

**THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO**  
**FACULTY SENATE**  
**Minutes of the Senate Meeting of August 29, 2006**  
<http://www.facsenate.utoledo.edu>

approved @ FS mtg. 9/12/06

---

**HIGHLIGHTS**

**Rob Sheehan**

**Resolution to Approve Graduation  
Nominations for Athletic Committee  
Merger Committee Report on Senate Merger**

---

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

**Chair Wilson** called the meeting to order. **Alice Skeens, Executive Secretary** called the roll.

***I. Roll Call –2006-2007 Senators***

**Present:** Ariss, Barlowe, Barnes, Barrett (Klein), Bischoff, Bopp, Bresnahan, Byers, Cave, Chen, Cluse-Tolar, Edwards (Baines), Fink, Floyd, Fridman, Funk, Hamer, Horan, Humphrys, Johanson, Kennedy, King, Lambert, Lundquist, McNerney, Monsos, Morrissey, Olson, Ott Rowland, Peseckis, Piazza, Poling, Pope, Reid, Ritchie, Schall, Skeens, Spongberg, Stoudt, Teclehaimanot, Templin, Thompson-Casado, Traband, Tramer, Wedding, Wilson, Wolff, Zallocco (48)

**Excused:** Niamat (1)

**Unexcused:** Hudson (1)

A quorum of incumbents was present.

***II. Approval of Minutes***

Minutes of April 11, 2006 and April 25, 2006 approved.

***III. Executive Committee Report***

**Report by Chair, Carter Wilson**

Chair Wilson welcomes the Faculty Senate to the first meeting of the academic year 2006-07, and asked for Roll Call. A quorum was present.

He then introduced Interim Provost Rob Sheehan to speak before the Executive Committee Report is given.

**Provost Sheehan:** Welcomes the Senate to the start of the academic year and an exciting year, and there are lots of reasons why the faculty should feel very excited and positive. I have been making the rounds to each of the cabinets and deans and would be happy to speak to other departments that would like me to come and speak. This is an important year with faculty retirement positions allocated hopefully back to the colleges and departments from which they came. It will be a year in which we will take a look at Round 2 of the faculty hiring program. It will be a broader round than the first one in a sense that in addition to the research criteria, we will also be putting a criteria in which will address the ability to do more student teaching in student credit hour generation.

We will also be looking at allocation of dollars that are at the university level that are consequences of some prioritization that's been occurring on the administrative side of the house. There are goals that some of those dollars flow to the academic side of the house where we can be out there increasing our enrollment and focusing on the quality of our programs. We want to suggest to people that Fall should be an important time in colleges and departments to be thinking about those requests.

This should be the number one thing we do at the university in prioritization is the allocation of faculty positions.

One thing we need to do is to take a lead on hiring and project over the next two to three years. We will have a whole lot of new colleagues coming in, once the new budgetary assumptions of those new colleagues are made, assuming they are assistant professors, what I would like to encourage you to do is to have in place by Fall 2007, a year long mentoring program for new faculty. It's going to have to have some sense and coherence within your discipline and to have a focus within the university level.

I envision an almost 1/3 increase or add to our replacement of faculty over the five year period. If we are going to do that we have to recognize that the graduate schools are not doing the job that they might have been doing years ago in preparing the new faculty to assume an important role to move into professorial positions. So I asked Carol Bresnahan and Bernie Bopp to put in place a mentoring program this next year. We had good faculty ads this year, I anticipate that next year we may double, certainly the year after we will more than double that, so one of the goals that I have, as an Interim Provost, is to put in place full internship programs for faculty. That is the least we can do. Several of us will be retiring over the next few years, that's a good legacy to leave behind.

We will have a visit from the accrediting body on September 25 and 26, 2006, and that's a visit focusing on the merger and on academic governance processes. We just heard today who the two people will be, we will share that with you in the event you know these individuals and will let you know and seek your advise and counsel on how to structure that visit for those couple of days. I really do feel that faculty are the lifeblood of the University. Now in another room you will probably hear me tell the advisors that they are the lifeblood of the University, or you might even hear me tell the students that they are the lifeblood of the University. I will tell you this that I will probably never say this about administrators that they are the lifeblood of the University.

The hard work continues to be done by the faculty. I plan to be at each Faculty Senate meeting and will plan to continue meeting with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, it's been scheduled at the worst possible time for a good conversation, at least without adult beverages. It's been scheduled from 5:00-6:00 pm on Fridays, if you can believe that. In the past Alan and I really enjoyed meeting with the FSEC on a regular basis. Know that the door is open, I will make the rounds to talk to anyone who is interested in talking. I am encouraged that people are optimistic. People who have seen historic cuts of the workforce over the years, and cuts that have impacted your ability negatively and your programs, I think we can begin to turn that around. I would like to be a part of this process in the next year or two while I am in this role. I will be happy to answer any questions and let you get back to your business.

**Senator Skeens:** Do you think we will see an early retirement program again?

**Provost Sheehan:** I'm in complete agreement. There were some aspects of the early retirement program we're dealing with that we didn't care for. This forcing people out early: Telling people who were supposed to go out in the third year that they can't go in the first year, when they have some perfectly valid reasons to do so. We had some lawyers advising us that we couldn't reopen the agreement on the early retirement incentives, but we could certainly start another early retirement incentive, and I think the answer to that is likely to be "yes". I would certainly push for a second early retirement program. I am the Interim Provost, and I am not the one to make the final decision, or if I was the Provost I'm not the one making the ultimate decision. But I will tell you that there are some people in the third year who aren't going, and I think we will realize that as we move along, that people are doing quite as they should, they are being conservative, they are putting their name on the list, and I don't think we're going to see the number of positions materialize that we had hoped to. At least some aspects of the program are very advantageous to the University and hopefully will be re-investing back to the departments in colleges.

I was telling someone today, if you take the salaries of the 22 faculty who retired, and here is this big number over here, you take out of it the one time payment provided to encourage them to retire, then you take out of that the visitor and part time money that is replacing their activity, and then you take out of that hiring 22 assistant professors in equivalent disciplines, there is \$800,000 that is left over this year that is at the bottom line. My argument is that we should begin now if we can't be investing necessarily in replacing how we set up the system but we still have some cash. We have some dollars at that bottom line that we should be begin to put in to the front of our University, and the front line is faculty who are in immediate interaction with students. So the basics of how the program was structured actually does leave some dollars to reinvest in the new faculty to come to this University. That \$800,000 is frankly the annual size of the higher faculty hiring plan that you heard so much about in round one, that we're just finishing up the third year.

So my goal as Provost and someone who has some financial background, it's really quite hard to keep those dollars on the academic side of the house, and it's quite hard to plug those dollars into areas where excellence will be the outcome if it isn't already, where excellence will be rewarded where it currently exists, and where we have unmet instructional need to be competitive in hiring workforce. So, I will push for it Alice. Other questions?

**Senator Larry Fink:** I never understood what the University gets out of it. It seems that new people come at higher salaries; we just hired an Assistant Professor that makes more than me. So I'm not sure if we are saving any money this way.

**Provost Sheehan:** I don't mean to be facetious, but had we had all University options, we wouldn't have extended the faculty retirement program in the College of Business. That's exactly true, it is in the College of Business where new faculty coming in are being paid more than exiting faculty. That is not true in the other colleges. And the \$800,000 that I mentioned is factoring replacement salaries what we know them to be in the discipline of the exiting faculty members. You are quite right. You couldn't hire an Assistant Professor in the College of Business for under \$80,000. I can tell you that is not true in some of the other disciplines. You will also hear some of the urban myth about how early retirement programs have bankrupt institutions. And that was typically when it involved buying service credit to encourage people to go from 25 – 30. Those programs are very, very costly. So this program we're quite optimistic about. I am optimistic about filling the positions under the new faculty hiring program. This is an exciting time if you can hang in there for 12-18 more months and you are going to start seeing a whole lot of new things.

**Senator Larry Fink:** When you go and hire new faculty is that going to be after the prioritization studies?

**Provost Sheehan:** My understanding is the prioritization process played out in the colleges, and they are going to be informing the colleges about their best and brightest and about their urgent need areas and we will be putting the responsibility for these faculty positions right into the hands starting with the department chairs and going to the deans. So if it's done right, the deans should be getting a strong input from the prioritization processes. It will have to be supplemented by an understanding of where we can grow enrollment at this University. I am here to unambiguously tell you that this University must indeed grow, it must grow at or above the state level because the way this formula works at the state level it will continue to be diversion of dollars on the subsidy side from the four years to the two years, because of their enrollment growth. We must do well what we have done this year. We are about a half a percent to three-quarter percent up above last year in term of FT head count and we are hoping to hold that. I really want us to grow. We can't grow with the existing number of faculty that we now have. It's an investment that pays back. Every faculty member that we have who comes in and teaches for us really yields a positive bottom line. With intentional hiring, as opposed to hiring each year, I think we can really help the quality and the prestige of this institution and the ability for this institution to generate funds.

**Joel Lipman:** Regarding the prioritization, what is the future of UPC? Can you comment on it?

**Provost Sheehan:** The President has indicated that he is looking forward to receiving the prioritization reports. I have not received any indication of a continued life of the UPC or the prioritization process outside department and colleges after that report is delivered. I think the quality of the product may determine what the president might have something to do with that. I can tell you that we will be moving into place processes by which the retired faculty positions are requested and those are due in December 2006, so that's going to pre-date some of the work of some of the prioritization committees.

I believe the faculty hiring program Round II, won't have those hiring processes and procedures rolling out very early in the Winter and I believe that we should be seeing an early return of some of the monies that have been identified on the administrative side of the house by as early as November of 2006. Those positions are in fact in play right now. The dollar figure that I mentioned earlier that I have heard is four million dollars are a couple of weeks away. I will have that figure finalized coming from various units. I'm basically saying to this administration that four years of cuts is much too long to maintain morale and to maintain the sense that we are in fact moving forward. Let's find some of these early dollars and put it in the academic side of the house, and let's give the dollars in your budget one year and you will search in the second year, and by three years later you will find faculty members. But I would like to move a little more quickly.

And if we have positions and we have dollars available for positions from this administrative reorganization I would like to have a fairly early decision making process so we can have authorizations to hire this winter in anticipation of having them join us in July of 2007. I may be just entirely too optimistic, but you know I like to see a glass half full rather than half empty, but I think we should have some progress. I am really frustrated having to say to you about these retired faculty positions, if somebody retired in July 2006 as 22 people did, you will find colleagues to replace that person are not going to start until July 2008. To me that's not acceptable. We've got to figure out a way to do this more quickly. I do think that is some ability to go back and look at our budget, revisit windows and make decisions. That \$800,000 is bottom line right now. Why aren't we using some of that \$800,000 to make some earlier moves on this.

**Senator Wedding:** Why are we always saying we have to focus on growth, should we not be focusing on quality, as opposed to just cheering on more students?

**Provost Sheehan:** I know I'm focusing on growth because I watched what's happened to this University for years of attempting to deal with cuts. It seems to be making things worse and worse. I don't think we are getting better quality by attempting to cut \$25 million out of our budget that we have taken out the last three or four years. At some point it will become irrelevant.

About one fifth of what the tuition is, but we are not quite there yet. So I think we have to grow; we are in a competitive business; we are seeking students to come to us for our quality and for the array of services that we offer. Those services include technology and our ability to deliver Podcasting, and have TAs fully staffing our science labs. Right now I am told by A&S that one of the reasons why we don't have enough science labs up and running to meet the science students is because we don't have enough dollars on the TA side to staff those labs. The value system that I have is if we have money, we can invest it in quality. You don't give away quality for quantity. We have some wonderful things at this university. We have wonderful residence halls; we have very wonderful instruction that occurs at all levels, and we can do more, if we have the resources.

**Senator Wedding:** I'm talking about the student enrollment that you seem to focus on. 40% of our students require remedial courses in Math and English. Some 30% require at least three remedial

courses in Math. This becomes the function of the Math Dept., who is teaching the remedial courses. To me that has a great impact on the quality across the landscape here.

**Provost Sheehan:** That isn't the conversation we are having. Some 1300 direct from high school students require remediation each year. Out of the 1300 about 250 of them are multiple remedials. Meaning they require remediation in more than one area. The remainder are taking one remedial course at a time, while they're taking general studies course work. In an ideal world all the remedial needs would be met at the high school. There is a piece of legislation winding itself through House and Senate that does require that kind of behavior change. As Harvey knows, or people who teach Math know, the biggest problem on the Math side, which is where we have the greatest need, is not with students who have taken Algebra II or Trigonometry, it is with students who didn't take it at all. Students who took two years of Algebra I, their Freshman and Sophomore year and then they took something else in their Junior year suffer. Sometimes it was Geometry and sometimes it was specialized Math, so these students who are coming to us are not remedial in a sense that they have been taught poorly, they are remedial or developmental in a sense that poor decisions were exercised in high school, and/or there were limited curricular offerings in the high schools themselves. So the piece of legislation is not only going to suggest that maybe we shouldn't be in a remediation business but it's also going to suggest that students' behavior needs to change if they are going to come to the University in the first place.

My own belief is that people still have a job to do in remediation. Whether we do it, 40% of our student population, most of those living in residence halls, I can tell you, if we lost that 40% of our freshmen population right now we would not replace them in the residence halls with Seniors or Juniors, or transfer. They just wouldn't be there. What makes this University so distinctive among its many other features is the beauty of its campus, the residence halls and its 4,000 beds and I am not prepared to give up lower division education at this university and figure out how to pay off the debt on our residence halls. What I am saying is that I think that we have put ourselves into a little bit of our own tailspin that we would like to reduce the amount of remediation and we would like the students to come better prepared.

It doesn't mean we are prepared today to tell the remedial students, 'we don't want you', in fact, what's really unique about UT is we have the best rate of remediation of any of the universities I'm familiar with and we knock the socks off Owens Community College. What that means is that students who come to us, I saw a report recently, do much better in our environment, than students who were remedial in a two-year college environment. So, it's a big debate, it's happening state wide. I really do think we can and we need to grow. The Ohio State motto has a very interesting strategy on how they grew to better preparation over several years. These are the debates we are having: the Owens partnership, the remediation and the State issues, the use of the Scott Park Campus. They're all good debates.

**Senator Barrett:** I am a sub for Prof. Klein this semester. I am curious about the degree to which we are studying our own students to look at ways on how we can grow. We might have the best XYZ Department in the Universe, but the high school students might not care when they are picking out a college if you have the best XYZ Department. I know if you are looking at the Pharmacy College maybe its reputation would matter, this type of students is already kind of pre-specialized. Graduate programs are also a little different. But for the typical student interested in general college studies, it seems to me their decisions are more vague than that. Do they like the campus? The dorm rooms? Are the parties good?

There are going to be factors influencing their decisions to come here versus other places. Sometimes just because they live in our neighborhoods. But if we want to grow we should be looking at what students are making their decisions on and try to provide the amenities that students care about.

Making the dorms attractive to live in, not the way we want to live in them, but because of the amenities the students want. We have a captive audience to poll to see why they decide on us versus others. We might also want to poll some students who went elsewhere.

Quality is a great concept and I want quality for a lot of reasons, but growing an institution may not be as tied to quality as some other things such as amenities.

**Provost Sheehan:** There are two ways to grow in this institution, one is to bring new students, then I agree with you and we need to look at the image and we are looking at it. We are talking to Marketing, but I think we understand the extent to which the students feel about high quality instructions and about their programs. The longer you keep students in a program the more they are starting to understand the value of their degree. And the lifetime connection to their faculty. I think we have to have this conversation both ways. Number one is what we are doing to attract new students, both direct from high school and transfer, our graduate numbers are looking great right now, and number two, what are we doing to retain students.

What kind of bureaucracy have we gotten in to. That's a very strong conversation we are having right now. John Gaboury was here earlier, we wouldn't let a student register because they had a fine in the library. For that you put a hold on your transcript where you do something a little more creative on the other hand. The same is true for parking; there are ways to get your dollar back. So we're having that conversation. We have reinforced the need for registration holds for academic advising purposes. That is very, very important and is a key strategy for keeping students connected and talking to advisors or something than taking a number and saying bureaucracy. I know you didn't intend on spending the whole time here. Are there are any final questions, otherwise I'll turn it over to Carter.

**Senator Chen:** With a new University I'm interested to hear if any of you know what risks there are for this new campus.

**Provost Sheehan:** Well I think we are promoting scientific research on this campus. I think that the division of Frank Calzonetti's duties into two VP's is a good thing though this might appear to be added administration. We really did something that I think that might be very productive, putting in a very much day-to-day manager in the office of research so their grant processing can occur. Animals are protected, radioactive materials on campus are safe. We also put somebody (Calzonetti) a lot freer out in the front line in pursuing some of those federal grants that are there.

I applaud Frank for the work he has done, he had another banner year. If you look at the growth rate from four years ago to today, in terms of research there is going to be difficulties that people may have encountering in doing research. Coming in on \$33 - 34 million on the University main campus in research is pretty impressive.

With the medical college and being able to compete with such things as cancer centers that's an advantage that we now have some more work in the sciences. I think what we have been doing and I signed off the last couple of days, on a whole lot of matching money that if it comes through, somebody is going to wonder where I am going to get it to pay for it. That's what you do is take a gamble. You agreed to add another Chemistry position and you agreed to add another position in Health Science in return for the dollars that are coming in. There is an important role for research on this campus. We are getting up there in the ranking and just climbed on the national ranking by a number of points as a consequence of this merger. And I think we should exploit the research. Thank you all for your time, and I will be happy to come back at any time.

**Chair Wilson:** I want to thank Dr. Sheehan again. I appreciate the time he spent with us. We have a long practice of the FSEC meeting with the Provost. Dr. Sheehan will continue to meet with us along with Dr. Bresnahan.

Now the Faculty Senate Executive committee report. Welcome back. We have many challenges and opportunities ahead of us this year. The FSEC has been working hard this Summer. This report will highlight some of the issues. Because of the long hiatus over the summer and the many issues we dealt with this summer, this report is a little longer than normal, so bear with me.

- The Mission Statement - as you know a draft of the Mission Statement was developed at the end of April and revised the first week of May. Two weeks were allowed for faculty input. We insisted on more time for faculty input, as the two week deadline in the middle of May which included the possibility of real faculty input, and we took issue with the timetable and some of the wording. I am happy to report that Dr. Jacobs was responsive to our concerns which gave us more time for faculty input and accepted changes that we recommended.
- July 19<sup>th</sup> Retreat - on July 19<sup>th</sup> the FSEC from both campuses and representatives of the Graduate Council attended an all day retreat with Dr. Jacobs. Barry Cohen, the consultant, facilitated the discussions. We spent a considerable time talking about what we value and the importance of shared governance, distinguishing between administrative faculty and non administrative faculty, referring to students as students, and the efficiency in decision making. We were brutally frank but respectful, Dr. Jacobs was open and listened before highlighting some of the major issues, the overall reaction was favorable and let me share some of the comments, one person said,

“I was pleasantly surprised by Dr. Jacobs ability to accept view points contrary to his own and to incorporate these into his decision making. This was the most obvious in the selection dates for the ratification of the mission and value statements...”

Another member of the FSEC stated,

“I was pleasantly surprised by Dr. Jacobs’ openness and impressed by his very adroit manner of conveying his own convictions on a variety of issues....”

- Students and Customers - we explained why we see students as students not as customers, although we shared Dr. Jacobs’ commitment to student centeredness to developing a nurturing environment, to maintaining high standards and to mentoring the students beyond the classroom. I must add that my son and daughter graduated from the University of Toledo. I, as well as many of you, have had sons and daughters of colleagues in our classrooms. What I do for my students, I do, not as a car salesperson trying to get customers, but as an educator committed to development and success of young adults. It is impossible for me to see my students as customers.
- Faculty and Faculty Senate – it was suggested that we, unlike the old MUO, have barriers between faculty members and administrative-faculty, and that we need to remove these barriers, and that administrators who are faculty members – deans – can speak for the faculty. One member of our EC underscored the emphasis that we have this “us and them” division, and he was kind of proud of it.
- I insisted, on the one hand, we see administrative faculty as faculty, and take pride in our collegial relationship we have with them, on the other hand, we need to distinguish between administrative faculty and non-administrative faculty and during the course of the discussion

we've learned that in maybe tenure and promotion decisions only a few of them will help the Health Science Campus. Make the same distinction between the faculty and administrative faculty that we do. We emphasize the point that administrators - President, Provost, Deans, etc., - do not speak for the faculty. At the University level the FS speaks for the faculty. All those in principle may be philosophical issues, to some, principles found in the University Policy Manual and its part of the collective bargaining.

- Efficiency and Faculty Participation - we talked about the importance of efficiency in making fast decisions. We expressed our willingness to make changes to become more efficient to work with Dr. Jacobs and the Provost to make quick decisions, to streamline our decision making process. We noted a few occasions when the FS was able to make quick decisions, however, we also recognized the trade-off efficiency and faculty participation between situations requiring quick decisions, more careful deliberation research and retreat executive committee members who are unwilling to sign off on the core values. We insisted on more time for faculty input and broader faculty participation. Whereas Dr. Jacobs saw this as a sign that the FSEC did not speak for the faculty, we saw this as the EC acting responsibly on behalf of the faculty. I insisted that for something as important as defining the mission and core values of this institution, we do not want a small group of administrators and leaders making quick and exclusive decisions. We need to have buy-in from the faculty, and you can only get buy-in by extending the time and give them the opportunities to have a voice in the process. We insisted on more time for faculty input, Dr. Jacobs gave us that additional time.
- Narrower and Deeper – at the retreat we asked for clarification of the meaning of the expression, as we had considerable anxiety of the future of the Visual Performing Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences, Liberal Arts, and it's my understanding that this expression has to do with not spreading ourselves too thin, not trying to be all things to all people and focus on what we do best. It alleviated our anxieties a little bit.
- Committees - a number of faculty members expressed concerns about faculty representation on key committees, particularly the Strategic Planning Committee, the Provost Search Committee and I expressed my concerns to Dr. Jacobs about the need for additional faculty members, and he did respond by adding additional faculty members. And, I will co-chair with Penny Poplin Gosetti, the provost search committee.
- Senate Merger - as you know in early July the FSEC had a joint meeting with the Health Science Executive Committee and voted unanimously to include a resolution to endorse the concept of merging the two senates, and I believe that once you review all of the materials of the data, you will agree to this course of action. However, ultimately the faculty must decide this issue. This is a major agenda item.
- Prioritization is on track. We are going to get a report from Prioritization Committee at the very next Faculty meeting.
- The Curriculum Committee. There are a couple of things that I need to mention. I need to announce that the Curriculum Committee will continue to serve the college of Health Science Human Services and Pharmacy this year. They do not have undergraduate curriculum committee on the HSC, so our curriculum committee must continue to serve those colleges.
- Announcement from Steven Peseckis in regards to some amazing changes in course modifications, and developing a web based secure, user friendly and practical system for



developing, posting, and tracking new courses and course modification proposals. This system will not be up and running until the beginning of next year, however, Steven proposed that, for this semester Faculty fill out electronic forms as approved by the Faculty Senate and the Provost Office. There will be more about this later.

- A final word about the change. We embrace change. We are committed to making substantial and radical changes this year. We are committed to efficiency in decision making, however we are also committed to what I call purposive change, change not for change sake, but change for a purpose. Change to make us better and stronger. Change to make us more efficient and responsive. This upcoming year we have a great deal to accomplish, many challenges ahead, many things to change, but we also have things that we value and that we will work to preserve. Let me conclude from a quotation from the public administrator. Herbert Simon, the author of *The Proverbs of Administration*. A fact about proverbs that greatly enhances their quotability is that they almost always occur in mutually contradictory pairs.

“He who hesitates is lost,” (make quick decisions)

“Look before you leap,” (deliberate before making decisions)

This concludes my faculty senate report. Thank you.

(copy of Chair Wilson’s full FSEC report)

### **Faculty Senate Executive Committee Report**

Welcome back. We have many challenges and opportunities ahead of us this year. Our Faculty Senate Executive Committee has been working hard this summer. This report will highlight some of the issues we have grappled with. Because of the long hiatus over the summer and the many issues we have been dealing with, this report is longer than usual and I apologize for this.

#### **Mission Statement**

A draft mission statement was developed at the end of April and revised the first week in May. Two weeks were allowed for faculty input. We insisted on more time for faculty input, as the two week deadline in May precluded the possibility of real faculty input and we took issue with some of the wording, particularly the use of the expression, professionally focused. I am happy to report that the upper administration and Dr. Jacobs were responsive in granting additional time for faculty input and accepting some changes in the wording of the statement.

#### **July 19 Retreat**

On July 19 the FSEC of both campuses and representatives of the Graduate Council attended an all day retreat with Dr. Jacobs. Berry Cohen, a consultant, facilitated the discussions. We spent considerable time talking about what we valued. We talked about the importance and meaning of shared governance, effectively consulting with the faculty and distinguishing between administrative faculty and non-administrative faculty, referring to

students as students, and speed and efficiency in decision-making. We were brutally frank about our differences, but we were respectful. Before highlighting some of the issues, let me make this point clear: the overall reaction of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee was favorable. We had more in common than differences. Let me share some of the favorable comments from EC members:

I was pleasantly surprised by Dr. Jacobs' ability to accept viewpoints contrary to his own and to incorporate these into his decision making. This was most obvious in the selection dates for the ratification of the mission and values statement but it also occur elsewhere in yesterday's proceedings...

I was pleasantly surprised by Dr. Jacobs' openness and quite impressed by his very adroit manner of conveying his own convictions on a variety of issues...

Let me highlight some of the issues:

### Students and Customers

We explained why we see our students as students and not as customers, although we shared Jacobs' commitment to student-centeredness, to developing a nurturing environment, to maintaining high standards and to mentoring students beyond the classroom. I must add that my son and daughter graduated from The University of Toledo. I, as well as many of you, have had the daughters and sons of colleagues in classes. What I do for my students, I do, not as a car salesperson trying to get customers to choose my product, but as an educator committed to the growth, development and success of young adults. It is impossible for me to see my students as customers. However, it is possible for me to understand and appreciate Dr. Jacobs' vision, while eschewing the use of the term customer.

### Faculty and the Faculty Senate

It was suggested that we, unlike the old MUO, have barriers between faculty members and administrative-faculty and that we need to remove these barriers and that administrators who are faculty members—deans—can speak for the faculty. One member of our EC underscored the “us and them” division between faculty and administrators. I insisted that on the one hand we see administrative faculty as faculty and take pride in our collegial relationship with them. On the other hand, we need to distinguish between administrative faculty and non-administrative faculty. During the discussion, we learned that in making tenure and promotion decisions the old MUO, make the same distinctions between faculty and administrative faculty that we do. We emphasized the point that administrators—the president, provosts, deans do not speak for the faculty. At the university level the faculty senate speaks for the faculty and although this principle may be a philosophical issue for some, this principle is found in the university Policy Manual and is codified in the collective bargaining contract.

## Efficiency and Faculty Participation

We talked about the importance of efficiency and making fast decisions. We expressed our willingness to make changes to become more efficient and to work with Dr. Jacobs and the provost to make quicker decisions and to streamline our own decision-making process. We noted a few occasions when the Senate was able to make quick decisions. However, we underscored the trade-off between efficiency and faculty participation and between situations requiring quick decision and situations requiring more careful deliberation and research.

At the retreat, EC members were unwilling to sign off on the Core Values. They insisted on more time for faculty input and broader faculty participation. Whereas Jacobs saw this as a sign that the EC could not speak for the Faculty Senate or the faculty, we saw it as the EC acting responsibly on behalf of the faculty. I insisted that for something as important as defining the mission and core values of this institution, we do not want a small group of administrators and leaders making a quick and exclusive decision. We need to have buy-in from the faculty and you can only get buy-in by extending the time to give them the opportunity to have a voice in the process. We insisted on more time for faculty input into the core values. Dr. Jacobs gave us the additional time.

### Narrower and Deeper

At the retreat, we asked for clarification on the meaning of the expression, narrower and deeper, as we had considerable anxiety over the future of the visual and performing arts, the humanities and the social sciences and the liberal arts. My understanding is that the expression has to do more with not spreading ourselves too thin, not trying to be all things to all people and trying to focus on what we do best.

## **Committees**

Many have expressed concerns about faculty representation on key committee, particularly the Strategic Planning Committee and the provost search committee. I had emailed Dr. Jacobs expressing concerns about these committee, he responded by adding additional faculty members. I will co-chair the provost search committee with Penny Poplin-Gosetti. I had nominated Penny and she spoke in favor of having a faculty co-chair.

## **Senate Merger**

As you know, in early July, the FSEC had a joint meeting with the Health Science Executive Committee and voted on and approved unanimously a resolution to endorse the concept of merging the two senates. I believe that once you review all of the material and data that you will agree to this course. However, ultimately the faculty must decide this issue. This is a major agenda item.

## Curriculum Committee

I need to announce that our Curriculum Committee will continue to serve the colleges of Health Science and Human Service, Nursing and Pharmacy this year. Also, I just received an email from Steven Peseckis early this morning announcing the development of a web-based, secure, user-friendly and practical system for developing, posting, and tracking new course and course modification proposals. This system will not be up and running until the beginning of next year. However, Steven propose that for this semester, faculty fill out the electronic forms as approved by the FS Curriculum Committee and provost office in the past and accessible on the Provost's website (<http://provost.Utoledo.edu/index.asp?id=132>).

## A Final Word About Change

We embrace change. We are committed to making substantial and radical changes this year. We are committed to efficiency and speedy decision making. However we are committed to purposive change, change not for the sake of change, but change for a purpose, change to make us better and stronger, more efficient and more responsive. This up coming year, we have a great deal to accomplish, many challenges ahead, many things to change, but we also have things we value and that we will work to preserve.

Let me conclude with a quote from Herbert Simon, the author of "The Proverbs of Administration\*" A fact about proverbs that greatly enhances their quotability is that they almost always occur in mutually contradictory pairs. 'He who hesitates is lost. (Make quick decisions) Look before you leap. (Deliberate before making decisions)"

That concludes my report. Thank you.

Herbert Simon. 1987. "The Proverbs of Administration" in J. Shafritz and A. Hyde. Classics of Public Administration.

**Chair Wilson:** I have a resolution to present in regards to graduation, Log Item 0607-2, approval of candidates for degrees. This is, as you know, a tradition of the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate approves the candidates for degrees. The charge the EC requested to pass a motion of diversity in the academic year for approval candidates for degrees the fall and spring commencement. Andy, you have to help me out with this. Do we need a motion for second?

**Andy Jorgensen:** This is from the Committee so we don't need a second.

**Chair Wilson:** Any discussion on this? All in favor of the resolution say, "Aye", all opposed, same sign. Unanimously *passed*.

Now I would like to turn the podium over to Senator Debra Stoudt to do the election for the Athletics Committee.

**Senator Stoudt:** I hate to disappoint you, but we will not be having an election. We are in the nomination process. This is much more complex than electing the FS officers, and involves a two-step process. We had two nominations through petitions; a third nomination was ruled ineligible since there already is an individual on the Athletic Committee from that college – the FS rules state

that only one individual from any given college may be elected by FS to serve on a University-wide committee. Also, only full-time faculty are eligible to serve on these committees.

So, I currently have two nominees. A third form just submitted to me is incomplete, so it will have to go back to that person. I will take nominations now from the floor, have them seconded, and then hand out petitions to be completed by the nominator or nominee. At the next FS meeting we will elect one of these people to serve in this position. Are there any other nominees?

**(?) Tom:** Which colleges already have people so they will be eligible to be nominated?

**Senator Stoudt:** Arts & Sciences & Law. I don't know who else is on the committee.

**Senator Skeens:** Dr. Jacobs appointed two more females.

**Senator Stoudt:** We are working with the Office of the Provost to identifying others on the committee. Nominations?

**Senator Hamer:** From Education - Celia Regimbal.

**Senator Stoudt:** Is there a second?

**Senator Skeens:** Seconded.

**Senator Stoudt:** Other nominations? If there are none, the nominations are closed. We will take care of the elections at the next meeting. Thank you.

**Chair Wilson:** Now I would like to turn the podium over to Prof. McSweeney and Prof. Floyd on their report from the Cultural, Historical and Shared Governance Subcommittee of the Faculty Work Group on Senate Merger.

**Senator Floyd:** For those of you who are new to the Senate or those who may have forgotten how we've gotten to this point, last March the two chairs of the executive committees of the faculty senates appointed a series of committees to look at faculty issues related to the merger. One of these was this committee called the Cultural, Historical and Shared Governance Subcommittee and we were charged with looking at the structures of shared governance on each campus, and how the historical and cultural development have affected shared governance on each campus, and lastly, this issue of whether and how the two senates might be merged.

Our committee met most of the summer and we had a lot of discussions about the issue of merging the senates. At the beginning our committee was not anywhere near unanimous on the issue of merging the senates, but during the discussions, and thanks to a lot of research which our colleague, John McSweeney did, we decided on June 15<sup>th</sup> that we would unanimously recommend that the two senates be merged. Our reasons included things such as the need for the faculty to speak in one unified voice; the need for clear lines of communication with administrators, including the President; the fact that with college realignment, if we maintain a geographical representation, the question of which college is represented by which senate is murky at best. Also, our investigation showed that all other universities within Ohio that have medical schools have one senate. And the University of Michigan and Wayne State University both have one senate. On June 30<sup>th</sup>, members of our committee met with a joint meeting of the EC of the two faculty senates, and presented our recommendation. You will hear that report today. As a result of that the joint FS committees agreed unanimously the concept of merging the Senates.

John is going to present his PowerPoint presentation on the research that we did on this issue and then we will open up for questions. We will talk at the end about the process we envision for continuing discussion of this question. We had some printouts of John's PowerPoint available, but they may be gone. The PowerPoint presentation is available on the FS website, on the left hand side there is a link. So you may want to print it out for yourself and study our report. At this point I will turn it over to our colleague from the HSC, John.

**John McSweeney:** It's a pleasure being here today. I have a long association with the University of Toledo. It started shortly after 1981 where I started my position with MCO and served as an

adjunct faculty member in the department of Psychology. I have been on several dissertation committees and I am also an evening student in the College of Law. My advisor and one of my professors is sitting here and I would like to say they do an excellent job, and I appreciate them as a student as well as colleagues. I want to talk a little about the work the committee did earlier this year in the old University of Toledo and the Health Science Campus, now the new University of Toledo. As Barbara said, we were both, as well as John Barrett, on the Cultural, Historical and Shared Governance Subcommittee of the FAST, which stands for Faculty Synergy Task Force, that was charged with examining self governance at the University of Toledo and making suggestions for the new UT Senate structure. Some of the issues that went into the discussions are worth noting.

New UT Senate Organizational Options – five scenarios:

- Complete Unification.
- Unification Incorporating Divisions by Primary Mission.
- Unification Incorporating Divisions by Geographic Location – main campus vs. HSC.
- Separation by Location with Coordination - maintaining separate senates and having some type of coordinating body.
- Complete Independence by Geographic Location.



\\

fss00cv02.utad.utole

Complete PowerPoint Presentation available, click on this icon ---->

**Senator Olson:** We also have the Graduate Council which has not been reflected here, so one of your involvements will be what do you do with the graduate council in this reorganization.

**John McSweeney:** Right, so this will also be a complex design.

**Senator Fink:** How many senators are there at MUO?

**John McSweeney:** I think there are about 50, I was the past president of FS and I should know this. I lost touch.

**Senator Chen:** How many senators do you expect to be here?

**John McSweeney:** I think that's something that will be discussed in the future, and it's entirely dependent on which way we go.

We conducted a survey of other universities, especially Ohio universities and included some Michigan universities. We were interested in unification of faculty cultures and identity as a faculty. We are all members of departments, of colleges, and all citizens of the University. It also eliminates potential jurisdictional representational conflicts. It's a standard structure recommended by the FS leaders, specifically educational issues associated with graduate programs and it could be addressed within the new Senate structure.

The unified Senate concept was discussed and unanimously endorsed by the Joint Faculty Senates at a joint meeting at the last minute, at which we could get together and still exist as separate institutions on Friday afternoon on June 30<sup>th</sup> 2006. By Sunday we were one institution.

**Senator Fink:** I have two questions, the representative schools that you looked into, are they basically separated or together?

**John McSweeney:** Some yes, some no. At Ohio University, they are not next together. They are on two sides of Athens, that's one that is separate. At Wayne State, the campuses are nearby each other. I think they are about a mile apart. At the University of Michigan they are right next together. At Ohio State they are also right next together.

**Senator Fink:** I have a concern with people's teaching schedules. We have to make sure they come here for meetings, and I believe that some of my colleagues think that there may be some conflicts and are thinking that this will increase conflicts and decrease attendance and therefore,

**John McSweeney:** That is one of the conflicts that we have to consider that was raised in some of our discussions. Some of the Faculty Senate members say, yes, it's an issue getting everyone together at one time. If you work hard at it, you can pull it off. But there is no question, the larger the organization the more complex and more difficult it becomes to function efficiently.

So what's next in the nutshell? If you folks approve this and it is approved at the HSC, a construction of a new constitution and bylaws follows which will get approved by the Senates and faculty. Here is the proposed outline:

- General presentation on the merger – which is what we are doing today for you, and it will be at the HSC as well.
- Develop a basic outline for a merged senate, to be drafted by the Cultural, Historical, and Shared Governance sub-committee.
- Endorsement of basic outline by joint Faculty Senate Executive Committee.
- Proposal sent to the Faculty for their comments.
- After their input, prepare resolution on basic outline for merger to be voted on by both Senates.
- Appoint committee to draft new constitution and bylaws for a joint senate.
- Vote by the total Faculty on the new constitution and bylaws.

This will be very important to the University, which is not the same thing that we had on June 30 2006; we have to think differently, act differently and I do believe that flexibility will be required. The choice is up to you and our faculty. If you want to continue on with the reconstruction, we can do that. I am very much interested in it and we want all of our faculty members working together. Thank you and I will turn it over to Carter.

**Senator Floyd:** We will be happy to answer any questions about John's research.

**Senator Wolff:** Is there a thought to do away with our current Graduate Council?

**Senator Floyd:** We haven't really gotten beyond anything presented today. What we did is present information on the five scenarios that we came up with. We would like to hear your ideas. We are not proposing any particular structure at this point; we just want feed back from you. From there we will move forward with trying to come up with some bare bone structural concept that we can send out to faculty for comments, which will address issues such as what to do with the Graduate Council. From there, once we get the feedback we can then go forward with the official vote of the two senates. But at this point, these are five proposals, five scenarios, we're suggesting number one but we haven't worked out the details.

**John McSweeney:** We are at the conceptual stage.

**Senator Fink:** Instead of having two meetings a month where one of us is traveling to it, it seems to me it would make sense to make a slight modification so that the entire senate meets once a month and a subset (based on issues being addressed) could also meet once a month. That way each faculty would not be required to sit through issues to which they are not knowledgeable or have no interest in. This way, we would avoid having as many conflicting schedules/meetings and losing a lot of people in attendance. This way senators would find it easier to arrange their schedules to avoid conflicts by having the joint meetings once a month and not twice.

**Senator Floyd:** So what do you do with a College like Arts & Sciences? These are some of the issues that we are getting into.

**Senator Fink:** You said a lot of this is just a rough frame, but it makes sense to meet once a month, and there are quite a few things with both sides may be disinterested in having any input, or again would feel not knowledgeable enough to have an opinion.

**John McSweeney:** I guess I would be careful when we start talking about both sides. That concerns me.

**Senator Barrett:** I've been to a number of these meetings, as John and Barb know, partly because the Law School is perceived to be in a little bit of a unique position to speak because we often don't really care about some of the issues that come before the Faculty Senate because we are a different fish. We are purely graduate and we have closed admissions, etc. And we are small, with little voting power. So both sides were sort of interested in how do we fit in with the UT Faculty Senate. I would just like to say in response to your comments, I envision as details get worked out on a merged senate, the goal will be to build a better mouse trap for all involved.

This is by no means a perfect institution. I'm assuming nobody thinks it is. It doesn't mean it doesn't do a lot of good things, it does. But I certainly would hope that if I'm involved in proposals and drafts somewhere down the road, hopefully I won't be, but I would like to see more things handed off to appropriate committees of various types with periodic reports to the Senate, because committees can be more agile, they can respond to needs better and they can be made up of the appropriate constituent groups, and they may not always be centered with matters of interest to all. We may decide that we want to have faculty on a committee instead of a senator. But there are a lot of things about graduate education that various colleges will want to meet on, things about undergraduate curriculum the graduate schools don't care about as much, etc.



So, if you envision this working right, let's not have two senates, let's have one senate and let's compartmentalize issues with periodic reports to the whole as appropriate. The devil here is in the details and the details are going to be important to this being acceptable in the end. But I think the model is one that ultimately most benefits us, the faculty, meeting together, having one voice, having a better integrated institution at the end. We need to come together as a group as we get to know each other as a group. I think a little creative thought process will solve most of what you talked about. Maybe not all of them.

**Senator Fink:** That makes a lot of sense too.

**John McSweeney:** I would agree, and I would emphasize that we need to look at this fresh and we need to start to see what is it that the Senate needs to do, and look at what is the best structure to handle that.

**Senator Stoudt:** Do you know anything about the history of the other two merged institutions cited in this report? I am not sure - Andy, maybe you can answer this - if the MUO Faculty Senators are appointed or elected?

**John McSweeney:** Elected.

**Andy Jorgensen:** The Executive Committee is appointed by the President, is it not?

**John McSweeney:** Yes, the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate is appointed by the President. The difference is that our officers are elected from the whole faculty, so we do have a president, and a vice president. They can be senators but not necessarily.

**Andy Jorgensen:** The Executive Committee, they are appointed by the president as advice to the president. Not elected through the ranks of the faculty

**John McSweeney;** Some of the officers that serve on the Executive Committee are there by virtue of them being officers. For example, our president elect, (we don't have a vice president), past president as well as the secretary are all elected officers but they serve on the Executive Committee in addition to the ones the president appoints.

**Senator Stoudt:** We need to know more about a numbers of these issues before any decisions are made. We don't even know how many senators there are at MUO or how many faculty there are on the Health Science Campus.

**Senator Floyd:** Again, we are not talking about the existing structure. We are talking about something brand new which will be probably very different from what exists on either campus right now.

**Senator Stoudt:** Once again we are being asked to vote on something and then work out the details afterwards.

**Senator Floyd:** No, you won't be asked to vote on anything, you will be asked to vote on constitution and by-laws that will be completely sketched out as a new structure, how people are elected what the proportion of representation is. That is what we will vote on and not just by the Senate but by all faculty at both institutions.

**Senator Stoudt:** I have a problem understanding how someone can endorse an option if we really don't know what the option entails.

**Senator Floyd:** We are not asking you to endorse anything at this point. We do endorse the concept of merging the two into one Senate. What that structure will turn out to look like, we don't know at this point.

**John McSweeney:** We are not asking you to endorse the former MUO Senate. Or even this one.

**Chair Wilson:** Let me add something here, when I was at the last FSEC meeting at the HSC, they were still having conversation about this, and they are still talking and they have some different

perspectives. What I'm hearing some of the members saying is that they like the model that we have. My understanding is that was their recent change?

**John McSweeney:** We did make some recent changes to make it more like the UT Senate. I served on that committee.

**Chair Wilson:** They made some recent changes to make them more like us because they liked our model and they liked the level of info that we have, so some of them are raising questions as to how can they be more like us. Others are raising some of the same questions, what about having some discussions on how can that be best resolved. One way of resolving is doing more work, and as John pointed out within committees. Another way to try and resolve this is to have special calendars where we note that these issues would be on the agenda, and different issues would be at different times. First of the month curriculum issues, second week would be more general informational issues. So, we are still in the talking stages. There is nothing on paper. How can we best do this to handle all of the issues. So there is really no details on the proposal, just how can we best do this.

**John McSweeney:** It's just a concept of a unified senate, one that represents all the faculty members in the University.

**Senator Edwards:** Thank you to all on your committee for all your work in investigating options. I also think that I would support your recommendation of a unified senate, too. I think we need to look at what the overall goal is here, and that is faculty governance and giving the faculty an important voice and a role in the governance of their institutions, and having input into that process in running the institution. We can do that much more effectively if we speak with one voice, than if we are divided. We are one institution and we need to be a part of one institution and work together.

**John McSweeney:** It could be a model similar to the current one at main campus at UT, or similar to the current one at the HSC, or a combination, or it could be something completely different, one that doesn't resemble the model at either place.

**Senator Bresnahan:** I am interested in some of the cultural historical parts of your committee's title. I chaired this body and like here, I had the chance to sit in the senate for several times, and I think I know pretty well what our senate is like here. This Senate has censored an administrator. A current senator, my colleague, Erik Johansen, asked pretty blunt question of a trustee some years ago about inflicting a former president on us? This senate has a history of being pretty feisty and independent. I just don't know what the former MUO's senate is like, so I guess my question is going to go how are we going to blend these two cultures to maintain the important role Senate has on this campus at least in shared governance.

**Senator Floyd:** We did look into that. We asked the committee members of the old MUO and the committee members of UT to draft for each other their perceptions of faculty governance at their respective institution and what they perceived as shared governance at the other institution. That's in the final report, and if that's not on the web I will ask the secretary to put it on the web. We did come up with the conclusion that our faculty is a little more aggressive, we are used to being involved in matters beyond academics, and we had a collective bargaining agreement. On their campus there are many professionals and some faculty consider themselves professionals before they consider themselves faculty. They also have this business attached to their campus that we don't have. We would've liked to have done this study scientifically with a survey, but we didn't have time to do that.

**John McSweeney:** The other thing is that we have a shorter history and have not been involved on campus as long as you have.

**Andy Jorgensen:** I would speak favorably for a single senate primarily so that we can speak with one voice. On this campus we have a tradition of the Senate speaking for the faculty. Whether it's an academic regulation, with respect to a Vice President, or whether it's speaking out on a particular

issue. That is something that doesn't always exist on other campuses and it's something we want to treasure and continue. I think it's good for us to have that for the entire university, particularly because we have a president who came from the other campus that has a different model, and that president might not realize who speaks for the faculty. He may think that he can only call a few people, or check with the Dean. That's not how it works on this campus. We can handle the details of a merger. But we want the Senate to speak for the faculty with one voice.

**Senator Fink:** I think you have done a lot of work and I appreciate all the work, John mentioned more creative solutions, so I just want clarification, are we voting for "yes," let's explore?

**Senator Floyd:** We are not voting for anything today.

**Senator Fink:** Ok, in the future, I would like to see more details, yes, in principle let's vote to actually merge.

**Senator Floyd:** That's exactly what will happen. What will happen is that our committee will go back because the joint senate executive committees have asked us to do so. We will go back and sort of flush out a bare-bones concept for a merged senate, which we will then take to the joint executive committees to review. We will then bring it to the Senate and if they approve it, the plan will be then be brought forward to the Senates for discussion and for feedback by all faculty. Then we will have the vote of the Senates. If it goes along and progresses, we will vote on a complete constitution and by-laws. That is what you will vote on.

**Senator Fink:** Hopefully you will do this in stages.

**Senator Floyd:** We will, after we incorporate the feedback.

**John McSweeney:** I guess I have a question, Barb, do we need some sort of an endorsement to go forward with this?

**Senator Thompson-Casado:** That's exactly my question.

**Senator Floyd:** That's something for Carter to decide.

**Senator Thompson-Casado:** Are we not going to explore different scenarios?

**Chair Wilson:** My idea is that this would be purely informational.

**Senator Thompson-Casado:** But it sounds to me like that would be flushing out the unified senate model.

**John McSweeney:** I thought we would be looking for an endorsement of developing a plan.

**Senator Olson:** I was the author of the thing that the EC accepted for the unification and it was my understanding that after we endorsed it, we would take it back to the FS for them to endorse it. We as the EC are not in a position to speak directly for the FS in it's totality in this matter, but instead, the fact that we could agree would indicate that now we could ask the Faculty if they would agree. Also I would like to comment on one other factor. There may or may not be minority views and regardless whether the EC accepts the majority views, it is completely within the jurisdiction of any faculty member that holds minority views to bring this forward to this FS, and if they feel strongly enough about it, they should in fact do so.

**Senator Wedding:** I think this is going to be very complicated for two reasons. One, you have administrators, and I understand that administrators do not serve in the MUO Senate.

**John McSweeney:** That's correct.

**Senator Wedding:** If you go to them to vote, a vote of our faculty to lessen the combination, you would led the administrators in both in that general election. There are some very interesting issues here. I am not speaking for or against these issue. I'm saying the devil is in the details.

**Senator Floyd:** I think you have to define the voting pool, which I assume will be what is in our Policies and Procedures as defined as the faculty of this institution.

**Senator Wedding:** For that particular election.

**Senator Floyd:** Right. I think there is definitely an issue as to what a faculty member is.

**Senator Wedding:** The second issue down the stream of all this is, the policy and procedural manual that will be resulting from the combination of the two, and that to me would be a very important merger that takes place. We certainly would want a committee put together that, for

instance would pick the worst aspects of each manual for the detrimental fact. That would be the most important event of all is the ultimate policy manual which results from the combination of the two senates.

**Senator Floyd:** This Senate doesn't have anything to do with the policies and procedures manual. What we would draft is the constitution and by-laws of this senate.

**Senator Wedding:** I disagree. The senate does from time to time pass items that go into the policies manual.

**Senator Floyd:** But I don't think we have the right to vote on policies.

**Senator Wedding:** At one time, around 1995 the policy manual existed, at the bottom three votes, one indicated by the Senate, they approved it, then the Administration approved it, and then the BOT themselves. So our policy manual had actually sections approved by all three. The fact is the Senate had been involved in the policy manual.

**Andy Jorgensen:** People had asked about the number of faculty; the number of faculty on the main campus including those like Pharmacy, etc., at the end of June, was approximately 700 full time faculty, which includes lecturers and VAP's. At what was MUO, there is between 300-400 full time faculty members, roughly half of them are clinical faculty. So the total faculty members at the present UT is about 1,000. This is something to rave about to students who are considering perhaps a community college.

**Senator Wedding:** I don't want to leave with a thought that this Senate does not have some sort of input or legal authority with respect to the policy manual.

**Senator Floyd:** I think this is outside of the discussion that we are having.

**Senator Wedding:** Ok, but I think this is the ultimate.

**Senator Floyd:** So at this point I would open to a motion to endorse this, we can vote on it, if not, we will consider this discussion.

**John McSweeney:** The motion would be to put your motion forward,

**Senator Olson:** I recommend the motion for unification, not specifying which process we would receive, but was a motion that expresses the fact that we agreed that unification did have to occur and that if we endorse the philosophy, that we would unify. And that we would not get into the specifics, on how that would be done.

**Senator Barrett:** Support in principle.

**Senator Olson:** Support in principle. Exactly. We don't need a second, it does need to be voted on.

**Senator Stoudt:** This is considered a report, correct? I tried to raise this issue before and was told that we are not voting, but it turns out that was in fact the expectation of some members of the EC. If you expect a vote to be taken, then you need to send out the resolution. I'm not talking about a "no-brainer" like endorsing candidates for degrees. This is a very, very important issue.

**Senator Floyd:** It was sent out as a resolution to all senators.

**Senator Stoudt:** As a resolution?

**Senator Floyd:** Yes, after the joint meeting on June 30<sup>th</sup>.

**Senator Stoudt:** It's not on your agenda.

**Senator Olson:** I recommend that we table it until next meeting.

**Chair Wilson:** I'd feel more comfortable that we do that, because I am sort of in an awkward position, because we really should have worked this out.

**Senator Floyd:** I thought we did.

**Chair Wilson:** I thought we did too. And I apologize

**Senator Barrett:** I think tabling is a good idea so people can think about it, get their arms around it, look at the report and look at the five options. If you feel really strongly and want to talk about one of the options at our next meeting, this is a democracy. If you have an idea, faculty input is appropriate. There is no intention to cram this down everybody's throats, its just a lot of people talk about it and collectively we kind of came to the same viewpoint.

I will say, though, that this is going to be painful for everybody. If you talk to people from the MUO campus some of them were worrying about being out voted on everything when we merge the senates because there are more of us. Everybody has their own issues and those are going to have to be worked out. And if they cannot be worked out, a merger will not be approved.

So I think we need to pick a model and we need to work on the details for that model and then we need to see if we can get faculty buy-in by on it. And I happen to think that unification is the best model, but if we have people disagree with me, we will work on a different model. As a lawyer, I discourage my clients from the kind of negativity, that says we cannot find an acceptable solution. The idea is we can't pursue in a meaningful way 4 or 5 models at once. I think we need to pick one and work on it. And we need to use our best collective judgment on which one to work on and if we can't work the details out we can try another model or we just give up. Until you get the details you never know what's acceptable. The details are going to be hard because it's going to affect all of us. Let's be realistic about that and see if we can come up with a marching order on how we want to pursue this.

**Senator King:** There is a motion on the table and I would like to second Walt's motion.

**Chair Wilson:** There is a motion to table this issue.

**Senator Olson:** We are tabling a vote on the resolution of the joint Faculty Senate Executive Committee with regards to merging the Faculty Senates.

**Senator Barrett:** Endorsing in principle. Endorsing merging Faculty Senates in principle into one unified body.

**Senator Bresnahan:** This was listed on the agenda as a report not a resolution.

**Senator Olson:** We can accept the report.

**Chair Wilson:** Here is the issue. On the agenda this is presented as a report and if it's the sense of the Senate that this is just a report, that means that we are going to delay voting on any resolution if we can proceed with the discussion. Could we get a strong vote how many people see this as just a report, raise your hand. It's unanimous that this is just a report. Can we now proceed with the discussion as this being just a report.

**Andy Jorgensen:** Carter, the way to do it is to have just the person who moved the resolution to withdraw the motion.

**Senator Olson:** It was no resolution, it was a motion.

**Chair Wilson:** I would like us to proceed with the discussion.

**Senator Floyd:** Are there any more discussions on the issues presented?

**Senator Chen:** What is the future composition of the Senate? I think we need to know clearly how many senators there will be from both campuses? You are talking efficiency, what happens if there are only ten senators from the HSC? Is that an efficient way to represent the other campus?

**Senator Floyd:** That would be critical, the idea of how people are represented.

**John McSweeney:** It would be up to us as to how many we should have and how they should be represented.

**Senator King:** I would like to push the discussion a little bit and say that if we move to a unified senate, we should also have a more complex committee structure with more authority delegated to committees. We might as well move that way.

**Senator Thompson-Casado:** Can we get heads up to all the senators for the next meeting in advance. I had the agenda emailed today and it looked like just a report when I got it, heads up to people as to what's going on.

**Senator Floyd:** Yes, it was intended by us to be a report, and that is indeed what we've presented to you. Unfortunately someone requested it be put to a vote. That made it confusing. This was a report.

**Senator Thompson-Casado:** Can the PowerPoint be attached to it?

**Senator Floyd:** The PowerPoint is already on the FS website. On the left side of the page you will see John's PowerPoint.

**John McSweeney:** I guess what I was looking at, and we can certainly delay this to the next meeting, is that I would like to get some kind of sense whether the Senate supports this concept. If

you want to continue on the way we are now, that is, one senate over on the main campus and another one on the HSC and we can stop this work.

**Senator Thompson-Casado:** John, I support once again, you know how we had that 15 min. discussion on the merger of FS, if you all remember that, and I support looking at what you are presenting and I don't feel like I can endorse anything right now without looking at the options and having some discussions.

**John McSweeney:** We don't need to decide on anything today.

**Senator Edwards:** Just a comment, the Student Senate when Scott Park Campus had one meeting per semester at the Scott Park Campus,

**John McSweeney:** In ten months from January 1, 1990, to October, 1990, when two Germanys merged, and they managed to form one government, and now they are the most powerful economy in Europe, and the third most powerful economy in the world; use that as a lesson as to what is possible.

**Senator Olson:** I believe that the Senates should in fact unify and merge and I fully support what Dr. Jorgensen said earlier with regards to speaking with one voice. If we evolve into two senates, it is possible that we could get the administration that would say, 'that Senate supports it, so I'm going forward.' Rather than having the unified faculty support or not support. Then you will also have the problem that, what if we are in a position where we will have to censure like we did previously. One faculty censures and the other doesn't. What is the affect of that?

It is extremely important that the administration see us as one faculty, not two faculties that could be divided into different groups and operate in different ways. So, I believe the unification of the Senate is an essential thing that has to happen. How it comes together it still has to be decided. But in principle the unification really needs to occur. I really would like to see one unified senate without all these divisions that were mentioned and the options, but that's for the complete Senate to resolve and not just my vote alone.

**Senator Johanson:** Made a motion to adjourn.  
The motion was seconded.

**V. *Calendar Questions***

None

**VI. *Other Business***

Old Business: None

New Business: None

**.VII. *Adjournment:*** meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Alice Skeens  
FS Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Kathy Gabel  
Faculty Senate Office Admin. Secretary