
HIGHLIGHTS

Dr. Kay Patten Wallace, VP Student Affairs
Dr. Patricia Metting, Co-chair, Academic Honors Committee
Reception for DUPs

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, Brickman, Caruso, Chiarelott, Coventry, Crosetto, Denyer, Dowd, Dupuy, Elmer, Fink, Fournier, Heberle, Hoblet, Horan, Hornbeck, Hottell, Humphrys, Jenkins, Jorgensen, Kennedy, Kistner, Lee, Marco, McSweeny, Metting, Moore, Nandkeolyar, Niamat, Oliver, Peseckis, Piazza, Plenefish, Powers, Randolph, Regimbal, Rouillard, Sheldon, Skeel, Teclehaimanot, Wolff,

Excused absences: Barden, Giovannucci, Gunning, Grothaus, Laux, LeBlanc, Nims, Olson, Shriner, Thompson-Casado, Tietz, Wedding,

Unexcused absences: Ankele, Duggan, Malhotra, Solocha,

A quorum was present.

II. Approval of Minutes: Minutes of 9/15/09 meeting 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 9/29/09

First, I would like to call your attention to a new item on the agenda: we request that everyone please set his or her cell phone to vibrate. I also want to apologize in advance for a somewhat long report today.

With regard to updating past matters:

- 1) For an update on H1N1 on campus, I yield the floor to Dr. Gold.

Provost Gold: There is a relatively small number of students with influenza-like illness being seen on the Main Campus and a significantly larger number of patients in our Emergency Department. That number is about 4 to 6 to 8 a day. Those students are in residence hall or their homes, and not in class, cafeterias, etc. We have not received shipment of the H1N1 vaccines. Small amount of seasonal vaccine are still available. More information is available on the website, utoledo.edu/fluprep.

President Barrett:

- 2) I am pleased to announce that the Board of Trustees has approved adding a faculty representative to each of the board committees that does not presently have one, except for the Trusteeship Committee. As you know, president of FS already serves on the Academic Affairs Committee. At present, the Board is developing a process for selecting the new representatives. The FSEC feels it would be appropriate for Faculty Senate to make recommendations for these posts, so when we get to action items, we will consider a proposed process for doing so.
- 3) I have received a stack of contracts for administrators who received bonuses last year, so if there is a desire to do so, we can entertain any suggestions for dealing with these when we get to items from the floor. However, since the AAUP has already requested these documents as well, and administrative compensation is not explicitly within Senate purview, we may wish to see what AAUP is planning to do first.
- 4) The misconduct policy is about to be posted. There is a significant change from the Main Campus past practice since the results of an investigation are no longer going to go to the entire Research Council for review. However, I personally examined a significant number of policies from other universities and our proposed policy fits squarely within the best practices employed by top-level research institutions across the country. The process remains faculty driven until the final disposition of the case, which is left to the provost, with the entire composition of both the inquiry committee and the investigation committee being tenured faculty members, including mandatory representation from Research Council. Jim Trempe will be at the next senate meeting to discuss the policy in more detail.
- 5) With regard to administrator assessment, Pres. Jacobs made a proposal that I would like to outline for you. He also gave an overview of this at last week's board meeting. Pres. Jacobs has agreed to come to our next meeting to discuss his idea in more detail, so we have a couple of weeks to think about it. The current proposal is to review all deans with sufficient years in office, the provosts, the president and all the Senior VPs. However, instead of doing an internal assessment, Pres. Jacobs would like to use a top tier national firm with which he has neither significant connections nor past dealing. The assessment is to be formative rather than summative, and reports and conclusions are to be shared with appropriate faculty constituencies. I have since talked with him about this proposal and he is willing to discuss an internal assessment as an alternative.
- 6) The Committee on Committees has been appointed and will be populating all the other senate committees in the coming weeks. Thank you all for sending in your preferences. We also have a few university committees with openings, and once FSEC finds out the exact number of open spots, we will proceed with filling them as well.
- 7) Audited financials will be ready in mid-October, so we will be having Scott Scarborough back at the end of October for a more in-depth report.
- 8) Remember, FS is co-hosting a reception for the DUPs after this meeting and a getting to Professor Workshop on Oct. 16.

With regard to some new matters:

- 1) It is my hope that Faculty can take more of a proactive role in finding ways to better the University rather than constantly being in a reactive mode. That is why we have two other action items for you to consider: the creation of an ad hoc committee to find ways to bring the cultures of our two campuses together (possibly through such things as brown bag lunches on each campus highlighting teaching and research innovations from the other campus); and the creation of an ad hoc committee to examine challenges currently confronting the university and potential solutions.

Admittedly, this second one may be large enough to merit subdividing into sub-committees.

- 2) Purely as an informational matter, I wanted to let you know the board authorized the implementation of furloughs for all faculty and staff in the event the university finds itself in a deficit.
- 3) Also as an informational matter, I have been told that some of you may have errors in the report UT sends to STRS about your contributions to STRS. The person I heard about this from had been on sabbatical and although UT paid STRS, the report sent to STRS indicated this person had not been employed here. Apparently, payroll is working to correct this, and I have no idea how many people it applies to, but it is something I thought you should know about and that you may want to keep an eye on.
- 4) Another matter of note is that Pres. Jacobs is contemplating the creation of a new strategic plan. As this develops, we want to make sure there is significant and broad based faculty involvement in the process.
- 5) FSEC is diligently dealing with each of the log items we receive, either by sending it to committee, asking someone to come to senate to give a report or dealing with it directly. I would like to mention a couple of these log items in particular.
 - a. Someone requested anonymously that students receiving exam accommodations because of their disabilities have a notation placed on their transcripts that accommodations were received. Without regard to the merits of this proposal, I made several inquiries about it, and although the matter is not 100% settled, to do so is likely illegal. As such, I have no intention of sending this to committee for discussion on the merits unless I am instructed to do so by Senate.
 - b. Someone has suggested that we form a committee to look at UT's potential role in a relationship with the gaming industry in Ohio. Since there is no present committee that seems applicable, I would be happy to entertain a motion from the floor to form such a committee when we get to Items from the Floor.

I now wish to turn to the matter that has been keeping me up at night since our last meeting. I fear I am not up to the task before me as neither a politician nor a great orator, but I feel the matter merits discussion and so I will press forward and I hope you will forgive me for the awkwardness of my comments. I wish to talk about the role Faculty Senate, and faculty more broadly, should play in the coming years to move the University of Toledo forward. My comments are not meant to offend but rather to state where I think we are at this point and to state the path I believe we should take.

I believe that the University of Toledo has pockets of greatness but is not nearly the university it can become. I also believe that the vast majority of us- faculty, staff and administrators- are willing to work quite hard to make this university all that it can be. Finally, I believe that the faculty, with our intelligence, creativity and depth and breadth of knowledge are the single greatest resource this university has and that every time a major decision is made that does not include us, an opportunity to make a better, more creative decision is lost. So how do we maximize our contribution to this university? To answer that I think we must first look at the tools we have at our disposal to make ourselves heard.

With regard to legal authority to force our way into the decision making process, the board has made quite clear that we have none.

Obviously, we have the power of the demos. As a large constituency, we can censure, condemn, vote no confidence and take other actions to rile up ourselves and those around us. This is a powerful tool, but it is a destructive one as well. While I understand there are times we must use every means at our disposal, including this one, to stop the university from going down a disastrous path, I suggest to you that we should think long and hard before invoking it. Every time we take such actions we do more than just condemn a leader or a decision. We also cast our

university in a negative light locally and in the academic community generally. We present ourselves to the world as a house divided against itself- unsure of its direction and purpose. So, while we must be ever willing to use this power, we should not rush to embrace it.

Finally, we have the power of persuasion. We are smart, creative and knowledgeable- surely we can make strong, reasoned, persuasive arguments for the positions we advocate. I hope for the day when every significant decision at this university is based upon consultation between faculty and the administration; where faculty input is actively sought because it is understood that we are a great resource for this school and that better decisions get made when we are included in their formulation. I believe this is the best avenue we have to build a better university, but in order for it to work, those with legal authority must include us in the decision making process. But how do we get the administration to listen to us?

Demanding a seat at the table works if you have legal authority, and it may also be accomplished by invoking the power of the demos, but will we really be heard? I think we all know that getting a chance to speak is not the same as being listened to. Who amongst us listens to someone we consider a thorn in our side? When we categorically condemn a course of action or make personal attacks on those who make presentations to us, we appear unruly and disrespectful, and I suspect we make it harder for those in positions of authority to listen to us when we have good ideas.

In order to be listened to, you must have a relationship of mutual respect and trust. However, these take time to build, and missteps will be made along the way, so part of the difficulty lies in how to react to decisions we disagree with while we are trying to build such a relationship. There is little doubt that this administration has done things that many of us disagree with, and that they have made misguided decisions at times because we were not brought into the decision making process. But that is not really the issue before us at this time. If we want to build a better university, we must act with restraint, and work to establish avenues of dialogue upon which trust and respect can be built. But if such a relationship is impossible with those in control, all that will be left to us is our power of condemnation, with all its limitations.

So, I posit that we are at a cross-roads. Shall we bite our tongues and endure certain decisions we disagree with so that we can try the power of persuasion or shall we condemn and censure decisions that are already made with full knowledge that in doing so we will not have our voices heard in the decision-making process and that we harm the university by our actions as well?

While I believe that we must all follow our own conscience in such matters, I assert that this is a decision we must make as a group, that no one of us should choose the path that will affect all of us. As such, I hope we can all respect the wisdom of the group, even if we disagree with it.

As for me, I believe we should try to work with the administration to build a better relationship. I do not reach this conclusion naively; I have not “drunk the Koolaid”. I understand the limitations of this administration and the frustrations a number of us have with it and its past practices. I come to my conclusion based on assessing where we are and the fact that I see no viable alternative.

Since I joined UT in the mid-90s, from my perspective the faculty on the main campus has never had a very good working relationship with the administration. If there was a golden era, it was before my time. That being said, I think significant progress has been made in the last few years. We now have faculty back on all the board committees but one. FSEC and the FS President meet regularly with top administrators and are increasingly giving input into the decision making process. The Senior VPs have all been encouraged by Dr. Jacobs to include faculty whenever they are putting groups together to form new policies or procedures. But much remains to be done. Too many decisions have been announced to us rather than formed in consultation with us. I also believe the administration is trying to make UT the best it can be, even though I don't always agree with how they are trying to do it. These are hard working, professional people that you can negotiate with. I'm not saying I always get my way in a negotiation with them, but if you come prepared, with data, with evidence of how other successful institutions handle similar issues, with persuasive arguments, they will listen and compromise. In my opinion, these are people we can work with.

Equally important, they seem to have the strong backing of the board, so if we choose the other course, we will likely fail and further erode our credibility.

Some of you may argue, "Enough already. We have tried to work with them and it has not worked." I agree that mistakes have been made and problems still exist between the faculty and the administration, but has the administration broken faith with us to the point that we should no longer try to work with them? Has the proverbial "straw broken the camel's back?" If it has, then we are left with no choice but to condemn and censure. But I do not think we have reached that point. There may come a time when I must embrace this alternative, and if so, I will not shy away from it, but for now I would choose the other path. I see improvement- greater access for faculty to the board and to decision making bodies; growing trust and respect between those of us that work with each other; and I foresee the other approach failing anyway so the risks of my proposed course of action seem minimal.

So, if you agree with my suggestion, how are we to make things better? All of us must be part of making UT all that I know it can become. This cannot be accomplished by a few of us negotiating in back rooms. The process must be open, transparent and inclusive. First, the FSEC will continue to advocate for the interests of faculty and for greater access to and inclusion in the decision making process. Second, senate must use its time and its visitors to gather data concerning the challenges and opportunities facing this university and then we must develop concrete proposals to bring to the administration for meeting them. We must break from the cycle of responding negatively to decisions that have already been made and spend our time formulating input into the decisions that are being made. And we must treat our guests with decorum and respect. However, I believe we must also look at restructuring ourselves and how we operate so that there is a time and place for critical, reflective debate and discussion- a space where we can confront the hard issues with a view towards providing constructive feedback. Finally, we as a faculty must be ready to bring our ideas and creativity to bear on solving the problems we encounter every day. If you encounter something that doesn't work at UT, don't complain about it, think of a way to fix it, and then call the administrator who handles that area and share your idea. If you an expert in a subject matter, volunteer to work with a committee that can use your expertise.

If you do this, I think you will be shocked at how receptive the administration will be to your offer of help and your ideas. And if we all do this, not only will it be impossible for the administration to ignore faculty input, not only will the board and administration realize what a powerful positive force we are for this university, but also we will build something amazing here at the University of Toledo.

I apologize for droning on so long, but this is a critical issue. We must decide the role we wish to play in this university for the foreseeable future.

I now yield the floor to Provost Haggett for the provost's report, after which we can discuss these matters as items from the floor.

Provost Haggett: Thank you, John, for those remarks. Let me start by saying that I am absolutely delighted that you will be recognizing our six newest distinguished university professors (DUPs) this afternoon: Karen Bjorkman, Vijay Goel, Blair Grubb, Joan Kaderavek, Alan Pinkerton, Ron Viola. You make us proud to be your colleagues and it's wonderful to see their recognition and to share their accomplishments. They join seven others for a total of thirteen distinguished university professors right now. I do want to point out that a call for nominations for this year's class of DUPs went out to the University community by email on September 18th. In case you missed it, there was University wide email that went out and we are calling for nominations for distinguished university professors again. Nominees can be brought forward by any tenured member of the university faculty. There are no self-nominations, so please think about your colleagues who deserve this level of recognition and consider putting together a nomination packet for your colleagues. They are due by December 11th. What happens after you nominate someone, there is a seventeen-member committee chaired by vice-provosts Metting and Gaboury, and that committee will review the nominations and they are asked to recommend up to five individuals to Provost Gold and myself. There can be up to five more people named as distinguished university professor. If we do this, that will top us out; that will fill all the available

slots. How the slots become available, by people retiring or leaving the institution. Over the years we've added several slots, right now we have up to five individuals that could be named.

I was planning on talking about the H1N1 flu, but Provost Gold already mentioned that. I want to thank the Faculty Senate for your endorsement of the relaxed attendance policy. We do want students to stay away from class if they do get sick, at least 24-hours since they had fever. You can help us by talking to your students in your classes about the policy and tell them that the H1N1 is the same as the swine flu. We think that some students haven't made that connection yet. If you noticed in *The Independent Collegian* they asked if the students were going to get the H1N1 vaccination, and two of them said, 'I don't know what that is.' While the Faculty Senate has endorsed this policy, it remains every faculty's decision as to how they handle that in the class. So it's a partnership here. We need students to not take advantage of this attendance policy and we need faculty to work with them and we need and appreciate your support in that.

We are recruiting for two positions, one is assistant vice-provost for UT Learning Ventures. Last time I spoke with you I shared some information about this new organizational structure that combines the former Center for Teaching and Learning and the former Distance Learning Organization into a new structure we are calling the University of Toledo Learning Ventures. We will have an internal search. On September 16, I sent an email asking for nominations and applications for this position. I realize I have been criticized for adding another administrator but I do want to point out that we are actually getting rid of an administrator so it's from two people to one. We really do need a faculty member to step up and take on this role, it's an incredibly important role. We are looking for a tenured faculty member who is an associate or full professor, and if you will indulge me for a minute, let me read what the position description says: 'This position will supervise Learning Ventures division and support staff including a director and administrative director; oversee consultants and other internal and external partnerships; manage budgets and oversee activities of the education incubator and classroom academic support operations and services; establishes and oversee training and support for the design and development of online classroom structure; supports the creation and support of instructional materials for all types of instructions; insures an effective and efficient support service for faculty teaching online and other delivery approaches; supports the assessments and teaching effectiveness of online, blended and hybrid instructions; supports applications for external funding of university online blended program initiatives; oversees activities associated with the Center for Teaching and Learning and collaborates with other faculty support offices and represents the university in various on and off campus groups.' So, the responsibility is fairly large, but I know there are faculty, perhaps some of you in this room, who would be interested in taking on this leadership position. This position is designed to report to me and the person can come from anywhere across the campus. Several people have expressed interest in the position and applications are due on October 9th.

Couple of other comments, the student observer program will continue in the UT Learning Ventures. In fact, we have reallocated resources to double the budget for that program. Jeff Jablonski last week sent out an announcement that program continues and if you or your colleagues are interested in having a student observer come to your class, just contact Jeff to get more information and make those arrangements. I also want to mention that the Learning Venture staff are all moving to the Education Incubator on October 16th. This is the third floor in the Memorial Field House. Somebody told me today that you can't go up there. You absolutely can go up there, I encourage you to go up there. That's where the instructional designers are and they are there to help the faculty, to work and partner with you with your courses. Remember, faculty have direct access to instructional designers, they are housed in the Education Incubator. We are hoping to have extended hours. Now it is 8:00-5:00 operation and we are looking to have it extended to 8:00-8:00 operation.

I believe the Faculty Senate is aware that in the spring of last year the Board of Trustees approved the establishment of the School of Solar and Advanced Renewable Energy. We are recruiting for a dean for this school. This school has its focus on solar and advanced renewable energy. I would hope that everyone in this room would agree with me that this is one of the pinnacles of excellence here at this institution. People in Columbus last week would come up to me and ask what we are doing in solar. We are looking for a respected recognized leader with a demonstrated record either in academia, business or public service that has the credentials that can take our solar efforts to the next level. In the meantime, Nina McClelland has agreed to assume the additional responsibility of an interim dean of the school. She will be very happy if we move quickly to identify someone to take over this responsibility.

I had several people who inquired in my office about what used to be called the Program for Academic Excellence, Provost Gold and I renamed it the Strategic Enhancement Awards. We did not have that program last year because there was insufficient funding to do that. We are working on a revised call for proposals for these awards and we hope that we will have that out to you soon. We do intend to have a call for proposals for the Strategic Enhancement Awards to support faculty efforts that will align with the Strategic Plan and will add value to the academic programs of this institutions.

In closing, I want to thank the Faculty Senate for continuing the initiative started in my office the *Getting to Professor* workshop that will take place on October 16th and it's wonderful to see that continuing. I will be glad to take questions.

Senator Anderson: Can you say more about the structure of the School of Renewed Energy?

Provost Haggett: We debated whether this would be a dean or a director and the dean sounded like a better academic term. But really the way this is structured, this is a school that starts with existing faculty. The faculty having appointments both in the school as well as with their home departments. So you can probably imagine some of the people will more likely be part of the School of the Solar and Advanced Renewable Energy. We have three faculty positions that we are recruiting for, positions that are matching commitments in an Ohio Research Scholars Program grant that we got two years ago. Those individuals we hire both with an appointment in the school and back into their home department, be it Physics or Electrical Engineering or somewhere else. We will start the school that way. There is no presently curriculum in the school. We would probably start with the PhD program.

Senator Barnes: I need a clarification on the H1N1, is it airborne?

Provost Haggett: I think Provost Gold mentioned, it's airborne and droplets, so sneezing and coughing and if you got it on your hands and touch the handrail, the next person who touches the handrail could get it. That's why we are trying to keep sick people home. Thank you.

President Barrett: We will now entertain items from the floor.

Senator Jorgensen: First of all, thank you for you comments. I would agree with you on the vast majority of the comments that you made. I would agree with you that we should be civil and in terms of not pulling out all the stops at the present time. But I would disagree slightly on the past relations between the faculty and the administration. For the two recent presidents had excellent relationships with the faculty, Bill Decatur and Dan Johnson. Both respectfully listened to the faculty who were on Board committees at that time. In recent years we took a step backwards. First, I want to ask a question and then make a comment. Was the Faculty Senate Executive Committee involved in the development of the blueprint of the Learning Ventures system to changing the learning to this model?

Senator Barlowe: Yes.

Senator Dowd: Maybe Senator Barlowe was involved, but last year's Faculty Senate Executive Committee was not involved in any conversation about the Learning Ventures.

Senator Jorgensen: Relating to your comments about continuing to seek a place for faculty at the table when decisions are made, I agree with you. The ELearning Operation affects a significant majority of faculty and over 10,000 students. I don't know if the new plan is a good

way or not, and this may even be the best plan possible, but it's one that very much affects the academic mission of this institution. I am not aware of any discussion other than the one at the previous Senate meeting that this was going forward. ELearning in the past was part of the library and today it is not. I think the faculty should be at the table discussing this. We are not always at the table and we must be.

President Barrett: I completely agree. We both need to be at the table when decisions are being formulated not after they have been made.

Senator Jorgensen: I refer to comments of the president as reported in The Collegian. I don't know if it's accurate or not, I presume it is. The president said, "The great, great majority of faculty feel they are adequately represented, adequately compensated, and the idea that they are not adequately heard is probably an idea that is held by a relatively small group." I disagree with that. I would agree with your statement that many decisions are made without faculty. I think this calls for the a process which is in our Constitution regarding the evaluation of the administration and the phrase is, "To facilitate bi-annual formative assessments of the provosts, vice provost(s) and deans..." That is our responsibility. The president's is not mentioned but we should be evaluating him as well. The Constitution also states: "The Faculty Senate may consider any subject pertaining to the interests of the University to act in the name of the University Faculty in making recommendations to the University Administration on these matters." So I would speak against an external group doing evaluations, that's our responsibility.

President Barrett: Dr. Jacobs will be coming to our next meeting and talk about his proposal for details. He has indicated his willingness to discuss our alternatives. As I read the language in the constitution I may read it not quite as empowering as you do. It says we will "facilitate" assessments, it does not say we will run them or that we control them. I think any assessment process is far more valid to everyone if everybody agrees to going into it, as opposed to we do our assessment he does his assessment. If we can come together on something that is acceptable to everybody, I think that's the best course of action. I think we have to talk to him about that, whether this is internal or external, we should look at the merits of each. There are obviously pros and cons. I have my opinions and I'm sure everyone in this room does as well. But before we close our minds to a particular course of action, let's at least meet at the table and try to discuss it and see if we can find common goals and grounds to create a process that works for everybody.

Senator Barnes: In terms of your comment about the faculty not being reactionary. In your comments you said, let's not be reactionary, let's be involved. The fact is that if the big decisions are handed down, you have no other position but to react to them. When I was on the Faculty Senate Exec. Committee, I said repeatedly that this is an inefficient process. It has been inefficient and it continues to be inefficient; even if we ultimately make our case to get a policy changed, it's terribly inefficient and sometimes very costly to students. I think the frustration is around the fact that we didn't create that environment, but it impacts us.

President Barrett: You are absolutely correct if all we hear is decisions that have been made. All we can do is react. My point was to suggest that we are hearing more things in formulation phase, we are being included in more. As an Executive Committee, it is our duty to make sure that what we are hearing about comes through to you transparently and in a timely manner so that we can react to it. I, on the other side including information that may be a little at the periphery in my reports. I will continue to do that and hopefully over time, I will get invited to more and more decision making process. I will continue to press for that and so we move out of the reactive process. So you are absolutely right, if all we hear is decisions already made, then that's all you can do.

Senator Regimbal: The comments about an outside group coming in to do evaluations of the administrators reminds me that we, as I remember we had an outside group doing an evaluation in Arts & Sciences, a report was supposed to come forward to have some indication as to what might happened with the dean's search. Do you have some sense as to where we are on that?

Senator Barlowe: I think Provost Haggett might want to respond to that.

Provost Haggett: The report that came from the Learning Alliance, that report was shared across the College of Arts & Sciences. There was a follow up group in early May, there were five recommendations and working groups generated in each of those focus areas. The dean has just sent an email a couple of weeks ago to reconvene and put together implementation plan with a November date.

President Barrett: Any further embellishment?

Senator Barlowe: Sharon and I agree that it's inefficient in many cases not to include faculty or faculty input. John also made that clear. It's also inefficient to try to get all faculty's input into any decision. You elect representatives so that we can have a more efficient process. And the opportunities for input by your representatives have been improving, as John has been trying to tell you and as I said all last year. One obstacle to efficient representation is that there is so much that passes for knowledge and information that is instead misinformation, innuendo and rumor. And when people accept misinformation and rumor as truth, then there is always somebody who will react. I went to a meeting recently where people asked a question of the committee chair, who answered the question by saying, 'I don't know the answer but here is the rumor I heard.' That rumor sufficed for other people in the room as information, and then they all reacted. Part of what happens in a big institution is that people don't always know enough to be proactive and are therefore reactive. What your Senate Executive Committee representatives have been trying to do is to bring as much as much real information to you as possible. That's not always efficient either but at least we are trying and we are at the table representing faculty across the two campuses. Andy asked earlier about the Learning Ventures. I was part of those discussions last year. That information was brought to Senate several times, although the organizational structure was not yet called Learning Ventures. I think if we are a little more careful about distinguishing between what is information and knowledge and what is a rumor and what is somebody's conspiracy, then we probably will do a better job of thinking through these problems in the way that John asks us to do. And, your representatives will be better negotiators.

Senator Heberle: I agree that college representation is complex. There does seem to be restructuring ourselves in some way and talk to each other more in a more formal atmosphere. I do hear rumors and it turns out that the idea that the dean of Arts & sciences is going to be offered a third year, are usually true. With respect to the round table, I don't want to go much discussing it, it's really a good example with the issues to administrative/faculty relations to functioning or not functioning. We did have this Learning Alliance group come in and it's very interesting how the shift from being a review of sort of punishment of the college for voting "No Confidence" in a dean, to being or help us discuss what we were going to do as college. In those discussions most what happened, as far as I'm concerned, we talked about what faculty is already doing in terms of reorganizing new college, relationships and ways of thinking about this college in terms of new identity. This school of solar and renewable energy was created in a year. Faculty have been trying to get the attention of the administrators, Arts & Sciences, the New Collaborative ever since this administration came in to office. And we have not been able to get their attention. Now the round table will probably be a nice place to get that attention. But I fear that it won't be, so in part I'm suggesting and hoping the round table will go forward. I hope the faculty supports much of what is in the round table reports. I'm really thrilled the direction it took was kind of unpredictable. The question than becomes how much will the outcome be affecting the school, because it already has been interrupted by the announcement of this new school. There was no participation by Arts & Sciences faculty or not the college overall. There are some issues there.

Senator Hottell: I would like to call your attention to a problem with the prospect of using an external evaluating commission. In these difficult economic times, many academic areas are severely understaffed. The money that an external commission would cost could be used to hire one and a one-half tenure-track faculty members in one of the underfunded areas.

President Barrett: There is obviously an expense issue and it's appropriate topic for us to think about and discuss. Was your question answered properly?

Senator Heberle: I am still wondering where we are with the dean's search. I thought that the result of this external review was about, and we are now going into a third year with an interim dean.

President Barrett: Provost Haggett, can you add some comments on this interim dean situation in the College of Arts & Sciences?

Provost Haggett: Originally, the plan was to start a dean's search this fall for the College of Arts & Sciences. This search was going to be like the dean's search for The Judith Herb College of Education. It will be a two-phase process. The first phases will be a vision process. I believe the round table discussion will be to create that vision process. I have talked to some of the people in this room whether to have the dean stay for a third year. So this should not be anything new. The Arts & Sciences' Council has discussed this because I brought that to them. Right now the College of Arts & Sciences is going through an anniversary year, a centennial year. My hope is that everyone here will take advantage of the remarkable things the college is doing to celebrate its 100th anniversary. We had a spectacular lecture by Jon Meacham. There will be a whole series of things going on. Please take advantage of these activities. And because of these activities we have not launched the search process. And right now, I would be thrilled if the interim dean would stay another year.

President Barrett: One of the things the Faculty Senate Executive Committee has talked with the Provost on a number of occasions is whether we should develop a general policy with regard to interim positions and how quickly they ought to be filled, and I think it would be a very appropriate topic for discussion at Faculty Senate in terms do we have recommendations and feelings on that point.

Senator Sheldon: Another thing to consider is that the University College struggled with an interim dean who didn't even have the faculty rank for eight years. So, A&S should come to us in five more years.

Senator Dowd: I would like to get back to the original question and comments raised by Senators Jorgensen, Barnes and Regimbal regarding the external evaluation of the provosts and the deans. I am just going to provide some facts for context to that discussion. In terms of chronology, during one of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee's Thursday morning meetings with the President and Provosts, Faculty Senate President Barrett noted that senators had suggested that Faculty Senate conduct an evaluation of the provosts and deans that have not been evaluated in two years. It was only after the Executive Committee notified the administration of these evaluations did President Jacobs announce to the Board of Trustees that he wanted to hire an external firm to conduct such evaluations. Further, at that Board meeting, President Jacobs did not indicate to the Board that Faculty Senate had already informed him of our plans to conduct those evaluations. To get to Senator Barnes' point, I don't know what President Jacobs' motivation was and I don't know if it is just a coincidence, but it appears that as soon as Faculty Senate started to be proactive about evaluations, President Jacobs announced to the Board of Trustees that he wanted such evaluations to be conducted by an external firm.

President Barrett: We have one more speaker for the day and a couple of action items and also the reception, so I want to move on but I want to ask if there are other items from the floor. Feel free to look it up in the minutes or in my report by next meeting. So turning in to the action items. First one, and they are all from the Executive Committee so they don't need a motion.

President Barrett: We have one more speaker for the day and a couple of action items and also the reception, so I want to move on but I want to ask if there are other items from the floor. Feel free to look it up in the minutes or in my report by next meeting. So turning in to the action items. First one, and they are all from the Executive Committee so they don't need a motion.

1. Resolution to create ad hoc committee to find ways to bring the cultures of the Main Campus and Health Science Campus together.

This committee would be populated by the Committee on Committees. Any discussion? All in favor? “Aye.” Opposed? “Nay” *Motion passes.*

Second action item:

2. Resolution to create an ad hoc committee to explore challenges confronting the university and potential solutions.

Given the discussion today, this might also include looking at restructuring and better ways in communication within the Senate as well. Any discussion?

Senator Heberle: This is too vague. To me it would be a waste of breath. I don’t mean to be insulting, but to explore challenges confronting the university, it sounds like a paper for a grad student. Can the Executive Committee tell us what the discussion was like and how can we be more specific?

President Barrett: This is something I suggested and by the time we got to this item at our last Executive Committee meeting a number of people had to leave so we did not have a robust discussion. With that being said, I deliberately left it vague because my vision was let’s get a committee together and let them decide how they want to proceed. They might want to create a sub-committee to see how Faculty Senate might be improved. They might want to look at communication with administration on certain issues. They might want to look at attracting students and what makes us more distinctive. I could come up with fifty different things to populate challenges and opportunities that confront this university, but I didn’t want to put just one of those forward because I don’t know that’s the one most important one or one the faculty might want to focus on. So my thought was to hand this over to a group and let them delegate to others specific tasks as they see those percolating up. But the notion was we need to take some sort of step to become more proactive and break out of the cycle of always just sitting here, reacting to what’s being given to us, and that may require restructuring the Senate. I don’t know, but we need to put somebody on the task to look at it, I don’t have the time to do it and with all my responsibilities, so that was my thought.

Senator Heberle: I will just speak briefly, there was a committee that tried to come forward to bring ways to talk about challenges in college and to bring out affirmative and positive ways and working with them and trying to figure out how to speak to the community about what’s going on at U.T. in an affective voice that would make sense to the community and also put a little more pressure on the administration and to encourage them to work with us. That committee sort of faded out. It was a great experience while it lasted. It was just faculty coming together and talking.

President Barrett: Other comments on this issues? All those in favor? “Aye.” Opposed? “Nay.” *Motion passes.*

Final action item:

3. Resolution to approve process for FS to make recommendations for the faculty positions on the board committees (FSEC to form list of recommendations then bring to FS for approval/modification);

This obviously would exclude Academic Affairs which presently has the Faculty Senate on it. The proposal is that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee would form a list of recommendations to bring forward to the Faculty Senate for approval or modification with nominations from the floor being acceptable. Any discussion? All those in favor? “Aye.” Opposed? “Nay.” *Motion passes.*

With that I will now call on Dr. Kaye Patten Wallace for a report on the Student Affairs restructuring and how students’ needs are being met.

Dr. Kaye Patten Wallace: Good afternoon. The purpose of this presentation is to give you a scope of the functions within the Division of Student Affairs, an overview of our restructuring and our focus for this year.

Click on this icon to view the full power point presentation.



\\
fss00cv02.utad.utole

Our figures for fall show that our student make-up is almost 19,000 undergraduate students, with an average age of 22.6 and just over 4,000 graduate students. Of our new undergraduates which includes Direct from High School and transfer students, almost half live on campus and half live off campus. To give you a snapshot of our campus living, we have nine residence halls, fourteen fraternity and sorority houses and we are currently housing 4,266 students and of those 74% are first-year undergraduates. It's also important to give a sense of our campus involvement. We have almost 300 student organizations, there are over 15,000 students using the Recreation Center per week, and the Student Union has over 28,000 students going through there per week. In restructuring the division of Student Affairs our goals were several,

- To increase efficiency,
- To improve customer service,
- To improve integration and seamlessness of services,
- To address fiscal stringencies that we were facing,
- With ultimate goal of improving retention,

When we looked at efficiency, we looked at cross-divisional functions and what we found is we had the same function in multiple areas. In most of these cases, we combined those functions so we have just one area with combined resources. To give you an example, we had student leadership programs in multiple areas, we now have an office of Student Leadership and that office works together with staff across campus to address student leadership. Another example, when we have functions on weekends such as dances and other social events, it's important that we have professional staff members at each one of these events. In the past we had three or four staff members who were responsible for staffing those events. Now, every professional staff member in the division is responsible for being in that rotation.

The other thing we are doing is asking staff to work across the division, so rather than being just singularly focused in their unit, we are asking them to work across the division in teams bringing together to work collaboratively to provide services to students.

Now, I want to talk about our goals, our focus this year is on student success and so in restructuring and moving forward our goal is to improve student success. I think it's important to point out that this is a collaborative initiative that involves UTLC as well as Student Affairs, we also work closely with faculty in terms of the beginning of the academic journey courses. I want to talk to you about a few of these initiatives. One is the Rocket 2 Rocket peer mentoring program. I am sure you are aware of the Blue and Gold Scholarship or the UT Guarantee for students from urban areas who have at least 3.0 GPA. The scholarship provides for tuition and fees. The Rocket 2 Rocket is a support structure to assist those students to be successful. Each one of these students has been matched with an upper class student, and the upper class student mentors have been matched with a faculty and staff member to provide support for them. Another initiative is MAP Works (Making Achievement Possible). This initiative is an early alert survey. Every freshman students takes it in the academic journey, the old FIY course and is

required to take a MAP course. MAP Works is designed to identify student issues whether they are academic, resident hall, roommate problems, or loneliness or just problems feeling connected, MAP Works is designed to identify those problems. Again, it is important to point out that this is a cross university initiative. We have hall directors, staff in the UTLC, faculty members and staff across the division who have taken a list of each of these students. MAP Works indicates a status for each student based on their response to survey questions. Green, that means the student is fine, yellow means that they may have some problems, and red alert means a student is in trouble. We are contacting those students with red alert individually to try to find out exactly what the concern is and address it. The focus is on retention, the first ninety days is really critical in students getting involved and getting connected. Another initiative is Living Learning Communities in Residence Halls. Staff in the Residence Life has worked with faculty to create at least three new learning communities this year. We have pre-law and engineering students who are freshmen in Parks Tower, and students in the Health Sciences, living learning community and are in Carter Hall. Alcohol Edu is another initiative. As you know, alcohol is a big problem not only at U.T. but on campuses across the nation. This year we received a grant to participate a study sponsored by Alcohol Edu. This survey is designed to help students distinguish between myth and reality as it relates to underage drinking. That survey is required for all freshmen this year and as part of alcohol awareness week we are going to expand and make that survey available to all students on campus.

Finally, we have expanded the retention focus of the Office of Multicultural Student Services. This is another example where we believe we have increased efficiency. Rather than those offices working individually, the Office of Multicultural Services includes African-American Initiatives, the Latino Initiatives, LGBT and International Services we brought the staff together to work collaboratively and to work with students on an individual basis. For example, students who are identified in the MAP Works as having problems in any area if they fall into one of the programs as African-American Initiative, or Latino Initiative, the staff in those offices call those students and work with students on individual basis. Because the campus climate and student involvement is really the key to student retention, we have also initiated several strategies to get students more involved and connected to U.T. They also provide an opportunity for students to give input. These strategies include Students Speak Forums, which are similar to the Town Hall but different in that they will be more convenient for students. Our initial plan is to have them in evenings, one in the Rec Center, one in the Student Union, and in the Residence Halls, places where large numbers of students congregate. We have also created a Facebook page which allows us to communicate with students. We put issues out there, raise questions, announce activities, etc. things that are important to students. We have established a Student Advisory Board which is largely comprised of presidents of larger student organizations, as well as students who participated in our Divisional retreat this past summer. The purpose of this again is to give students opportunity to give us feedback on key policy issues as it relates to students. Also, I have established weekly office hours every Thursday between 11:00 – 1:00 students can come in without an appointment. I will be attending the Student Senate meetings monthly to give a report and I will also be available at other times. Finally, we have published a pictorial staff directory showing who the students can go to and see for the various services.

Auxiliary Services is another area responsible for providing services to students, such as parking, and Rocket Card. This area is now part of the Division of Student Affairs and the structure brings together the major areas responsible for student customer related issues and services.

- In terms of food service, after next week when the students return from their fall break the students will be able to use their Rocket Dining Card on the Health Science Campus. We are working with a cafeteria over there to work out a meal plan option for students who are from this campus.
- Parking is different on each campus, students who are on the HSC – no change, but the student who have to travel from this campus to the HSC have to meet the parking requirements for both campuses.

- Bus service - one of the challenges will be when the pharmacy building opens up will be the bus service. I met with Christine Hinko recently and she and I will meet with Pat Metting and Chuck Lehnert and so we will have to continue and provide bus service in an adequate manner.
- Counseling services are here on the Main Campus and any graduate or undergraduate student is eligible to use those services free of charge. That won't change.
- Student Recreation – any student can use the Rec Center on this campus or the Morris Center on the HSC.
- Student organizations – any student can create or belong to an organization related to any of their needs. If we don't have one established already, there is a process in place for creating new organization. In terms of location, it doesn't matter which campus. Students will be able to have meetings on both campuses if space is available.

This is something that will be a challenge. I did speak to Susan Batten from the HSC and some of the issues for students who are first or second year students in Pharmacy or Nursing for example, most of their courses are on this campus anyways, so in terms of being able to use the Learning Enhancements Center, or other facilities that are here, it's not a big issue and will be more of an issue for upper classmates, a challenge that we will have to deal with.

I will be happy to take questions now.

Senator Barnes: Thanks for the information. Curious to know where we turn to to deal with students' attendance issues?

VP Patten Wallace: So what you are saying is you have students who are not attending?

Senator Barnes: Yes.

VP Patten Wallace: Right now I would say you send that list to the Dean of Students and copy Peg Traband as well. We are probably catching these students already because they will come up in Red Alert and I will talk to them. But to just be on a safe side, send that list and we will double check it.

Senator Jorgensen: This fall I see signs around businesses where they no longer accept Rocket Cards. Have we removed that from local businesses?

VP Patten Wallace: I am not aware that we have any problems. If you send me the names I will check things out and why there are problems.

Senator Jorgensen: Last Tuesday you had a national speaker on ELearning?

VP Patten Wallace: No. That wasn't us.

Senator Jenkins: Do you have the first year retention rates ?

VP Patten Wallace: 70%. Again, increasing to 80% is an audacious goal, but we will keep working on it.

Senator Anderson: Last year when we instituted the mid-term grading, has that shown any results? Did anyone do any follow-up study on that?

VP Patten Wallace: I am not sure, but I can find out. Thank you.

President Barrett: Right now I am turning it over to Dr. Pat Metting who will introduce the distinguished professors.

Dr. Pat Metting: I am Pat Metting, the co-chair of the Academic Honors Committees and vice-provost on the Health Science Campus. My cohort, John Gaboury, is the other co-chair of the Academic Honors Committee and vice-provost on the Main Campus. On behalf of Provost Gold and Haggett we are delighted to be able to introduce to you this year's newly appointed Distinguished University Professors. There are six and we will have the nominator of each of these nominees come and introduce them and then we hope you will join us in the reception.

Dr. John Gaboury: This is our second year doing this and one thing that we thought of is to have the nominating colleague to come forward and share their information with you to give you a better insight of the individual. I now would like to invite Prof. Kirchhoff please come forward who nominated Alan Pinkerton.

Prof. Jon Kirchhoff: Thank you all, and it's my pleasure being here. I appreciate the opportunity to introduce Alan. Many of you know him. This is a well deserved honor for Alan

and all the other DUP's being honored today and congratulations to all of you. Alan joined the faculty at U.T. in 1984 and he quickly began to establish the department's and the University's reputation in high quality crystallographic measurements. It began in a small room in the south wing of Bowman-Oddy, and later expanded in to the Arts & Sciences instrumentation center when the Ohio Board of Regents designated U.T. as the Center for Excellence for Crystallography in the State. A lot of that was due to Alan's hard work and persistence and as a tribute to him that the Center has been so successful over the years. As the facility grew, so did the recognition that Alan brought to U.T. Researchers from around the world came and are still coming to learn from Alan. His teaching of the art in crystallography is nationally and internationally recognized. I believe one of the examples is one of our former PhD students in Chemistry Department who took crystallography from Alan a number of years ago, was a staff crystallographer for many years at Harvard. After that he was hired by Michigan State to run their facility and built their facility into a high class facility. Alan's standing in the crystallography community also led to the Nobel laureate coming and speaking at U.T. The American Crystallographic Assoc. held an international meeting here in 1991, and his being elected president of both, the American Crystallographic Society, and [Pittsburg\(?\) \(inaudible during taping?\) Society](#). Our department was also able to attract top quality faculty who were either crystallographers themselves or had interest in crystallography. One of those faculty is Dr. Ron Viola whom we are also honoring today. Alan posted 206 peer review articles on a range of topics including the development technique for low temperature crystallography and high pressure crystallography. He has conducted pioneering electric high density studies with implications for energetic materials and rational drug design. As the result of his work, since 1980's his journal articles received an astonishing 3,101 citations. He has been a PI or co-PI in grants who has brought \$6 million to the University and he has received the U.T. Outstanding Researcher Award. He has accomplished most of his work same time he has been a department chair. He has been chair since 1997 has overseen an explosion in enrollment and building the department which he has done twice. Five of the assistant professors recently hired have received Prestigious Career Awards and placed in the department a very high regard in chemistry community. The recognition of Alan as a DUP is well deserved, an honor for him and the University, because it personifies the internationally recognized teaching and research that's being conducted in crystallography at U.T.

Prof. Alan Pinkerton: Thank you Jon, I appreciate those words. This is an award which is a great ego boost. There is nothing better for the ego than hearing that your peers recognize your work. So thank you to the people who recognize it, and thank you to the people who actually did the work. I have to admit that as a chair, I sit in the chair and pretend that my office is an important place but in reality, everyone else is doing the important work. All I get is the recognition. Thank you to all those colleagues who have helped, thank you to the students who have done all the research and thank you to my colleagues for the recognition.

Dr. Gaboury: Next I would like to invite Prof. Scott Lee, nominator of Karen Bjorkman.

Prof. Scott Lee: I would like to say what an honor it is for all of us to have such distinguished colleagues at our University. It is my honor to nominate Karen Bjorkman as a distinguished University professor. Before coming here she was a scientist at the University of Wisconsin at Madison working in the Space Astronomy Lab. While she was there, she worked with two different shuttle flights, space shuttle that went up, did some experiment, and then worked on a council in Houston for discussions on what the astronauts were doing during their flights. Immediately after that she came here to the University of Toledo in 1996 and rapidly moved through the academic ranks and achieved full professor rank. She is outstanding in every regard as far as a professor in teaching, research and service. In 1999 she was selected for a prestigious Cottrell Scholar Award by the Research Corporation. This Award has a person do innovative teaching and innovative research and combine the two to bring new things to the classroom for our students. In 2001 and 2005 she was recognized as a Master Teacher by the College of Arts & Sciences. And in 2008 she was recognized with the Outstanding Teacher Award at the University of Toledo. In research, she has brought more than \$2.2 Million in externally funded grants. During her time here she has 77 refereed publications with more than 1,600 citations in

the refereed literature. She has given ten invited review talks at international conferences. She has also been outstanding in regards to service in a number of professional organizations, three of which I would like to point out, The American Astronomical Society, The International Astronomical Union, and The American Association for the Advancement of Science. She has served these three professional organizations in a variety of roles, and was elected to The Council of American Astronomical Society for 2004-2007. She has also been very strong in outreach efforts in the field of astronomy with her work before coming to the University and then here. She has given a number of talks in Cleveland to an amateur astronomy association there. Recently, Karen has become a chair, always doing an excellent job, she always has a smile on her face and her positive spirit has helped lead us forward in our department. In addition to her research and her entire work here in terms of teaching research and service, I am reminded of the quote by Albert Schweitzer, who said, "Example isn't the main thing influencing others, it's the only thing."

Prof. Karen Bjorkman: Thank you Scott, that was very kind. I really would like to thank all my colleagues here at the University, this is a wonderful honor and I very much treasure it. I just would like to say thank you especially to all my colleagues in my department and all the students over the years, as Alan said, they did all the work. I especially would like to thank the staff in my department who make my job a lot of fun and a lot easier to do. This is a real honor and I really appreciate it. Thank you so much.

Dr. Gaboury: Next I would like to invite Laurie Dinnebeil, she nominated Prof. Joan Kaderavek.

Prof. Dinnebeil: The ability to read is key to the success of scientists, pharmacists, business professionals and engineers. Non-readers face a life of diminished opportunities. If the University of Toledo's mission is to improve the human condition, that is clear that professor and researcher whose work focuses on affective intervention to support early or emerging literacy must be recognized as a distinguished university professor. I am pleased to introduce Dr. Joan Kaderavek as Distinguished University Professor of Early Childhood Education from The Judith Herb College of Education. Joan has reached the extraordinary levels of productivity that have resulted in significant contributions to the field of early childhood education, speech language pathology and literacy development. She is a leading authority in the field of emerging literacy for young children with special needs and has an international reputation for her contributions to her field. Dr. Kaderavek's scholarship is most impressive. She was recently named as a Fulbright Senior Scholar specialist and will be traveling to India in January. Dr. Kaderavek has earned many honors throughout her career, including the outstanding scholarship award from The Judith Herb College of Education, The Ohio ACEAward, and honors from the Association from the Ohio Speech and Language and Hearing Association. She has also been recently selected as a Fellow of the American Speech and Hearing Association, a very prestigious honor. She was selected as the visiting teaching fellow at the University of Canterbury in Christchurch, New Zealand. She serves on some prestigious review panels including the Institute of Educational Science in reading and writing research in scientific panel and the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education's Board of Examiners. In addition to her work with the US Department of Education, she also reviews grants for the National Institutes of Health. In terms of scholarship, Dr. Kaderavek has published over 44 manuscripts in prestigious refereed national and international journals and has presented many referred and invited papers at state, national and international conferences. Finally, Dr. Kaderavek's academic success is recognized by close to \$4 million in federal funding to support intervention research in early literacy. She serves on numerous review boards and is currently an associate editor for the highly regarded Language, Speech and Hearing Services in the Schools. Dr. Kaderavek's scholarship is recognized by over one hundred independent referenced citations, as evidenced by a citation search and a search on Scholar Universe also shows that she is the leading authority in early literacy. Joan excels not only as a researcher but she also shines as a teacher. Here is what a graduate student had to say about her, "*As a professor Dr. Kaderavek is outstanding. She is the most helpful professor I have ever had in my entire college experience. Dr. Kaderavek goes beyond the call of duty to assist her students. She provides a best practice approach to teaching and learning. She is*

extremely text savvy and integrated a high level of technology into her classes. Dr. Kaderavek is an extremely positive person and is always providing excellent feedback and encouragement to students.”

Finally, she is a wonderful colleagues to those of us in The Judy Herb College of Education, as well as to her faculty colleagues in the speech language pathology program here at the University of Toledo. She is generous with her time, organized in her work and thoughtful in her approach. I am pleased to recognize her as a friend as well as a colleague.

Dr. Joan Kaderavek: Thank you for this award. I am very humbled and honored. I especially want to thank Dr. Laurie Dinnebeil who has been my department chair and associate dean. She has consistently facilitated and acknowledged the work that we do in early childhood. I also want to say that the University support of this DUP award for all of us who are being honored today encourages all the scholars in this room and the scholars across the university. That recognition of our individual intellectual pursuits is needed and valued. Pursuing one’s scholarship is sometime a solitary pursuit, however, I believe the awards today define our collective scholarly achievements.

Dr. Metting: At this time I would like to call upon a distinguished university professor of Chemistry Dr. Max Funk who will introduce Dr. Ron Viola.

Dr. Max Funk: I will have to give you a short chemistry lesson to show where Ron’s work fits in. Ron is the world’s foremost authority on enzymes of the aspartic pathway of amino acid metabolism. Why that is important is that aspartic acid is converted into three other amino acids, threonine, methionine and lysine. There is nothing hard about doing that but **you** can’t do it no matter how hard you try. Microorganisms on the other hand, or germs, have the enzymes which can convert aspartic acid into those other amino acids. To you and me those amino acids are known as essential amino acids. You have to get them from your diet. If you remove them from your diet, you will parish. Microorganisms on the other hand, make those amino acids so they flourish. If we know enough about those enzymes we can maybe find ways to interfere with their activity and have a way to kill the germs without interfering with human metabolism, because we don’t have those enzymes. And almost everything we know about those enzymes are a large fraction of what we know about enzymes is a consequence of the research that is going on in the lab for the last 25-30 years. Ron has published papers on this subject, his work is very highly regarded in the community I can give you evidence of that in several different ways. His papers are highly influential in the field. His work has been cited on average twenty times. His work has a very powerful influence in what goes on in this area of research. As you already know, research is a very expensive way to spend your time. Ron has been very successful with investigator initiatives, Peer Review Research and Grants. He has \$5 Million in federally funded awards, and if you add all the foundation and State funding his career funding is in the area of \$7 Million. Another regard in how his work is in his field, my nomination for Ron accompanied by endorsement letters from eight members of the National Academy of Science. I also want to finish with a comment about Ron’s teaching. Ron teaches the very extremes of the Chemistry curriculum. On the one hand, he is teaching a course right now is called Chemistry and Society, poets and business majors and it’s a course for non-majors and on the other hand he teaches courses in his area of specialization in enzymology He does an outstanding job in all aspects of that. The evidence of this is when I prepared his nomination I included every evaluation that has ever been carried out here at the University of Toledo for Ron, and every comment by every student that has ever been submitted about his teaching it’s all good. I can’t began to tell you how hard that is to achieve this in the field of Chemistry. This is the kind of colleague I am very fortunate to have in my department. Congratulations, Ron.

Dr. Ron Viola: Thank you very much, I really appreciate this honor. As mentioned earlier, this is the most important recognition from your peers. For those of us who work with only graduates it’s not unusual for them to change their majors several times before they finally settle on what they are going to graduate with. And sometimes the undecided is the biggest major we have. I’ve been fortunate. I knew I would be a chemist when I was ten-years old. I’m in my perfect job. It’s really nice to be recognized for basically having fun, which is what I do every day. Thanks.

Dr. Metting: The next nominee actually had five nominees, so the chair of his department, Dr. Joe Shapiro was going to do the introduction. Unfortunately Joe couldn't be with us and so the chief of the division, Dr. Chris Cooper has the honor of introducing our next distinguished professor, Dr. Blair Grubb.

Dr. Cooper: I feel pretty intimidated. We have heard the nominees and the awardees and it's a pretty distinguished group and I would like to make one comment about Dr. Bjorkman who is a real rocket scientist, and I can't wait to tell my kids about that. It's an honor to be here to talk about Dr. Grubb. Dr. Grubb and I have been together at the University of Toledo and the predecessor the Medical University of Ohio for a while. Dr. Grubb came in twenty-one years ago, in 1988. In that time he has been able to publish 191 full length publications, thirty-three book chapters, four books, interestingly enough, forty-nine full lengths of prose and nineteen poems. So one of the questions I have for one of his nominees from the English Dept. because I think it certainly it's very humiliating that he can not only publish of his intended field, which is disorders of fainting, but also scholarly work. What makes it more of an accomplishment is that Blair will remind you that he has done this without a minute of protected time in his twenty-one years, without grant funding it's largely observational work. He is also a committed teacher. He has four teaching awards from the Medical University of Ohio. Blair really paved the way for their success. That's probably one of the greatest accomplishments as a teacher is to be able to pave the road for those who follow us. Blair has also lived his bi-polar experience being the clinical faculty member. What that means is that he not only does research but also actively takes care of patients. Blair has a substantial practice of patients. Probably a third come to him as referrals from institutions outside the State of Ohio and even outside the United States for his specialized area of fainting. So, Blair is really a world-class resource on this campus. Not only for his academic achievement but also taking care of patients. Finally, Blair is a committed father, husband, member of his Synagogue, a leader in the community and that has really been inspirational to all of us. Blair, thank you.

Dr. Blair Grubb: Nobody achieves success alone, and everybody honored here today deserves a lot of credit equally of someone along the way, even starting in grade school, from high school to college and a medical school. And I couldn't have done anything without the constant support of my colleagues at the University of Toledo Medical Center. But I would like to give special thanks to my wife, Barbara, who drugged me through, whom I met thirty-three years ago today over a dead body in an Anatomy Lab. I was not doing very well and she literally was the head of the class, and she drugged me through medical school and has been a constant support throughout the last thirty-three years, and without her I couldn't have done anything. Thank you Barbara.

Dr. Metting: Unfortunately, Dr. Vijay Goel is out of the country but we didn't want to miss this opportunity to have you learn about his wonderful accomplishments too. I would like to ask Dr. Ron Fournier, his nominator, to come up.

Dr. Ron Fournier: Thank you Pat, and congratulations to all the nominees being recognized today. It is a pleasure for me to talk to you about Dr. Goel. It seems like yesterday, about ten years ago I had a chance to recruit Dr. Goel from the University of Iowa. Very well known bio-mechanics researcher and teacher and we brought him to Toledo to become a chair of our relatively young bio-engineering department. He did a great job as the chair but also continued to build his research programs and interact with students, both graduate and undergraduate. About a year or so ago he was appointed as our endowed chair of McMaster-Gardner Endowed Chair of our orthopedic bio-engineering. He has done it all, teaching, research, service, all of that is top notch. He teaches both undergraduates and advanced classes in spinal bio-mechanics soft tissue to our graduate students. But I think what's really interesting is to hear just a few of the comments of the level of support that we got from Vijay from the outside and throughout the world that know of his worked. I would just like to mention a couple of those. One of the comments in the letter of nomination is that he is an international leader in spinal bio-mechanics research and Toledo is on a world map for spinal bio-mechanics. He is entirely dedicated to the service in his profession. Another supporting letter said that he is recognized as the premier in spinal bio-mechanics and is actually the final voice. Another letter said, 'I cannot imagine a better and more respected applicant, national and international in spinal arena.' So we all in the

bio-engineering are very proud of Vijay as our colleague and I know he was thrilled to be recognized in this way. If he was here he would thank the committee for giving him this recognition.

President Barrett: I didn't think this was possible, but somehow I feel like I'm not working hard enough.

Dr. Pat Metting: If it wasn't obvious from the introductions, the University gives out outstanding teaching awards, outstanding research awards, it also recognizes outstanding engagement. What makes the distinguished university professor special, is that they have been exemplars in all three of those areas. John Gaboury mentioned that this is a tradition and we have completed our second formal recognition. I would like to thank the Senate for being the forum for this. This is the highest honor that the U.T. faculty member can receive. So it is only fitting that it is in the Senate where we do this, so thank you for it.

President Barrett: I just want to add that this is an incredibly distinguished group and incredibly impressive accomplishments, and U.T. is lucky to have you and I am honored that I can call you my colleagues. So let's congratulate once again to all of our distinguished university professors. I would also like to thank the committee for their hard work.

Are there any calendar questions? Any old business? Any new business? May I have a motion to adjourn? *Motion was made and seconded.*

V. Calendar Questions: None.

VI. Other Business:

Old business: None

New business: None

VII. Adjournment: Meeting adjourned at 6:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Nick Piazza
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Kathy Grabel
Faculty Senate Office Administrative
Secretary