

**THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO**  
**Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of September 29, 2015**  
**FACULTY SENATE**

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

Approved at F.S. meeting on 10/27/2015

---

**Summary of Senate Business**

Sharon Speyer, Chair, and Steven M. Cavanaugh, University of Toledo Board of Trustees  
Policy on Prior Learning  
Policy on University Centers and Institutes

---

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

**President Keith:** I call this meeting to order. Welcome to the third Faculty Senate meeting of AY 2015-2016. **Lucy Duhon**, Executive Secretary, called the roll.

**I. Roll Call: 2015-2016 Senators:**

**Present:** Anderson-Huang, Atwood, Barnes, Batten (substitute for T. Gray), Black, Burnett, Compora, Denyer, Devabhaktuni, Dowd, Duhon, Edwards, Farrell, Giovannucci, Gunning, Gruden, Harmyeh, Humphrys, Jorgensen, Keith, Kennedy, Kistner, Kovach, Krantz, Lee, Lundquist, Malhotra, McAfee, McLoughlin, Mohammed, Molitor, Monsos, Nathan, Nigem, Oberlander, Ohlinger, Prior, Quinn, Randolph, Rouillard, Schneider (substitute for M. Caruso), Slantcheva-Durst, Srinivasan, G. Thompson, Thompson-Casado, Weck-Schwarz, Wedding, White, Willey, Williams, Wittmer

**Excused absences:** Brickman, Cappelletty, Caruso, Duggan, Elmer, Federman, Franchetti, Gray, Hasaan-Elnaby, Hoblet, Sheldon, Smas, A. Thompson

**Unexcused absences:** Schafer, Skeel, Tevald

**III. Approval of Minutes:** Minutes of April 14, 2015 Faculty Senate meeting are ready for approval.

Academic Year 2015-2016. I ask that Executive Secretary, Lucy Duhon come to the podium to call the roll.

**President Keith:** I would like to call the September 1, 2015 Faculty Senate meeting to order.

I usually start the EC report by telling you that your Executive Committee has been very busy working on your behalf and representing your interests at various meetings and forums. And, we did. We had a long meeting with Dr. Gaber discussing known budget issues, the unexpected budget deficit, and possible actions that could reduce the deficit both in the short and long run. And, as usual, several EC members attended the Clinical Affairs, Finance and Audit and full BOT meetings.

However, I know we all have been unusually busy these last couple of weeks doing our regular jobs as well as organizing, participating and attending last week's events culminating with the inauguration of our 17<sup>th</sup> President, Dr. Sharon L. Gaber.

What a joyous day! While we were ceremoniously bestowing the rights and duties of a president on Dr. Gaber, it was also a wonderful celebration of the University of Toledo, its students, faculty, and the

community. I don't have the exact number but I know approximately a third of UT faculty participated in that joyous event. I was privileged to represent the faculty as grand marshal and also present President Gaber with a gift from the faculty.

I decided to take a few minutes in today's EC report to show you the artwork and tell you about the gift from the faculty to President Gaber. You'll have to imagine artwork with blue matting and gold trim in a black wood frame with gold beading.

The Executive Committee put a lot of thought into what would be an appropriate gift. We wanted something that would symbolize her inauguration theme – tradition, collaboration and transformation. The collaboration and transformation parts were easy, given the merger. The harder part was figuring out how to capture tradition in a gift. First we tried to marry images from the two campuses, which didn't work, primarily, because of the differences in architectural styles. We looked at blueprints (there are exquisite, detailed blueprints of University Hall), artists' renderings of buildings, new pictures, old pictures, etc. Nothing we looked at, or considered, worked with the themes of the inauguration. After weeks of development, we arrived at the image before you – a display of the University's seals spanning approximately 130 years.

It turns out there's quite a wonderful history there. The first seal was used from 1884, when UT became a municipal university, until 1931. It has a picture of a blockhouse and a motto that reads – Opportunity, Service and Co-operation. The second seal was designed to commemorate the movement of UT to Bancroft Street and the dedication of University Hall. Then-President Henry Doermann initiated a search for a new seal that included a trip to Spain to incorporate the coat of arms of Ferdinand and Isabella as part of UT's seal. That seal was adopted by the BOT in 1932 and includes two dates – 1872 and 1884, and a motto, which translated in English is – Guide to the Present, Builder of the Future [*“Coadyuvando El Presente, Formando El Porvenir”*]. In designing the seal, the artist forgot to include the word THE in front of University of Toledo, and it was not officially added until the early 1960s when the Board approved its addition. Engage the Present Create the Future

In 1967, the seal was modified to commemorate UT becoming a state institution. That seal was too round with too much detail to reproduce very well, so in 1974, an oval-shaped version of it was adopted by the Board.

There were two official seals from the Health Science Campus: the first used by the Medical College of Ohio, and the second commemorating its change to the Medical University of Ohio. Other than the name change, the main difference in the two is the switch in colors from gold and red to blue and green. We tried to ascertain whether there was meaning to the colors but were unsuccessful. {Does any Senator or guest know the meaning of the colors or the motivation for the change?} [no answer]

With the merger in 2006, elements of both Universities' seals were combined with the 1974 oval-shaped seal by adding a fourth date – 2006 – and modifying the shield within the seal to represent the disciplines on the HSC.

This gift would not have been possible without the help of Barb Floyd, Interim Director of the University of Toledo Libraries, Director of the Canaday Center and the University Archivist, Sara Mouch, Curator and Assistant University Archivist and the creative talents of Michelle Hoch-Henningsen, Creative Director in the Office of Marketing. Many thanks to all of them.

Now on to business. Since there was much interest at our last Faculty Senate meeting in the lack of breadth and depth in our Title IX training, I reached out to Jovita Thomas-Williams, Vice President and Chief Human Resource Officer. I asked her to send a point person to this Faculty Senate meeting to give us an overview of the scope of the additional types of Title IX training planned for UT faculty, staff and students. I added that if the plan was still being developed that would be even better because there are many Senators who would like to provide input. She forwarded my email to Kevin West, who cannot come to today's meeting but is very interested in meeting with a group of Senators to help develop the plan. If you're interested in working with Kevin West on this, let me know.

Yesterday I was informed that an announcement will be coming out later this week regarding new university housing requirements for first-year undergraduates. I've been told the requirement to live on campus will change from living outside a 50-mile radius to a 25-mile radius from UT, and will extend to their second year. These new requirements will be implemented fall 2016. The provost will be at our next meeting, October 13, 2015, to hear your thoughts on this issue, address your concerns and answer your questions.

As you can see, we have a full agenda today. First is a report by President-Elect Mary Humphrys, Chair of Committee on Committees. The standing committees have been seated and most committee chairs have been named. We're going to ask you to approve the appointment of two non-Senators as chairs of the Senate committees on Academic Regulations and Constitution and Rules.

Second on the agenda, we have two presentations on draft policies. The first is a revision of the Prior Learning Assessment policy. Over the summer, the EC worked with Beth Gerasimiak on this policy. Our goal was to insure that departments had control over the process as it related to their courses. We've asked Dennis Lettman, Dean, CALL, and Beth Gerasimiak, Senior Director of College Administration in CALL, to come today to discuss the current draft prior to it being posted.

We introduced you to the second draft policy last year. At our November 18, 2014 meeting, Senator Dowd introduced the idea of a new policy that would pertain to centers and institutes whose primary focus is not research. He proposed a university policy that would grant the Faculty Senate the authority to govern the designation of "Academic Centers" and "Academic Institutes" but did not ask for any Senate action at that time. We promised to return to the issue sometime in 2015, and that time is now.

Last but not least, we have two guests, Sharon Speyer, Chair, and Steven Cavanaugh, Vice Chair, of UT's Board of Trustees. They're coming at the end of their other 'job', which puts us in the second hour of this meeting. So we expect them around 5:15 p.m.

I am asking the Executive Committee, do you have any comments or reminders? Did I miss anything that we probably need to talk about or mention? Hearing nothing, I will then ask a second question, are there any questions from the senators?

**Senator Barnes:** I just wanted to say about the Title IX thing, there was a sexual harassment task force that worked really long and hard and barely had a voice the first time around and we didn't see a lot of that stuff get implemented. I think that is part of the sense of frustration and concern about what's going to happen there. I am concerned about accountability; we put a lot of time and energy into it, is it going to sit on a shelf again somewhere? How can we work some guarantees into that?

**Senator Dowd:** Senator Barnes, was there a report from that committee?

**Senator Barnes:** There were some recommendations for policies that moved forward, but by the time administration was done reworking them, the task force was less comfortable with the results of that policy. I think there were also some recommendations with regard to roll-out of trainings for people that might still be relevant, but that was few years ago.

**Senator Dowd:** Would you be willing to forward a copy of that report to the Executive Committee?

**Senator Barnes:** I will try.

**Senator Dowd:** Thank you.

**Senator Barnes:** Thank you.

**President Keith:** I would just say we have a new administration and they certainly seem to be very, very open to the faculty voice. I am optimistic that perhaps your recommendations will make it all the way through this time. Anything else? Are there any other questions? Well, in that case, I will turn it over to Senator President-Elect Mary Humphrys to talk about Committee on Committees.

**Senator Humphrys:** Thank you. Also, I would like to say that President Keith, you've done a really good job representing us at the inauguration ceremony, thank you.

[Applause]

**Senator Humphrys cont'd:** As President Keith mentioned, I chair the Committee on Committees for this year. I wanted to right-off-the-bat acknowledge the committee. They did a really wonderful job of turning around the information quickly and it is a big project. We were fortunate to have a lot of volunteers, but then comes the process of inserting the faculty onto the different committees and also gaining approval. I really appreciate and thank the members of Committee on Committees, they did a wonderful job and it was a pleasure to chair that committee. So, what I thought I would do is briefly go through each committee. The committee membership was primarily selected and suggested by the college representative on the Committee on Committees and then reviewed by both the Committee on Committees as well as the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. The first one we will take a look at will be the Core Curriculum Committee. Here's the membership of the Core Curriculum Committee. It will be chaired by Holly Monsos. You will note on these slides that per our conversation at the last meeting where there was some concern and also a suggestion that we make sure to include non-senators on these committees. Actually, when we went back and looked at the membership as it stood at that point a couple weeks ago, we realized there were quite a number of non-senators who were represented on the committee. We made note of those; non-senators, so you will see that as we go through. The next one is the Undergrad Curriculum Committee and Jenny Denyer will be the Chair. Chairs are selected by the president of Faculty Senate. You should also note that we did receive a very positive and quick response from Student Government, so there was a student representative on each of the committees and obviously

the students are aware of each committee they are on. Faculty Affairs, Cyndee [Gruden] will be the Chair of that and this is what the membership looks like. You will notice that in the Undergraduate Committee there might not be a representative, for example, from Medicine or Law, you will see a variance on the committee. Also, there are a couple of colleges who were still looking for volunteers to fill in, so there maybe...eventually finishing those. Academic Programs, Martin Ohlinger will be the Chair of that and this is what the membership looks like. Again, with the notation about the non-senators to give you an idea of representation beyond the Senate. Then, Regulations, this is one of the chairs that President Keith referenced earlier because Dr. Celia Regimbal is not a senator and would require approval from Senate. Student Affairs, Thomas McLoughlin will be the Chair and this is what the membership looks like. For the Constitution and Rules Committee there will be co-chairs. President Keith mentioned that she thought it would be...to have co-chair from both campuses, so it would be Dr. Mark Templin and David Giovannucci. Dr. Templin is not a senator so that would require approval. The Committee on Elections, I am not sure, because we are still waiting to get a chair for that and this is what the committee membership looks like. That brings us to the two chairs that require Senate approval. Before we do that, does anybody have any questions? [View PowerPoint on the Faculty Senate website]

**Senator Ohlinger:** What about the university-wide committees?

**Senator Humphrys:** Committee on Committees does not oversee that membership.

**President Keith:** The Executive Committee recommends appointing members on those committees.

**Senator Humphrys:** Are there any questions? Thank you again to everybody who volunteered. There are only so many spots. The good news is that we had more volunteers than we had spots, so we certainly appreciate your volunteering and also there could be other opportunities for you, so thank you very much.

**President Keith:** Thank you, Senator Humphrys. Okay, so, I am asking for a motion or two motions if you want to do them separately, to approve the appointments of Dr. Celia Regimbal as chair of the Senate Committee on Academic Regulations and Dr. Mark Templin as co-chair of Constitution and Rules. Both have represented their colleges as senators in the past, but neither is a current senator. Dr. Regimbal chaired Academic Regulations last year which began an investigation of an impact of policies. At the end of our April 14' 2015 meeting she asked Faculty Senate to grant her committee an extension by allowing...investigations this year. Her committee decided that they needed input from senators and others and there wasn't enough time left in the academic year to receive it. She knows the issues and she has the strategy to complete her work which is why I would like to appoint her. As I noted at our September 1<sup>st</sup> meeting, we're charging the Constitution and Rules Committee to review several revisions to the constitution and given the workload that is why I decided to appoint co-chairs. I thought it would be optimal to have one from the Main Campus and one from the Health Science Campus to make sure their voices are heard when we are considering revising our constitution. I would like Dr. Templin to serve as co-chair for the Main Campus. It is not an exaggeration to say that he probably has more experience revising a college constitution than anybody else at UT. As a faculty member at Judith Herb College of Education, he has led the effort to revise that college constitution at least three times prior to its merger with HSHS, after its merger with HSHS, and then when the super college was restructured into the three colleges that we have today. He also has been instrumental in revising the constitution for the graduate faculty as well as the bylaws for Graduate Council. So, I don't know if I needed to give you my rationales for asking your approval to appoint non-senators to chair Senate standing committees. So, a

motion or two motions, however you want to do that. May I ask, one or two? All in favor of appointing the two previously named non-senators to chair Academic Regulations and co-chair Constitution and Rules please say “aye.” Anyone against, please say, “nay.” Thank you very much. ***Motion Passed.***

Okay, next on the agenda is the presentation of a draft policy on prior learning credit. I welcome Dean Lettman.

**Dean Lettman:** Thank you for inviting us here this afternoon to talk to you about the prior learning assessment program policy that we have in place here at the University of Toledo. We came before Faculty Senate, March 2011 when we were in the very beginning stages of putting together a prior learning assessment program and a policy for the university which we had none before. The Senate in 2011 in its wisdom endorsed our prior learning assessment policy at that time and empowered us to go ahead and work on a policy and implement this particular program which, between that time and now, has really grown and improved. Because of things that have happened in between, and some things that are going on at the state level, and some things we’ve learned, we made some revisions to the policy that Beth Gerasimiak, who is the Senior Director College Administration in CALL, oversees our prior learning program, will report to you on some of the changes and new ideas and things that we have in our policy. A couple quick things that I just want to say, there is kind of a big picture on this and that is, you may or may not know that the state of Ohio, the Ohio Board of Regents, and now the Department of Higher Education has come forward working the last year-and-a-half to two-years to really pull together an overarching framework for prior learning assessment for the state of Ohio. I am also pleased to report that they basically adopted the framework that we have worked on to put in place here at the University of Toledo and are using that as a model for the statewide framework. We do have a copy, it is still kind of in draft form, and it’s in its final stages. It will be put out to all state of Ohio colleges and universities for them to use to implement a prior learning assessment program at their institution based upon this framework. The framework has four parts: part one talks about ensuring student-centered, faculty-driven practices- I want emphasize that because we couldn’t do PLA without faculty support. We knew that from the beginning and we put in place measures to assure we have faculty input and support throughout the entire process. We also talk about ensuring consistency of prior learning assessment, so in one area it is not being done in one way and in another area, another way because the inconsistency of courses, programs, and policy could really be an obstacle for students to get prior learning. It also talks about maintaining the academic integrity, having standards, having very clear procedures that transcend all institutions in the state, and then finally to improve portability of credit term, meaning that, if students [as we know] move from place to place, from school to school and so if a prior learning assessment is awarded at one institution and the student transfers to another, that would transfer with them. It is almost like the TAGs and C-TAGs that we are all aware of; I kind of call these “play-TAGs” which is really what it is all about. So I just wanted to report to you that we’ve been working very hard, and Beth has been working with the faculty committee which she will talk about, and how we can really improve our prior learning assessment policy. With that, I will turn it over to Beth.

**Beth Gerasimiak:** Good afternoon. Thank you for having us present to you this day. As Dean Lettman mentioned, back in 2011 we came to Faculty Senate with an original policy, that was the first time at the university that there has been some formal procedures, standards, practices regarding PLA and helping students gain credit for their life experiences through a process. Students earn prior learning credit through a couple of ways and I just want to mention a couple of things about this in case you are not familiar with the policy or hadn’t had a chance to read it quite yet. Students are earning credit through

standardized testing, perhaps it is military training or coursework that is evaluated through the American Council on Education or we're doing institutional PLA options such as portfolio assessment or credit by exam. So the policy is covering all of those options and putting some standard procedures and policies in place based on best practices. So, over the past four or five years we've learned a lot of lessons along the way. When the policy was first put into place we had this great plan and then things kind of evolved over the next four or five years. As the program evolved it became obvious that we needed to make some changes during the spring semester and so we began making those revisions. Some of the initial drafts of those revisions may have been a little bit too revised and so we worked with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee over the summer time and came to some agreed-upon language and policy that everyone was comfortable with. So that is the policy that was sent to you today or yesterday, sometime within the last 24 hours. I just wanted to briefly go over what some of those changes were.

In the first policy we found that it was not clarified what credit was accepted and evaluated from the American Council on Education, so this new policy clarifies what credit is evaluated and how it is evaluated. We now have a transfer credit evaluator director in the registrar's office that we also work with who has policies and procedures for evaluating that credit and so that has been clarified with how that is accepted and how it is evaluated. We made sure that colleges and academic programs establish their own guidelines so if you have accreditation guidelines you must follow that don't necessarily follow the university policy, those will uphold the policy, so you will be meeting your accreditation standard and that language it throughout the document. One lesson we kind of learned along the way is, we have students who are in the College of Adult and Lifelong Learning who came to college at the age of 18 and then at the age of 40 they were coming back to school and they got an "F" in Comp I and when they were coming back at 40 they had all this experience and they were interested in gaining credit for prior learning, but they had already taken the course. So we would go to faculty members and let them determine what their feelings were on that, so that issue was coming up more and more, so we wanted to make sure that we addressed that issue in this policy, there is new language in there that says, if a student earns an "F" or a "W" in a course, the credit is not earned. They must have an absence of a minimum of three years from any institution before they can pursue prior learning. That means, they have some sort of outside experience in that three years that would've given them that knowledge to earn that credit, that's the background of that change. We also added the statement that students must earn a grade of "C" or better, or a pass, to have credit reported. If they demonstrated proficiency in a class that should be at a minimum 70%, that was not stated in the first program - so we added that language. Last year there was a change in the assessment fee process so previously we were charging an assessment fee for the assessment of the portfolio or credit by exam for institutional PLA processes and then to transcribe the credit, students were being charged half the tuition rate. When we looked out and did some benchmarking with other institutions in the state, we found that we were a lot higher and way off on what we were charging in that area and it was affecting students' ability to be able to use the PLA process, so we did some benchmarking and students are now charged for the assessment practices only, which is the best practice and that is \$100 per assessment. So they pay \$100 to have their course assessed whether they earned credit or not, and then there is no fee for the transcription of the credit. We also do provide remuneration to faculty members for their time in assessing prior learning credit and so they are charging \$75.00 per course. That money is going directly back to the faculty member for their time and expertise for assessing the work. One of the last kinds of a change or just kind of a tweak was that we clarified the language on how faculty assessors are assigned, and they are assigned either through a department chair or associate dean or through a departmental authorization form. This is not so much a change in

procedure, but when we previously did this, we did not have an authorization form and so we clarified that in the language of the policy. Those are the main changes that were from the original policy and I just wanted to add, the great thing about PLA which really came a long way in the last four or five years, is it helps students shorten their time to degree completion, so a lot of our students are being able to demonstrate their knowledge – not duplicate their knowledge – to save time, money, and complete sooner. So with that I would ask for any questions or comments.

**Senator Molitor:** Just a few quick questions or comments. In the one section you say, a student must have a grade “C” or better or if it is pass/fail a “PF” to have credit recorded. I seem to remember a number of years ago the state issued some kind of requirement saying if a course earned a “D-” or higher that you had to accept credit for it. I don’t know if that applies because it is an internal thing or if that just applies to transfer credit, so you may want to look into that. The other issue is that the provost is passing around a policy on international background baccalaureate credit and I presume someday we will also have a policy on AP credit. In that section where you mentioned “standardized testing” you want to refer to those policies, as that will obviously dictate the policy regarding IB or AP credit.

**Beth Gerasimiak:** That is a great recommendation, we can do that. I’ve seen the draft of that policy and it is actually a state policy on advance placement so we can add those both to reference this policy.

**Senator Molitor:** Then I would like to also commend you on coming to us before releasing this policy. Usually, these policies get released for a 30-day comment and we have no idea what’s in them and what’s changed. I think this is a model for the way these policies should be handled, especially policies that are either new or undergoing major revision. It’s much better than us reacting to something within a 30-day comment period. It would be nice to have something that is released for the 30-day comment period that is pretty close to its final accepted form, or at least had substantial input from faculty, and so I commend you for that. I just also want to say that I think it is important to have the PLA policy and I think it is also important to have the IB policy that is being passed around, however in terms of credit that is awarded to our students, that turns out to be a very minor portion of the credit awarded. The “elephant” in the room is transfer credit and AP credit, and we don’t have any policies on AP or transfer credit that are formally published. I would recommend to the provost that we initiate a process to get those policies published. And again, if we can follow the same process that we followed with this PLA policy, I think it would be a good approach.

**Provost Barrett:** We are working on developing those as we speak.

**Senator Molitor:** Excellent. Thank you.

**Beth Gerasimiak:** I would also be remiss if I didn’t mention that we also have reinstated our prior learning assessment faculty advisory committee. We had one when we first started the program, but with some of the administrative changes it kind of fizzled, so we’ve instituted that, which Senator Molitor serves on, thank you. I thank all of them for their help and revising this policy as well.

**Senator White:** I have a few comments as well. The opening paragraph that we see here on procedure looks like kind of an introductory or overarching paragraph that may be not meant to be taken too literally. Best practices are referred to and you are referring to three different commissions and I am just wondering if the last sentence could easily become contradictory to those best practices. Are we leaving it

up to those best practices, or to each department to decide its own plan, or is this paragraph not meant to be so carefully examined?

**Beth Gerasimiak:** Well, when this policy was first distributed I think some of the early interpretations were the credit for prior learning policy was going to be mandated for every course at the University of Toledo which was not the case at all, and nor do I believe it should apply to every course at the University of Toledo, but it does have many courses that it could work well with. So, working with some of the faculty members, that statement was added to ensure it was distinguishable that that was not the case, the departments do have a say in how the PLA process works, if it's not applicable for their program, and if it's not meeting accreditation guidelines then the program policy I guess could trump the PLA policy.

**Senator Humphrys:** Beth was defending the statement I asked to be added in this, so I appreciate that. I just thought for the very reasons Beth was mentioning early on in the statement in the document that it should say something to the effect of, the way it originally read if I didn't know any better I would say that it was saying that every department is going to have to come up with a list of courses for prior learning credit so it really doesn't matter what you think, the only choice you are going to get is which classes those are going to be. So that was put in for the purpose of saying that if a department feels they have courses that would lend themselves to this type of credit then that is okay but if they don't then that is okay too.

**Senator White:** Okay, we are saying here that the entire rest of the document is explaining what best practices are, so, we're not going to be in conflict with the Higher Learning Commission Council, right?

**Senator Humphrys:** Right.

**Dean Lettman:** The Council is not going to dictate to us, well, I suppose. What we are trying to say, we put in place a program and procedures to follow for prior learning assessment that are recommended by these bodies of best practices. The decision as far as, what courses may be approved or used for prior learning and how they are evaluated is always up to the faculty and the department, none of that has been compromised.

**Senator Molitor:** If I can just interject before Senator White continues. Perhaps the first part that Senator White is referring to doesn't belong under "procedure," maybe it belongs under "purpose" and "scope of policy" to indicate that we will strive to have our PLA policy meet best practices. Then the procedure starts with "each department will determine which if any of its courses ..." "and the subsequent formal procedure that we are following. I don't know if that would satisfy your concern, Senator White.

**Senator White:** You are right; the opening part of that paragraph and the last sentence doesn't really go together which is part of the problem

**Senator Molitor:** Right.

**Beth Gerasimiak:** So Senator Molitor, what you are saying is that last sentence should be moved to the first sentence?

**Senator Molitor:** Yes, that last sentence should be the only part in there under "D. Procedure." Then that first part that starts with "prior learning credit will be coordinated through" ending with "the Ohio Board of Regents," that should perhaps be under purposes and scope of policy instead, because it really not part of the procedure.

**Senator White:** In general principle I just wanted to make sure there wasn't conflict there. Some of that does look like it might not be "procedure," so I will agree with that.

**Beth Gerasimiak:** If you have any other comments, the document was sent out and you can certainly email those to me and then it will also be posted for the 30-day comment in the coming weeks, so we do have time to look at other revisions and considerations for language.

**Senator White:** Very good. Just a couple quick things- it is an antidote only, but we have a student in a class which is creating problems because they got a "D" twice in the prerequisite course, they were transferred in. It would be great for those people who are thinking about transfer credit to think about what we are going to do with grades lower than a "C or C-," or whatever. But I guess this does not apply here, this is not about transfer credit, right?

**Senator Molitor:** No.

**Senator White:** Another thing, a minor thing, on page 3. – "a student may earn prior learning credit for courses that meet the degree requirements confirmed by a degree audit or an academic advisor," so I guess they can only get the credit if it's meeting the degree requirements for that student, right, is that what you are trying to say?

**Beth Gerasimiak:** Correct. So if they have experience in Dancing, but we don't have any courses in Dance or Dance is not part of their major then they would not be able to pursue prior learning credit, at least at this institution.

**Senator White:** Okay,

**Senator Krantz:** Just a general question and not related to the proposal itself. Do we [at this institution] have an idea how many students will take an advantage of this in a given academic year? Is it, 20, 200, or 2000?

**Beth Gerasimiak:** Well, I anticipated that question. So, we had 122 credit hours that were transcribed over last academic year including the summer semester and that equals out to about 17-20 students who pursued credit. So it is not a huge number but we are growing in the number of students who are looking at these options.

**Senator Krantz:** Will you anticipate with this policy in place that would become more in demand?

**Dean Lettman:** I would say, yes because of the statewide effort and if the state comes out with their framework and really promotes it at that level. We, the University of Toledo had done some promoting for prior learning assessment, but we don't call it prior learning assessment when we are promoting it, we call it limited credit where credit is due or something along those lines---

**Beth Gerasimiak:** Would Your Life Experience Work.

**Dean Lettman:** We are trying to put it out there for students, primarily non-traditional adult students as a way to bring them to the University of Toledo, so I do expect and hope that it does work.

**Senator Molitor:** If I could just follow up on Senator Krantz' question, my understanding of the process described in this policy doesn't reflect a big change in anything we are doing now, these are essentially our current practices.

**Beth Gerasimiak:** That would be correct.

**Senator McLoughlin:** I am new to this procedure here, but is this a statewide procedure, meaning, not only the University of Toledo, but Ohio State University has a similar policy related to this and all the other institutions in the state are doing this as well?

**Beth Gerasimiak:** So, within in the last couple of years the Ohio Department of Education started an initiative called PLA With a Purpose and they are looking at statewide guidelines so they are not mandating that schools do this, but they are providing guidelines and strongly encouraging all state institutions to have a PLA policy. As I mentioned, it does shorten your time to a degree- students are not taking courses where they already have the knowledge, it is a cost-savings to them. So it really advantages the students as well as the institution in several ways to help students to completion. The guidelines have not been published yet; I actually serve on the committee that is working on that. We are also one of the pilot studies at the University of Toledo and there are four other institutions in the state that would be exemplified in these guidelines and I believe they will be published sometime in 2016.

**Senator McLoughlin:** Thank you.

**Beth Gerasimiak:** We can share those with senators if you are interested in those guidelines. This new policy does follow those guidelines. To be ahead of the curve because I serve on the committee so I knew when they were coming. Thank you all.

**President Keith:** Thank you. Thank you very much. Beth met with us, the Executive Committee at least once or maybe twice this summer to go over this policy. She was very willing to hear our suggestions and make the changes. As I said before, I think our big concern was we just didn't want departments to not be able to control the credit hours that they were giving for prior learning and she certainly was sensitive to that issue, so it was a very good experience, thank you very much. Next, on our agenda is Senator Dowd.

**Senator Dowd:** To begin, I do not feel well today so I hope my presentation is coherent. I want to discuss proposed revisions to UT Policy 3364-70-16, *Research-related Centers and Institutes*. As President Keith indicated, last November or so your Executive Committee brought this issue to Senate with the idea of revising that policy to include non-research centers. Although this issue was discussed at subsequent Executive Committee meetings, it was not brought back for consideration by the full Senate last year. To be honest, the Executive Committee last year could not focus on this issue in Spring 2015 due to the tremendous workload we had in conducting evaluations of seven deans and a complete overhaul of the process used to generate a list of faculty members for each college that were eligible to participate in Senate elections.

Today I am presenting this proposal because I believe this policy needs to be modified to account for non-research centers. Before proceeding I need to note a couple of issues. First, I will be asking for only a "Sense of the Senate" on proceeding with this issue because we are proposing a revision to a university policy and Senate does not have the authority over UT Policy 3364-70-16. Second, due to the language of that policy, if Senate provides an informal endorsement of the proposal, I then have to take it to Research Council for their consideration and formal approval. Last, to make this discussion simpler, when referring to a "center" today I am actually referring to both centers and institutes.

This UT Policy grants Research Council authority over all "university designated" research centers. It also states that proposed non-research centers currently must also be reviewed first by Research Council.

If that council deems the primary activities of the proposed center to be anything other than research then Research Council must refer the proposal to different faculty governance body for evaluation. Such non-research activities could include education, outreach, etc. That is a wise dichotomy. However, over the past several years the Faculty Senate has not stepped-up to establish policies and procedures for governing the formation, review, and renewal processes of non-research centers. As a result, over the years several meritorious non-research proposals were referred by Research Council to other bodies but those proposals died because Faculty Senate did not establish the mechanisms to address such proposals.

In part, the reason why I am here today is born from sheer frustration by members of the Research Council. I have been a member of Research Council since 2003 and truly have great respect for that Council. With that in mind, Research Council is just not built to appropriately evaluate proposed non-research centers – that is why the existing policy states that another governance body is to evaluate such proposals. I remember Frank Calzonetti’s presentation at Faculty Senate about ten or so years ago when he noted that Research Council has taken ownership of research centers and his plea that someone had to take ownership of non-research centers.

Now let’s consider the revisions I am proposing. The attached document is a proposed policy intended to replace UT Policy 3364-70-16. The original policy governed the formation, review, and renewal processes for university designated research centers. The proposed revisions intend to expand the scope of the policy to include both research and non-research centers. They would grant Research Council authority over research centers and Faculty Senate authority over non-research centers. The proposed policy statement contains only two types of revisions. The first differentiates research centers from non-research centers. The second type of revision designates Research Council’s responsibilities and authority over research centers and Faculty Senate’s responsibilities and authority over non-research centers. While there are only two types of revisions there are many such proposed revisions across the document. I believe that none of the proposed revisions are controversial in any way.

As you see in the proposal before you, I did not attempt to define or describe what a “non-research” center is. I tried to do that in the first, second, and third draft policy statements. But those drafts were terrible failures. They were not just awful, in my view they were the absolute worst documents I have ever created. <laughter> The problem was that I tried to define and account for all possible non-research centers – they could be focused on education, outreach, engagement, etc. There were too many possibilities to define in a policy statement. It was like I was trying to define what is “not blue.” Not only could I not do that, the initial language was so contorted that when I reread that material I could not understand it – and I wrote it. <laughter> That is why I used the generic term “non-research” centers.

Given the nature and scope of UT Policy 3364-70-16, a critically important step in this process will be asking Research Council for their formal endorsement of the proposed revisions to that policy. At this stage I would like to ask for only a *Sense of the Senate* on the proposed revisions to that policy. Asking Senate for any sort of formal approval of the attached document would be, in my opinion, inappropriate since Research Council more or less is responsible for the current policy. To be blunt, I am asking for a *Sense of the Senate* now so I can then convey the message to Research Council that Faculty Senate is now ready to accept responsibility and authority over non-research centers – which it should have accepted several years ago. Therefore, bringing this issue to Senate for its consideration is the first step in the revision process. Consideration by Research Council will follow. And then the lawyers will be involved. For perspective, note that because this is a proposed revision to a UT policy, the final step will be

submission to the UT Policy Website for comments from the university community. At this point, do you have any questions or comments on the proposed revisions to this policy?

**Senator White:** I have one question. Who decides? It could be that there are going to be “grey” areas, I am not prepared to describe one right away. One that involves education and research because we always say those go together hand-in-hand, and so it could be a center or institute but how do they decide which one they want to pursue?

**Senator Dowd:** That is a most relevant question. That question arises for every proposed center or institute. In almost all cases it is evident from the proposal whether the primary focus is research or another activity. If the primary focus is not clear, Research Council simply turns to who is proposing the center and asks for guidance on this issue.

**Senator Molitor:** For those of us who are not familiar with the Research Center process, does the Research Council essentially have veto/final authority? What is the process in terms of the approval if I want to propose a research center?

**Senator Dowd:** University Policy 3364-70-16 states that the University Research Council has authority over the use of the terms “University Research Center” and “University Research Institute.” If not approved by Research Council then no entity at this university is permitted to use those terms or titles.

**Senator Molitor:** Let’s say the administration really likes a research center and Research Council doesn’t or vice versa? What I am asking is, is Research Council a necessary approval or a recommendation?

**Senator Dowd:** Again, University Research Council has authority over the use of the terms “University Research Center” and “University Research Institute.” No entity at this university is permitted to use those terms or titles without formal approval by the Research Council. The motivation from years ago was to stop faculty members from trying to establish rogue centers and institutes. Suppose I wanted to establish the “University of Toledo Research Center on Proctological Economics.” There must be a governance body to review such centers in order to protect the name and reputation of the University of Toledo. That said, given our guests today, it is prudent to state that the Board of Trustees can certainly establish any center they want, such as the recent establishment of the *Human Trafficking and Social Justice Institute*.

**Senator Molitor:** And so the proposed non-research policy would envision Faculty Senate playing a similar role then?

**Senator Dowd:** A similar role. But what this also means is that Faculty Senate would have to develop guidelines, policies, and procedures on how to submit a non-research center and every year when appropriate the Executive Committee would have to staff a committee to review it. Those are very important details, but we don’t have to pursue them at this point unless this policy is actually approved.

**Senator Schneider (substitute for M. Caruso):** Are there centers and institutes operating now on campus that have not been proposed to and approved by the Research Council?

**Senator Dowd:** There are, but these are typically centers established long ago. Some of which have been approved by the Board of Trustees such as the *Canaday Center for Special Collections*. There are others that did not go through the approval process established by Research Council. But Research Council also keeps inventory of all centers and institutes and each of those is reviewed on a five or seven year cycle. If

they are a named university center or institute, they have all been or will be reviewed by Research Council at one point or another. Does that address your question, Senator Schneider?

**Senator Schneider (substitute for M. Caruso):** I think so. I guess what I was trying to get a sense of is if there are existing centers or institutes that have not been approved by Research Council, would they then be required to apply?

**Senator Dowd:** If not previously approved by the Board of Trustees or Research Council then I suppose they would need to submit a proposal to Research Council if they wish to continue using the term or title "University Research Center."

**Senator Barnes:** I had a colleague who has been pondering creating something in that direction and she has some specific questions about how big the advisory board should be and things of that nature, should I direct her to Research Council?

**Senator Dowd:** Ask her to give me a call or ask her to stop by my office so we can chat.

**Senator Barnes:** Okay.

**Senator Dowd:** I can describe to her how Research Council has approached such proposals in the past. Do you know if this a proposed research center or non-research center?

**Senator Barnes:** I am not sure, actually.

**Senator Dowd:** Thank you.

**President Keith:** So, are we telling Senator Dowd to move forward on this?

**Group of Senators:** Yes.

**President Keith:** Thank you, Senator Dowd.

All right, I think our guests have arrived. You can come up here to the podium if you'd like. Last, but not least, they are scheduled at this time because they have other jobs. It was more convenient for them to come after their other jobs, so we scheduled them for the second part of today's meeting, if not, they would've been first on the agenda. So, I would like to introduce the Chair and Vice Chair of Board of Trustees. Sharon Speyer is the Chair of the Board of Trustees. She was appointed in 2009. She is a UT alumni as she earned her Juris Doctorate in the College of Law after earning her Bachelor of Arts Degree in International Studies from Ohio State University. In her other job, she is president of Northwest Ohio region for Huntington National Bank which is subsidiary of Huntington Bank Shares, a \$56 billion dollar regional bank holding company headquartered in Columbus, Ohio. The Vice Chair is Steve Cavanaugh. He is also serving as Vice Chair to the Board of Trustees, Finance and Audit, and Trusteeship and Governance Committees. He was appointed more recently in April 2014. He is also a UT alumnus as he earned a Bachelor's Degree in Finance and a Master's Degree in Business Administration with Honors from the University of Michigan. In his other job, he is the executive vice president and chief operating officer of HCR Manorcare, which is a post-acute healthcare service company that operates skilled nursing facilities, assisted living facilities, home-help, and hospice agencies and output rehabilitation clinics with annual revenues of \$4 billion.

I invited them here because it is our custom to ask the chair and vice chair to address Faculty Senate and they graciously agreed. This was the soonest meeting we could get them to attend. I thought if they wanted to make some statements, or understatement, or whatever they want to do, following that, if you have questions, Q&A. So please welcome our Chair and Vice-Chair of the Board of Trustees.

[Applause]

**Board of Trustees Chair, Speyer:** Thank you. I had the pleasure of being here with Joe Zerbey, I was vice chair. So, just a couple comments- I am very happy to be here. I think this is an exciting time at the university. I think President Gaber said it very well at the ceremony on Friday. I think it is time to honor history and honor tradition and collaborate in an ever-changing industry of higher education. So I am in banking and he's in healthcare and we are Trustees at the university. So we are aware of the changes in our industries and we know how challenging that can be and I think that the relationship that the Faculty Senate has with the president is really important. I think to the extent that we have goals that we want to surpass which I think we all do, we all strive for excellence, we've got some challenges ahead of us. I/we think it is very important that we do that in a collaborative way, but we do that with as a sense of urgency. So, really I'd like this to be a dialogue. I am going to yield the microphone to my colleague here, but I think it is more important to be a dialogue than for us to speak to you, I would rather we speak with you.

**Board of Trustees Vice Chair, Cavanaugh:** I won't say much more behind what Sharon said. I think for me, I think the concept of opening a dialogue partnership is really the most important thing we have. My observation is someone that is relatively new to the Board of Trustees and relatively new to the day-to-day dynamics of the university is that in our recent past we've had an awful lot of "us and them" and we are not going to solve any of our problems that way. And so, our objective is to really think about how to address the challenges that face our institution, how we capitalize on the opportunities that are there for our institution and really do that in a way that is most likely to yield success. I think that means that we've got to be open-minded with each other, I think we have to listen to each other, and try and find the best solution for the university that we can, and that doesn't mean that we are always going to agree about everything, but what I am here to tell you and what Sharon is here to tell you, from the Board of Trustees perspective, we are coming with an open hand and we are looking to establish a relationship and really get us focused on capitalizing on what we think is our tremendous opportunity for this university going forward. So that is what we are here to talk about and we will be glad to answer any questions. I guess as far as we're concerned, there is nothing out of bounds or out of reach. We welcome your feedback. We are interested in feedback and hopefully exchanging ideas and dialogue a conversation, help us both understand how we are thinking about the world and help us get to some better solutions. We don't have a whole lot beyond that. We will kind of yield the floor to you for questions or feedback that you want to give us.

**Senator White:** I just want to say, first and foremost, I am going to boldly say, many in the room were just as excited as you were when you put the medal on Dr. Gaber.

**Board of Trustees Chair, Speyer:** That was a beautiful experience.

**Senator White:** That was remarkable and wonderful to see you doing that. So we are very excited and I will boldly say again, many in the room are probably very excited hearing you express your interest in the dialogue and the feedback, back and forth, and communicating with each other about most effective ways that we all can move forward. It was a few years ago in this meeting that I found myself quoted in the

Toledo Blade for talking about policies that were going in place, that was putting the university at risk because I thought about the resources that the university has- there are trustees, there's administration, there's faculty, students, buildings, equipment etc., but my feeling was the most valuable resource honestly, is our young faculty- they are the people who are going to be here investing in the students at this institution for many years to come. So, I just want to make that comment that they may be expensive, they may not always agree with what different people want to do, but they are our most valuable resource. Everything that we can do to keep them and attract new great researchers and educators, I said a few minutes ago that research and education goes hand-in-hand, and I think administration agrees- anything we can do to attract the best young faculty to this university is going to be paramount.

[Disk Change]

**Board of Trustees Vice Chair, Cavanaugh:** This isn't an administration problem when we talk about enrollment, it is an opportunity for all of us that we need to focus on. I think if we do that then that is going to help open up the playing-field for all of us. In particular, think about from a business model standpoint- a place where you guys have an opportunity to help us the most, graduate students. When you think about those, financially that's most attractive to the university, but also it is a place where you guys as sitting members of the academy have that opportunity to attract really talented and really smart people to our organization and that helps us both from a reputation standpoint or retention standpoint, but also help solve some of the resources issues as well. So I agree completely about the retention issue, but as I said, I think that one issue trumps them all because at the end of the day if we don't have students here there's no purpose for any of us and that is the thing we have to keep foremost in our minds. Everything has to start with that objective from my perspective, there's a twist on it.

**Senator Anderson-Huang:** I've had a fairly long history with this institution that is about to end in May. Starting out as the chair of The Arts and Science Council and eventually becoming president of this body, when I started out in those positions we had a very adversarial relationship with the administration and with the Board. It's been a joy to see over the years how that actually has changed. It is not just last year; your predecessor, Mr. Zerbey was very communicative and a good person to talk with and I feel this institution can "move on without me"- the future is very, very clear and bright, so thank you very much for your part in that and for selecting Dr. Gaber.

**Senator Dowd** I would like to follow-up on what Senator Anderson-Huang stated. The change in the environment among administration, faculty, and the Board of Trustees has been wonderful. We are facing a number of challenges, including budgetary and non-monitoring resources. What I would like to say is that there is nothing wrong with the Board of Trustees asking Faculty Senate to conduct work for you or to look into issues that concerns the Board. You have 1,200 faculty experts at your fingertips. We want to participate and we want to make sure the long run viability of the university is certain. Bring us in; we are all in this together.

**Board of Trustees Chair, Speyer:** So at the risk of being redundant, I think Steve's point about helping with enrollment- you all know your areas of expertise a whole lot better than any of us could possibly know. The students that are graduating and looking at colleges today have a better understanding with what they want to be when they grow up and they are very selective. I would encourage all of you to share with your colleagues that you are the best advertisement for the incoming freshman class for 2017. Tell people about the programs that we have. Tell them about the time you spend with students. Tell them

about internships or programs that differentiate us because candidly, you are what is going to be attractive to these students. It is amazing how many times I talk to colleagues that work with me and they tell me that their child is looking at Cincinnati for Engineering and I will say, well, have you looked at Toledo? No. So I will call to see if we can get somebody to meet somebody and it is not just engineering, it is whatever school it is. That is so critical and I think we tell each other really well. I think we all know how good we are, but we need to get that message out and if you can help do that and help get that message out to your colleagues I think that is the biggest help we can use right now.

**Board of Trustees Vice Chair, Cavanaugh:** I think that is right and I have said it before, enrollment is “job one” for all of us. I think literally if every faculty member on campus can somehow get to that one kid, it is a question whether they are going to come back or not come back next year. If you help keep that kid on campus, what that does for our institution is unbelievably transformative and so I don’t pretend to understand the details of higher education, I am still learning and probably a year from now I will still be learning how this really works, but I do know there are colleges on campus that have been successful, so when I think about Engineering, while our enrollment has been going down, somehow over the last ten years they been growing every single year. I asked Nagi and other people, how did you do that? Well, it was the faculty members who went when kids didn’t re-enroll their freshman to sophomore year they called them up and said, “Hey, I had you in class. What is going on? I didn’t see you register for class.” Some of them say, I am not sure or I am not sure if I want to come back, and they’ve talked a few of those kids into staying. Every little victory like that makes a huge difference. So, if there’s anything that you guys can help us on here is a chance- tell them our story, how good we really are and help get that message out and then those kids that are already on campus, let’s make sure they make it from their freshman to sophomore year, let’s make sure they are graduating, and then if they have the potential and interest to go to graduate school, let’s make sure they are doing it here because we have so much to offer them. I think if we can do that it is hugely transformative.

**Senator Devabhaktuni:** I would like to speak to the subjects of both the graduate enrollment and the enrollment. I will speak about one first and then if there’s time I will speak about the other. Being an active researcher, academic enrollment is very dear to me. Not only the enrollment in terms of just quantity, but quality of graduate students that we attract. Seeing that the university has lost its enrollment this year and the biggest dip comes from the academic sector is very disheartening to me. I was really expecting a headline of at least one administrator being fired for the loss of graduate enrollment because that shows accountability. I am just telling you how frustrating it could be to just watch graduate enrollment go down. President Gaber says research has gone up at most universities. Most of our work in research gets done by graduate students. I think that somebody should be held responsible for the decline in graduate enrollment and then new people should be brought in who will have the energy, desire, knowledge and ideas for graduate enrollment at the university, just not in terms of numbers, but also in terms of the quality.

**Board of Trustees Chair, Speyer:** Okay. Well, what I can say to you is that there is clear accountability with respect to the goals to the university that the Board has made very clear to Dr. Gaber. She started in July and so I think we have to give her an opportunity to assess what has caused whatever it is, whether it is graduate enrollment declining, whether it’s research, whether it’s philanthropy, whatever it is. We are seeing her make changes on her administrative team. I am confident that she will continue to do what she deems to be appropriate and to the Board of Trustees. When we went through the interview process and the selection process there were certain things that were non-negotiable. One of them was, we want to

grow enrollment in an appropriate and responsible way. We lived through that time of “let’s just get a slug of kids in” and then you see that the first year retention number dropped. So, we want to do this right. We are kind of moving an “aircraft carrier” so besides having an overnight, we want to balance that with some sense of urgency, but we want to do it right.

**Board of Trustees Vice Chair, Cavanaugh:** The only other comment I would make is, I think we have a change happening in enrollment management function. There was an agreement reached for a key high level employee to separate from the University of Toledo- I think that was their choice, but I think it was in the context of backup of a performance of five years’ declining enrollment with not a particularly clear plan with how to turn that around was not going to be acceptable. I think by Dr. Gaber asking a relative number and significant probing questions about what is happening with the numbers and what are we doing to turn them around? To some degree the lack of satisfaction answers to that it kind of led to a change. Sharon said it well, it takes time to build a team and it takes time for a strategy to be in place and execute that, but Dr. Gaber said it in her inauguration that she has a sense of urgency and accountability. Everything I’ve witnessed whether it is in her previous track record or in the couple of months she’s been here, she is about performance, metrics, and processes, so I think you are going to be pleased with that over time. The people she is going to bring in are high-caliber people and expected to do their job and if they don’t, the university is going to be making changes.

**Board of Trustees Chair, Speyer:** But the reality again, especially when it comes to graduate education, we all need to be a part of that. We can’t rely on an enrollment director to do that all by themselves.

**Board of Trustees Vice Chair, Cavanaugh:** That is kind of my..., it is easy to say administration blew it on enrollment and to some degree maybe that is right, but, I am obviously being provocative on purpose, in reality it is all our issues, so I think we all have to own it and say, we have this great story to tell, how come it’s not getting traction in the market place? We all kind of own that a little bit.

**Senator Jorgensen:** First, an observation and then a question. 2015 has been a very good year. The second half of Nagi’s term as interim president was a great time. We needed that and it was fortunate that we had that. We were able to recoup and land a top quality candidate for a president and we were part of that process through the interviews. She obviously started a very good term here and the change that you referred to was a good one. She had an excellent time speaking to us a couple of weeks ago to work on these things. Having worked with members of the Board in the past through leadership of Senate, a word of caution: it will not be easy to find the right path for board members. We truly don’t want the board members micromanaging the university because there are things that shouldn’t be in their area. We also don’t want to repeat the history of the Board not really knowing what was going on for years and allowing things to happen. The Board needs to be sensitive enough to realize what their role is and how to prevent both situations. Another question is, we still have only seven board members, so are missing two, is our governor spending too much time in New Hampshire <laughter>?

**Board of Trustees Chair, Speyer:** The answer to that is, yes. I will tell you, absolutely. We’ve done everything to make that happen. We’ve shaken that bush out as far we can. It is a little bit of a head-scratcher to me. Many of us on the Board are lucky or unlucky enough to work for publicly traded companies, so we get governance and we understand. We do not want to run the university and our bosses don’t want us to run the university which that would be a malpractice<laughter>, but, we also understand that we have judiciary duty.

**Board of Trustees Vice Chair, Cavanaugh:** We always joked with Dr. Gaber, especially those of us who have boards of their own- we have a healthy respect for executive prerogative and so we have no desire to be running the day-to-day operations. I think what we tried to do as an organization is set out goals and objectives that are relatively clear and relatively well understood and measure progress against those goals. Enrollment is an absolute- it is either going to go up or down or stay the same, but it is a number that we can measure or we can track with. Philanthropy, we can track and we can see whether it is growing or not growing. There are a lot of things that we can measure. And for those of you who went to our last Board meeting, they were handing us a one-page dashboard that showed all the key metrics in the university and I told her it was literally the best I've seen with what was going on at the University of Toledo over the year and a half I was on the Board. I think that is kind of a relationship that we are trying to cultivate about, I am not interested in the details, I am interested in the results, and how do we get there and so I think we are going to try to create that kind of dynamic on the Board. I give Sharon and Joe a lot of credit. I think they've gone through a period where they really needed to understand a lot of what was going on with the university that they maybe did not have full transparency and I think they got to the bottom of that and helped the Board move forward. If necessary, we are going to get involved in that, but I don't worry about that with Dr. Gaber, she gets the relationship that way we were for.

**Board of Trustees Chair, Speyer:** Having said that, if I can just make one comment. One of the patterns that started several years ago and we've continued it, the chair and vice chair meets with the president on a weekly basis. We don't tell her what to do because our job is to hire her and we might give her our opinion. But ultimately, there's a level of accountability and we need to understand where we are going and what we are doing. We think there's a much better balance and I think the balance will continue to get tweaked as she gets her "feet wet." I think she talked about launching strategic planning, but not over the summer. So as the university progresses it will be an evident flow, but, I want to make sure we are clear that we are not hands-off, but we are definitely not interested in running the place.

**Senator Quinn:** My question is more a comment in putting things into perspective. So I arrived in 2001, and one of the things that struck me is how often I would run into a neighbor who would tell me glowing things about the College of Engineering, the College of Pharmacy, or the College of Education and there were enough details in their discussion that I could tell they had been speaking to someone from the University of Toledo. So it is clear that you had 1100-1200 commercials out there on a day-to-day basis pumping the University of Toledo and then I would say, the last few years those commercials went quiet. I don't think it was anybody saying negative things, it is just, when you are telling a parent, you should send your child to the University of Toledo, you have to really believe that and feel that something good is going to come out of this. When you lose that confidence in leadership and where things are going, those 1200 commercials kind of go quiet. And so, I would recommend that the Board of Trustees and the leadership recognize the importance of those commercials because they are every day, and they are out in the community, and they are very persuasive when the person says it really believes it.

**Board of Trustees Chair, Speyer:** It was very well said. You are spot on. I think that there is a cadence to it- several were used to it and then it stopped and now we need to reunite that.

**Senator Ohlinger:** I just want to ask, what are the Board's thoughts on ProMedica? I realize that is a huge topic. Honestly, it is a very complicated and broad topic and I am very excited about it and I think my colleagues in Pharmacy as well as general healthcare profession. It is a wonderful opportunity. My concern is the way that it is unfolding and evolving is that on many levels it is still being packaged as

“this is a college of medicine thing. we are moving part of medical education over, yet, other areas will be impacted, but don’t worry, we are okay.” Yet, medicine is the one driving it and we can’t have everybody at the table trying to do something like this for it, obviously it has become too... I am not sure there’s an appreciation of how far-reaching these consequences are going to be across all healthcare professions- just for example, the College of Pharmacy when you look at our students- we have students that need experiential training, we need over 800 months of experiential rotation for our fourth-year pharmacy students and a large portion of that is at UTMC. When the teaching services go away, those rotations go away, so, where are our students going to go for our 800 rotations, likewise with our residency programs, likewise with faculty and clinical practice sites, and likewise with research and every other college on campus could be saying the same thing? I know we will get there, it is just my concern that we are not proactive enough getting these other stakeholders in the conversation early enough then we are going to find ourselves in a bind two, three, four, five years from now rather than managing it ahead of time and saying, here’s how we are going to bring these other players in.

**Board of Trustees Chair, Speyer:** So, you are right, it is a big issue. The short answer, because there’s a lot of conversation about that between the Board and President Gaber, and governance was probably the biggest focus that we, as the Board, worked at. And so when this document was signed, one of the things that we wanted to make sure was that Dr. Gaber was at the table because she represents the entire university when we are talking about how things are going to evidently flow. And so, this AAOG, affiliation organizational group, I can’t remember what the first “A” is, is voting between the university and ProMedica and she is one of the representatives to ensure that we don’t do something detrimentally to the rest of the university and to ensure the partnership with the College of Medicine provides things forward. I don’t have a “best” to answer that because I think three years from now we should stand here and tell you, we said trust us, you see it turned out okay. We just don’t have a crystal ball. I think you’ve got really smart people who are focusing on this and honestly, to do something with the document of the College of Pharmacy is going to impact enrollment and it is going to impact finances, it is just a delicate thing.

**Board of Trustees Vice Chair, Cavanaugh:** First of all, I think the deal itself is transformative and quite frankly necessary. When you really project it out, the future of our health sciences and medical school with the idea that we were going to have a little tiny hospital that was going to meet the educational needs of 1/3<sup>rd</sup> to 1/4<sup>th</sup> of our students that was an unsustainable model, so I think we fixed the immediate problem from a learning environment perspective. The financial side of the deal is also very attractive and injects resources into the campus that we quite frankly would not be able to develop on our own singlehandedly, so those things are all good. I think we do view this as the entrée with even broader relationship with ProMedica. I think as somebody that is in healthcare services, the things that keep me up at night are, where am I going to get my nurses, therapists, pharmacists, and people like that from in the future because we know the demographics and we know all the issues that are going to drive demand in those fields, and so there’s a natural need and a natural desire for ProMedica to want to have a strategic relationship. What I would say to you and others that are kind of in your spot, first be patient; we have to get the medical piece right first. But, I would be thinking externally about what can be my value proposition to ProMedica. What can I do? What are their needs for going forward and how can I potentially meet those needs? How can I do it in a way that can support the needs of our learners? I bet when you start drawing that Venn diagram, there are an awful lot of intersections in terms of the circles and so that is how I would be thinking about it if I was in your shoes. We think about this realistically and

we think about what's in the best interest of the entire university and how do we create a university that is great, not just in medical school but all colleges and so we are not going to forget about that aspect. I think I will turn it around a little bit and say, you ought to be proactive and literally start thinking about how can I work with these guys that have got 14 hospitals in Northwest Ohio and a \$2 (plus) billion organization, how does that all fit in with how I can partner with that.

**Senator Ohlinger:** If I can just follow-up on that real briefly. We haven't yet been "invited" to the table. We initiated this conversation on our own with ProMedica, and so we are doing that because we are concerned that if we don't, and we are not proactive, then we will find ourselves in a spot where we are not in good situations.

**Provost Barrett:** If I can add on a little bit. The ProMedica agreement provides that ProMedica will provide substantially all of our clinical needs for all of our healthcare operations, so that is built into it. It is primarily in agreement with the College of Medicine, but it does extend beyond that. It wasn't just the College of Pharmacy that reached out when this deal was being cut. The people like Chris Cooper and Dave Morlock that were doing the heavy lifting in the meetings came together, met with all the Health Science deans, and updated them and said it is time for you all to start talking to your counterparts. So, we haven't worked out all the details. It is going to take years to work out all the details, but those are things that are very actively being contemplated.

**Senator Wedding:** I think the moving forward in the direction of the medical area is really a super move. The focus that we've given this new president, who I think is going to be a great president, I think there's two things that we put on her that really is going to be difficult for her to achieve: One, enrollment is going to be a real problem and I am not sure it should be something that we should be so focused on- maybe we can't do something about it; maybe what we should be doing is adjusting our plans and our budget to adjust for perhaps a decrease every year at 1-2% until things look well off. The reality here is what's out there. The second thing is to call this institution outside the medical field, outside the College of Medicine or the Health Science Campus- we are not really a research campus in terms of funding. If you define research as "funded research" then we are a poor model. There are departments in Cincinnati, Ohio State, or Michigan that have bigger funded research than in our entire university, so we just have to recognize that. We have a real problem if we are going to define research as funded research, and if you put that monkey on her back along with this enrollment, we may a few years from now be looking at her as a failed president which will be greatly unfair. I think the positive in all this is moving forward in the medical area and I think it is very, very important.

**Board of Trustees Chair, Speyer:** I guess my response to that is data matters. I don't have all the data, but I would believe that President Gaber will have it when she comes to the Board with her plan. I think I just read in the Chronicle that OU has grown its enrollment over the last several years. I know that she is in the process of putting some peer group information to bring to the Board to talk about if these are our peers whether it's peers from an enrollment standpoint, research, whatever the criteria is, these are the peers that we are going to compare ourselves to and then there will be an appropriate plan. I don't know the answer, but what I do know is that if we don't grow revenue then we will have to cut expenses. That is every business model that I know of, it is kind of one or the other. The revenue part is a whole lot harder, but I think it is one that is more sustainable and it is a whole lot more fun <laughter>. I don't know enough about the research part and that is where I would have to rely on Dr. Gaber.

**Senator Wedding:** This is public information. You can look online and see what's the funded research is for this university and all these other schools. And if you are talking about cutting expenses, just remember that the faculty as I've said many times to my friend, John, represents less than 20% of the cost of the academic budget. It is not the faculty that is driving the cost on this campus and I am not sure if enrollment has that big of an impact. There are costs to be cut on this campus, I am not sure what they are, but I think I will take a hard look at administration, which is probably one-and-a-half to two times of what the faculty cost. I think when you start cutting administrators I will be a believer on what you really plan to do.

**Board of Trustees Chair, Speyer:** I am not planning on doing any of it, first of all, let's make that very clear. So again from a clarity of role standpoint, when I make the comment about revenue and expenses I am also not suggesting that I have the answer with respect where those expenses will come from, again, data matters. I know that Dr. Gaber is in the process of doing some master planning, looking at our footprint. I do not disagree with you and we have to look everywhere. I think that she has demonstrated her commitment for looking at administration when you look at Sam McCrumin and his position, replacing two other people who left the university. She continues to be committed and I know she spoke to this group about making sure that we are spending money appropriately. We need to spend money appropriately at every level and start at the administration, there's no question about that.

**Board of Trustees Vice Chair, Cavanaugh:** There's a couple of other comments that I would make. First of all, I think your overarching theme of we have to do realistic budgets and financial planning and live within our means, 27% agrees with you. My response to the enrollment issue would be the same response I have for any of my sales and marketing people who start to complain about opportunities to grow the business when I start talking about my own business. My basic question to them is always, is there enough market share for us to meet our business objective and variably, the answer is always yes. So, my comment is we need to make it the other guy's problem. So I will tell you there are enough students out there to meet our objectives. If we execute and perform as an institution we will have enough enrollment to grow our enrollment. We haven't done a very good job with telling our story. When I look at the comprehensive programs we have, the fact on a net tuition basis we are the cheapest state university in the state of Ohio and we can't grow our enrollment, you've got to be kidding. And so I don't accept the premise that it is a... "conclusion" that enrollment is going to go down. If we don't do anything different, you are probably right, but we are going to do some things different. The second comment that I would make and this is going to sound a little confrontational, but when you say faculty is only 20% of the cost, I can pick any line item in the income statement in the university and say it is only "x%" of the cost and then put different factions against each other, "we ought to cut them, not us" and so, that is kind of that "us versus them." I will tell you I bet in every corner of this institution we can find deficiencies- administration, absolutely, no question. We as business people when we think about a consumer business or healthcare business the first place you want to go after cost is the places that don't cut cost, so I can promise you that is the focus we have but I don't want to get into this dynamic of "cut them, not me." That is not productive and it is not helpful in solving our problems and so that is kind of where I am going to push back a little bit when you guys give us that feedback because we have to solve these problems together. That will be kind of my pitch to you is don't look at it like that, it is not faculty versus administration; it is the University of Toledo trying to deliver services and education most efficiently possible, whatever that means. Sharon is right, neither one of us is going to be smart enough to figure that

out, but we are pretty confident that we've got a president that is going to hire the right people who are going to make the right decisions themselves.

**President Keith:** Well, we are out of time because the meeting ends at 6:00 p.m. Are you willing to take one more question?

**Board of Trustees Chair, Speyer:** Yes.

**President Keith:** Are there any other questions?

**Senator Giovannucci:** You talked about the 1200 commercials and the graduate students supporting the students' growing enrollment, both graduate and undergraduate and those are very different things, you can't apply the same model to each. But, I think it is a common thing that I see, so I just want to confirm that you guys know this too is that there are short-term things that need to be done to grow enrollment and part of that is marketing, right? Marketing is important, but that is not a long term and it is not really a thing that makes a great university. I think it goes back to the idea of having supporting faculty bringing in young faculty and faculty that are doing active research because when you have those people you are going to attract good graduate students because they don't come here for the "new building," they come to work with professor "x." Those same people can develop prestige and they can also develop undergraduate programs that are quality. I just say investing in people actually, I think in the long-run it is way more important than investing in a building. I know buildings have to be maintained and you want to upgrade things, but if it's a choice between I got "x" amount of money to spend, I will veer on the side of the people.

**Board of Trustees Chair, Speyer:** So, if I can take my trustee hat off for a minute and put my personal hat on. As a mother of a 21- and 24-year old, you are the brand. All of you and your colleagues are the brand. My kids chose to go to Ohio State probably more because of football than anything unfortunately, but at the end of the day, they made that choice and it had nothing to do with billboards, it had nothing to do with the materials that were sent, and it had nothing to do with the website, it had to do with the experience that people that they knew had- that experience they had at Ohio State and they learned about it from friends, they went to college visits, the spoke to professors, and they connected. I did four or five college visits with each of the kids. It was really interesting to watch, first of all, I thought all they did was pay attention to was Xbox, but they were really into it, so it was a proud moment. I completely agree with you and this is where your comment, Senator Quinn and your comment, Senator White come together- all of you and your colleagues are the brand. You are going to make a difference in a young person's life and if we don't get them on campus and connect with them, I mean, this is a beautiful campus. My husband and I were walking to the parking lot after the dinner set for Dr. Gaber Friday night and we both said this is a gorgeous campus and we forget how beautiful it is. If we don't get them on campus and we don't sell them then they may or may not choose us. If we don't tell our story then it is not going to happen, so I completely agree with you.

**Board of Trustees Vice Chair, Cavanaugh:** I think you are right. I think the best thing is, Dr. Gaber gets it. When you think about graduate education for the last several years we gave off this vibe that research isn't important and scholarship isn't important and that is not a focus of this university, and we don't do a lot to retain some key factors, so my personal friends left the university for those reasons and went to places that are doing things that it just "kills" me to watch them do it there and not do it on my campus and lo-and-behold, we are surprised that our graduate enrollment is down- I am not surprised.

More importantly, you've got somebody who is running the place that gets it and is going to do the right things to try and strike that balance and have the right focus there. We can't have everything we want, but we can have...that we want to be successful and I think we are trying to get some of that balance back and I think Dr. Gaber made that very clear with how she is thinking in her role.

**President Keith:** Thank you very much. Well, are there any items from the floor? Hearing none, may I have a motion to adjourn? Meeting adjourned at 6:07 p.m.

**IV.** Meeting adjourned at 6:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Lucy Duhon  
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard  
Faculty Senate Office Administrative Secretary