

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of January 19, 2016
FACULTY SENATE

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

Approved @ FS meeting on 2/16/2016

Summary of Senate Business

Discussion:	120 hour minimum/126 hour maximum
Resolution:	Health Science and Social Justice & Human Service Merger
Updates:	UT Diversity Plan Provost Search Status of Rocket Innovations

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 ninth Faculty Senate meeting of AY 2015-2016. **Lucy Duhon**, Executive Secretary, called the roll.

I. Roll Call: 2015-2016 Senators:

Present: Anderson-Huang, Atwood, Black, Burnett, Cappelletty, Dowd, Duggan, Duhon, Farrell, Franchetti, Gibbs(substitute for A. Jorgensen), Gray, Gruden, Gunning, Harmych, Hasaan-Elnaby, Humphrys, Keith, Kennedy, Kistner, Kovach, Krantz, Lee, McAfee, McLoughlin, Molitor, Monsos, Oberlander, Ohlinger, Prior, Quinn, Regimbal(substitute for M. Edwards), Rouillard, Sheldon, Slantcheva-Durst, Smas, G. Thompson, Thompson-Casado, Weck-Schwarz, White, Williams, Wittmer

Excused absences: Barnes, Brickman, Compora, Denyer, Devabhaktuni, Federman, Giovannucci, Hoblet, Lundquist, Malhotra, Nigem, Randolph, Srinivasan, A. Thompson, Wedding

Unexcused absences: Elmer, Mohammed, Nathan, Schafer, Schneider (substitute for M. Caruso), Skeel, Tevald, Willey

III. Approval of Minutes: Minutes of November 10, 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: Thank you. I have a question before we get started. We are temporarily in this room. Well, we are in this room for the entire meeting so that is not what I mean by “temporarily,” but the rest of the meetings on this campus will be in our usual room, 103, so since we have all this technology, do you want me to adjust the lights or turn up the volume?

The agenda is off slightly, we only have one set of Minutes to approve, and those will be the Minutes of November 10, 2015. Do I have a motion to approve the Minutes of November 10, 2015? Are there any corrections or discussion? Hearing none. All those in favor, please say “aye.” Any opposed? Any abstentions? Let the record reflect, the Minutes of November 10, 2015 are approved. **Minutes are Approved.** Thank you.

Executive Committee report: Welcome to the first Faculty Senate meeting of Spring Semester and the ninth meeting of the 2015-16 academic year. I hope you enjoyed your break and have returned recharged and ready to go to work, since we are going to be unusually engaged with curriculum issues this semester.

Your Executive Committee has been busy since the last Senate meeting. Aside from our usual meetings, we met with the Provost, attended the Provost's staff meetings and the Board of Trustees' Clinical Affairs, Academic and Student Affairs, Finance and Audit, and Trusteeship and Governance meetings.

In our meeting with the Provost, we discussed how UT would implement a new mandate[†] from the State regarding experiential learning. Experiential learning is an experience that allows students to apply and extend their knowledge while participating in the workplace or other real-world situations. Examples include: Internships, Co-Ops, Practicum and Clinical Experiences, Field Work, Student Teaching, Service Learning, Directed Volunteer or Co-Curricular Activities, Laboratory and Undergraduate Research, Study Abroad and Juried Exhibitions and Performances. Starting next academic year, this mandate requires state institutions of higher education to make experimental learning available to students as part of the curriculum of their degree programs. Our challenge is to document the extent to which it is embedded in the curriculum of all our degree programs and identify those programs without experiential learning opportunities. The good news is that UT is ahead of the game in terms of having many experiential learning opportunities for our students. Thus, it may not be that difficult to comply with the mandate. Since the process is still developing, expect to hear more on this issue at our next Faculty Senate meeting.

Another topic of discussion was how to share with the faculty a document that President Gaber had received from Senator Lisa Pescara-Kovach that includes safety and health contacts for UT students. The Provost gave the document to the University Teaching Center for them to include it as part of the syllabus template. The EC agreed that was a good idea as long as it is a suggested addition to a syllabus and not required. We have passed around copies of the contact sheet for your review.

President-Elect Humphrys and I met with Lawrence Kelley, Interim Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration. He told us he had a list of immediate issues to address, which includes payroll, the accounting system, and security issues in IT. He stressed that building and sustaining the credibility of finance and budget is a top priority. Our main message to him was that one goal should be to restore faculty's confidence in the budget process. For example, our annual budget has become a modern version of "the boy who cried wolf." Over the last eight or so years we've seen projected deficits, the size of which has swung widely from month to month, making it difficult to understand the realities of UT's finances. Once he's had a chance to settle in, we'll invite him to a Faculty Senate meeting.

In late December, Matt Schroeder, President's Gaber's Chief of Staff, updated us on the proposed changes to the financial aid policy that would have eliminated the stacking of institutional scholarships on top of the dependent tuition/fee waiver. The official word is that President Gaber has decided to forgo any changes to the Institutional Aid Policy at this time. I was asked to convey thanks to the faculty for providing feedback since your comments helped guide this decision.

I also want to bring to your attention the Master Plan website, currently highlighted on the MyUT portal, which can be used to give feedback on utilization of our facilities. There will be a Brown Bag Master Plan Presentation on February 3rd, and Senator Fred Williams, our representative on the Master Plan Committee, will give us a report at our February 16th meeting. To view the website, go to UT's website and search on Campus Master Plan Update, which will take you right there. If you want the URL, talk with Senator Williams at the end of this meeting

In my last report, I explained that Strategic Enrollment Planning is a priority for the University this semester. I told you that there were seven working groups that were in the process of appointing members. Each working group contains several faculty members including some members of the FSEC. Thursday, January 7th, we were invited to a Strategic Enrollment Planning Conference with the consultant from Ruffalo Noel Levitz. Each group was given its charge, asked to complete a SWOT analysis and identify the Performance Indicators, such as enrollment statistics by college/program, that determine the Key Performance Indicators, such as overall enrollment. Although this may sound familiar, we are told it differs from what we have done in the past because we are identifying metrics that will allow us to determine if we are accomplishing our goals. If we aren't making progress, we'll stop to ask why. Expect to hear more about SEP in future EC reports.

After our last Faculty Senate meeting, the Provost's office called a meeting to discuss an extensive review of our 2015-2016 Catalog of Courses. I had been involved in initial discussions about the need for this review. It is an opportunity to correct any errors in our catalog of courses that have occurred over the years. Its intent is to have each department examine its graduate and undergraduate courses for the purpose of correcting any errors in a course's title, its description, pre- and co-requisites, the semester or semesters offered, and its general education and/or multicultural status. Departments will have the opportunity to expand a course description from 30 words to a maximum of 75 words as long as the additional text reflects the content of that course as it currently exists. While the review covers both undergraduate and graduate courses, Faculty Senate's role is limited to those in the undergraduate catalog. The goal is to have it completed and the corrections approved before the end of Spring Semester.

This review has been described as an amnesty. However, it is only an amnesty from the Curriculum Tracking system. Any corrections must be submitted to a department's curriculum committee and then follow the normal curriculum review process for that college. After that, all changes will be submitted to the appropriate Faculty Senate curriculum committee.

After the Provost's meeting, I met with the Chairs of Core Curriculum, Undergraduate Curriculum, and Academic Programs to devise a plan to get this work done by the end of Spring Semester. They had several ideas to make the process smoother, which were adopted by the Provost's office. More importantly [for the sake of my sanity], the chairs of our Senate committees are confident that their committees can get this work done on time. Since the Associate Deans are asking the departments in their colleges to have everything wrapped up and ready to send to the appropriate Faculty Senate committees within the next month, and given the deluge of work involved, any other curriculum items need to be submitted as soon as possible.

Senator Anderson: President Keith, the letter says in the title changes that only typographical errors are allowed, is that true or can one make slight modifications to the title itself?

President Keith: I believe it is just to correct typographical errors in the course title. If you want to change the title itself, then you have to go through the course modification process. That's my understanding, but there are some associate deans who were at the same meeting in the room, Senator Molitor and Schneider, can you verify what I said was true?

Senator Molitor: That is correct. If you want to make a change to the title, then you need to submit it through the curriculum tracking system at this point.

President Keith: Now, the only exception I think is if you had made that change and it's just never been coded correctly. Are there any other questions?

Senator Don White: Is there a chance any more that a similar offer will be made for the graduate courses?

President Keith: Yes. I don't know if that's gone out yet, but the Provost's Office is working with Graduate Council to do the exact same thing with graduate courses.

Senator Don White: Okay.

President Keith: We are just responsible for undergraduate curriculum, so I didn't want to "muddy" the waters by talking about graduate courses.

Senator Don White: Okay.

President Keith: Is there anybody else? Okay. What I wanted to emphasize is that given the timing of this project, this is really my first opportunity to talk about it before the full Senate. I want Faculty Senate to take ownership of this project – after all we are the stewards of the University's curriculum – so I asked that the announcement of the review of the undergraduate courses indicate it is a joint project of Faculty Senate and the Provost's Office.

Those are some of the issues that FSEC has been involved with since we last met. As for our meeting today, as you can see we have a packed agenda.

In terms of what we are doing today, the first item on the agenda is a request that you approve Professor Wade Lee to be co-chair of the Senate's Academic Programs committee. Senator Ohlinger had asked, if Professor Lee was willing, could he be added as co-chair and I said "yes" and just simply forgot that Professor Lee is not a current Senator. He was approved as a member of the committee, has been serving in that role for several months, and gave a report at our last meeting. I'm asking you to make it official.

Next is the resolution on the merger between HS and SJHS. As you probably recall, Dean Ingersoll discussed the merger at our November 24th meeting. The timing is such that on January 11th, the BOT's Student and Academic Affairs committee approved moving it to the consent agenda at the next full Board meeting, which is February 5th. Our input is still required, however. So I am going to ask for a vote on the resolution.

We then move to a report/recommendation by the Senate Committee on Academic Programs on the issue of

changing the required hours from a minimum of 124 to a minimum of 120 for a UT Baccalaureate degree, and capping the maximum number of credit hours at 126 unless there are extenuating circumstances such as accreditation or licensing requirements that require more hours. This was introduced by the Provost last year in anticipation of the then Ohio Board of Regents approving the draft *Guidelines and Procedures for Academic Program Review* for 4-year colleges. Since it was approved April 2015, now is the time to have the conversation.

We have three guest speakers. The first is Dr. Willie McKether, Associate Dean of LLSS and the Special Assistant to the President for Diversity. He is here to give a report on the process for developing a University diversity plan. Next is Dean Ingersoll, Co-Chair of the Provost Search committee who will update us on that search. Finally, we have Drs. William Messer and Norman Rapino who are here to report on the status of Rocket Innovations.

Are there any comments or reminders from the Executive Committee? Are there any questions from the Senators? Okay, then I want to ask for your indulgence to change the agenda slightly. I ask that Dr. McKether actually give his presentation now. He informed me that he has got a very important meeting with a student back on the Main Campus and would appreciate the chance to get back in time to make that appointment. So if you don't mind, we will have him come and then follow the agenda as it reads. Is that okay?

Group of Senators: Yes.

President Keith: Thank you very much. Here is Dr. McKether to talk about the diversity plan for the university.

Associate Dean of LLSS/Special Assistant to the President, Dr. McKether: Thank you, President Keith. A document is circulating right now, but I will go ahead and get started. I do thank you much for allowing me this opportunity to provide a real quick update on the diversity plan that I'm working on. As you may know, in November, Dr. Gaber asked if I would take the lead in establishing and writing a university-wide strategic diversity plan. She wanted it to be complete by April or May, and that was November. She wants the diversity plan to include the voices of students, faculty, staff, as well as the community. Again, this was not in response to what was going on in Missouri, this is something that I know she's been talking about for quite some time. So of course, I accepted the challenge. I began right away to establish an advisory group that would be responsible for providing some input of what the plan might look like. So I put together a timeframe, so what is circulating right now is the timeline of what I am looking at. If you look at the very bottom, the focus groups will be the first thing that we will do. This plan will include a series of focus groups, both on the Main Campus and on the Health Science Campus as well as the community, to be followed-up with an online assessment survey that will be available to everyone on the Health Science and Main Campus as well as the people in the city of Toledo. So the focus groups will start on Monday, January 26th. That first focus group will be comprised of staff members on the Main Campus. The first three focus groups will be on the Main Campus: The first will be staff, the second will be of students, and the third is of faculty. The following week we will do a number of focus groups on the Health Science Campus as well as one focus group in the community at Kent Public Library. Following those focus groups we will then go back and submit/modify the IRB and do a survey. We will be asking staff, faculty, students, and the community in particular, what do you think about, how do you feel about diversity? Do you think there's inclusion? Do you think there's equity? It is not just asking those questions, but also asking the community

to provide some suggestions how you think we can improve these things. It was important to Dr. Gaber to include the voices of the community in this plan, so there will be those two opportunities for the focus groups and the on-campus survey as well.

The idea was for me to get all of this done and then take some time and go back to the document provided here, and by March - April, hopefully, we will collect the data, retreat back to our desks, do lots of data analysis, and to take that time to write. Then by April 18th, we will provide the first draft of the diversity plan to Dr. Gaber. I should add, with consultation and with the advice of the Advisory Board, that we will be hoping to review and make suggestions as well. It was important for Dr. Gaber that the campus will have some time to review this document before we thought it might be complete, and so that time period will be April 25 to May 6th. These are all target dates and it is likely that I will miss some of these deadlines; I've missed some already because things don't always go exactly as planned, which I anticipate that. But, if things go exactly as planned and if this holds true, then by May 13th, we hope to have a final plan that we will then say is the university's diversity plan. So the idea is for this to be an interim process. We will develop a plan for this year and it is strategic in a sense that we will take a look at it and once the plan is implemented, my task is then to pass it on to Dr. Gaber. Once the plan is implemented we will come back a year from now and assess to see how well we've done and see if there are any other policies and procedures that we hope to implement and make modifications to, and then start the process all over again. So, that is the plan for the diversity plan. Again, I came today to provide you with a quick update and answer any questions that you might have as faculty about the intent or goals for the diversity plan. Are there any questions?

Senator Gruden: Who are the members of the Advisory Board and how were they selected?

Dr. McKether: In fact, there is another document/sheet that I did not pass out, but will be happy to do so. Right now that group is comprised of [about] 15-20 individuals. It is based on a number of things: (1) People who had expressed an interest in serving in such a capacity. (2) Individuals that we knew from previous conversations who had an interest. It is meant to be a group that continually evolves, so if there are people that are not on the committee, but express an interest, we are happy to expand it. Do you want names?

Senator Gruden: Well, I think people are going to want names at some point, yeah. You don't have to read them off now, but they should be available somewhere I think for us to see at some point.

Dr. McKether: Well, right now, Marketing and Communications is in the process of developing a website and all the documents that I have here – including the list of this advisory group – will be posted on the website. The idea here is, from Dr. Gaber's perspective, that this whole process be as transparent as possible. So in addition to me talking to people, and the website, we have to make sure that the campus community has as much information and knows everything that we know about that's happening.

Senator Gruden: Just to follow. How do we make that available for people to know that they can express interest in this committee, because this is the first that I've heard of that myself? How do I communicate that to others, that they can participate if they would like to? Do I have them contact you? What is the process for that?

Dr. McKether: We haven't established one quite yet to be honest with you, but we can say for now, if you

know someone who may have an interest, of course they can contact me. As we start this focus group process, as we are talking to people, we will ask for suggestions, so that would be another way for people to say I know of someone or I would like to participate or [just] go to the website. Now, the website is not live yet, but I anticipate that it will be live within the next week or so, and so through those ways people can then let us know that there's an interest to participate.

Senator Gruden: Thank you.

Senator Anderson-Huang: Do you have outside communication with, say, Historically Black Colleges or women's colleges? I am thinking particularly of the University of Maryland Baltimore Campus which has a very good program in diversity that would be an interesting thing to emulate.

Dr. McKether: Well, the answer is, yes. Part of what I started doing very early on is reviewing other diversity plans from other universities. There's Arkansas and the University of California, Berkeley, there are a number of universities. Right now I am just out doing a large survey of different diversity plans to get a sense of what other universities have done – in particular, those universities with a track record of doing a really good job of both recruiting and retaining faculty, staff, students of color, and all students. At this point, we are in the process of doing this broad survey to see what's out there and see if the plan that we developed is something that we could be proud of.

Senator Smas: I believe you mentioned the community of Toledo would be involved, I wasn't sure if you meant the UT community of Toledo. Can you address how these participants in the focus groups are going to be selected, because I find the timeline is so short, we are just hearing about this now and next week or so is when the focus groups are starting?

Dr. McKether: Sure. For the first question, I meant both communities; I meant both the UT community as well as the Toledo community. For the broader Toledo community we will do a couple of things, we will be contacting a number of groups that have met with Dr. Gaber and expressed some interest or concern with diversity, so that is one way we will do it. And right now we are in the process of developing news releases that will be sent out to mainstream media, so that is the way in which we will notify the community. As far as the Main Campus, yes, this is a very short process, I absolutely agree. It is somewhat crunched, but I should remind you that the community will have two ways to participate and so the focus groups will be the first way and those will start next week. We are doing the very best we can to get the word out so there is an article for an example in UT News. Now, we fully realize everybody is not going to read UT News and everybody is not going to look at their emails on a regular basis and so I except the fact that everybody may not get a chance to participate in this round of focus groups, but we are hoping by mid-February when the online survey is available that would be an additional way for people to participate. Again, this is an interim process and the first time out of the gates is not going to be perfect, but we do want to include as many voices the very best we can.

Senator Smas: Perhaps you can just clarify additionally. How many focus groups are you aiming for on each campus? What is the number of people per group, it is hard for me to know? Thank you again.

Dr. McKether: There will be both invited and open focus groups. For example, for staff we did a stratified random sample; we got a list of all faculty and staff on campus and that is an end of 40 weeks so that is going to be the first invited group for the focus groups. Then we will follow up by an open focus group

which will be held on the Health Science Campus and it will be open to anybody, any staff member whether they are on the Main Campus or on the Health Science Campus and so that is how we went about selecting and developing these focus groups. Now, I will tell you additionally, I had a list of about 35 focus groups – they looked to me more like town hall meetings because a focus group is typically not more than 10 or 15 people. Clearly, we are going to have some of these sessions between 25 to 100 people, so it is going to end up looking more like a town hall meeting and we accept that. Again, the important thing here was to collect the voices of people so they can be reflected as best as possible in the final plan.

Senator Smas: Thank you.

Professor Kimberly Colson: This seems rather rushed as you recently said, it is “crunched.” When did you consider doing something like this, was it a month ago or two months ago? It would be nice if you could extend the length of time for the focus groups so you can really get the full nature, if you know what I mean.

Dr. McKether: Well, let me go back to your first question. We didn’t decide last month, actually again, it was in November when Dr. Gaber approached me about doing this.

Professor Kimberly Colson: Okay.

Dr. McKether: If you attended any of her earlier town hall meetings, even when she was interviewing and even since then, she’s expressed her interest in diversity and her interest in having this diversity plan and so I wouldn’t say it was “rushed.” Now, it does seem “crunched” because she wants to have this diversity plan in place by the end of this year and that means that we need to move relatively quickly to have something in place before faculty, staff, and students leave for the summer. So she wants to have this plan in place for next fall and in that sense it seems crunched, and that is why we want to get these focus groups conducted as quickly as possible, but yet to be as methodical as possible. It is my intent to spend as much time once we have the focus groups transcribed to immediately begin the process and analysis to see what’s going on with the data and then to have that reflect to some degree in the online survey. So I admit, it is crunched and she recognizes that, so again, I am working as quickly as I can to be as methodical as possible to make sure this is as thorough as can be.

Professor Kimberly Colson: Okay. As a follow-up to that, would you feel comfortable asking Dr. Gaber to maybe slow it down a little bit and extend these focus groups out a little bit more so it is much more developed, we know the exact numbers, and everyone is up-to-date with how this process is going to go forward?

Dr. McKether: She would probably say, and we had this discussion just a little bit ago, this is an interim process; there will be time to go back and modify and make updates. I think she feels comfortable that this is not the end-all, this is really...because right now we do not have a university-wide diversity plan and so the thought here was to at least get something started. I think this is something we can be proud of because I think a lot of eyes will be on this and that is why she wants to make sure we get this in now.

Professor Kimberly Colson: Okay. Thank you.

Senator Wittmer: Just a minor suggestion. Obviously, I think there’s some consensus with Faculty Senate about the concern about the length of time. Would it be possible to have some of these earlier focus groups

and use that data to help, and I completely understand the need to have that focus group data to put into the online survey, but there is no reason why you can't continue to have focus groups throughout the process while you are collecting the survey data as well. That might be a happy medium of compromise in order to continue to collect more in-depth information which is exactly what you are trying to do with the focus groups, just continue that process while doing the survey as well.

Dr. McKether: As an anthropologist, I fully agree. I fully believe in having boots on the ground and talking to people and updating. For me this is really about learning about the culture. Culture is something you don't change, you don't learn about just one time. She and I had discussions and I believe. I will take this back to her for sure. I am completely open to the idea of having these focus groups on a regular basis because again, we won't get everybody in this initial round.

Senator Wittmer: But if you want to do it, do it right. Thank you.

Senator Prior: I have a concern. I think I heard you say the only open focus groups are on this campus instead of the Main Campus, so I think it is biased of who comes to the open focus group on this campus because it may eliminate people from the other campus.

Dr. McKether: Well, maybe I misspoke, so let me just clarify. What I should say is, there are going to be three open focus groups on this campus- one for faculty, one for staff, and one for students. We could've probably created a number of focus groups that go on and on and on, but the idea here was again, get a set number that will include the voices of [all over] the Main Campus and Health Science Campus.

President Keith: We are going to ask him to come back and give us an update in a meeting or two.

Dr. McKether: Thank you for your time.

President Keith: So, next on the agenda I am asking you to approve Professor Wade Lee to be co-chair of the Academic Programs Committee.

Senator Anderson-Huang: So moved.

Senator Ohlinger: Second.

President Keith: Okay. We have a seconded motion, so let's vote. All in favor say "aye." Is there anyone against, please say "nay." It passes. Thank you very much. ***Motion Passed.***

Next up is the resolution. This resolution is with respect to the merger of Health Sciences and Social Justice and Human Service as part of our duty to provide input into any reorganization of a college or *department*.

University of Toledo Faculty Senate Resolution 1/19/2016

"Regarding the University's reorganization plan to merge the College of Health Sciences with the College of Social Justice and Human Service to form the new College of Health and Human Services"

Whereas, Article 7, Section 7.2 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement states that the Administration will seek input from the Faculty Senate on the reorganization of colleges and departments;

Whereas, on November 13, 2015 faculty representatives from the College of Health Sciences, the College of Social Justice and Human Service, and the Judith Herb College of Education met with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to provide their views on the reorganization plan;

Whereas, faculty input included a consensus of those involved to move the Department of Higher Education from the College of Health Sciences into the Judith Herb College of Education;

Whereas, faculty input also included a consensus of those involved to move the Department of Public Health from the College of Medicine to the new College of Health and Human Services, with faculty offices to remain on the Health Science Campus;

Whereas, while the decision to reorganize these colleges was not faculty-driven, and faculty members residing in these colleges have undergone reorganization five times over the last eight years, this year's process has been faculty-driven;

Whereas, the merger and accompanying changes will take effect July 1, 2016 providing time for faculty of the three existing colleges to work out their new reporting structures;

Whereas, the Executive Committee of Faculty Senate has reviewed the proposed reorganization and commends the faculty of the three colleges for their commitment and input into the reorganization process;

Therefore, be it resolved, while the input provided by Faculty Senate can take many forms, in this particular case the Faculty Senate of the University of Toledo on this 19th day of January, 2016 endorses the process used to gather input regarding this proposed reorganization.

President Keith (cont.): Is there any discussion?

Senator Prior: The third *whereas* I feel is inaccurate among the Graduate Council of the former College of Social Justice and Human Service. Higher Ed. represented there and we weren't in favor of Higher Ed. not coming with us to the melting of the colleges. Higher ed. wanted to come with us and at least the faculty wanted them to come with us, but that was not the decision that was made, so the third *whereas* in my sense, from what I experienced is inaccurate. There wasn't a consensus of those involved on the faculty level, [only] above the faculty level there was a consensus.

President Keith: When the Faculty Senate Executive Committee met with representatives from your college, we really did get the impression that there was a consensus from the faculty and higher ed.

Senator Prior: They didn't want to move. They petitioned the other college asking them if they could come. They were asked to make a case to be able to come and they were rejected.

President Keith: We were told that. I will take back what I said, but we were also told at the end that they were satisfied with where they were going and how that all ended up.

Senator Prior: They didn't have a choice.

President Keith: Okay. So, how would we modify this resolution then to more accurately speak to what happened?

Senator Prior: Not Higher Education and not the other programs in the College of Social Justice and Human Service. It was made above us; they made it above Graduate Council for sure.

Senator Krantz: President Keith, the question was who did make the decision?

President Keith: The decision to reorganize was not faculty-driven. I thought we addressed that in that *whereas*, but once it was decided we were assured that the process at that point did become faculty-driven.

Senator Prior: We accepted it; we did not absolutely accept it with grace, but with optimism moving forward to be united with Education.

President Keith: Okay. I want to fix this resolution so it is something that we can support and it is our obligation to provide input. How would we fix it so we can support it?

Provost Barrett: How about in the third *whereas*, if you change the word "consensus" to "agreement," – "included an agreement of those involved"? That doesn't imply unanimity, a unanimous decision the way a consensus does- it was a brokered decision because there was controversy about where to put them.

President Keith: Would that satisfy you, Senator Prior?

Senator Prior: I don't know if I am the one that has to be satisfied; all I am saying is there was a consensus on the part of faculty; it was the opposite of what's there.

Provost Barrett: It depends on who you are referring to.

Senator Prior: Pardon me.

Provost Barrett: It depends on which faculty you are referring to. Your statement reflects the view of the faculty in the College of Social Justice.

Senator Prior: And Education because Ron Opp is the Chairman of Graduate Council, and I was present for those conversations. He didn't reflect that they wanted to move, he reflected that they wanted to stay with us.

Provost Barrett: That is the same faculty group that is currently in Social Justice.

Senator Prior: Higher Education was part of that and that is who I am talking about, yeah.

Senator Molitor: Perhaps the third *whereas* can say, "whereas subsequent discussions resulted in the decision to move the Department of Higher Education from the College of Social Justice and Human Service to the College of Judith Herb College of Education." You can also say "subsequent discussions with faculty input."

President Keith: So before I start typing, "*whereas* subsequent discussions with faculty input included an agreement of those involved to move the Department of Higher Education from the College of Social Justice and Human Service into the Judith Herb College of Education." Is that accurate?

Senator Prior: I apologize, what was that again?

President Keith: I should have typed it. What did you say, Senator Molitor?

Senator Molitor: Subsequent discussions that include faculty input.

President Keith: I will type it.

Senator Molitor: After “faculty input,” put “resulted in the decision to move.”

President Keith: Is that better?

Senator Prior: It is accurate.

President Keith: So as amended, are we willing to vote on this resolution?

Senator Mc Loughlin: Just a minor point. I think the name of the new college, instead of “and,” I think the “and” is actually ampersand, I believe that’s the case. It is minor, but still I think that was the way it was written out, the College of Health & Human Service.

Unknown Speaker: I’ve seen it both ways.

Senator Mc Loughlin: Oh, okay. I thought I’ve seen it officially with an ampersand.

Senator Gunning: I do have a question, a clarification probably for me more than anything else. The first *whereas*, that discusses collective bargaining - through the years I’ve heard that collective bargaining isn’t discussed at Faculty Senate, but now you have a Faculty Senate resolution about an agreement about collective bargaining, so I see that’s a problem. Why do you have the first *whereas*?

President Keith: It is in the new contract that---

Senator Gunning: Yes, but that is collective bargaining, that’s not the Faculty Senate. I can’t talk about collective bargaining because I am in the College of Medicine. We don’t discuss affairs with collective bargaining with Faculty Senate; I haven’t heard it once over six years.

President Keith: I am not sure if that’s what we’re doing. I think all that we’re doing -- and you are going to say that is what we’re doing -- is that when I tell you that we are abiding by the contract- the contract says that the employer must seek input from Faculty Senate.

Senator Gunning: There is no problem with that; I don’t have a problem that. I have a problem with that from the Faculty Senate because we don’t discuss collective bargaining with Faculty Senate, so that is an independent issue.

President Keith: Well, how will we provide input without stating that?

Senator Gunning: It is a resolution from the Faculty Senate.

President Keith: So you want us to take out---

Senator Gunning: Well, I am one voice; I am not in collective bargaining, but I do know this much, we never talked about collective bargaining in Faculty Senate, so I am raising a point. I don’t see where it is necessary.

President Keith: What is the sense of the rest of the room?

Senator Molitor: I just interpret the first *whereas* as reaffirming what we’ve been directed to do through the collective bargaining agreement.

Senator Gunning: I've never heard us discuss collective bargaining in the Faculty Senate and this is a Faculty Senate resolution, so I don't see where it's a problem.

Senator Anderson-Huang: I don't think we're discussing collective bargaining here; we're just saying there is such a thing.

Senator Gunning: I agree with that, which is why I don't see what the point is.

Senator Don White: President Keith, can you scroll down? The main point of this document is at the bottom. I don't think this is an issue here. All we are doing is endorsing the process so if collective bargaining has something to say about the process, all we are doing is endorsing the process that's used here.

Senator Ohlinger: It is just the context.

Senator Don White: Right.

President Keith: Okay. Are there any other issues? Does anybody else have a concern?

Senator Smas: I just have a question. The fourth *whereas*, shouldn't there be changes made to the third one? Is that accurate in itself? I know there is a consensus.

Group of Senators: Which one is that?

Senator Smas: The College of Public Health; I don't know if anybody is here that can to speak to that.

Vice Provost Thea Sawicki: There were two departments of public health. The people in both departments have a chance to discuss input and they reached a consensus and they agreed.

Senator Rouillard: I would just like to address the comment about the first *whereas*, and it is true that typically Faculty Senate doesn't discuss collective bargaining agreements. This isn't so much about Faculty Senate and collective bargaining as it is a recognition that the administration has paid attention to our contract and has paid attention to the role of Faculty Senate in such matters. It is actually a statement of good faith that we recognize the good faith on which the administration has acted in this process.

President Keith: So is the sense of the room to just leave the first *whereas* as is or modify it in some way?

Senator Ohlinger: It is acceptable.

Group of Senators: Leave it.

Senator Anderson-Huang: I think we should just leave it as it is.

President Keith: Are we ready to vote? All in favor of the resolution as amended on the floor please say, "aye." Any opposed? Yes. Please record that there's one that is against. Any abstentions? **Resolution Passed.** Thank you very much. Resolution as passed:

"regarding the University's reorganization plan to merge the College of Health Sciences with the College of Social Justice and Human Service to form the new College of Health and Human Services"

Whereas, Article 7, Section 7.2 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement states that the Administration will seek input from the Faculty Senate on the reorganization of colleges and departments;

Whereas, on November 13, 2015 faculty representatives from the College of Health Sciences, the College of Social Justice and Human Service, and the Judith Herb College of Education met with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to provide their views on the reorganization plan;

Whereas, subsequent discussions that included faculty input resulted in the decision to move the Department of Higher Education from the College of Social Justice and Human Service into the Judith Herb College of Education;

Whereas, faculty input also included a consensus of those involved to move the Department of Public Health from the College of Medicine to the new College of Health and Human Services, with faculty offices to remain on the Health Science Campus;

Whereas, while the decision to reorganize these colleges was not faculty-driven, and faculty members residing in these colleges have undergone reorganization five times over the last eight years, this year's process has been faculty-driven;

Whereas, the merger and accompanying changes will take effect July 1, 2016 providing time for faculty of the three existing colleges to work out their new reporting structures;

Whereas, the Executive Committee of Faculty Senate has reviewed the proposed reorganization and commends the faculty of the three colleges for their commitment and input into the reorganization process;

Therefore, be it resolved, while the input provided by Faculty Senate can take many forms, in this particular case the Faculty Senate of the University of Toledo on this 19th day of January, 2016 endorses the process used to gather input regarding this proposed reorganization.

President Keith cont.: Next on the agenda is a discussion about changing the required hours for a Bachelor's degree to a minimum of 120 and a maximum of 126. Please welcome Senator Ohlinger, Chair of Academic Regulations.

Senator Ohlinger: First off, thank you for formally approving Wade as co-Chair. One of the charges that has come forth for the Academic Programs Committee, which was already alluded to today is the number of maximum and minimum hours for a Bachelor's degree. Our president mentioned earlier that through the Ohio Board of Regents [now called the Ohio Department of Higher Education], the Chancellor of the Board of Regents put forth and finally approved and published the guidelines for academic programs review. It is a whole binder worth of material about that process. In one of the appendices is a definition of some of the programs across the state of Ohio. So here's the definition from those guidelines: for a Bachelor's Degree which is an award that requires 120 semester credit hours: A Bachelor's Degree program should not exceed 126 semester credit hours, unless it can be shown that the additional coursework would be required to meet professional accreditation or licensing requirements.

President Keith: This is just a list of programs that are over 126 credit hours - there are 25 programs out of 110 that are over 126 credit hours.

Senator Ohlinger: Currently, at The University of Toledo we have 25 programs that have more than 126 credit hours for completion of the degree requirements. At our next Academic Programs Committee meeting we will be discussing this, but I thought it would be worthwhile to bring it here first and discuss it. Maybe people will have input on this because I think this is quite a task. Again, anyone that has input on

this, our approach to review this is mainly coming from the Provost's Office and I know our provost is here, so if you have any comments on this we will be glad to hear them. This is for the undergraduate level, Bachelor's Degree.

Senator Dowd: The purpose of this question is for clarity in the Senate's Minutes. Are we following a State statute or just a recommendation in this discussion of moving the minimum credit hours to 120 from 124? In addition, can program requirements be between 124 and 126 credit hours without further action?

Senator Ohlinger: So my understanding--- Well, go ahead please.

Provost Barrett: Let me say a couple of things. The state of Ohio has published and brought into force a four-year degree handbook which are the regulations under which all public four-year universities are supposed to operate. Now, there's no specified consequence to not following it so you can take that for whatever it is, but we are supposed to be following it. The handbook says a Bachelor's Degree program should have between 120-126 credit hours, should be a minimum of 120 and should not exceed 126 credit hours, unless accreditation or licensure requires more. So we are trying to come into compliance with it by modeling this. If a program is currently between 120 and 126, it doesn't need to change; it has the option to, should the program choose to go through the process and doing so. If it is over 126 as the chart indicates, it still wouldn't need to change if the number of hours tied to it is mandated by accreditation or licensure -- which I think would be another column I would add to that particular chart, maybe an asterisk showing if accreditation or licensure requires it -- just to clarify that those really are not; it is in a zone in a situation where they would need to move.

Senator Ohlinger: As mentioned, the wording, *minimum of 120 and programs should not exceed 126 credit hours hasn't been put forth as a mandate or programs shall not exceed is a should not.*

Senator Anderson-Huang: This is just a semantic quibble. Where does this document come from because you say "*an award that requires completion of 120 hours?*" There could be awards that require completion of "80" hours and then those aren't part of it.

Provost Barrett: This is the definition of a Bachelor's Degree in the four-year handbook.

Senator Ohlinger: The Ohio Board of Regents guidelines and procedures for academic program review, this is actually from one of the appendices; that is the definition---

Senator Anderson-Huang: Okay. I am just quibbling this English because it says, it could be interpreted as, "*any award that requires 120 semester hours,*" but I don't care about any other award.

Dr. Thea Sawicki: A Bachelor's Degree by definition is 120.

Senator Anderson-Huang: It doesn't say that. It says, a Bachelor's Degree *is* an award [it should say].

Dr. Thea Sawicki: The colon is the...It is defining a Bachelor's Degree.

Senator Anderson-Huang: I don't think so.

President Keith: Senator Anderson-Huang, if we had given you the full appendix you would have seen that it started with Associate Degrees, going alphabetically.

Senator Anderson-Huang: I understand, but I am just quibbling.

President Keith: Currently the minimum is 124 and this will allow programs [if they chose] to change their requirements, so they only require 120 hours or not change them at all.

Senator Rouillard: But there is still a requirement that the programs will go through the usual curriculum change process?

President Keith: Of course.

Senator Ohlinger: Basically, again, we will be discussing this at the next Academic Programs Committee meeting. I wanted to get a sense of direction, some guidance from the full Senate as to the concerns that need to be discussed before we “flesh it out” so we can bring it back for a formal vote.

President Keith: Senator Molitor is doing some investigating to find out how many of those programs that have more than 126 hours have accreditation or licensing requirements. Senator Molitor, could you share with us what you found?

Senator Molitor: For the College of Engineering, all of our Bachelor degree programs are at 128 hours. These programs are subject to external accreditation and need 128 hours for accreditation. The Bachelor of Science in Pharmaceutical Sciences leads to a Doctor of Pharmacy degree which is also subject to external accreditation and licensing requirements. The Information Technology Program in the College of Business is co-offered with the Engineering Bachelor of Science in Information Technology, and we want to make both programs have the same requirements. Therefore Business puts their Information Technology at 128 hours, so we can keep our Engineering Information Technology program at 128 hours to maintain external accreditation. The Communications and the Arts Bachelor of Arts in Music Programs are subject to external accreditation which requires the credit hours to be either 127 or 128 hours depending on the instrument or concentration.

The only ones that was in question were the College of Education degree programs. I just spoke to Richard Welch this morning, all of the programs listed have licensure and non-licensure versions of those programs. The licensure versions of those programs need 128 hours, however students can pursue those programs in a non-licensure version that will not require 128 hours. So Richard said they’re going to have discussions in the College of Education about how to proceed with any potential program modification on non-licensure versions of those degree programs.

Senator Ohlinger: Thank you.

President Keith: So, what is your sense? If we are giving some input into academic programs, what is our input?

Unknown Speaker: What was the question?

President Keith: What do you think about changing the minimum to 120 and the maximum to 126, unless there are extenuating circumstances?

Senator Rouillard: It sounds like it is not going to affect most of our programs anyway. As long as it is within a range and it coincides with the range given in the handbook published by the Department of Higher

Ed., I don't see that there's a problem. It really looks like most of our programs are already conforming to this.

President Keith: Is there anyone else?

Senator Cappelletty: Is there a statement needed from Faculty Senate of the University that currently defines the minimum number of credit hours to get a Bachelor's Degree higher than 120 that needs to be changed?

President Keith: I will tell you, I don't know. I know we kind of talked about this for a while. It is my understanding that we can't find any official document that comes from Faculty Senate that says it should be 124 credit hours. This came about when we converted from quarters to semesters and whatever we had before 124 was just reducing that number appropriately.

Senator Ohlinger: It was just the way the math worked out.

President Keith: Yes, it was just the way the math worked out, but perhaps the provost can speak more authoritatively to that. Is there any documentation that states 124 hours is the minimum required that came from Faculty Senate?

Provost Barrett: Not that we could find in our records. It happened during the semester conversion as everybody knows, but the record keeping seems to be lost in the "sands of time."

Senator Molitor: For the record, a few years ago the Faculty Senate approved either a program modification or a new program for the College of Adult and Lifelong Learning which was approved for 120 credit hours.

President Keith: We did not mean to set that precedence I don't think.

Senator Krantz: I have a question for Senator Ohlinger. Does the committee presently have a relatively streamlined procedure for accepting an explanation from these programs and then approving it relatively quickly? In other words, to allow for compliance with the state?

Senator Ohlinger: I am not sure I understand the full question, I am sorry.

Senator Rouillard: From these programs?

Senator Krantz: Yes.

Senator Dowd: Such programs do not have to change.

Senator Krantz: No, but don't we have to document that these are following accreditation requirements or just the fact they are following accreditation requirements is sufficient?

Senator Dowd: President Keith, perhaps the Faculty Senate Executive Committee could follow up that issue.

President Keith: We will follow up on that. I think I thought what you were asking is if this gets approved, then a bunch of programs will want to be reduced to 120 credit hours, will they have a streamlined process to handle that? Faculty Senate Executive Committee will report back at our next meeting.

Senator Ohlinger: We will report back at whichever Faculty Senate meeting we are put on the agenda with a formal recommendation.

President Keith: It will be the February 2nd meeting. I am giving everybody warning here that our February 2nd meeting will consist primarily of reports from our standing committees. Thank you, Senator Ohlinger.

Senator Ohlinger: Thank you.

President Keith: Next, on the agenda is an update from Dean Ingersoll regarding the provost search.

Dean Ingersoll: Thank you, President Keith. Basically the background work, we are recruiting individuals to apply for the position. The position was open till the 9th of January; at that time we had 66 full applications that were received for the position. Last week the search committee met to review all the applications and ten applicants were recommended for airport interviews. The airport interviews will be conducted in Detroit later this week with the idea that we will identify three or four candidates who will be coming to campus for an on-campus interview. The idea, the goal is that those on-campus interviews will be performed during the first two weeks of February with an offer being hopefully extended shortly after the last candidate visits. At this particular point, the candidates who are airport interviews, their names will remain confidential during this part of the process, however those candidates who are doing an on-campus interview, that information will be made public so folks will know about those candidates. You can keep up with what's going on with the search by going to: [utoledo.edu/offices/provost/provost search](http://utoledo.edu/offices/provost/provost%20search) -you can see information about the committee's general schedule and as information comes available, like the finalist candidates that would be available on that website as well. The schedule for the on-campus interviews has not been established yet, but we are committed to trying to make as many folks have an opportunity to interact with the candidates as we possibly can. That is pretty much an update to this point. Are there any questions?

Senator Smas: I have a question. Based on our earlier presentation about the diversity plan, could you speak a little bit on how the idea of diversity has applied to your search?

Dean Ingersoll: That has been an important consideration. Although, I can't identify the candidates at this particular point, I can tell you that the ten individuals for the airport interviews are much more diverse than the faculty that we have at the university.

Senator Smas: Thank you.

Senator Dowd: Would you elaborate on the timeline with respect to the expected starting date of the new provost? Is that start date July 1, 2016?

Dean Ingersoll: That is the plan. The hope is that an offer will be extended in February which will give someone time to do that. That would certainly be the president's prerogative if a candidate, for example, couldn't start at that date. That's the goal.

President Keith: Well, thank you very much, Dean Ingersoll.

Well, our final agenda item in terms of presentations is Dr. William Messer and Dr. Norman Rapino who are here to talk about Rocket Innovations. Welcome.

Dr. William Messer: Thank you, President Keith. I am very pleased to have a chance to speak to Faculty Senate. We've had a long process of reorganizing and revamping Rocket Innovations. I believe that Rhonda Wingfield, the previous interim executive director for Rocket Innovations spent some time talking to Faculty Senate previously so I don't want to rehash all of that history, but I would like to say that I am very pleased with that process. We have really made an effort to bring Rocket Innovations into alignment with the rest of the university, so that's been an intentional transition. What I've been trying to do since the original decision was made is to bring Rocket Innovations under the Office of Research, under the vice president for Research, to align research with Technology Transfer and Rocket Innovations. What I hope is a continuum of research and scholarship, driven by faculty and students where we have technologies that are developing out of our research, we have opportunities to add and then license that work and license that technology, that's the effort of the Office of Technology Transfer under Steven Schneider's leadership. Then where we have research and technology that aligns with entrepreneurship, we can move that forward to Rocket Innovations to help take that technology out into the real world. I think that analogy works really well when we are talking about technologies and with working with Norm Rapino, who I will introduce in a moment, I think we have some opportunities to do even more than that. So in my own experience, as I've been involved in research that leads to patents which then leads to the spin-off companies, we have a chance then to actually work in the real world which often provides opportunities to take what we learn in the real world back in the classroom setting and drive additional research. To me that is an exciting process and having gone through that, I think there's a real opportunity to position Rocket Innovations, not only to help our developing technology companies grow and prosper, but to really have an impact on how we do business at the university to bring entrepreneurship into our colleges and to promote a shift in our culture to help us do all of that a little bit better. So with that background, I am pleased to say that we've moved forward in that reorganization and realignment. We have hired a new Executive Director for Rocket Innovations, Norman Rapino.

I am pleased that Norman has joined us. He has a strong background in Toledo. He first graduated with a Bachelor's in Chemistry from the State University of New York.... He also has a PhD from the University of Toledo and a MBA from the University of Toledo as well. He's been involved in entrepreneurial startups and mentoring for a number of years and mostly he's been at the University of Michigan where he helped oversee their NSF I-Corps program. He is working to bring at least part of one of the grants that he's been working on [here] so UT will be taking a leadership role in promoting the NSF I-Corps program in the region, in the mid-West. So I am very pleased that he has joined us and I am very happy to turn it over to Norm. Thank you.

Dr. Norman Rapino: Thanks for the opportunity to talk with you. The first thing that comes to [my] mind is the misconception that entrepreneurship is just about startups. It is really just a way of thinking. Entrepreneurial thinking and innovative thinking are things that naturally flourish inside our university and those are also the core values of Rocket Innovations. I know our challenge at RI is to support faculty goals as they relate to technology, from initial concepts that lead to use out in the world. I've said probably 500 times to faculty that nobody expects you to leave the university and do a startup –you can, but it is very rare for something like that to happen. We want to give you the opportunity to take the things that you think about, and care about, and see if they can have a real-world impact. Should you choose to do that with us,

we will help you, even with connections to grants. We want to have a strong connection to the entire campus at both the student level and the faculty level. We also want to help connect the University to opportunities that are outside as well. This is the 5000-ft. level view. I would be happy take some questions or comments.

Senator Rouillard: At this point, how is Rocket Innovations being funded? Are you using what was left from UTIE in terms of funds, what little was left there and you're getting more funding from the university? It sounds like you are also concentrating a lot on outside grants, so, can you tell us a little bit how your unit is being funded?

Dr. William Messer: We have not asked for any new monies from the University for this position or moving forward. So we have some residual monies from the initial investment that UTIE received.

Senator Rouillard: Can you tell us what that is?

Dr. William Messer: I think we have roughly \$900,000 left from that initial \$10 million investment, that is available capital to be used, I should say. There are investments and there's equity in various companies and things like that still. There are some things that have been written off, but we do have roughly \$900,000 that we can invest in companies moving forward. We've taken a bit of a shift over the past several months- our approach is no longer to invest millions of dollars in new companies, that process did not work very well. Typically, what we would be looking to do, and we modeled this from what the Michigan State University group is doing, we are looking to make something like \$100,000 investment in a company with a valuation of \$100 million, so Rocket Innovations will have 10% of that kind of thing. It will vary likely, depending on what's needed by the company, but we are going to try to hold that in line as much as we can.

Senator Rouillard: Thank you for your candor. Thank you for changing your plan which seems much more reasonable.

Senator Dowd: I have a follow-up question. First, my understanding is that there is roughly \$900,000 in that endowment. Will that be applied to both salaries and investments or will it be designated for investments only?

Dr. William Messer: I think that's for the investments only. I should add, the position is a university position.

Senator Dowd: Dr. Rapino's position has changed from an endowment supported position to a budgeted university position?

Dr. William Messer: Yes.

Senator Dowd: Moving those activities under the Office of Research was an improvement. Moving the Director's salary to a university account was not part of the plan discussed previously.

Dr. Norman Rapino: Hopefully, you will also think that the process that we're bringing is an improvement. We will be using a process that's been adopted by the NSF and NIH, which is the Innovation Corps (I-Corps) process. Without it, trying to select projects and ventures in which to put resources and investment is very hard to do. We are going to make the opportunities, ideas and ventures themselves help us decide if they are worthy of support by going through a rigorous process called Customer Discovery. The

inventor or person with the idea can choose to participate in the process and we can help them learn if there's really a market need for that idea out in the world. So we at RI don't sit around and try to guess which ideas are good ideas. We really try to be data-driven and get information about the idea from the market place that tells us there's a real need for it.

Senator Molitor: Just a follow-up regarding long-term funding. You are going to have \$900,000 to start with and presumably there will be other funding sources down the road. My understanding for the Tech. Transfer office is that they are fully or partially funded on licensing fees that comes back from intellectual property. Is that the kind of a long-term model that we are viewing for Rocket Innovations?

Dr. William Messer: That will be ideal. We will see if we can get there. Any increase in funds or any extension of funds, we will go through the usual budget process. We have not asked for new funds for Rocket Innovations. We have a portfolio that we can still work with for the next year [I think] so my plans are not to ask for any new funds. Norm or I may decide differently between now or when that process kicks off, so we will go through that budget process and make a request as we move forward.

Dr. Norman Rapino: I am very anxious to get to know anybody who wants to get to know me. I realize that some people don't necessarily want to go down a commercialization or entrepreneurial path, but for anybody who does, or who just wants to know more about it, it is really useful for us to have a face-to-face conversation. I am really interested in forming relationships with individual faculty who are interested in translation, entrepreneurship, and entrepreneurial thinking; once again, not just startups.

Dr. William Messer: Let me follow up with that. Just with working with Norm and talking to him over the last few weeks, he's a great idea person. I think this process of customer discovery, I've seen it in action with some of our new technologies as teams have gone through the I-Corps program. I will give you an example of one of the groups that is developing a device to remove blood clots. They thought they had their market and they knew who they wanted to talk to, so as part of the process they visited with a cardiovascular surgeon at Toledo Hospital. They met with them and the surgeon said, oh, this is a great idea, it should remove blood clots; you are on the right track, but I will never use it. And the reason was because, by the time the cardiovascular surgeon saw the patient, they would be dead. So they said, instead, you need to go talk to the people in the emergency room because that is the physician that would use it. So they went in and talked to the personnel in the emergency room and that really changed their thinking. It changed their market. It is actually a smaller market than what they thought it would be, but it is a more focused market. They've got a lot of important research that they can use as part of that customer discovery. They actually built up enough information to say realistically this is who we are targeting in a small business grant that goes out. So they actually have a market plan that is based in reality just by going through that process. We are already talking about ways that we can use this customer discovery approach and develop this entrepreneurial approach, and how we do our day-to-day work in the Research office, and I am hopeful that will resonate with faculty as they are thinking about how to do things a little bit differently to get a little bit different result in what we're doing.

Dr. Norman Rapino: One final thing. There are obviously great ideas that need to get out into the world to be found in every corner of the university. In the past I've met with faculty to talk about the ideas they have and the opportunities they see, and at the end of the meeting they would say, don't you want to know about the details of the tech.? [I'll say] No, I am here to talk to you about letting me help you with the translation process, and to a great degree that is independent of exactly what the technology or idea is. I respect the

process and ideas. And finally, I want to remind you all that you don't have to have a STEM idea to have us really want to help you, or work with you.

President Keith: I have a quick question, Dr. Rapino.

Dr. Norman Rapino: Yes.

President Keith: I understand that this is your first day at UT, so I am just wondering since you invited us to visit you, do you know where your office is?

Dr. William Messer: It is on the Main Campus at the end of the College of Engineering. If you go to Dorr Street and Westwood, it is off of Dorr in that first building.

Dr. Norman Rapino: I spent the last five years at the University of Michigan working in this process. I love the idea of meeting new people and learning what they care about, and from that starting point working with them to create a real-world impact based on their ideas and passion. So I am happy and eager to have a conversation any time.

Dr. William Messer: Please tell your colleagues.

President Keith: Are there any more questions?

Dr. William Messer: Thank you.

President Keith: Thank you very much and welcome to UT.

Dr. Norman Rapino: Thank you.

President Keith: Well, that finishes all the items on the agenda, except for items from the floor. Does anybody have any announcements or issues that they want to talk about? Well, I have one quick reminder that I should have probably put in my EC report. The University posted a new policy sometime last week. The policy is on university evaluation of faculty qualifications, including faculty holding less than a Master's Degree - you might want to go to the policy page to see if you want to give some comments.

So, if there are no items from the floor, then may I have a motion for adjournment? Meeting adjourned at 6:46 p.m. Thank you very much.

IV. Meeting adjourned at 6:46 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Lucy Duhon
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard
Faculty Senate Office Administrative Secretary