THE UNIVE RSITY OF TOLEDO
FACULTY SENATE
Minutes of the Senate Meeting of February 16, 2010

HIGHLIGHTS

Prof. Celia Regimbal, Chair Academic Programs Committee
Prof. Charlene Gilbert, Director of Eberly Ctr. for Women
Dr. Berhane Teclehaimanot, Assoc. Prof. Curriculum & Instruction/Josh Spencer,
Desktop Packaging Engineer III
Dr. John Gaboury, Interim Vice Provost for Faculty & Organizational Development

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 John Barrett** called the meeting to order, **Nick Piazza**, Executive Secretary, called the roll.

I.   Roll Call –2009-2010 Senators:

Present: Anderson, Barlowe, Barnes, Barrett, Baumgartner, Caruso, Coventry, Kinner (Crosetto), Denyer, Dismukes, Dowd, Dupuy, Elmer, Fink, Giovannucci, Gunning, Heberle, Hoblet, Horan, Hornbeck, Hottell, Humphrys, Jenkins, Jorgensen, Kennedy, Kistner, Laux, LeBlanc, Lee, Malhotra, McSweeny, Metting, Moore, Niamat, Nims, Olson, Peseckis, Piazza, Plenefish, Powers, Powless, Randolph, Regimbal, Rouillard, Skeel, Solocha, Stepkowski, Teclehaimanot, Thompson-Casado, Wolff,

Excused absences: Ankele, Brickman**,** Chiarelott, Grothaus, Marco, Nandkeolyar, Sheldon, Shriner, Tietz, Wedding
Unexcused absences: Fournier,

A quorum was present.

II.   Approval of Minutes: Minutes of 2/2/2010 were approved as distributed.

III.   Executive Committee Report:

Executive Secretary Nick Piazza is asking the Senators and guests to introduce themselves before speaking to get the speakers' names recorded accurately in the minutes.

President John Barrett:
President's Report 2/16/2010

As you can see, we have a very busy agenda, so I will try to keep my remarks as brief as possible.

At our last meeting I gave a response to a log item about computer monitoring and promised to confirm what I reported with Godfrey Ovwigho. He confirmed that there is no active monitoring of the University personnel's computers, but they will open up a particular person's computer if appropriate circumstances exist.

As you will recall, last week we voted to proceed with the assessment process outlined by Dale Dwyer that the Assessments Committee had worked out with the Provosts and the President. Both Provosts have confirmed that they have met with CCI, which has assured then that the process will be confidential- it will be impossible to identify the individual submitting the data. They also confirmed the software application specifications yesterday and beta testing should occur next week, with full deployment shortly thereafter. I have stressed the importance of moving swiftly, as the semester will be over before we know it, and have also pointed out the likely time lag that spring break will impose on the process.

We also voted to clarify the Constitution pursuant to the provisions of Article XII to indicate that those holding a rank of dean or higher would not be eligible for election in the future but that this clarification does not affect anyone's current term. In connection with this vote, concern was expressed over how do we make sure that future senate's will remember this clarifying vote, so the matter was sent to the Constitution and Rules Committee to consider amending the Constitution. After reviewing the matter, the committee decided that an amendment was unnecessary to accomplish this purpose. Not only are amendments cumbersome to procure, including a university wide vote, but also setting the precedent of amending the constitution every time something is clarified undermines the purpose of Article XII, which exists to avoid having to amend the Constitution. Instead, the committee is recommending we pass a motion to append any clarifying votes to the Constitution just as we do with the Appendix and Rules. As such, they would be given to all incoming senators and posted on the website with the Constitution, the Appendix and the Rules.

On the election front, nominating ballots have been updated and verified and are about to be sent out. These will be due on March 5. Final ballots will be sent out on March 26 and due April 9. Final results will be announced just prior to our final meeting of the year on April 27.

We have a motion from the Academic Affairs Committee to be voted on as well.

Our final motion concerns disapproving of President Jacobs' pre-tenure interviews. As you all know, last fall when this idea was announced, Senate passed a resolution urging him to reconsider. However, since our last meeting, he has announced he is proceeding with these interviews, so FSEC is bringing forth a resolution disapproving of this course of action.

As many of you know the budget process has begun for next year. This five-step process is currently in the pre-hearing phase and in March budget hearings will begin. To help inform you about this and other major issues of concern, we are trying to put together something a little different for our next meeting. We have invited Bill Logie, Scott Scarborough, and Bill McMillan to hold a panel discussion on topics of interest in their areas, such as the budget, the furlough plans, changes in STRS and developments in Columbus. Hopefully they will all be able to attend, and with all of them as well as the provosts in attendance, hopefully we can get immediate answers to almost any questions you may have about what is going on in the University.

Finally, I want to remind you the BOT passed a resolution calling for the President to accelerate fundamental, transformational and sustainable change. In response to that resolution, Provost Haggett made a presentation to the Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the BOT yesterday. This presentation outlined four potential avenues for fulfilling this resolution. They are: creating a new organizational structure (similar to what ASU has done); creating new curricular guarantees (either for what the students will receive as part of their education or what competencies students will have when they graduate); creating new degrees and methods for delivering them (once such degree is already in process); and developing new expectations for faculty scholarship and accomplishments (such as including community engagement in what is seen as scholarship). While much of what was presented was in the form of ideas to think about and it was acknowledged that additional brainstorming will need to occur, it seems clear that this resolution

will form the basis for important discussions about the directions in which this university will be heading, and that the administration is at least willing to consider radical changes. Furthermore, some of these ideas are already in development in places like the A&S roundtable. Provost Haggett indicated that faculty will be included in the development of these and other ideas for implementing this resolution.

We now have a special item to address before the Provost's report.

Senator Carolyn Lee: The Faculty of the College of Nursing would like to take this opportunity to honor the memory of two special faculty colleagues.

Dr. James Hampton, Professor Emeriti in The College of Nursing, died December 7, 2009, having been diagnosed with ALS in 2007. Working at MCO and UT since 1986, Dr. Hampton served The Health Science Campus as an accomplished scholar in his field of pathophysiology and was held in high regard by students in a variety of disciplines. Jim's intellect, love for life and family will be fondly remembered by all who knew him.

Dr. Debra Buchman, Professor in The College of Nursing, who earned her PhD in Research and Measurement at The University of Toledo, died of cancer on January 22, 2010. Dr. Buchman served as Director of the Center for Nursing Research and Evaluation and was the recipient of awards for both teaching and research. Her passion for nursing and wonderful personality will be missed and remembered by her faculty colleagues.

President Barrett: Thank you and now we go to the Provost's report.

Provost Gold: Thank you Professor Barrett. I would like to add that I had the pleasure of knowing both, certainly not as long as some of you. Their contributions to this University and in the college of Medicine and the spirit of giving will long survive. However, their untimely tragic loss undercover the fragility of one's life, and the importance of living it to the fullest. Thank you for your comments.

I will keep my comments brief. Last February 9th, Mr. Chuck Lehnert and I had the pleasure of conducting a Town Hall meeting on this campus to talk about facilities programs, and construction renovation of academic and clinical resources, to talk about the status of the pharmacy building, to talk about the in-fill of the Block Sciences Building, changes that could potentially occur in the library, Intensive Care Unit project in the hospital, etc. There is a web archive that was specifically developed to answer questions that students and staff and faculty have on this campus. It was reasonably well attended and I thought the questions were excellent and hopefully it will serve as a resource, so well received actually that I think we are going to do it again in a couple of months as these projects continue to roll out. Yesterday I had the pleasure of presenting to the Academic Affairs Committee to our Board of Trustees the names of two candidates to receive honorary degrees in the College of Medicine on the 4th of June at the time of our annual commencement ceremony. These candidates that have been presented through the Academic Honors Committee and indeed are worthy of this. First is Dr. Kevin Weiss, Dr. Weiss has many accolades including his history of receiving his doctorate degree at the National Institute Health Center for Disease Control. His current role is the President and Chief Executive Office of the American Board of Medical Specialties. Dr. Weiss is an internationally regarded leader and the ABMS is the organization that accredits the American Board of Neurology and Psychiatry, surgery and others. So this is grandfathering organization of physician accreditation in the United States who board certification. He is really a visionary and quite articulate.

The other candidate that we proposed was Dr. Herbert Pardes, a Psychiatrist to have served as chair of the Departments of Psychiatry at both University of Colorado in Denver and at Columbia, then became dean of the College of Medicine at Columbia and for the last eleven years has served as a

president and chief executive officer of the New York Presbyterian Health Care System. His accolades through the presidency national organization the Institute of Medicine and the National Academy of Science are remarkable, but in his current role as president of one of the most successful, Club 100 of health centers in United States makes him particularly attractive to us to bring him to campus to learn from his experience, and to not only participate in the commencement activities. All of the commencement speakers and honorary recipients host seminars for faculty and students during the days around the commencements. I will see to it that the entire university is invited to meet these gentlemen and to participate in their ability to share their wisdom. They are both remarkable candidates.

The other thing I would like to mention before I invite questions is that the College of Medicine faculty, our general counsel of our research organization, our Institutional Review Board, to a large extent of the leadership of Drs. Skeel and Dr. Gmerek and others, have been working on the development of a policy titled, "Compensation for Treatment of Injuries of Subjects of Clinical Trials". That may sound like a very archaic subject to you. First of all, as this policy becomes mature, will ultimately go on the web to be posted. This policy relates specifically to question of in the very unusual situations in which an injury to a patient should occur at the time of a clinical trial (that is sponsored by a pharmaceutical company) how is the payment for that going to be arranged. There are many different permutations on this. The organization, the staff, faculty of the College of Medicine, IRB, etc., have done extensive benchmark research and as a result of that we are changing our policy, such that where possible we are going to bill the patient's insurance company and then pass all additional charges that are not covered, back to the commercial vendor that is sponsoring the trial. As opposed to doing it the other way around.

Ohio State and many other universities have policies that exactly mirror this, but others that do not, (the University of Michigan absorbs the entire clinical cost within their own university structure). There are several permutations. I believe that this policy will open the door to a large number of corporate sponsors research trials, that we have been prohibited from negotiating with because of the specific aspect of it. And that's the reason we worked through the effort lead by Dr. Skeel and others to make this change in the policy. The may be also help faculty members far beyond the College of Medicine, Pharmacy or Arts & Sciences or Health Science & Human Services that do corporate funded research trials. This could be a tremendous potential impact on them as those negotiations go forward. Please look for the policy as it gets posted on the web. If you have any thoughts about it, as usual I am interested in listening. I thank the group that spent so much time and effort on this policy and I believe it is very significant step to move forward for the university to open the door to these trials.

Senator Dowd: I'd like to raise two points on this issue. First, for that policy, will you be distributing that policy to Research Council members for their comments?

Provost Gold: We could. We were just going to post it and anybody, including Research Council could respond during the posting period. Roland, do you have any thoughts about it?

Senator Skeel: No. It applies primarily to clinical research but I have no problem with going to anybody.

Senator Dowd: The other point is that the description of the candidates' qualifications for the honorary degrees which was presented to the Board of Trustees was far more detailed than that presented here. Will you be posting the expanded description of those qualification on the web for the university community to review?

Provost Gold: The PP that I prepared always gets posted as part of the Board proceedings, but if you would like me to share that with you directly, I will be very pleased to. We formed a very extensive list of candidates every year and will probably go through a dozen of potential candidates so we hone the list down. We actually work two or more years in advance. We are now finalizing the next year, president and Chief Executive Officer of the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and a highly regarded Nobel Laureate.

President Barrett: Thank you Dr. Gold. We now have two action items, a clarifying motion from the Constitutional Rules Committee that comes through the Faculty Senate Executive Committee so we don't need a motion and second, we can just vote.

Senator Jorgensen: You can see the screen that says GO-33, GO-1, but we have already done that for every clicker. I have also added a feature where you can see your vote recorded. Of course, there are no names, so if you vote now you will be able to see your vote, with the clicker number being on the back of your clicker. I personally checked that everyone of those clickers works but if you want to double-check, run up to the front and check your clicker number.

President Barrett: Here is the resolution:

All clarifying motions passed by Senate pursuant to Article XII shall be appended to the Constitution (like the Appendix and Rules).

Any discussion of this motion?

Senator Anderson: This motion itself is fine. My original question as to whether one is or is not an eligible candidate for Faculty Senate should be specified more clearly in the Constitution, it does need further discussion. Assuming that this is an interpretation and it does not need whatever is required for amending the Constitution, then it can be changed every year. Different Senates can change an amendment but the people who are already elected under this policy will remain. I think the Constitution should say who is eligible for membership on the Senate.

President Barrett: I did not take the comments from last meeting, and I'm sorry if I misunderstood, I did not take those to mean that this is a question that is a fundamental issue that needs to have the entire University faculty weigh in on which line are we going to draw. If that is the case, we should amend the Constitution to be that clear. The Constitution & Rules Committee did discuss both that issue and that we were clarifying an ambiguity and this was within the spirit of Article XII and this was a line in the realm of reason of what our intent was when we created that Constitution. We also talked about the issue of what about situations when each senate votes a different way in a subsequent year. This could happen with any clarifying issue and so anytime you clarify anything you could take it as an issue for which you need to amend the Constitution. Our conclusion was if a clarifying motion is voted on and sits there and isn't objected to in the future, you probably drew the right line, probably clarified the right way. Whereas something that gets continually revisited doesn't feel like it's merely clarifying anymore but rather a political issue, and this is the kind of thing that should go to an amendment process. I think our sense was to have the clarifying motion exist as is and see if it gets respect as precedent in time. But if there are future votes on this issue or if there is some other clarifying issue that Senate keeps revisiting that is the situation we really are not clarifying anymore. In that case you really have a hot button issue that you ought to amend the Constitution on. If you wish to make a motion that says don't do this or if you want to suggest the Constitution & Rules Committee go further to amend the Constitution, because of this particular issue, I'm happy to send it to the committee if that is the will of this body.

Senator Anderson: Let's wait until after this motion, I think it's appropriate to bring up another motion later.

President Barrett: Other discussion on the motion? If not, we are ready to vote.

Motion passes 39:7 with one abstention.

We have a second Action Item, this came from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, it was emailed to you earlier today. It has a number of recitals concerning why we are not in favor of pre-tenure interviews and also outlining the history of what's happened here recently, followed by the actual resolution.

5

Resolution

Whereas:
- President Jacobs has announced that he is proceeding with requiring candidates for tenure to complete an interview with him prior to forwarding their applications to the Board of Trustees;
- Applicants for tenure undergo a rigorous multi-step structured evaluation in all colleges and through campus wide procedures that involves review of their past job performance as documented by records of scholarly activity, service and performance as educators;
- Research on interviews in employment indicates that such interviews generally have low validity with respect to job tenure,[i] are highly unlikely to provide any incremental validity to the tenure review process and have the risk of allowing personal biases regarding individual characteristics to intrude;[ii]
- Pre-tenure interviews of this sort are not typical and are not in conformity with best practices in academia;
- An interview of a tenure candidate with the President is likely to be of little or no benefit to the University or the candidate;
- The Faculty Senate has already recommended that the president not proceed with interviewing candidates for tenure; and
- The Senate believes that a more productive role for the President in the tenure review process is to ensure that the process is rigorous, valid and implemented appropriately for all tenure candidates:

Therefore, be it resolved that:

- The University of Toledo Faculty Senate wishes to express in the strongest terms possible its disapproval of the President's decision to interview tenure candidates prior to approving their application; and
- The Senate asks that the President not proceed with the tenure interviews and that he instead endeavor to ensure that the tenure review process has been conducted according to stated policy and procedure.

[1] McDaniel, M. A., Whetzel, D. L., Schmidt, F. L., and Maurer, S. D. (1994). The validity of employment interviews: A comprehensive review and meta-analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology, 79, 599-616.
[1] Huffcutt, A. I., Roth, P. L., Conway, J. M., and Stone, N. J. (2001). Identification and meta-analytic assessment of psychological constructs measured in employment interviews. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86, 897-913.

The end is two-fold.

Senator McSweeny: As to the recitals, there was one minor revision; the wording was changed just to make it clearer.
President Barrett: So there is a footnote to recital 3 commenting on the research on interviews and employments that is not on the projector screen. Any other discussion on this?
Senator Skeel: It seems to me that was redundant to the motion that was made and approved last fall, and I really failed to see what the benefit for either the process or to the Senate or to the faculty members who may be up for tenure would be by submitting this. It seems fairly clear that we have expressed our opinion as a senate already, I believe Dr. Jacobs did hear what we had to say and it sounds that he has decided not to agree with what we have said and therefore it seems unnecessary

pushing it in to his face again to make the second resolution repeating what we have already said, which he has already rejected. Furthermore, I don't think it will have a practical purpose of getting him to change his mind just because we say it again.

Senator Heberle: The first resolution said we ask that he reconsider. It didn't explicitly say we disagree with the policy. I find it very appropriate not jus to make him change his mind, because that may or may not happen, which may clear and further education and communicate to the public, students and the Board of Trustees that this is a bad idea. To me that's a political maneuver which may not have a practical affect in the President's mind but I think the Faculty Senate on such issues carry weight.

Senator Skeel: Your resolution already said that the Faculty Senate recommended that the president not proceed with interviewing candidates. If that is not what it said before, than we should change this resolution.

President Barrett: I believe the first recital is relatively reflective, but it is not exactly a mirror image, it's not a quote of the initial statement where we asked him to reconsider. We can change the wording if people wish. I would certainly entertain a friendly amendment.

Senator Dismukes: It seems to me if we withdraw this it would defacto say we approve of what the president is doing and it is my understanding it is not what we are trying to say.

Senator Dowd: To follow up on that, the original resolution simply asked the President to reconsider his decision. Now, the language of this new resolution states that we are expressing our disapproval of the President's decision. This resolution reflects the current view of the Senate and is a stronger message.

Senator LeBlanc: I have a problem with the third bullet, whereas, "...Research on interviews in employment...", I pulled those articles and looked at them, neither one of those articles say what that paragraph says. I think it really misrepresents both articles, in the conclusion of one of the articles actually says, in case of an interview the conclusion was the opposite a structured interview was found to have a respectable level of validity, so I have a problem with that because it misrepresents the articles and it should be removed.

President Barrett: I am going to turn this over to John McSweeny. John contacted a number of faculty members for information in this area, studied it and collated the information, so he is the one to respond to this.

Senator McSweeny: I looked at the articles and the research; it doesn't involve tenure in academic situation. The first point simply refers to articles and interviews with job tenure, again, not in academia but in general and a predicted value of interviews with respect to job tenure...It is a little muddy because they could lose their jobs because they have left the job. So the criteria vary from study to study but overall the correlation was .20, which means 4% of the variance in job tenure was accounted for .by the interview results. The second point was raised by what I've learned from one of the faculty members I consulted and made the distinction between if the interviews was used for employment initially or for continued employment in the same job.

Some of the research was that an increase in validity in predicting job performance was realized by using interviews at that particular point (initial employment) was due to the positive results of using structured interviews: structured interviews, that are specifically designed to look at the characteristics of that particular person's job, that have standardized .procedures and so on. The incremental validity was not helpful in these interviews when applied to predicting job tenure or performance after the person had held the position for a period of time.

The third point was based on a second article which indeed did show that personal bias was one of the issues that crept in some of the decisions that used interviews as a component of the selection process. So indeed, you are correct in respect to the interview if they are done for initial hiring decisions, if they are structured and directly applied to such they can be made valid at that particular point. The situation we are dealing with here is with retaining somebody in the same position they already have.

Senator LeBlanc: My other point is that that's really a lose paraphrases from 1964 article , it's not from either two articles listed there.

Senator McSweeny: It's from 1994.

Senator LeBlanc: No, it's from 1964, you know how the beginning article always use prior research, it's from a quote from 1964 article.

Senator McSweeny: Was it from the meta-analysis in 1994?

Senator LeBlanc: It is, but that reference is from 1964 article. I will quote you, it's from Mayfield, 1964, "...Mayfield concluded that intelligence is the human quality that may be best estimated from an interview. The interviewer assessments offered little if any incremental validity over the testing alone." Mayfield 1964 article.

Senator McSweeny: The incremental issue that came from a set of studies for which I didn't list a specific citation.   It was by way of email conversation I had with Professor Dwyer. The tenure issue is related to the Table #8.

Senator LeBlanc: I still think it's an inappropriate reference.

President Barrett: This is something we need to think very seriously about, obviously we don't want to cite to a study and have it not be appropriate or accurate, because that will undercut the validity of the other points being made. On the other hand, if it is accurate it makes that much stronger point. So I throw that out to everyone for discussion.

Senator Heberle: I really appreciate the Executive Committee going through the effort to collectively write such a long resolution. Perhaps the length of it will begin to dilute through this kind of going back and forth about details of the actual problem we are trying to address. I'm not sure what to do about that, do we want to vote in the spirit of the resolution so we can move along quickly and leave it to the Executive Committee to write a more simpler resolution for a package for the President to show them why this is a bad idea.

President Barrett: This is an important matter and I think it needs the time to deal with it. Other comments? Do we want to vote on it as it is? It does not need a motion.

Senator Skeel: I would like to make another comment, if I were a CEO of a corporation and I was going to offer someone a lifetime employment or recommend to my Board of Trustees that someone have lifetime employment, I guess I would like the opportunity to meet this person, say hello, so if there are any clarifications that they needed to give before I went ahead to make this recommendation. It's pretty clear to me that all of the prior dossiers that are collected, are simply that, they are recommendations. Only the Board of Trustees may give the tenure. To deny the opportunity arbitrarily because we are afraid of what one person might do to a person who is coming through the process, I think is ill advised.

Senator Jorgensen: In the president's commentary about why he did not want to change his mind about this he cited the fact that the faculty members were reviewed by their chair, their dean and the provost. He neglected to mention that they were also reviewed by the faculty in their department, the faculty in their college and the faculty in the University. So all of these faculty members are reviewed at six stages. In their department of course they are known on a daily basis over a number of years by their faculty colleagues who were in their professional area. Universities have evolved through a process which for UT is very detailed six levels of review, for the five years before a tenure recommendation is made to the President. It is after that the President decides. It is a system that is pretty standard in the American higher education. And if you are going to go to a non-standard method and say we have a better method for some particular reason, it is incumbent upon you to say, we are going to do this a different way because we have a reason for doing it a different way, and I haven't heard a reason for why there would be.   Secondly, even more importantly, there are contractual obligations related to tenure awarding, very specific one that are negotiated at the table over a long period of time. If this is proposed by the administration, by the President as another part of the process, then it should be at the negotiation table where this is raised, not as something in the middle of a year for a particular group of people who have already been here a number of years. This is not justified by the culture of higher education. Of course, the culture of higher education can be challenged but there needs to be a reason for it, and to be an outlier to this area is of no value to the University of Toledo.

Senator Olson: A university is not a corporation; it never has been a corporation. The President of the University is not the CEO of a corporation.   President of a university has a much different structure, much different foundation, and much different internal working network than a corporation. In a university historically professors were not considered to be top down working employees. They were considered colleagues more working together, experts in given areas. The President was a colleague who came from the faculty and would return to the faculty. To liken this to a CEO running a corporation is an analogy that definitely does not work for a university.

Senator LeBlanc: Walt makes a good point. Going back to that research topic, that's all job interviews, it's nothing to do with academic areas, that's basically interviews for corporate jobs. So reciting research for interviews in corporate situations, yet we are saying a university is not a corporation.

Senator McSweeny: I would agree with you. Basically the data can be generalized in the academic situation from corporate situations. I thought that was the best data that we have, and are fairly summarized by that statement. However, if you believe that we should have data that directly applicable to academic situations, I don't have a problem if we amended the resolution if there is going to be a lot of debate whether these studies are applicable to the resolution or not.

Senator Barrett: We need to decide whether we want to include the third recital or not. To a degree this is an unusual process, it is not common, I wouldn't be surprised not to find data of studies on it. If nobody is doing it, how would you gather data.

Senator Hoblet: If that is a stopping point on moving forward, than we need to take that out. I vote no on point number three. I make a motion to amend, to remove that until we have confirmed research that does support those statements.

It was seconded.

President Barrett: We need to vote on it.

Senator McSweeny: Before you take this out, John's point is well taken, we will never going to see this research. So we have to use the research that is closest to and is analogous to situation like ours.

Senator Hoblet: If that is a problem leaving it in, then it needs to be removed. Because this resolution speaks very clearly to what we are stating. I think it could be misinterpreted.

President Barrett: Are there any other comments on the motion to remove recital number three from the Resolution? If not, all those in favor of removing it, please vote A, all against vote B, and those who want to abstain, vote C.

Bullet 3 will be removed by a vote of 39:7.

Is there any more discussion on the resolution itself with bullet point three removed?

Senator Heberle: I wanted to make a friendly amendment to change the language that would reflect the language on what we voted on before. It's not crucial, but I wanted to clarify that.

President Barrett: If people would like, we can change the language that says, ..."The Faculty Senate has already recommended that the president not proceed with interviewing candidates for tenure; and,..." to, "...The Faculty Senate has already recommended the President reconsider his position with regard to interview candidates for tenure."

The motion passes 37:9 with one abstention.

Amended Resolution
February 16, 2010

Whereas:
- President Jacobs has announced that he is proceeding with requiring candidates for tenure to complete an interview with him prior to forwarding their applications to the Board of Trustees;

- Applicants for tenure undergo a rigorous multi-step structured evaluation in all colleges and through campus wide procedures that involves review of their past job performance as documented by records of scholarly activity, service and performance as educators;

- Pre-tenure interviews of this sort are not typical and are not in conformity with best practices in academia;

- An interview of a tenure candidate with the President is likely to be of little or no benefit to the University or the candidate;

- The Faculty Senate has already recommended that the president reconsider his position with regard to interviewing candidates for tenure; and

- The Senate believes that a more productive role for the President in the tenure review process is to ensure that the process is rigorous, valid and implemented appropriately for all tenure candidates:

Therefore be it resolved:

- The University of Toledo Faculty Senate wishes to express in the strongest possible terms its disapproval of the President's decision to interview tenure candidates prior to approving their application; and

- The Senate asks that the President not to proceed with the tenure interviews and that he instead endeavor to ensure that the tenure review process has been conducted according to stated policy and procedure.

Vote: 37 in Favor, 9 Opposed, 1 Abstain

President Barrett: This is the end of our action items and I would like to call Prof. Celia Regimbal for a report from the Academic Programs Committee after which we will have a vote on that as well.
Senator Regimbal:

<div align="center">

Academic Programs Committee Report
Approved by Faculty Senate
on February 16, 2010

</div>

All new programs and program modifications are posted at:
http://curriculumtracking.utoledo.edu/

The Academic Program Committee met virtually on 2/10 and approved the following:

From **HHS**
1. Athletic Training : request for a change in degree title from a BS w/a major in Athletic Training to a BS in Athletic Training. The request is a response to new accreditation requirements and does not require new courses or resources.
2. Health Performance: request for change in program name from Health Information Management (HIM) to Health Information Administration (HIA). The request for a name change aligns the UT program with programs offered by other universities and will position the faculty to develop a master's in HIA.

3. Counseling: request to add three courses to the list of electives for a minor in counseling. The addition will not change the number of hrs. required for the minor.

From **ARS**
1. Biology: change in requirements for the minor in Biology to eliminate BIOL 3090 & 3070 from the required list and

- require that the remaining 6 credits must be taken at the 3000 – 4000 level.
- A non BIOL courses may not be used to satisfy the requirements in the minor.
- this would allow student a wider choice of BIOL courses that may be taken to satisfy requirements of the minor and may expand students intellectual growth in Biology.

2. Biology: change the classes that may be taken P/NC to satisfy the requirements of the Biology major or minor. This change would bring the P/NC policy in line with other natural science programs and only allow a restricted suite of individualized study courses at the 4000 level to be taken P/NC

Motion passed 42:1.

Prof. Charlene Gilbert: Good afternoon everyone. My name is Charlene Gilbert and I am the director of the Catharine S. Eberly Center for Women. I have met many of you and this is the first time I am addressing the combined senate. When I came two and a half years ago, I spoke to the Senate on the Main Campus around September of 2007. Those of you who were there, you might remember that I was joyful, I was honored, excited about the privilege to serve at this fine institution. I am still joyful and honored. But more importantly I am wiser and still honored to be serving here at the University of Toledo, serving the student and staff population. But it's hard work and I have a much better understanding of that in the two and a half years I have been here and served on many committees and it's been a pleasure for most of that time. I will talk a little about the work we do at the Center and about some of the major projects. The Eberly Center was founded in 1977 by Catharine Eberly who was a member of the Board of Trustees and we are located on the Main Campus right across from the Quad. My goal is to serve faculty, staff, students and women in the surrounding communities. We advocate for women's equity in education, work and health. The Center's primary goal is to support women in their efforts to achieve their highest potential. The fact that the Center serves women on campus and off campus makes it unique. Which is one of the things that attracted me to the job when I read about it. It was a rare combination to be in the Office of the Provost and help women across the campus as well as women coming in to higher education. One of the things that I organized last fall is to develop a mentor program for women interested in STEMM, and the expectation that the STEMM area offers. I wanted to make sure that we are not left behind in that effort. I asked the Institutional Research how many women are in STEMM, and found out that only 16%, so I thought that as an opportunity that we may be able to do something about that and try to get that number close to 50%. I wrote a proposal for a mentor program and increase the number of undergraduate women pursuing majors in STEMM, Science, Technology, Engineering or Math skills. The first year went extremely well, received support and were able to get Isabel Escobar from the College of Engineering to coordinate that program and we were able to run that the first year and were successful. We had 100% retention rate in women not only at the University but more importantly in the STEMM areas. With the support of Provost Haggett we were able to do it a second year, the year we are in now, and we had well over 30 students enrolled. We are hoping that we will continue to have the same success in terms of retention rates. For women who are undecided we tried to show them women in the fields such as Polymer Science, Bioengineering, Biology Research, and lure them to the University.

Another project, Project Succeed, our flagship program, we have been doing it for over twenty years. This program is aimed at women in transition. We have classes, continuing education, support groups, higher education counseling, open computer lab in a child-friendly space. We work with women and try to help them find a path back to education, realizing that higher education is a key to a woman's success. We work with women who are facing all kinds of obstacles maybe coming in from difficult divorce, domestic violence situation, laid off from their job, or women who are perhaps older. Their children are grown and gone and they are thinking about their next chapter in their life. We help them make a plan and a way back to this institution. Some of the graduates of Project Succeed have gotten professional employment, and when women get their degrees, chances are good their children will get a higher education degrees as well. We also do promoting women's voices through brownbag series, the series has been featured on WGTE we featured women from every college on the campus. We've had a great deal of success with these series. This semester we moved to Libby Hall in order to accommodate larger audiences.

We also collaborate with academic units to bring national scholars and leaders to our campus and community. Last semester we brought in Asra Nomani, journalist and outspoken advocate on behalf of women's rights within Islam. Along with several departments on campus including the Philosophy Department and the Women's and Gender Studies we organized this special guest lecture last fall. This semester we are also co-sponsoring a lecture by Dr. Doroceta Taylor, a national expert on green jobs and environmental justice. We also are working on bringing in Dr. Rosemarie Garland-Thompson named as one of the "50 Visionaries Who are Changing Your world, a leading scholar in Disability and Women's studies. We are also very involved in Community Engagement projects, we are deeply committed to forming strategic partnerships with organizations and institutions in our community. One of the projects we are involved in is the Ella P. Stewart Academy, also The Toledo Early College High School, Girls in Science Day, sponsored by the NW Ohio Assoc. of Women in Science and the Eberly Center for Women. It will be in March and we will bring girls in from six different high schools and show them the possibilities in majoring in Math and Science here at the University with 5th and 6th grade girls. We also are involved in tutoring, we have 26 tutors, mostly college students. They are there this afternoon, the first week this semester. It's a ten week program and they go twice a week. Within fifteen minutes of this institution are Central City schools most of them eligible for free lunch and they really appreciate meeting college students. We are hoping to increasing the pipeline of girls interested in Math and Science. We are also very involved in Domestic Violence. We serve on the Lucas County Domestic Violence Task Force Steering Committee, Hospital Sub-Committee, Fatality Review Committee. The hospital sub-committee was responsible with working with UTMC hospital to be one of the first hospitals in the region to adopt protocols for domestic violence in emergency rooms. Our campus is leading in that effort. We are also involved in Momentum 2010, a regional advisory committee. We will be in Columbus in March and it will be an all day conference for young women. We are involved in partnerships with various academic units on grants and proposals that will insure the increased participation and retention of women in under-represented areas. Specifically, Building Ohio's Sustainable Energy Future, Choose Ohio Scholarship Program. We were a Co-PI on the proposal for this program which received a five-year $1.45 million grant from the Ohio Board of Regents. The PI is Dr. Geoffrey Martin. We are working with NSF/ADVANCE-PAID proposal, and the University is preparing a grant to submit to the National Science Foundation aimed at increasing the number of women faculty in the sciences. The writing team is being led by Dr. Jamie Barlowe and includes female faculty in science from throughout the University.

We have a number of resources available to women both on and off campus. Open computer lab, Resource Room, Quiet Room, Scholarships, we give out nearly 40 scholarships a year ranging from $250 to $1,000 each. We have a full-time licensed independent social worker who is available to assist women with making plans to return to school, work, or who are in need of advocacy assistance to resolve obstacles keeping them from achieving their education, life or professional

goals. We also have A Women's Volunteer Corps who volunteer their time and services to the University community.

A lot of what we do is aimed at the campus pilot, we want to make sure that respectful and encouraging women, faculty, staff and students, do that through a number of efforts including the University Sexual Harassment Task Force, and I co-chair that with Rebecca Zietlow from the Law School. There will be women elected from this campus in leadership group starting March and I also chair the President's Council on Diversity.

I want to say a few words on the Sexual Harassment Task Force. The members of the task force includes, Lawrence Burns, Interim Director and VP for Diversity and Equity, Sharon Barnes, Charlene Gilbert, Diane Britton, Nancy Collins, Kathleen Keanda, Diane Docis, Amira Gohara, Shanda Gore, Michele Martinez, Traci McDaniel, Meghan Kapp – student, Penny Poplin Gosetti, Nicole Buonocore Porter, Kerry Rottenstein, Kevin West, Rebecca Zietlow. We are looking at a number of issues, the group is meeting this academic year and by the end of the academic year we are looking at having some recommendations and some proposals. Right now there is not a lot of information about sexual harassment on the campus in the central way. So we are trying to find ways to get more information on people's experiences. We know that there are challenges and issues across the campus in every college but we don't have a mechanism for collecting that data. We are also looking at education and training, and finding recourses to train all the members of the community, responsibilities and obligations and expectations in the workplace and to do more to educate the communities about these issues. We are looking at other institutions to see what their policies and procedures are that would be considered best practices that we might use for possible suggestions on our campus. How many have seen our sexual harassment policy? Most of you have received and were asked to sign that you have read it. Some of you may not have received it as there were not enough to go around. You may have noticed when you read it that it is very dense. Someone in crisis and trying to get some information on sexual harassment policy may not know exactly what to do and will find the policy not all that clear. So we are looking at the policy to redraft it in a way that it will make more sense and clear for all involved. We also are trying to create our policy so that it will be more than just a document; we want a policy that will help us with the message that this is simply not acceptable. We would rather not be at a place where it would become a legal issue. We want this simply not be tolerated. Looking at reporting procedures and resources on campus, some of you may remember Captain Integrity, does anyone know the number for Captain Integrity? Captain Integrity is the one getting all the sexual harassment situation.

Lastly, how do we get to a place where we have a better culture where this would not be an issue. One thing we know is that 90% of people on this campus are not harassing anyone. And 90% of people in this room know someone involved in a sexual harassment situation. We rarely say the names of people who have been involved in these situations. In our graduate program, the chair of a program married one of our students. It turned out well, they got married and had three lovely children. I personally would have hated to have been in the class with her when they were dating. As you know lots of graduate programs can be extremely competitive. I 'm a film maker, film programs that can be very competitive, in some places people even undermine each other. You also may know a situation where a student is dating a professor and it turned out very badly. So one of the things that we are looking at is beginning to understand what sexual harassment is and how do we change the culture. There are a lot of things that need to happen around this issue that are bigger than just what is in the policy. We are hoping by the end of the academic year we will have some recommendations and will share with the provost and anyone else who might be interested as well.

Senator Fink: I am astounded by this story, is there a rule that you are not allowed to date your students.

Prof. Charlene Gilbert: No, I don't believe there is a rule. That's one thing that we are looking at. One university says, even if it is consensual, it's still sexual harassment. If you have power over that person and he/she asks you to go out for an ice cream, it's really not consensual.
Any other questions?
Senator Randolph: I just wanted to commend you on your leadership in this area.
Prof. Charlene Gilbert: Thank you and thank you for inviting me.
President Barrett: Next is a presentation from Dr. Teclehaimanot
Josh Spencer: Good afternoon, I'm a team leader of the desktop development group in the Information Technology Department. I have been on the Health Science Campus for eleven years. I am currently studying for my master's in educational technology with Dr. Teclehaimanot. He asked me to come today and talk to you about a project I have been working on for about a year that has some real potential with distance education. I will be talking to you about the University virtual lab and I will spend a little time on some of the concepts of virtualization.

What is the University of Toledo virtual lab? What we are trying to do is build with this new technology a student lab that is accessible 24/7, 365 days around the clock and around the world including the internet connection. There are a lot of potential benefits for this, and also potential for reduction in physical labs, energy savings, hardware savings, reclaimed space, things like that. Some of the current applications we found today, for example in Residence Life lab we were successful in replacing all the traditional desktop computers with the exception of one in each lab with thin-clients computers. Thin-clients are little boxes about the size of my hand, there are no moving parts, have very long shelf life, they last a long time and they are inexpensive. These thin-clients all-connecting to virtual machines making a variety of software from the various colleges with these different applications available to students and clients. We have a Clinical Skills Testing Center on the HSC, our original showcase of this technology where a lot of failing hardware, laptops, things of this nature that weren't working very well, and we replaced them with thin-clients and they have been working for about a year with no problems of down time. The individual desktops replacements that we have been piloting, I'm very excited to mention that the HED clinical projects are actually going to be implementing 300 thin-clients throughout the hospital for variety of reasons, one is that it helps with HED clinical clients since we no longer have to worry about data at the end point. The thin-clients do not store anything. All the data all the streaming that you see come from that virtual machine back in the data center. So it drives down cost of energy. A couple of limitations in technology, it is Windows virtualization only. When we build these virtual machines, the only things that we can build today are Windows machines. The Mac operating system on the educational side is a big vacancy, and we realize that and there are a lot of folks working with Apple trying to make that a reality, but it's not there yet. If you have a Mac machine at home or in your dorm room, as long as it is Intel Mac you can connect to the virtual lab and make use of the window devises. The streaming video does not work well with this technology.
Senator Elmer: In terms of streaming video, wouldn't that depend on what kind of software you are using for the video, for example, if you were using Java, wouldn't that be easier on this particular platform?
Josh Spencer: Java is okay, but what really happens behind the scene is, we have the virtual machine sitting in the data center, and it goes out to YouTube, and it takes a compressed video stream and it stuffs a whole lot of videos and it compresses it, and the virtual machine decompresses it. We are sitting here trying to pull the entire decompressed video across, so you get choppy video due to this technology. There are some things in the works that really help by re-compressing that video and sending it back out to the teaching lab, but we're not there yet. I am confident by this time next year we will have a lot of that worked out.

A little more technology overview to help you understand what we are really doing here. VMware View 3 is the product that we are using to make all this building virtual machines happen. VMware is a company that the State of Ohio and the Board of Regents came up with, a really nice contract that allows us to buy at greatly discounted rates. So we buy this technology and we build unique

pools for each of the colleges or each of the specific labs. For example, Dr. Schwartz has been using this technology since almost the beginning, and he has a couple of classes that have specific configurations, Windows Operating System, so much RAM, and so we build up this pool of twenty machines that have this particular configuration for the College of Law, and then we use entitlements for basically saying which students have access to which of these virtual labs. A student in the Math 1200 class, for example, will automatically be entitled to make use of this lab. Everybody in this room, in case you haven't seen it yet, has access to the UT open lab, Window XP, all the software that we have enterprise licensing for, is put in there so you can get in there and check it out. The URL is, www.utoledo.edu/it/vlab.

We use non-persistent virtual machines and this is key to help improve student up-time. What this means is every time a student connects to a virtual lab, checks out a machine from one pool or another, they can use that for ten hours. At the end of that session, they log out and disconnect, the virtual machine shuts down, destroys and recreates, and the whole process takes about two minutes. It's very rapid and it insures that every student has a clean, perfectly working system environment. Many of you are familiar with the VPN, (?) environment, it's a same secure SSL encryption technology for all connection, anywhere you are on or off campus. The technology behind UT labs, we have 16 Dell blades, and basically we have 128 processing cores and 768 GB Ram that sits in a small box, and it's very cutting edge technology. Today we have 26 unique configurations in classes or different colleges with well over 400 virtual machines and some room to grow. The next slide shows a very high level overview how the VLab design works, whether you are at home or your personal devise or in a dorm room, you can go through the internet or here on campus, everybody is driven through the central point set of hardware. It checks your credentials, and reviews who you are to make sure you are entitled to use the system and which pool of system you are entitled to use and it will then allocate one of the systems to you.

You have a couple of options and I encourage you to look and see these supportive labs. I am now going to demonstrate to you, I'm going to use the basic logon, it doesn't require installation of anything, but it can for advanced access. When I put my credentials in, it connected to the server, it's going through a secure tunnel, verifying my UT credentials and is saying this is the list of labs you have access to. Most of our students won't see such an extensive list, they will see only those they are entitled to and their course membership, and I will pick the UT Open Lab. You will notice you don't have to authenticate.

Senator Fink: This is all very impressive, I'm curious with all that information, are you protected against cyber crime viruses once you get in and can they spread?

Josh Spencer: Excellent question, are we exposing ourselves to that. We have done a significant amount of research on how can we provide this type of service and still protect ourselves. The reality is that many folks are doing similar type things from the outside using straight RDP, desktop protocol for windows has been around forever, and a lot of people are wide open through a very unsecure channel, make use of this software, configure all sorts of things, this concept allows us to create SSL tunnel which is as good as VMware client as good as web encryption gets today. Because it's all browser based, there is really no client install, there is nothing today that I am aware of that can hop from your system into the environment.   It's pretty secure, the fact that we are destroying the virtual machines every time that they are used really helps us. Even when a student comes in the environment and plants something suspicious, within ten hours that machine is gone and destroyed. There is a VLAN server subnet, virtual building, where all those machines reside and there is a significant amount of firewalls to clean that and the rest of the environment. So there are several layers of protection in place. That's the end of my presentation and you can see the virtual machines run on Windows.

Senator Teclehaimanot: I would like to thank you for the opportunity to present to the Faculty Senate. This was presented in Vancouver, Canada, at the 2009 E-Learn--World Conference on E-Learning in Corporate, Government, Healthcare, & Higher Education. The international conference was organized by the Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE) and co-sponsored by the International Journal on E-Learning. This annual conference represents 70

countries and serves as a multi-disciplinary forum for the exchange of information on research, development, and applications of all topics related to e-Learning in the Corporate, Government, Healthcare, and Higher Education sectors. Josh is my graduate student and also a team leader on the desktop development group in the Information Technology Department at the University of Toledo. I believe that information is power. The more the faculty are informed, the more they will be able to utilize this technology in their classes. I use this E-Learning framework for my classes in the distance learning courses. I know all of us faculty members have done an excellent in job teaching and my point here is how do we go from good to great. If you are teaching distance learning course I believe the VLab will help you to enhance your courses. Pedagogical dimension of E-learning refers to teaching and learning. Do we know our students? Does the course provide clear goals and expectations of what the students are required to do? How do we know that our students have the skills needed to access technology? We assume they know how to do it. I taught an online course last semester and a student in the middle of the semester said, I don't know how to access Blackboard. That's almost six weeks into the semester. When students are registered for E-learning course, I think we have to make sure that they have the basic technological skills required to do their assignments without any difficulties. At the same time, the goal of the course ought to be clearly defined to avoid any ambiguity. The new Blackboard version 9.2 includes a complete set of tools for course preparation, delivery and management. It also gives instructors an easy way to prepare dynamic courses and efficiently manage interactions with students. The Blackboard Learning System provides a convenient, easy-to-navigate environment for completing day-to-day teaching and learning activities to enhance the teaching/learning process. At the same time we have to make sure that the medium we utilize supports multimedia attributes of the Internet and digital technologies such as text, audio, video and graphics. We assume our students have the latest technology available, but that's not true. Sometimes students can't even open up a (.docx) document because they have the old version of Word. Another issue that we need to address is technical support. Does the course have personnel who can assist learners to set up for starting the course? Are the hardware requirements for the course clearly stated? Does the course provide links to resources where all necessary software can be downloaded?

The main goals and objectives of this presentation is to inform faculty the potential and the benefits about the University of Toledo's virtual lab. Students don't have to purchase all the software needed for the course in order for them to do their homework. They can access the virtual severs 24/7, 365 days round the clock and around the world including the Internet connection. In other words, they don't even have to come to the University to do their course work. I think this will help us to advance our courses and hopefully it will help our students to improve their learning and take advantage of the new innovative technology from any location around the world.

Another dimension of the E-learning framework is interface design. It refers to the overall look and feel of E-learning programs. Interface design dimension also encompasses page and site design, content design, and navigation Firefox, Safari, Internet Explorer). We as faculty must make sure the course website design ought to accessible by a wider user population. Students should not be disadvantaged for using PC or Mac platforms.

Evaluation. Evaluation, takes place before, during and after. Which means there is always room for improvement, especially with the distance-learning course. The evaluation for E-learning includes both assessment of learners and evaluation of the instruction and learning environment. We need to listen to our students concerns in order to improve the teaching and the learning process.

Management. The management of e-learning refers to maintenance of learning environment and distribution of information. Does the course notify students about any changes in due dates or other course relevant matters? Maintenance is very important on how information is disseminated from the departments and Colleges University wide.

Technical support. One of the challenging tasks faced by students University wide is technology support. Faculty need on-site and on-demand technical assistance both with the equipment and software itself and with the implementation of the technology in the classroom. Without technical support, nothing is going to work smoothly. Students should be informed in advance how to contact for technical related issues. At the same time, ethical considerations of e-learning related to social and political influence, cultural diversity, bias, geographical diversity, learner diversity, information accessibility, and legal issues should be addressed.

Institutional. The institutional dimension concerns with issues of administrative affairs, academic affairs and student services related to distance learning. Does the course provide academic quality comparing to traditional course taught as face-to face on campus. There is a need for colleges to establish clear communication mechanism with the Registrar's Office at the undergraduate and graduate level programs.

The University should establish 3-5 years technology strategic technology plan. The vision should also be communicated to the university community clearly. Another important issue related to technology is faculty development. In order to integrate the new emerging technologies into the curriculum, a well-designed faculty development workshop ought to be offered to Faculty University wide. We also need to take advantage of the Ohio Third Frontier Network (Internet 2) infrastructure to support distance learning and research. IT and Learning Ventures need to work together as a team to move the University technologically forward to the next level.

Unfortunately our time is up. Thank you.

President Barrett: Thank you, Dr. Teclehaimanot. Sorry we have to rush you but we want to bring up John Gaboury to talk to us about library conversion. It's a big issue and we need to hear his report.

V. Provost John Gaboury: I wanted to give an overview of the environment that is impacting the libraries across the country in universities. To put it into a perspective what the University libraries are dealing with in Toledo, but it's not a unique situation. I wanted to give you some examples of just some of the headlines from some titles of articles that are out there regarding this.
'Library space in the digital age, the pressure is on.' This is in the Health Science Libraries, because of the different institution we have together now.
'The Changing a Cultural Icon: The Academic Library as a Virtual Destination.'
'Re-visioning and redesigning "a Library for the fifteenths through twenty-first centuries.' This is from the Library and Center for Knowledge Management, the University of California.
'Renovated, repurposed and still "one sweet library", University of Maryland.
So it is possible to do some of the things we want to do and still have something that we will remember, those of us who are over thirty can remember as a library.

To show you in the State what has happened at Ohio State. They had a major renovation of their primary main library. What I wanted to share with you on their webpage from the director's statements, "...the purpose of their major renovation of that entire building was to transform this library into this 21st Century teaching, learning and research facility." More importantly look at the third sentence as far as what they did, they had a blend of quality print collections, they did a very in depth critical assessment as far as the quality of the collections they had. Originally, there were 2.5 million volumes in the Thompson Library. When they were done, they only brought back just over a million. That's a significant change. This is important to share with you as we go through and we share the impact of virtual libraries. I want to share with you some of the things we are doing, and this effort has been going on for more than five years. If you recall pre-merger we had the Information Commons, we went through an extensive discussion with students and looking at our reference collection as a start. Also over five years ago, I made a key hire in the library, Alice Crosetto who is also a part of this Faculty Senate and she is the collection development librarian. I gave her a charge at that time, as we the library have not done critical assessment of our collections.

We have a lot of volumes but the question is, are they used, are they still contemporary, do the faculty still want to utilize these resources as part of their teaching. I'm working with undergraduate and graduate students. In talking with her we have seen that over the years, starting back in the 80's there has been this gradual shift in change away from monographs and actually circulating. We could speculate that we are moving to the new digital age back then was still early. We could speculate that faculty expectations waned, and you moved more towards journals or more current type of things. It's probably a combination of all those things that bring us back to the days environments as far as responding to what do we need.

Libraries across the country have prime real estate. One of the advantages is we have always said, we are the heart of the university. What I mean strategically located. When you are strategically located you also have square footage in space that is valuable. It is not uncommon for administration to ask, well, now with the digital environment, what are you going to do. Four years ago we begin a process, Alice begin slowly working with certain departments, certain disciplines. One of the first things we accomplished, Andy, do you remember when were talking about electronic journals moving from print for Chemistry to the electronic environment, and the Chemistry Department worked with us and said, yes, we wanted to move totally towards that. That's an example. I asked Alice to refresh my memory a lot goes on and also I delegated this and Alice is involved with this daily. But for example, three years ago Barb Floyd was the subject liaison that worked with the History Department and a critical assessment was done of History. I have asked her over the past two and a half years to begin to speed that process up. Julia Martin, has worked with the College of Business, Mike, I think Julia talked about Economics with you or was going to. So we have librarians who are reaching out with Alice being the point person. Ruth, I know you and Linda had a meeting recently to talk about the type of resources we have and print collections. Ruth and I worked together on many things. She has a heart, she thinks from the heart. She believes strongly at what she does. So our challenges as we started to work with faculty and acknowledge the strong feelings that faculty and disciplines have about print collections. But also we're not able to give you the perfect 100 percent panacea approach. What we do is we adapt. We put out a basic operating principle, again, these are not 100 percent foolproof, but you have to have a starting point. One of the things Alice was doing as these conversations are going on with the departments is to go ahead and say, has it circulated in the last ten years. That's just a numeric thing, in other words, has it been checked out. We have a lot of things that haven't been checked out or maybe once in 45 years. One of the things across the nation that is noted in the literature is the fact that many institutions do not have a depository, an off-site depository for those type of resources, journals and monographs that aren't used very frequently. We are fortunate that in Ohio we have a regional depositary, we have one right in Perrysburg. We have a 24-hour turnaround.

Senator Hoblet: I just wanted to be very clear that as a faculty member, if you use only checking out materials as an index for assessment, it may be very misleading because I use the library and I will spend hours in the library pulling texts off shelves, I will use those texts and never check them out. And I am not alone, I give my students library lists that I have used in the years past and this is an issue because I send them on a scavenger hunt, never to check out a text but to look at some collections or some publications that are key to their education. This spring when I send them out, many of the texts have disappeared. That to me is a travesty, and we don't know what is going and how to replace it, especially when I don't have an E-list of the things that have been removed from collections. I think that's very important for us. Also, can we have more information on the assessment of our libraries particularly from faculty stand point in knowing how valuable those libraries are to our students.

V. Provost Gaboury: Absolutely. That's why I mentioned Alice to you. She is the one that is charged as the collection development librarian to conduct these assessments and to reach out to department chairs. I am not sure of the library liaison she worked with, but there have been various contacts. She hasn't worked with every department yet, but she has been moving on this process to do that.

Senator Thompson-Casado: It may be helpful if we had a book review of which departments will be allotted space wise. Perhaps there are some departments that like certain things

electronically, perhaps those of us in literature really need to have certain aspects of the collection on paper.

V. Provost Gaboury: Sara Lundquist isn't here but I see Sara walking out from the Library with armloads, and I know certain disciples use physical collections more than other disciplines. What I am about to show you is that our goal is to have a blend that the print collections are not devalued the kind of collections that aren't utilized. And there is no panacea for this. As Ruth know, we have worked together many years, I'm open to variations, options, I agree with you that each discipline has some uniqueness to it. I want to take you real quick through the presentation, we take our program statement and actually visualize what we want to do with space,

Senator Dowd: I think the Senate should be aware of the fact that starting in January 2009 Dean Gaboury decided that the library would no longer accept Ph.D. dissertations or master's theses. Though he is an *ex officio* member of Graduate Council, never informed Graduate Council of his decision and as far I as know he has never sought faculty input about that decision.   Even when Graduate Council voted to move to electronic theses and dissertations, Dean Gaboury stated that the library will have nothing to do with such documents regardless of whether they are in paper form or electronic form. I mention this because I would like the university community to understand that one of the pillars that these changes to the Library is based on is the simple fact that the Library has turned its back on the intellectual legacy of this university --- the dissertations and theses written by our students. Our dissertations and theses are being submitted to Ohio Link and Proquest, and that's fine. But the Graduate Council has had to turn to the office of Information Technology in an attempt to establish a local repository for these document because Library now refuses to accept them. If the office of Information Technology is now acting as a library, what is the Library becoming?

V. Provost Gaboury: This is what is done nationally, what is done by every major research library not only in Ohio. Go to the ETD's website.

Senator Dowd: They have a repository for such documents.

V. Provost Gaboury: You have lost your argument in that. The faculty and the Graduate Council voted to go electronically.

Senator Dowd: I am not talking about paper documents versus electronic documents. Instead, I am talking about how the Graduate Council voted to establish a repository with the office of Information Technology because the Library decided to not accept dissertations and theses.

V. Provost Gaboury: No they didn't. Have a committee look at it, and get your information correct.

Senator Dowd: No, that statement is absolutely wrong. Please check the minutes from the Graduate Council meeting to verify that it voted to establish a repository for dissertations and theses elsewhere because you decided that the Library would no longer hold the intellectual legacy of this university.

President Barrett: We are in overtime, people are leaving. We are going to have to have you come back. We have a very busy schedule for the next meeting and we are not going to bring him in then, but the meeting immediately after spring break should work. If you have questions about the library, email them to me and I will forward them to John, so that John can give a full summary of those issues when he comes back. John, do you want to wrap it up?

V. Provost Gaboury: Just quickly, the HSC when looking at the 5th floor of Mulford Library and Dowling, the seating capacity, the sports technology you will see that we have three concepts that we are using for any changes we are doing in facilities on both campuses. We have had feedback from students that it is important to have different zones of quiet. When you have technology, it's very noisy. What you see to the left of the screen is the Information Commons. In the center a collection and stacks that serve as a sound buffer. Then we have the second zone that is quieter but not ultra quiet. At Mulford Library we have the 6th floor and two very long areas. Three years ago Dr. Gold gave us money to convert one of those to ultra quiet study research area. We are going to replicate that on the other side. At Carlson, we are looking at all the journals that are on the 2nd floor will go totally digital. All the bound journals will be removed over the next six months. The Information Commons was too good of a success. They need additional space to be able to utilize

technology so we are looking at virtual computer spaces, but more importantly to provide collaborative learning classroom spaces that we have a strong need for.

Senator Jorgensen: This seems like a major shift in library. We just got additional classroom space in the Field House, why do we need to lose space in the library for classrooms when we have other rooms that can be classrooms?

V. Provost Gaboury: This is open space. If you have a better suggestion let me know.

Senator Jorgensen: Did a faculty committee talk to you about this topic in the planning? Our department was asked which of thousands of books do you want to get rid of. It's good we were asked, but we had no idea this was part of a plan to shift more classrooms to the library. I am in the Faculty Senate and never heard about it until we got an email in our department about getting rid of books.

V. Provost Gaboury: Books have not been removed from this floor. This was print journals.

Senator Jorgensen: There has been a major shift in the workings for the library and removing books. And the Faculty Senate doesn't know about it. That's the point I wanted to make.

V. Provost Gaboury: Okay. On the 5th floor, I asked Barbara Floyd to put in a proposal to the Women in Philanthropy, those of you who have been on the 5th floor know the quality of the carpeting in the Study and Research Space on the 5th floor. What we are proposing is the original tables go back many years that we protect and preserve and recognize what classical libraries were. This is an example of that. Then on the 5th floor to go ahead and enhance the gallery that we have there, The Canaday Center, and also to create, you heard me mention the zones, we are looking at repurposing that floor with ultra quiet scholarship study and research area similar to what we have done here. The one thing we have heard from students, we have all that technology but they still need that classical ultra quiet study and research space.

Senator Hottell: When you comeback I hope you will address that the faculty need quiet place too. So with your plan, we are losing those, right?

V. Provost Gaboury: Yes, because they weren't used.

Senator Hottell: So there is no plan to have it elsewhere for us?

V. Provost Gaboury: No. And it wasn't recommended by my library committee, because of little or no use.

Senator Barnes: For a few years I sat on the Faculty Senate Library Committee, is that still in existence?

V. Provost Gaboury: Yes, and these plans were shared with them.

Senator Barnes: Do you know who is on it?

V. Provost Gaboury: I'm sorry I don't remember.

Senator Dowd: I am the chair of Faculty Senate's Committee on Committees. I don't think the Faculty Senate has a Library Committee. At least I do not recall our committee appointing anyone to the Library Committee.

V. Provost Gaboury: I'm sorry, it's a University committee. We meet on a monthly basis.

Senator Jorgensen: Are there any faculty members on it? If you meet on a monthly basis who are the faculty we should be talking to?

President Barrett: John, if you will give that to me, I will distribute it to the Senate.

Senator Regimbal: How much of that will be done between now and spring break, books are being moved, and spaces are being changed. How much of that will continue?

V. Provost Gaboury: Alice is still working with the departments. Understand that as far as assessing the collection whether we are moving in this direction or not, the charge I gave her was to take the critical assessment of the collection and the viability and the use of the collections. If we weren't even doing this, Alice would still be working with the departments because for three decades we never did an assessment of the collections, so, Celia, that needs to be done regardless. From that aspect it's time that we did it.

Senator Rouillard: Remember this is not just for our students, the University is supposed to support our research and I am not hearing of a lot of attention being given to how we support faculty research. I am seeing a scientific model where the information isn't five minutes old, then it needs to go to a depositary. And in Humanities that's not how we work.

President Barrett: There is obviously more to discuss on the subject, we are well over our time. Should I move Logie, Scarborough and McMillen to a later meeting and bring John back? Can I have a show of hands?

The Executive Committee will look at what's going on on the budget front to see if there are critical issues and then we will make a judgment call.

VII.   *Adjournment:*   Meeting adjourned at 6:10 pm.

 Is there a motion to adjourn?
 Motion was made and seconded.

Respectfully submitted,

Nick Piazza   Tape summary: Kathy Grabel
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary   Faculty Senate Office Administrative
                                                                       Secretary