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**President Mary Powers** called the meeting to order, **Karen Hoblet,** Executive Secretary, called the roll.

***I. Roll Call: 2010-2011 Senators:***

**Present**: Anderson,Atwood, Barden, Barlowe, Barnes, Barrett, Batten, Baumgartner, Benjamin, Brickman, Carr, Caruso, Chiarelott, Cluse-Tolar, Dowd, Eastop, Fink, Fournier, Franchetti, Funk, Gardner, Gibbons, Hammersley, Hoblet, Horan, Hornbeck, Jorgensen, Kistner, Laux, LeBlanc, Lundquist, Molitor, Moore, Nandkeolyar, Ohlinger, Olson, Piazza, Plentifish, Powers, Randolph, Regimbal, Rouillard, Sawicki, Sheldon, Shriner, Skeel, Solocha, Stepkowski, Teclehaimanot, Thompson-Casado, Tinkel, Wedding, Weldy, White, Yonker,

**Excused absences:** Dismukes, Malhotra, Wilson,

**Unexcused absences:** Crist, Giovannucci, Humphrys, Lee, Moynihan,

***II.******Approval of Minutes****:* Minutes of 10/19/2010 were not yet ready for approval.

***III. Executive Committee Report:***

**President Mary Powers: S**enators and guests should introduce themselves before speaking so the speakers’ names are recorded accurately in the minutes.

I am calling the meeting to order. Welcome all to the fifth Faculty Senate meeting of the academic year 2010-2011.

To start the meeting, I ask Secretary Hoblet to call the roll. Thank Secretary Hoblet.

By now you have probably noticed that the seats are a little different today. President Jacobs’ will be joining us at approximately 4:30 pm. and he has requested to have this seating arrangement today.

Minutes for the September 28th meeting were sent for your review. May I have a motion for approval of the minutes from the September 28th meeting? Second. All in favor? Any opposed. Please let the record show the minutes from the September 28th meeting have been approved.

As I start the Executive Committee Report, to start with addressing some of the comments that I’ve had about delay in Minutes being distributed to the faculty at large and to the Senators for approval. I wanted to talk a little bit about the chronology and what we’ve being trying to do and what we are challenged with, this year. As I mentioned in our first two meetings, a decision was made by our previous main campus provost to cut the support staff hours for the Faculty Senate administrative secretary in half. It seems that the decision was made without review of the job demands and responsibilities. Throughout the summer, even before the job was advertised internally, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee expressed concerns. We questioned the provost and chancellor in at least two of our monthly meetings about this decision given the demands of for the position. A detailed position description was provided to justify our concerns. Internal candidates for the position were not identified just a couple weeks before the start of fall semester. Just in time for the start of the semester, our administrative secretary started in her position. Consistent with what was needed in the past, at least 32 hours of labor are typically required to transcribe the first draft of the minutes. Then, time is needed for speakers to review and approve their portions of the minutes. Transcribing and preparing the minutes is the most time-consuming of the responsibilities of the administrative secretary position. I noticed and some of you as well, on Saturdays September 25th, October 2nd, October 16th, I and others received e-mails from the Faculty Senate administrative secretary with drafts of minutes. In her dedication, she has been working to keep up with the minutes outside of time that she is scheduled to work. There are other routine logistical demands for the administrative secretary associated with the time it takes to set up meetings and to be present at meetings. I have received many comments about the minutes and especially the lapse in getting information out to the larger community about the Faculty Senate meetings this year. This lapse is in no way the fault of our secretary, it’s is due to the circumstances. Additionally, there is now a need for Health Science campus elections for non-bargaining unit faculty that, according to past practice, should be conducted by the Faculty Senate office. Besides bringing up the concerns about the staff reduction at the provost/chancellor meetings throughout the summer, I want to let you know some of the steps that I have taken to try to address these concerns. First, I additionally set up a meeting with Provost McMillen on Thursday September 16th to request that the hours for the position be increased to 30 hours per week; I think that will be about the right amount at least and I thought that at some time we will have that request granted. I spoke with Brenda Grant informally about the concern on October 1st following the Finance and Strategy Committee meeting. There had been no response by Monday October 18th, so I sent an e-mail to both Provost McMillen and Brenda Grant asking for word about the progress of my request and received no response to that e-mail. On Friday October 22nd, I sent the following e-mail message to our administrative secretary: “I am writing to let you know that while I appreciate your willingness to work beyond 20-hours per week, I am not authorized to have you work more than 20-hours per week. Please know that I have requested the hours for the position be increased to 30 hours; however, the increase has not yet been authorized. I am hopeful that we will be able to have the hours increased to meet the demands of the position.” Recently, Kathy Grabel indicated her willingness to come in a couple of half days per week to help out, and I appreciate that Brenda Grant approved this request on Friday; however, this doesn’t address the issue of not having enough time budgeted so the office can function consistently throughout the year and we are still working on this issue. I am taking time in the Executive Committee report so Senators are aware of the status of the office and also what the time and effort that has been devoted to addressing the problems created by a decision that was perhaps made before thinking about the consequences.

A further complication for distributing the minutes to all faculty surfaced in the last week, Quinetta attempted to send e-mail to all faculty. We learned that she is not authorized to send e-mail to all faculty. Quinetta has been working with IT to resolve the problem since last week. Today, I submitted an IT service request and apparently that issue has been dispatched to a person in IT and hopefully the Minutes can be e-mailed to all faculty. We are just doing our best in spite of all the obstacles that we have. Meanwhile, approved minutes have been posted to the Faculty Senate website and please direct faculty to the Faculty Senate website for Minutes until the problem is resolved.

**Provost McMillen:** May I say something?

**President Powers:** Yes.

**Provost McMillen:** May I comment on that?

**President Powers:** Yes please.

**Provost McMillen:** In consultation with Chancellor Gold and earlier this week with Brenda Grant, we have decided, out of the Provost fund to increase to your proposal ask to increase the her position to I think three quarters. Right?

**President Powers:** That I think would be just right. Please let the Minutes show record of the above.

**Senator Barden:** Do we know what the benefits are for three quarters, does it equal benefits?

**Chancellor Gold:** Typically it requires a half time status to become benefits eligible. This will be determined by HR.

**President Powers:** Next, I will report on the status of five log items that the Executive Committee is currently following up on. The first is a documentation of policies concerning the allotment of student fees, particularly unspent fees that remain at the end of a fiscal year. The second is a request for Faculty Senate to attempt to verify student fee allocation to athletics. The third is to try to do something about the loud music coming from the Student Union and stadium that penetrates windows and interferes with concurrent lectures and office work. Other concerns were raised at the first Faculty Senate meeting about the library and another concern was raised at the first Faculty parking and these concerns have not yet been addressed and we will continue to update the Senate with our progress.

There will be no report to the Faculty Senate this week from the group that is leading the effort to prepare for the Higher Learning Commission review. However, Senators should seek out information at the last open forum on Friday November 5th, if you haven’t already attended one of the earlier two open forums. Please encourage your colleagues to attend the open forum. Dr Sawicki, please remind the Senators of the date/time/place for the open forum this Friday.

**Senator Sawicki:** The third forum deals with economic viabilities, a Special Emphasis topic, as well as Criterion II, which is preparing for the future. It is November 5th, next Friday, 9-11 am at the Research and Technology Complex in room 1010. That’s near Engineering on Westwood and Dorr. I look forward to seeing you all there.

**President Powers:** Okay, thank you very much. At our last Faculty Senate meeting, I reported on one effort Dr. Jacobs is taking to improve his interaction with the Faculty Senate. Last Tuesday Ilene Muething from Gap International met with past, current, and future Faculty Senate presidents/chairs and President Jacobs, Provost McMillen and Chancellor Gold. I sent an e-mail to Senators on Thursday reporting on the meeting. In the e-mail I stated there was a discussion about a shared belief in the importance of the administration working together with the Faculty Senate to make the University of Toledo better. Much of the discussion at the beginning of the day centered around a vision for UT in the future. Dr. Jacobs hoped for the Senate to become a source of ideas. The Senate Presidents asked for more engagement of the Senate as a body for investigating and modifying proposed directions of the administration. There was also a discussion about the need for the Faculty Senate to be able to quickly respond when the administration needs faculty input. Some discussion concerned when the Senate President may speak for the Executive Committee, and when she or the Executive Committee may speak for the Senate as a whole. Following from the meeting, it seems the Faculty Senate has an opportunity to establish a more engaged working relationship with the administration. Dr. Jacobs has committed to devoting two hours each month to the Faculty Senate and has directed Provost McMillen and Chancellor Gold to discuss the when, where, how with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee at an upcoming Thursday morning meeting. Additionally, Dr. Gold’s office has scheduled an additional meeting of the provost and chancellor with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee each month. Furthermore, today, we will have our first provost/chancellor forum.

As was discussed at our last regular Senate meeting, on Tuesday October 12th President Jacobs sent a message to some members of the UT community that included the following statements:

“I think we need a pause to reflect and think. I plan not to take any significant implementation steps for the next month. I would like to have some initial personnel actions and other steps ready for the December 6 meeting of the Board’s Academic and Student Affairs Committee. In the interval I invite your input and action. This should not be seen, however, as an opportunity to reopen the debate on whether or not the university should reorganize its academic structure.”

“Individuals, students, faculty, and staff; ad hoc groups, college counsels, The Senate, Deans, Chairpersons, Vice Presidents; please think about the best way to implement. Send your ideas. But, most of all perhaps, you can say “here’s a way to do this and I or we will get it done.” Let’s try for not only action items, but action itself. Everyone is empowered to “just do it.”

“Finally he said, I urge the College Councils and the Faculty Senate to become implementors. Where Administrative action is needed please call or visit. I promise I will keep an open mind for the month’s moratorium. Thanks. lj”

The month of “pause” will end on November 11th and there is a need for the Faculty Senate to respond. If the Senate agrees, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee is prepared to develop a list of areas in which the Faculty Senate should be involved. We so have available an initial list for you today if the Senate would like to pursue that.

Most of the discussion at Friday’s Executive Committee meeting evolved around an effort to gain a mutual understanding of just what has transpired since the announced reorganization, how we can work together to make the University of Toledo better, and what is the role of the Faculty Senate, given the events that have led up to this point. It was agreed that there is no detailed *plan* for reorganization at this point; rather, there are stated outcomes. It is unclear what the leadership envisions for the process of reorganization and it was agreed that minimally, a written statement outlining the process of reorganization would be necessary to provide a framework. In addition, since there has been no plan communicated for achieving the stated outcomes, anticipated costs, economic and non-economic, have not been considered to our knowledge.

Following the session with Ilene Muething, now more than ever, we are aware of the importance of having a shared vision that has mutual agreement, and working together toward that shared vision. We discussed the reality that the stated reorganization outcomes do not represent a shared vision at this point. Given the process for developing the stated outcomes, it is not clear how the stated outcomes can be transformed into a shared vision. Ideas from Senators for how to achieve this would be welcome.

That concludes the Executive Committee report for today. Now I would like to invite Dr. William O’Neal to provide a tribute for our colleague Dr. Glenn Ames.

**Dr. O’Neal:** Good afternoon, it is difficult for me to be here. The last two years have not been good for the History Department. We lost Professor Boyer after his ten year battle with his blood disease. We lost Charlie Glaab; his passing was ideal, he was literally on his way to school when he died. He was getting dress before class, he laid on his sofa at home and he never got up. Then there was Glenn, Glenn underwent surgery on July 14th he was able to live for two more months and he has left us. He joined the faculty in 1988 and he spent twenty-two years of service to this University, to his college, and to the History Department. He came here as an assistant Professor and in five years he was promoted to associate and in another five years he became a full Professor. His research concern Portuguese, France, and by extension India and the Asian trade groups. Consequently he became to know many people throughout the world and he made many valuable contacts both in Europe and in Asia. Glenn was a prolific publisher and the most prolific of recent time. He gave many papers at conferences; he published more papers that I can count and he published five books in his brief life. His research was excellent as his evidence by the fact that the university honored him as outstanding researcher in 2004. Also supported by the fact that he had… he received awards from the American institute…from his research from the Protégées Ministry of Education and other such groups. Glenn was an amazing teacher. This man had more natural talent than anyone that I’ve ever known in teaching. He was simply able to teach a class of 295-300 students in lecture and he can teach a class of eight people in a seminar, just as well and just as professionally. On the graduate level he directed many theses and dissertations and he had four PHD’s to his credit. One is still not complete; somehow she will finish. Professor Ames served in this body on the Faculty Senate and in the council and in as council often. Usually he was somewhat quiet, but every once in a while he was known to lose his cool in situations that irritated him. As a person, he was applicable and amicable, always interesting, and seldom predictable. His life circled around this University, the History Department and his commitment to the University of Toledo and around his two children who were the actual center of his life. He was a good colleague, he was out spoken. There was never any doubt on which side of the question he would stand and he always made his point extremely well. He has left a legacy; at least I have found out after his funeral that he had left a legacy to this University. I’m not so sure that it is a good legacy, but it is there with us. Every year he was committed to basketball. Every year at the NCAA tournament there was a pool in the department owned and operated by Glenn Ames and every year every member of the department was somehow forced to get into that pool and all of Glen’s friends were; I being one of those friends to enter every single year and to donate somewhat of a profit. I have the sole honor of coming in last on the list every time. I think that Glenn thought that was a place of honor for me; his family has asked that it would be continued. I hope that I can get out of this college. We have lost a good friend, we have lost a colleague and I hope that we can all remember the good that he has done. Thank you.

**President Powers:** Before moving forward, if we can just pause for a moment and observe a moment of silence for Dr. Ames.

**[**A Moment of Silence**]**

**President Powers:** Thank you Dr. O’Neal. I am happy to welcome Dr. Jacobs to meet with us today. Actually the Faculty Senate Executive Committee made a last minute invitation to President Jacobs to address the Faculty Senate this afternoon. It was felt that we needed a frank, but respectful discussion concerning how we can work together to raise the statue of this University. Thank you Dr. Jacobs for accepting our invitation, is it your pleasure that we move forward or do you want to sit there?

**President Jacobs:** I would like to sit here if that works for you.

**President Powers:** Okay. How would you like us to conduct the session from this point?

**President Jacobs:** Let me have a drink of water.

**President Powers:** Okay.

**President Jacobs:** Well, if you can put up with it maybe I would hold forth for three or four minutes or five perhaps and then I would be happy to do questions and answers or any other format you like. We had a limit, did we not? For a half hour, that would be fine with me, so if I can hold forth for a few minutes. Let me remind you if I may, the formal written in our Strategic Plan vision statement of the University of Toledo say that we, *University of Toledo is the transformative force for the world.* That seems to me to be open for a lot of interpretation, the word *transformative* is one of those words that is changing its meaning almost every day and I am not quite certain that I knew what it meant in the first place, but I thought that it would be worthwhile to take just a moment to think what that might mean to you and what that might mean to me. Let me tell you what it means to me, at least I believe that this institution has within its grasp a destiny that is I think could be tremendously important. I believe that we should ultimately take our place as one of the small handful of institutions that have had a major impact on the world and have a major impact on what the world is thinking, and what universities untimely are. It seems to me that if we follow in the path-way and follow in the footsteps of University of Michigan or Ohio State University or any other number of such universities that we can work really hard and really effectively for our entire life time and never catch up. I’m not certain that catching up with those bench mark institutions, if that’s what they are is the best course of action for the University of Toledo, nor is it reasonable in my opinion for some of the same reasons to pursue what it is that is exemplified by a Harvard, Yale or Columbia; in fact they actually serve a different societal function in my opinion. But I think that we have an opportunity to be one of the institutions that has a huge impact on the world, creates new understanding, new as people like to say these days “new parodies” for what our contribution can be and that’s my interpretation of the institution vision and that in fact is my personal vision, my personal hope, my personal desire, and one that is what I would like to see us work together towards; to be a institution that has a huge impact and of course a solitary impact on what it is to be a human being. As I say we can chase Ohio State, University of Michigan for many decades and we will all be gone, at least I will before we ever catch up, so we need to be something different. If we need to chart our own course, our own path way it seems to me and I think that we have been doing that and thinking about that; although I will confess I don’t know if we thought about it together very carefully and maybe it’s my hopes that we can do that better and more. But I think that we have an opportunity to cease a wave of societal change that is happening around us. There is a huge recognition of the need for universities to become engage with their communities and a huge recognition that universities can play the role, a pillar of society by their creation of workforce, by building an innovation system, technology transfer other aspects of innovation systems like health care, creating a place where people like to live and in so doing becoming one that is popular now days spoken of as an “engaged university” or we have spoken of over here a more “relevant university.” That change that societal change is sweeping the country and when we find ourselves for a whole bunch of historical reasons, many of them not of our own doing we find ourselves in a leadership role or at least a potential leadership role in that societal change. I think that we have a choice that’s going to happen I think that universities are going to change dramatically as of course almost every other institution, churches, and governments all changing the very fabric of our society being stressed and perhaps torn in some places. Universities are going to be different, I don’t think that there’s much question about it. We can lead that change or we can look at it from behind as it is out in front of us. I think that we are leading it and I think k that we have an opportunity to lead it. I think that the excess of history and a number of other things put us in a position where we very well given this institution on being one of the institutions, one of these universities that have a tremendous impact on what it is to be a human being in the 21st century. That’s my goal. That’s what I think the words *the transformative force for the world* mean. It seems to me that if were to agree on something like that then we would have something at least perhaps subjective, but some measuring stick to measure all sorts of decisions against prioritization, budgetary priorities, building priorities, and other difficult decisions that will only be pressed up on us in the next year or two or three if we can agree a little bit more on what that vision statement means. It seems to me that we can measure dozens of difficult decisions or for that matter, easy decisions against that kind of a vision. I believe and I said to a group of former and current Presidents of the Senate a couple of days ago, I’m sure that Mary mentioned that to you, I think that we can work better at having some type of commonality vision. I confessed to that group and now say to you and perhaps I haven’t annunciated that vision as clearly that I have it in my mind; I’ll try to do that more clearly and see if it is something that we can join together in and in pursuit of and join together in pursuing. If we can come to some kind of commonalty or vision, I think that we have a great opportunity to make this an institution with a tremendous impact in the future. That’s my hope and that’s my dream, that’s what I want to try to do and correctly or incorrectly, right or wrong it is that vision that causes me to against which constitution and criteria, against which I try to make decisions on a daily basis. So maybe we could process that, is that something that we want to do together? Can we come together on such a vision? That’s what I would hope to come together to find a common ground, to find common language, to find unity for purpose, at least that’s how I would think about this. That’s the end of my holding forth Mary. That is the three minutes that you gave me. What would you like to do, question or answers?

**President Powers:** Can you take questions?

**President Jacobs:** Yes. Dr. Barden.

**Senator Barden:** I would like to start by saying that I do not disagree with anything that I heard, I believe that we can start a fruitful discussion of our differences from these opening thoughts

 **President Jacobs:** Good.

**Senator Barden:** And think about it, did the rest of you hear anything that you disagree with, except Walt?

**Senator Olson:** I definitely disagree with some of it.

**Senator Barden:** Let’s fine tune that, we can start there. To me, the problem that we are having is that level of abstraction, I like all of that. But a level of how it implements and the operations and the intelligence and all of that part of it, I think that we haven’t been doing it together. That’s all.

**Senator Olson:** I looked for a mission for a university a couple of weeks ago from the 1980’s and the 1990’s and very, very, very few universities had a mission statement. The reason for that is most universities knew what their mission was: it was to educate. Well today we find the university as a social engineering tool of government to do other things. Much of what I heard of engaging community are nice words and we should be a part of the community. But it seems to me that our central role is still education. We shouldn’t be forming companies. We shouldn’t be taking money and resources that are appropriated for education purposes and transferring those to private entities or 503 C’s, which, if you will that are not private industries, for purposes that are quite alien to the mission of an university. The University has had mission growth. Our mission today has grown too big: we do research, we do job creation, we do studies for the community that the community should pay a consultant for and we hire a lot of consultants to do what we ourselves ought to do. I really find that the mission of the University today is not the mission that the mission of the University, twenty years ago. It is not correct that our mission should be so broad. We should return back to what made the American University great in the world to begin with: that was teaching people. If we broaden our mission too much, we waste and destroy our resources so that we can no longer teach and that is my big concern.

**President Powers:** Dr. Jacobs just stepped out the room, so if we can just pause a moment.

**Senator Barden:** I can do my Honors presentation very quickly

**President Powers:** Would you like to do it?

**Senator Dowd:** No, we should wait.

.

**President Jacobs:** My wife has been in a car accident. Nobody is hurt, but the car is not drivable. She’s in Cleveland, so bye.

**President Powers:** NowI would like to invite Dr. Barden.

**Senator Dowd:** Can I make a suggestion, with respect to Dr. Barden’s presentation?

**President Powers:** Yes.

**Senator Dowd:** Could we hear from the Senators any questions or information that they wanted to ask President Jacobs? The Executive Committee could compile a list of those questions and then present them to President.

**President Powers:** Yes. Dr. Sheldon.

**Senator Sheldon:** The one thing that kind of concerned me which I wish that I have had a chance to address is that he seems to say that there is “one way” forward and I think that I have been hearing from Senate and a lot of our concerns that there are probably multiple ways to move forward and we are not hearing that from administration; that there are multiple ways, multiple avenues on how we can move forward. We are being dictated that there is one way, quite frankly Dr. Jacobs way. I really would like the Executive Committee to bring that forward that this is not a binary, this isn’t faculty versus administration and there have to be other ways. That is why it is so important for us to ask for more discourse with the President on reorganization because we have ideas.

**President Powers:** Thank you Dr. Sheldon, we will make a note of that and it is in the Minutes. Dr. Thompson-Casado.

**Senator Thompson-Casado:** Perhaps a clearer articulation of what *transformative force* means. I don’t know what that means to me as a teacher in the classroom. I know a lot of universities are taking the path toward corporatization, academic freedom, and shared governance in favor of expediency with regard to decisions. I don’t know if that is the model that he is talking about or if he is talking about engagement; what we do in the Foreign Language Department where we engage our students, we engage the community. Those seem to me to be two different paths and perhaps he can articulate a little better for us.

 **President Powers:** Thank you. Dr. Piazza.

**Senator Piazza:** For me my concern would be in the reorganization plan. There are a number of main colleges that are going to experience a transformative experience. I would be interested in knowing what kinds of transformative experiences the colleges that are not named in the reorganization plan are going to have.

**Senator Barrett:** I to some degree want to push back a little on what Walt said. I don’t want to detract from the obvious importance of the education mission, but I am deeply, deeply concerned as someone who hopes to be here another twenty to twenty-five years with whether we be here in twenty or twenty-five years?  Education cost continues to sky rocket. Nobody seems to want to give us money to educate people any more.  The State subsidy goes down and down and down. Students and their families can only afford so much and so viability is a big issue to me. Thinking about ways to recreate ourselves - whether it is through new funding mechanisms, or partnering in new ways and being engaged and revitalizing the community, or finding ways to teach outside the classroom may be solutions; I’m not averse to exploring any of those. I’m not saying that I am buying in to them, but I ‘m not averse to exploring any of them. But to me, you don’t transform just for the sake of transformation, it has to be for a purpose - it has to be to make us sustainable, to help us better educate our students, or to create greater splash and attention so we can get higher rankings for better students. I could list ten or twenty purposes.  We do not have to pursue all of them, but if we are going to transform we need to be pursuing some of them. For me the one question that I heard over and over again from constituencies throughout this University, and this is why I am bringing it up, is that we need a simple statement with how this plan, not the details because we do not have the details , but how the restructuring serves one or more purposes. What is the purpose for breaking up Arts and Sciences into three Colleges? What does it purportedly accomplish? And that is how we can buy into the vision. If it makes sense for a goal we can say that we agree with the goal, but if it doesn’t make sense for attaining the goal then there is no reason to do it. To me the single thing that I have heard the most is people asking why we are doing it, not that we’re doing it. I think that there needs to be a little more explanation - not of that we need to transform, but of what we are gaining by this particular transformation.

**Senator Olson:** John you didn’t contradict anything that I said, I agree with you.

**Senator Barrett:** Now I’m scared.

**Senator Dowd:** I agree with Senator Barrett. One of the questions I wanted to ask President Jacobs today was what roles he sees Faculty Senate playing in this transformational change. He failed to consult with us. We requested to talk to him about this issue. But he would never agree to meet and discuss this issue with us. That is water under the bridge. But I don’t know what he really wants us to do at this point. It could take the form of being involved in task forces, appointing people to those committees, or some sort of leadership role. I am not in any sense pre judging this. But given the fact he ignored the Faculty Senate’s repeated requests to participate in discussions leading to his decision, and that he now wants Senate to implement some non-descript plan, I really don’t know what his vision is for Faculty Senate in this process.

**Senator Solocha:** I would like to follow up on that. I am from the College of Business and we have leaders and we have managers and managers manage things and leaders lead people. The whole notion of change; there is a book by John Cotter on leadership and change and the whole idea is that you cannot over state your mission; you cannot over state what you are trying to achieve. I think that I am following up on Mike, I have no idea where we are going and I haven’t for a while. So, if you can read the book I suggest it.

**Senator Barnes:** What the name of it again?

**Senator Solocha:** Leading Change by John Cotter.

**Senator Lundquist:** I don’t know what it means to want to be a transformational voice for the world. It seems like a grandiose ambition which is fine, you can have grandiose ambition, but I hear no talk about how you do that. I am also unsure about the other thing which is improvement of the human condition. If President Jacobs is going to make decisions based on whether or not we improve the human condition, I don’t know how that can be anything but subjective on his part. I mean, who in this room thinks what they are doing is *not* improving the human condition? I think that education does do that. I would like to have some kind of middle ground between a kind of grandiose idea of what we are going to be and something concrete to hold on to. . I think that I can make today a statement about how my department does improve the condition of some actual human beings who live in the State of Ohio. I think making a claim that we’re going to transform the world and improve the human condition is way more abstract then any actual working human beings can manage.

**Senator Anderson:** We can always go back to a Chinese proverb that starts with transforming a family. I must say that I was pleased with the initiative to finally come to us and say “I would like to participate in the discussion of this meeting.” It’s too bad that the accident happened, but if we could keep pulling on that, keep pulling on that, and keep pulling on that. I kind of agree with some of the other statements though, it just isn’t clear where the reorganization that has been forwarded achieves any of those goals; with one possible exception that was mentioned in the last faculty senate meeting which would be a little bit more elevation of the Arts.

**Senator Wedding:** Dr. Jacobs has indicated outside of today publically that he wants the University to be the economic engine of North West Ohio, to that end he is on the Board authority and he is on the regional role partnership and he is involved with other outside activities. I think that to try to define this University is being this research that is going to fund the economic development of this area is a little bit over the top. You can go to other places in the country like M.I.T which has done a very good job in Massachusetts where the budget over close to a billion dollars, Michigan has made some kind of contribution to South East Michigan with their budget over seven hundred million and you have Ohio State that is up there. Our research budget is quite small, it is about sixty million give or take. It is not going to be an impact on this area. For us to divert resources from the foundation or from other places to try to fund outside companies, some of which are highly speculative is looking way into the future and will not have any short term impact on this area. Our mission here should be as always, which was already said; teaching, service and research. The research is fine, but to try to define that to being an economic engine for this area is a bit over the top in my opinion.

**Senator Olson:** The diversion of research will have immediate effect: it will raise the cost of student education.

**Senator Dowd:** I would like to follow up with my friend and colleague’s comments about the need for a quick response. I agree, but there has been change within the last couple of years with regards to how Faculty Senate Executive Committee has been able to operate. I think that I can speak for the last three Senate Executives Committees in saying that the Executive Committee does not receive information before it is broadcast to the university community and we are never informed before any decision is made. The Faculty Senate and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee are always put into a reactive state by this administration. To be consistent with what you were saying, communication needs to be improved. If Faculty Senate is going to be any sort of partner with this administration, even if it’s a junior partner, the administration needs to bring Senate into discussions before decisions are made. That is, we are always reacting to decisions instead of contributing to the discussion of issues before decisions are made.

**Senator Fink:** It’s clear that the University is going to go through a great deal of rapid change, stress financially, and changes in society that is going to cause us to have to respond rapidly. I think once we have reestablished a partnership with administration or approve the partnership with administration, I think that we going to have to look at how we are going to reform the Senate, so we are much faster when giving them help because otherwise we will be ignored because things have happen quickly, so we have . I know that we suppose to be a deliberate body, but I think if I would ask the Executive Committee once we figure out how the President would like us to contribute. I read some of the things that he had sent out through e-mails to all of us and one of the issues again was speed. I think one of the reasons that it has been resistance with working with us is historically we have been slow to respond. I’m not blaming, but I mean a request for proposals or other things. I know that this has happened in the College of Business it takes some time, although it got a lot better since I’ve been here. That is one of the reasons I wanted to join the Senate so I could see if we can get things quicker, but I think that we are going to need a whole new model where we are definitely very involved, but one when we have a way of cutting through things so we can get the feelings of the Senate, but still react faster. So maybe people like Mike or other people on the Executive Committee that has been involved. I know that I have spoken passionally about wanting to make a difference. You might have some ideas about the kinds of reforms that we will have to make and we might want to speak to administration where they see us as helpful and where they see us as a road block and what we can do to be more aggressive when providing fast. Because a lot of things that are going to be changing rapidly on the road and we might have to adapt quickly. I think for our own survival; I’m with John, I worry about our survival. We are going to have to figure out how a way to make change quicker, which is what one of my colleagues said, who’s an expert with a two minute drill with Dr. Lunbecker. He works with organizations about how to stop the endlessly slow process and make these changes quicker so they can be done; we are all capable and we are all bright. We might have to change the way we do things and administration might have to change too. First we have to understand commonly what they want us to do and how we can help and then affect that view if we don’t agree with it and then eventually we have to be quicker in our responses.

**President Powers:** Thank you. I think Dr. Dowd had his hand up next.

**Senator Dowd:** I would like to follow up with my friend and colleagues comments about the need for a quick response. I agree, but there has been change within the last couple of years with regards to how Faculty Senate Executive Committee has been operated. We are never informed before any decision is made and I think that I can speak for the last three Senate Executives Committees; we almost never get information before hand. We are always put into a reactive state. I mean to be consistent with what you are saying; there need to be an improved communication. If Faculty Senate is going to be a partner, a sort of partner, even if it’s a junior partner, we have to be brought in the discussion and I think that it is important that that is noted. We are always reacting rather than contributing to a discussion before a decision is made.

**Senator Fink:** For the record, I meant no criticism of the Senate or the Executive Committee. I’m just saying that the Executive Committee will have to figure out what it needs to be able to do that and then figure out what mechanisms. So you have to articulate what and how the information has to fall to you and then figure out a way to be faster. So both changes have to happen.

**President Powers:** I think that Dr. Anderson had his hand up first.

**Senator Anderson:** I think some of these comments can be addressed to the Provost and Chancellor forum, so maybe we mix into that at some point of this discussion.

**Senator Barnes:** I just want to underscore Dr. Lundquist’s point about needing clarity about what Dr. Jacobs’ vision of transformative force is. I think that it is a really important question for us. I share the sense that we transform the lives of our students if we do a good job as teachers. I feel that’s what I am doing here, and I think that he means something different in the sense of how he introduces the topic. He says that we are not going to play catch up with O.S.U or U. of M and we are not going to be like Harvard, but there’s a sense here that he is talking about how our University is positioned among other universities. I think that rightly, this is his concern more than mine. But I think that what he means by transformative force is not clear to me, and it seems, based on what he said, that the economic engine part of it is really important to him. I think that what the Executive Committee should take away from what several of us have said is that we are educators, and that is how most of us, I think, arrived here. This economic vision is not one that we have good grasp of. Whether we buy into it or not is totally different. I think a good leader must get people that who will implement his or her vision. So, I think that is what Dr. Jacobs is working on now, but we still need a clearer picture of what that vision is.

**President Powers:** Thank you. Dr. Hoblet.

**Senator Hoblet:** I would like to personally clarify my perceptions because they are a little different then my co-herts on the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. I don’t qualify us as never getting communication. I believe that we have gotten communication on a majority of changes that have come to us before the Senate as a whole. I would qualify that the time line between us getting the communication and being able to come up with a cogent response to inform our Senators and to respond to administration has been so small and short that it is difficult to come up with and articulate a consensus of representatives from the Senate and their colleges. So with that said, I agree I think that we need mechanisms in place to have the information at our fingertips. It is difficult when we sit on Faculty Senate Executive Committee to get to every Committee where information is shared that we in turn need to share in a timely fashion with the Senators. So a different model for how we function needs to realized for Faculty Senate Executive Committee. I believe FSEC needs to serve as the conduit between administration and the Faculty Senate.

**Senator Skeel:** I would just like to say that I think that this is the best discussion that I have ever heard by the Faculty Senate. I think that the questions and ideas have been very thoughtful. I think that all of them are relevant questions and I see them coming in a very positive mode of let’s continue the discussion with the administration rather than saying that administration is not willing to listen to us. It sounds to me that if Dr. Jacobs has come here saying we do want more engagement; there was obviously some engagement that took place with the Senate President’s past and present. I think that we ought to continue this dialogue and move forward with a positive optimistic approach.

**President Powers:** Thank you Dr. Skeel. Dr. Jorgensen.

**Senator Jorgensen:** As we look into the future as you relayed that the President has invited us to make suggestions and comments and implement about the invitation, so I think that we should. That is one thing that I think that should be very high in our minds. For example, a number of Deans will be selected, maybe it will be internal search, maybe it will be external, and maybe it will be a temporary appointment. I think that it is the role of the Faculty Senate to come to grips with these issues. For example to toss up one idea, I think that the Search Committee for the new Dean should have majority of tenured faculty members on it, of course administrative, students etc., but I think that they should have majority of tenured faculty on them because those individuals will be representing the faculty of the college. I think as we divide up into these colleges we as the Senate to be concerned with the governance of each of those colleges. It’s just like our constitution established as governance and the colleges that existed as we merged this institution. I think that it is imperative for Faculty Senate to wrestle with these issues to come up with principals related to establishing of these colleges.

**Senator Sheldon:** Although I understand, on one level we are selling a diploma and then the job the next day. I do have temptation as a humanities person to resist a corporate model. However, in the Humanities some consideration has to be given to reflection which requires time. I don’t think that we are ready; well it doesn’t sound like the Executive Committee much like Faculty Senate are given much time to reflect upon or even being given the concrete details. But even if we are given the concrete details I still need time to reflect up on them. Because that is part of the process I think a humanities person goes through. So I think that reflection has to be taken in some consideration. We are not yet a limited liability corporation or close.

**Senator Olson:** Educators need to take time to reflect. You don’t just learn it by opening the book and reading it. You don’t learn it by sitting in the classroom and listening to someone else speaks. In fact, many of the subjects I teach I didn’t learn them until I taught them and I think that a number of people can say that. I don’t think that I am the only one. It requires the time to think about it. It’s an old saying, “haste makes waste” that is definitely true. We become better teachers because we reflected on the subject. We make better decisions because we think about the decisions rather then immediately snapping to making a decision. Yeah, we recognize that a decision has to be made and there actually could be a timeline to where a decision has to be made, but many of the timelines that are being forced on us are unreasonable.

**Senator Regimbal:** I agree with what Andy has said and I think that a lot of people right now are wondering what’s going to happen in the process of selecting new leadership for the new colleges; the President says we will have conversation. Recent practice has been the President will appoint will make the decisions with limited discussion with faculty. This is the way appointments are done today. So my question to him will be are we really going to have Search Committees? Are we going to follow policy that’s in place? Or will there be appointments that are interim and then become permanent?

**Senator Barnes:** Without a national search.

 **Senator Regimbal:** Pardon me?

**Senator Barnes:** Without a national search.

**Senator Regimbal:** What we perceive as an official search is national but he told us we should look internally. I think the administration we have right now overlooks many of the University procedures that we have in place. I would like some discussion to go on about whether those policies and procedures have value anymore.

**President Powers:** Thank you. Dr. Fink.

**Senator Fink:** Since Dr. Mc. Millen and Dr. Gold are kind enough to be here today, maybe we can ask their views on some of the things that they would like the Senate to be doing, changes that they would like to see made, or how they view the ideal partnership from here on that is required so they can do their jobs better.

 **President Powers:** Would you feel comfortable to transition to the forum proportion that we talked about having at this point?

**Provost Mc Millen and Chancellor Gold:** That will be fine.

**Provost Mc Millen:** Dean Barden, would he like to talk about Honors?

**Senator Barden:** What’s your pleasure? This is a pretty valuable discussion. We can kick my session down the road since it is just presentational.

**Provost Mc Millen:** I only say that because I did have a privilege with sitting on Tom’s Advisory Committee Tuesday morning. The Honors College is one of the great things at this University and Tom has done an excellent job of moving it forward and an excellent job with taking it to the next level. So, whether or not today or some other time. I want to make the endorsement up because it was a good discussion and Glen was there.

**President Powers:** Okay. Thank you. Does anybody have any questions that we might be able to address to the Provost and the Chancellor in this forum part of the meeting?

**Senator Fink:** Why don’t we just let them speak?

**President Powers:** My vision for the forum was that we will have a time where the Senators would bring concerns to the floor as opposed to having the direction pre-established or pre- determined. I was just wondering if we could start off by getting questions from Senators.

**Senator Olson:** I am always shy and lacking for questions.

**President Powers:** I noticed that about you.

**Senator Olson:** We are going to be facing tight budgets and we have already cut back on some secretaries and we cut back on all of the lab technicians that we use to have. We are basically now at bare bone structure and yet we are going to be asked to make further budget cuts. How do you see that impacting departments and student classes?

**Provost Mc Millen:** I will volunteer for this one because as you all know that it is Election Day. It’s certainly is and I don’t need to repeat what you have heard from finance and Dr. Jacobs that it is a difficult situation in the State and in the country for economic stuff. The election will make a difference in Ohio on whether or not a…succeeds or whether the challenger becomes the governor. Obviously the conventional wisdom is the Governor. Strickland is friendly to higher education and has been and supportive of us. Although some of the universities are opposed and spoken out against the universities systematizing the universities. Congressman Kchick has been silent… of an…in government relations is…She actually went on Quest to find out Kchick’s higher education form and it came up empty which is not a good thing. So, it is unsure where we will stand. A couple little facts however is to inform you and some of may know this, just to inform you about the election and the consequences. I may have said this to some of you before and I apologize for repeating it; there is a difference in a new governor coming in. The whole process of doing the budget is pushed back. It’s a little more time to prepare a budget statement. It’s a little more time for the new administration to prepare the budget. It will be assuredly there would not be a budget by June 30th, it may pass that deadline and go into July and August. That of course creates a midst problems for anybody to try to come up with a budget including this University of course. There is no way around this. It is going to be difficult to estimate what we are going to have to cut from our budget, from our previous budget. It’s going to be difficult to estimate how the two year budget will be; how much we will gain the first year and how much we will gain in the second year. It is going to be difficult to estimate how much the tuition will be allowed to rise whether there will be a restriction on that or not. It is just going to be very difficult. I am not as pessimistic as other people in the administration, maybe some of you the cuts will be as deep as they have been estimated. Two things may come about. Fist, there was revenue for Ohio’s revenue in September did meet its goals and in fact improved a little bit. If the economy is going alright and we make our budget month to month, we will find out in October in a couple of days if we have a decent Christmas selling season with taxes and we may be alright; maybe we will get our June payment even depending on whose governor. Also the other political thing that will come up in which you all heard about over the last two week particularly is how important Ohio is for 2012. It is important for both parties and it is a possibility that neither party at the federal level will let Ohio sink because letting Ohio sink may come back and hunt them. So, I doubt that it will be stimulus money. I doubt that it will be bail-out money, but there is a possibility that there will be a revenue enhancement. That is building castles on sand and all old touches and I don’t want to do that, but I am optimistic that there may be some money coming in. Once again that is one-time money, but hey we will take one-time money. Dr. Rouillard.

**Senator Rouillard:** I appreciate your optimism and I would like to share it and it sounds like recently the Trustees have also shared a little bit of your optimism and when they were asked if our deferred payment actually comes in in the first month of July 2011 budget year, will that money be returned to the individual units, they indicated that the 1.5% could be reallocated elsewhere. This goes back to the same question, to the same points that Walt has been bringing up and Don Wedding has been bring up that more and more of our resources are being allocated to business initiatives. In flush times that may be a good thing to do, but right now it is very, very questionable. It leaves us that much more vulnerable in the face of the 2012 cuts.

**Senator Terry Cluse-Tolar:** I think that I brought this up in the summer and a couple of times before fall started and now the same situation is beginning to rear its ugly head again as we approach Spring semester and that is the part-time budget. Faculty is down all over the University and yet we are told that we have a limited amount of part time money to be able to hire someone to come in and teach a class. We really pay them peanuts; $750 a credit hour with their fringes to come in and teach a three credit hour class. Three students alone signing up for a class pays for itself and we are going to keep the lights on anyway. So, I still do not understand why we have limited part-time budget money when that could be a revenue source. If we can fill a class, why are not able to run it? There is a second part of that and that is December 7th we will be opening a system for us to develop our class schedules for next fall; if we have no clue about what our budget is going to look like and our part-time allocation, how can we, with any level of intelligence, create a class schedule?

**Provost Mc Millen:** Actually Mike and I were discussing the same thing just the other day and as well with a couple of other people, but I think that is an important point. In this role I’m continually torn between what I believe in and that is the tenured faculty; in points of the tenured faculty and looking at some…faculty and realize that the number of tenured and tenured track faculty are very low in many of the programs. The number of other faculty lecturers and visitors and part-timers and graduate students are high to compensate for that. I think that is a major issue for this University and it can’t be solved and it can’t be…the spring semester obviously and it needs to have a longer true academic plan, but we also have talked about the fact that the visitor and part-time; your ability the people in the room that is responsible for hiring, your ability to estimate and get the best visitors and part-timers is crucial. It is certainly my intent as much as I am able to free-up visitors…earlier and part-timers…, so you can go after and make crucial items if you need to early on. When I came in at the end of the, when I came in last May or June, I was confronted with the tail and the back with the fact that there were extra classes that still…money in it. I’m not sure if we can solve that issue, but at least get money upfront that we know has to be there. X Department isn’t certainly going to hire ten visitors and then hire two, I mean we know that there is going to eight at least; between seven or eight. The question about the last two maybe it is something that has to do with budget, something that has to do with the class size, I mean there are other issues that come to play. But at least all so we can do them and the necessary early hiring that just seems reasonable.

**Chancellor Gold:** Terry, I can address your question a little bit more; Dr. Mc Millen and I both committed to all of the colleges that they will be able to hire at minimum 75% of their visitors and lecturers and they should get on with it. At least for the timing aspect of that 75% are not going to be depending upon the budgetary cycle. If we are wrong about that then I guess we will have to deal with the consequence, but at least that commitment for that first set of 75%. We also made the same commitment to the Dr. Koumenecki regarding the graduate students; I believe the number was 80%. We asked the Graduate College to go ahead and offer 80% of students in which we believe and for the other 20% we will have to deal with that during the budgetary cycle.

**Senator Terry Cluse-Tolar:** Can I just follow up? When we are looking at spring and we are down faculty and I can fill a class and I am being denied somebody that we are going to pay $2,250 it does not make fiscal sense, but I’m just a social worker and I am not in the business school, but that doesn’t make fiscal sense to me.

**Chancellor Gold:** I guess, under most circumstances. You are far more knowledgably in your area then I am, but I guess if filling that class with new students who are not attending other classes is where the economic and programmatic decisions lie. If we are talking about filling that class and instead of filling another professor’s class but choose to attend the visitor’s class or part-time faculty member class that is where the economics of that model start to break down.

**Senator Olson:** That’s sounds pretty good to me.

**Senator Barnes:** Well, doesn’t it exceptionally suppress some programs and benefit others though?

**Chancellor Gold:** That is where the judgment has to come in, absolutely.

**Senator Thompson-Casado:** And the problem is if you have a course that is required for a large number of students such as a foreign language, they are not switching to a Professor class it is simply closed down.

**Chancellor Gold:** I agree with you completely that we need to find a way to get those classes caught up. I also completely agree with Dr. Mc Millen; regarding the important balance between tenured and tenured track faculty and I happen to be one of those people that firmly believe that having the strong research mission not only creates scholarly work for the University, but enhances the quality of our educational program.

**Senator Jorgensen:** I am glad to hear you both comment the low number of tenured and tenured track faculty that we have for an institution of our size, I mean we recognized this for a really long time. This points to one of the topics that we can work together in the future in shared governance means if through some development in the budget for fall 2011 or fall 2012 will be the opportunity to hire ten or twelve or some number of additional tenured, tenured track faculty. Additional positions on the faculty, one of most of the important decisions a institution can make in a academic area; which college they are going to go to, which department they are going to go to. In times in the past we had various ranges of success with having some faculty input to where these positions might be. Faculty put together proposals that say move in this direction this will be a good way or a college will say this, or we want by to have selective hires among a couple different departments. So I just invite that you consider this if there is that occasion in the future to expand the tenured, tenured faculty. There is a means for shared governance in that and if there is a faculty group that reviews those proposals and where those positions will go because that will be a major decision that is effecting our direction and a major decision about whether administration saying which way do we go.

**Provost Mc Millen:** That is a major decision on how faculty interacts with Deans too.

**President Powers:** Dr. Skeens.

**Dr. Skeens:** I’m not a Senator, but may I ask a question?

**President Powers:** Yes you may.

**Dr. Skeens:** This is for Bill, but I don’t know whether you feel comfortable answering. Could you commenton how the three Deansfrom Arts and Sciences will be selected?

**Provost Mc Millen:** Well, there’s a bit of a problem.The problem is case is continuing in the courts for a future decision… Part of the whole issue of course is with Dr. Jacobs is… for thirty days, I’m taking input and the court case I think it not be, I don’t know if I can speculate how we are going to do. I have talked with some faculty groups that have invited me in to talk and we have exchanged ideas that have been discussed, but I think that it is difficult for me right now to talk about that.

**Senator Piazza:** Assuming that we are able to go forward at some point and somehow we have some way of identifying leadership within colleges. In the past the way the process has worked is that the faculty that is going to be moving into these new colleges and the leadership of those colleges will be charged with coming up with their own operating principals and procedures etc. And they work that out largely among themselves. Programs and faculty moving out and who are retiring are not included in those discussions. Do you intend hold to past practice or do you see a different process? The reason that I ask is because I think it will be reassuring for people to know how this whole process is going to work. We know what the outcome is supposed to be, we don’t know how necessarily to reach it.

**Provost Mc Millen:** I certainly have nothing planned in my mind and no sense that there is going to be an up evil on how with past practices with them. I think that’s fine. Anybody that has been around universities for a while knows that there are things that are done in a certain way.

**Senator Barnes:** Wouldn’t you say the same about hiring Deans? Can’t you tell if we are going to have a good year or not in terms of hiring practices?

 **Provost Mc Millen:** I think that is going to be an excellent practice. I think that it will be very successful and everyone will be extremely happy.

**President Powers:** I would like to thank Provost and Chancellor Gold for taking time out for this forum today and I hope everyone was pleased and feels that we were able to bring some issues into conversation. Thank you both. I would like to now move forward with the meeting.

**Chancellor Gold:** May I ask the group will they like us to do this again? Would you like us to make this a part of your meeting?

**Senators:** Yes.

**President Powers:** Thank you very much.

**Provost Mc Millen:** If you haven’t voted yet, vote.

**President Powers:** Dr. Barden if it is okay with you can we hold off on your presentation until the next meeting because we have a couple of other issues that we need to get to today.

**Senator Barden:** Yes.

**President Powers:** Thank you all for your participation in this last hour or so with discussion and with questions and so forth. At the last Faculty Senate meeting, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee was designated to draft a resolution to bring to today’s Faculty Senate meeting about the lack of inclusion of the Faculty Senate in the planning and discussions of the structural reorganization of the University of Toledo.

The following resolution was drafted:

Resolution Concerning the Lack of Inclusion of the Faculty Senate in the Planning and Decisions of the Structural Re-organization of the University of Toledo Approved on 2010.10.11.

2010.11.02

**Whereas:** Portions of the Constitution of the Faculty Senate read:

Article I. Scope

The Faculty Senate of the University of Toledo is an elected body of the faculty, with responsibility to promote the mission, function and interests of the University of Toledo and its faculty. As such, the Faculty Senate acts as the representative voice of the faculty.

Article II. Responsibilities and Jurisdiction

The Faculty Senate may consider any subject pertaining to the interests of the University and to act in the name of the University Faculty in making recommendations to the University Administration on these matters.

Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the Faculty Senate shall have the following specific powers and responsibilities:

A. To provide a collegial forum for communication and consultation between the University Faculty and the University Administration.

B. To promote a positive working environment for academic, clinical, and professional excellence and growth for the faculty of all Colleges within the University.

C. To protect faculty rights and privileges, equal opportunity, due process, and academic freedom, and to promote an exemplary standard of ethical conduct at the academic, professional and administrative levels.

D. To review and respond to policy, procedural and programmatic changes initiated or recommended by the University Administration that affect the University Faculty or the academic mission of the institution.

E. Subject to the supervision and control of the Board of Trustees of the University as delegated through the academic administration, to exercise responsibility for the academic affairs of the University, including: the academic rules, regulations, policies and standards regarding undergraduate students; the standards for granting of degrees, honors and awards; and the oversight of student development and progression.

F. To participate in a meaningful manner in any University long range strategic planning or prioritization, including budgetary, policy, fiscal and facility planning.

G. To facilitate bi-annual formative assessments of the provost, vice provost(s), and deans to ensure accountability and improve administrative performance.

H. To have a meaningful role in university-wide academic appointments, including being an active participant in the search process.

I. To form standing and ad hoc committees as may be appropriate for effective and efficient execution of its duties.

J. To review periodically the structure of the University Faculty, including non-Faculty Senate appointed and elected committees, and make appropriate recommendations to the University Administration.

K. To develop and adopt rules, procedures, and appendices to this Constitution for the effective administration and operation of the Faculty Senate.;

**Whereas:** The above Constitution has been duly approved by the President and the Board of Trustees, as well as the Faculty of the University of Toledo;

**Whereas:** This Constitution is viewed as a guarantee of an active relation between the Senate and the Administration;

**Whereas:** The agreed upon participation has not been followed in preparing the re-organization plan presented to the Board of Trustees by the University President on 2010.10.11 and subsequently approved by the Board;

**Whereas:** The re-organization will have broad and long-ranging effects on many in the university, including faculty, students, and staff;

**Therefore:** The Faculty Senate of the University of Toledo hereby resolves that a severe strain on mutual trust has occurred, that will be very difficult to overcome in future interactions with the administration.

We offer this as a starting point and look to the Senate to determine if the Senate would like to move forward with the process of approving a resolution along these lines

**President Powers:** This was drafted along the lines of what was communicated at the last Senate meeting. It doesn’t capture what was communicated or if sentiments have changed, but we would like to explore that now with the Senate.

**Senator Wedding:** Is this it? Is this all there is, just those two paragraphs?

**President Powers:** This is the “therefore” that we have and a series of “whereas” but I guess we are sort of looking at what’s the therefore substance of a resolution will be.

**Senator Wedding:** Are we going to vote on this, I hope? Are you asking for us to approve this?

**President Powers:** Do we want to? Is this acceptable?

**Senator Wedding:** I certainly will like it.

**President Powers:** Yes. Is there any discussion about was this what we were asked to do? Dr. Skeel.

**Senator Skeel:** I think that this was what the Executive Committee was asked to do, however there’s been a lot that has transpired since that last Faculty Senate meeting and it would seem to me that for us to approve this type of resolution at this time will be throwing water in the face of both the administration and the people on the Faculty Senate Executive Committee who have worked to improve relationships; even though there has been a strain, which is quite clear, it seems to me that people are already working to overcome and we should not put further constraints on the ability to overcome those things by this type of resolution. “

**Senator Barrett:** I think that it is also important to some degree to remember the time line on all of this. You can fault the administration for conducting a reorganization plan in the middle of the summer, but the group was put together in the spring and at the time it did have a Faculty Senate Executive Committee member on it; things were brought out during the summer when the Senate cannot be consulted. The question is was Faculty Senate Executive Committee completely consulted or consulted in the right way. In some ways, I’m saying that there is not a strain, but there are a number of things that could have been done better.  But it is important I think to realize, that unless we are going to say administration shouldn’t do things in the summer, there is no way that they could have consulted with the Senate in the summer for input because we don’t exist in the summer - only the Executive Committee does.

**Senator Thompson-Casado:** The Committee of Twelve was formed before the summer time. The Faculty Senate member that was on that committee was not appointed by the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate constitution was breached and I feel that we have an obligation to our representatives to acknowledge that it was breached.

**Senator Olson:** We have a constitution crisis. Here we have an obvious breach that is resulted in a court battle. The administration has had a history of saying we are going to consult with you and have all of these feel good meetings like what happened this past Thursday; then a few months later they are coming back and saying we did this and we will like your forgiveness and we will like your help to implement. Up to this point we have not really taken a firm stance on the fact that our constitution has been violated and yet it continues. There has been a history of this and there has been a history of this ever since the merger has started. The constitution is very clear about the Faculty Senate being involved in strategic decisions and being in a consultative position. I really feel that there are only four things that we can do. One is censure. Two, is voting no confidence. Three, is withdrawing from all administrative functions that faculty currently do for the administration. Four, is do nothing. This is somewhere between doing nothing and the other three in my opinion, but at least we are doing something. I can’t say that I wouldn’t vote for this because I probably would if that’s our only choice. I think that it is time that the Faculty Senate stand-up and say something or else I think that it is time for the Faculty Senate to disband or to take Senator Fink’s proposition, have another constitution assembly to determine what our Faculty Senate will be in the future and what-ever contract we form with the Board of Trustees, we understand they can breach that at will. It’s simple as that.

**President Powers:** Dr. Barden.

**Senator Barden:** Let’s go back to the language of the resolution. The problem that I have with it is that it doesn’t really call for any action.

**Senator Barnes:** Me too.

**Senator Barden:** It’s the statement of a condition that will be difficult to work within in the future. That’s what a resolution should do.

**Senator Barnes:** It’s not a resolution.

**Senator Barden:** If we want to make it work as a resolution it must call for actions. We can ask that the administration abide by the terms of the collective bargaining agreement and we will try to remain open to ideas the administration brings forward.... or something like that.

**President Powers:** So, we are looking to modify this?

**Senator Barnes:** Let’s hear from more people though.

**Senator Anderson:** Let’s hear from some more people.

**President Powers:** I think that Dr. Hoblet was next.

**Senator Hoblet:** One of the things that I want to be very clear about is some of the language that is being used just like Dr. Jacobs *“*transformative” language*.* We are saying that a breach has occurred and to be honest with you I read the constitution and I think that it is a fine line here using the word “breach”. I’m not sure that we have breached our constitution. I would like to be a prudent Faculty Senate member and on the Executive Committee, I would like the Committee on the Constitution and Rules to review the constitution and what has occurred and come to a final determination if our constitution has been breached. If our constitution has been breached then we need to react in a manner that is appropriate and commensurate with that breach. I would hate to put the cart before the horse. I think that we need to have a working list of committees for the reorganization and I think that we also need to determination if there has been a constitutional breach. If in fact our Committee finds that there has been a constitutional breach then again I think the language of our resolution should be strong and our actions should be aligned with that language.

**Senator Barden:** The breach is in the bargaining unit. Article 7.2: The employer will effectively consult with the Faculty Senate, questions within the jurisdictions within the Faculty Senate, so it is in the bargaining unit language which is probably the court case is going to settle.

**Senator Olson:** It is also Article II of the Constitution, A through F

**Senator Hoblet:** John is there a breach?

**Senator Barden:** Could we have the constitution posted?

**Senator Barrett:** The issue is what do you take to be “effectively consulted” with Faculty Senate. I think reasonable minds to some degree differ, but there was a pretty low level of consulting with us at least before the initial proposal came out. You can argue that any time you put a committee together to come up with a proposal and are presented the proposal, you have been consulted. If the Committee of twelve came up with a proposed reorganization and we were putting input in afterwards, then you could say we were effectively consulted, but the die seemed to be pretty cast by the time that it was presented. If you want me to come down on one side or the other, while I think reasonable minds can differ, I don’t think that we were effectively consulted. But that is the opinion of just one person on the committee.

**President Powers:** Please introduce yourself.

**Senator Gibbons:** We seem to be jumping around here, perhaps we can quickly scan through the entire document for example, the “whereas” can justify what you said what the problem is and hopefully a resolution. We seem to be moving back and forth. If we scan through it and go back and read it line by line.

**President Powers:** Good suggestion.

**[**Overlapping discussion occurred in this interval which leads to the final resolution being passed**]**

The following resolution was unanimously approved by the Faculty Senate on November 2, 2010.

**Approved by the University of Toledo Faculty Senate November 2, 2010**

**FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION**

**WHEREAS** Portions of the Constitution of the Faculty Senate read:

Article I. Scope

The Faculty Senate of the University of Toledo is an elected body of the faculty, with responsibility to promote the mission, function and interests of the University of Toledo and its faculty. As such, the Faculty Senate acts as the representative voice of the faculty.

Article II. Responsibilities and Jurisdiction

The Faculty Senate may consider any subject pertaining to the interests of the University and to act in the name of the University Faculty in making recommendations to the University Administration on these matters.

Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the Faculty Senate shall have the following specific powers and responsibilities:

A. To provide a collegial forum for communication and consultation between the University Faculty and the University Administration.

B. To promote a positive working environment for academic, clinical, and professional excellence and growth for the faculty of all Colleges within the University.

C. To protect faculty rights and privileges, equal opportunity, due process, and academic freedom, and to promote an exemplary standard of ethical conduct at the academic, professional and administrative levels.

D. To review and respond to policy, procedural and programmatic changes, initiated or recommended by the University Administration, that affect the University Faculty or the academic mission of the institution.

E. Subject to the supervision and control of the Board of Trustees of the University as delegated through the academic administration, to exercise responsibility for the academic affairs of the University, including: the academic rules, regulations, policies and standards regarding undergraduate students; the standards for granting of degrees, honors and awards; and the oversight of student development and progression.

F. To participate in a meaningful manner in any University long range strategic planning or prioritization, including budgetary, policy, fiscal and facility planning.

G. To facilitate bi-annual formative assessments of the provost, vice provost(s), and deans to ensure accountability and improve administrative performance.

H. To have a meaningful role in university-wide academic appointments, including being an active participant in the search process.

I. To form standing and ad hoc committees as may be appropriate for effective and efficient execution of its duties.

J. To review periodically the structure of the University Faculty, including non-Faculty Senate appointed and elected committees, and make appropriate recommendations to the University Administration.

K. To develop and adopt rules, procedures, and appendices to this Constitution for the effective administration and operation of the Faculty Senate.;

**WHEREAS** The above Constitution has been duly approved by the President and the Board of Trustees, as well as the Faculty of the University of Toledo;

**WHEREAS** This Constitution is viewed as a guarantee of an active relation between the Senate and the Administration;

**WHEREAS** The agreed upon participation has not been followed in preparing the re-organization plan presented to the Board of Trustees by the University President on 2010.10.11 and subsequently approved by the Board of Trustees;

**WHEREAS** The re-organization will have broad and long-ranging effects on many in the University, including faculty, students, and staff;

**WHEREAS** A severe stress on mutual trust has occurred that will be a challenge to overcome in future interactions with the Administration.

**THEREFORE:**  The Faculty Senate resolves to continue to work with the Administration to overcome this stress and expects the Administration to abide by the terms of the Faculty Senate Constitution and to seek input on matters within the Senate’s purview.

**President Powers:** Also, the Executive Committee has prepared some ideas for the reorganization:

**Conditions and/or Faculty Senate Involvement in Re-organization Going Forward**

2010.11.02

1. Dean selection: 2 year interim, some form of confirmation vote by college faculty.
2. Re-organization of College Committees on Academic Personnel.
3. Letters of expectation, and tenure and promotion elaborations concerning school involvement and other interdisciplinary activity.
4. Assurances of academic freedom in the classroom and in research activities.
5. Clear communication from the Administration about all aspects of the budget (would go a long way toward re-establishing trust).
6. Student involvement in planning where it affects them.

**President Powers:** That concludes the executive business for this meeting. Is there any other business from the floor?

We now have time for general questions and concerns that Senate should address.

May I have a motion for adjournment?

**IV.** Meeting adjourned at 5:58 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Hoblet Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard

Faculty Senate Executive Secretary Faculty Senate Office Administrative Secretary