closing that gap. Another thing they pointed out was to fill in most senior administrative positions following national searches and that was something strongly recommended.

There are some miscellaneous things, but there are not in any category: One thing that was error on our part was that we publicized the terminal degrees that our faculty /have. The Banner system has a banner manual input for these degrees and if we go back in time some of those have not been kept up and as we have gone into the newer Banner system we know what is going in now. But, we have faculty that have been around here for a very long time and we do not always have the correct data. Also, if you have a Masters’ Degree and it showed a Doctorate and if you put all your degrees down it will pull you out in all levels and it might show that you have a Masters’ Degree when you actually have a Doctoral Degree too. So, we took the information that we had and to top it off when it got printed out the lines and columns were shifted down so it looked like we had a large number of Bachelors’ Degrees. We cleared that up and there was a misstatement of facts section and we sent it to them and they pointed out that we made a mistake. But, what they pointed out is that we still had a large number of unlisted which is what “we didn’t know” and so we are working on cleaning that up. Developing and managing talent: They looked in several places that we had disinvested in credited development in a number of areas and one of the areas was in staff development. So, they gave a recommendation that we should work on that area and also in the area of research in terms of development, training, and getting research grants etc. Consider seeking community engagement: They were very complimentary in our community engagement. One of the things that came up out of research and libraries was that the requests had been made for research and deficits activity and it is hoped on their part to continue to monitor those budgets based on research and problematic areas and making sure we are preparing that to our peers. They also indicated and recommended that they recommended that the routine of administrative autonomy on the Main Campus, Law Center, Health Center, and the Library as well, but pay particular attention to combining data with the library system. They were very impressed with experimental and service learning. We had a number of students that came in and they were so excited for telling them what they were doing. We headed over to the… Center and showed them some of our hands-on opportunities that we have here and we were strongly commended for that and they also felt that there were pockets where they saw more of that than others. They wanted us to make sure that we were creating opportunities across other disciplines and colleges for those kinds of experiences. That is the finding, but there are other things in there. I would like to turn now to the HLC Pathways. This is a project that the HLC Commission been working on for several years. We are not the only ones that are moving towards this model. It is a direct response to the kinds of influence by the federal government. They want much more accountability. They want to know more of what’s going on within the six years. So, they have revised and restructured the criterion. They want to focus on integrity, transparency, and demonstrate quality which is going to come about annually inputting of data into an evidence file that they have, it is sort of like creating your tenure dossier on a yearly basis and storing it in a central location so that HLC has a chance to look at it. They do not require that everyone does it. It also reached the focus on compliance and accountability issues. They want to know our jobs placement and the outcomes for students getting jobs. So, these are all things that we have to report on and it is important because if we are not collecting that data then we need to start collecting that data because we are bound to produce the information. In hopes of doing this they hope for a rigor that they are all familiar with the accrediting body, HLC did receive a letter a couple years ago…. There is a lot of cleaning that is going on and as a result there are three pathways: standard pathway, open pathway, and AQIP which is the continuance pathway that has been going on for awhile. We all received letters in the middle of the summer that indicated what pathway we were going on. We are on a standard pathway and a standard pathway that is closely monitored for institutions that are on the move. There are a lot of institutions that are doing that now because they are looking at institutions education. They are creating distance learning programs at various sites and these are all things that must go through HLC, we must go through HLC. When we start a campus offsite or if we have a program in another country it all has to have HLC’s approval. So, there are institutions on the go that are doing these kinds of things. Another thing is that you have to keep up the data that is going to the Commission and what I think is that it builds a culture of people thinking about that. Let me show you what this means:



Year one, that is where we are, AY 2012-2013. What you see in this system is two times where we are doing assurance finding. Remember when I said, assurance is the criteria? You will see that we are going to be submitting that twice. We are going to submit it once in year four and then we are going to submit it again in year ten, that is the 75-80 page document. What we will be working on on a yearly basis is putting our data into an evidence file and part of what we will be doing if figuring out how to go about doing that. The one thing that we do want you to notice on here is year four we will have another site visit. They are abbreviating the visits. There will be three to five people at most, but it will be a time for them to come on campus, look for evidence, ask some questions, and then give us a…report, so to speak. So, in three to five years we will have another site visit. The evidence file has information that they want in that, course catalogs, financial statements, handbooks, student handbooks, class schedules, government documents, and faculty rosters etc. They said that we need to have that, but I cannot tell you how hard it is for the committee to gather that data. So what we are going to be doing is creating a process for developing the evidence on file, so people will know what it is that they need to be saving. The second thing is that we need to develop some standing committees. We will be allowed to have thirteen people across the institution who can contribute to the evidence file and so we need to be setting it up like how are we going to get the information into that. We also need to address the suggestions that are in there. Finally, we need to start preparing for our next site visit. I know that this is a “reader’s digest version” that I just gave you, but does anyone have any questions? Who wants to help volunteer on the next site visit?

**President Dowd:** Penny, I appreciate very much this report to Senate and for the enormous amount of time and energy you have devoted to continued accreditation. Is there any other business? Senator Rouillard, would you like to make a couple remarks about Committee on Committees?

**Senator Rouillard:** Yes. I am still waiting to hear from a couple of people. I will be sending out an email to those members to the Committee on Committees so we can meet at one or two time slots on Friday and perhaps be able to finish up with the rest of committee assignments over email. If I sent you an email asking you to be on Committee on Committees and you accepted it, please exspect an email tomorrow about a meeting time. Thank you.

**President Dowd:** I have one more point to make about Senate appointments. Faculty Senate established an unofficial policy four or so years ago about committee appointments. Please let me explain this unofficial policy. Senate contacted all Senators with a request for volunteers to serve on our committees. If you responded indicating a couple committees you are willing to serve on, then thank you very much. However, the interpretation followed by the Committee on Committees is if you did not respond and did not volunteer to serve on one or more committees, then you have volunteered to serve on any committee. The point is, when we make the committee assignments we want Senators to be on these committees. So, if you have not volunteered for one or more committees it is not too late to do so. Please contact Vice President Rouillard because we really do need participation of the Senators. Also, please turn to the junior faculty in your department and ask them to volunteer, because you do not have to be Senator to serve on Faculty Senate committees. Let’s get junior faculty involved in shared governance.

**Senator Thompson-Casado:** I have a question, are we going to invite Vice Provost Pryor in to talk about his new learning ventures program because there was a meeting on Thursday and it looks like there is a lot of curricular things that was different?

**President Dowd:** Did anyone hear about Vice Provost Pryor’s new course?

**Senator Thompson-Casado:** Because I thought Faculty Senate has to approve those courses?

**President Dowd:** As I understand it, it is an existing course, and it may impact programs. Honestly, I don’t understand what Vice Provost Pryor is trying to do. When I spoke with him there was a lot of “hand waiving” but not much detail. He made a number of statements that I did not understand. For example, why would a student take an ethics course from an ethics professor when she could instead have some coach whose background might be in economics? Huh? I don’t want to speak for any of the other Executive Committee members about that conversation with Vice Provost Pryor, but after talking with him I walked out of that room knowing less than when I walked in. I am going to send an invitation for him to speak to the Executive Committee. With regard to inviting him to speak to Senate, during his last appearance before Faculty Senate he disrespected Senator Anderson, President Anderson at that time. So at this point I do not want to invite him to speak at Faculty Senate. Stay tuned. With that, is there any old business? Any new business? Given the events of today, please go to the Board of Trustees webpage and contact Trustee Hussain, thanking him for speaking on behalf of faculty to express their views to the Board of Trustees.

**Senator Barnes:** I am just wondering if the Executive Committee will consider some kind of response to the appointment of Dr. Scarborough becoming provost so that this body can consider it.

**President Dowd:** At this stage I would like to hear from Senators. We need input from you because, after all, we work for you. I will take this up with the Executive Committee, but I need to hear from faculty on this issue.

**Senator Barnes:** Thank you.

**President Dowd:** If there is an point to this, it cannot be that only the Executive Committee stands up and voice their opinion, I saw that today personally.

**Senator Barnes:** What I am asking is, given the recent history in terms of lack of administration response to faculty concerns that has left many folks feeling like there isn’t recourse, or a sense that we will have our voices heard, I am wondering if you can give us some recommendations of things that might actually be effective. Many of us have worked very hard to be heard in various ways and found that difficult.

**President Dowd:** If you can, contact the Executive Committee members, myself, and/or send a note to the Faculty Senate Office and I will take this to the Chair of the Board, Mr. Koester. That said, we have to give him credit because he stuck through our entire meeting today. I will carry that message forward. And now, I say the words I have been waiting for all day, do I have a motion to adjourn?

**IV**. Meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by: Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard

Lucy Duhon Faculty Senate Office Administrative Secretary.

Faculty Senate Executive Secretary