

THE UNIVERISTY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of April 14, 2020
FACULTY SENATE
<http://www.utoledo.edu/facsenate>

Approved @ FS on 08/18/2020

Summary of Discussion

Note: The taped recording of this meeting is available in the Faculty Senate Office or in the University Archives

President Brakel: Welcome to the fifteenth Faculty Senate meeting of the 2019-2020 academic year. At this time I will ask our Faculty Senate Executive Secretary Mark Templin to call the roll.

Present: Anderson, Bailey, Barnes, Bigioni, Brakel, Bruce, Case, Chou, Compura, Coulter-Harris, De le Serna, Dinnebeil, Dowd, Duggan, Edgington, Ferris, Frank, Garcia-Mata, Gibbs, Giovannucci, Gray, Gregory, Hall, Hammersley, Harmych, Hefzy, Inch, Jayatissa, Koch, Lecka-Czernik, Lee, Longsdorf, Lundquist, Maloney, Modyanov, Molitor, Niamat, Nigem, Oberlander, Ohlinger, Ratnam, Reeves, Roseman, Rouillard, Schlageter, Steven, Stepkowski, Taylor, Templin Thompson-Casado, Tiwari, Wedding, Weldy, Welch

Excused absence: Heberle, Phillips, Sheldon,

Unexcused absence: Dowd, Longsdorf, Murphy, Park, Phillips, Schlageter, Schroeder, Kistner, Lammon, Menezes, Murphey, Pakulski, Park, Schroder,

President Brakel: Do we have a quorum?

Senator Templin: Yes.

President Brakel: Thank you, Secretary Templin. You've received today's agenda, and I will entertain a motion to this agenda.

Senator Molitor: I move to approve the agenda.

President Brakel: Do I have a *second*?

Senator Weldy: Second.

President Brakel: Thank you. All in favor, just quickly put 'yes' in the checkbox. The agenda has been adopted. Still working out some Minutes. Quinetta is back in the office and so we will be getting those at our next meeting; we will get rid of that backlog. The Executive Committee Report: With today's packed agenda, I will try to keep today's Faculty Senate Executive Committee Report brief.

The Executive Committee met April 3rd to prepare for today's meeting. We also discussed what was known about the university's budget situation at that time. Regarding the budget situation, you may have heard from yesterday's Board of Trustee's meeting that the university is looking at a 20% budget cut for fiscal year 2020 and 2021. This morning, the Finance and Strategy Committee met to review the current and future budgets and a list of potential cost savings moves. There are many options under consideration and specific savings related to the options were not listed. Some options are already implemented such as a hiring freeze. At the moment, it appears that \$29 million must be eliminated in the future budget. A major component of this is the decline in student enrollment that is projected for next year which is being exasperated by the current COVID and economic crisis. As stated in our last report, faculty are encouraged to reach out to continuing students to register for Summer and Fall classes and to reach out to accepted incoming students to encourage their matriculation to UToledo. Please be aware that Ohio State has opened their wait listed students to be accepted at OSU and this will have a ripple effect to other Ohio institutions. Your reaching out to these students may make a difference where the student matriculates. Faculty should talk with their department chairs about ways they

believe can improve the budget situation such as examining potential course offerings that could possibly be offered at a later time, what courses, including summer courses, that could be offered that would generate more revenue, class size increases and any other options that might be helpful in the current environment.

President-Elect Jeff Hammersly and I met with Provost Bjorkman regarding policies that are still on our list to examine this semester. We also discussed the status of new hires and gave a heads up regarding COVID-19 related research studies that were in the early stages of a proposal.

Dr. Hammersly and I met this morning with the President's Chief of Staff this morning. Dr. Hammersly reported on what is occurring with the current COVID-19 fight with regard to the positive work of the medical staff including nurses and custodians and expressed the concern that the medical staff is supported in this time of stress. This includes how announcements regarding the RFP for UTMC are made which is providing another source of stress for individuals.

We also raised the issue about faculty may need access to their office and the library for summer class materials.

Finally, as indicated in yesterday's email, Faculty Senate meetings are open meetings and I extended the WebEx invitation to the faculty at-large. I believe that I responded to everyone that requested the invitation. If I missed someone, please know that I missed your email and that I had no intent of excluding anyone.

This concludes today's Faculty Senate Executive Committee Report. Does any Executive Committee member like to add anything to the Executive Committee report?

Senator Hefzy: I have a question. You mentioned 20% budget cut.

President Brakel: That was a percentage that was stated yesterday at the Board of Trustees' meeting. The information we received this morning from the Finance and Strategy meeting was \$29M is what needs to be cut or raised.

Senator Hefzy: \$29M represents what percentage?

President Brakel: It implied that it was 20%

Senator Hefzy: \$29M is 20%. Thank you.

President Brakel: It is from the general fund budget. Remember there are other budgets across the university. Are there any other questions? Hearing none. Is Jeff Hammersley on the line? He may be seeing some patients so we will come back later to him. Next is the Provost report. Provost Bjorkman, are you on the line somewhere?

Provost Bjorkman: I am. Good afternoon everybody. I hope you are staying safe and well, and the same for your families and loved ones. It is hard to believe we only have two-and-a-half weeks left in this semester of classes. I don't know about you, but to me, it seems like this semester has already been about 100 years. I know it is a heavy lift for our faculty this semester and I continue to be incredibly proud of your efforts on behalf of our students at the University.

Today I'd like to give you a few updates, including actions taken yesterday by the Board of Trustees who approved 50 of our faculty for promotion and tenure. Hopefully President Brakel has the ability to unmute everybody. I am going to ask you for a virtual applause as we congratulate these faculty on their achievements.

[Applause]

Provost Bjorkman cont'd: In addition to yesterday's Board of Trustees meeting, three Distinguished University Lecturers were approved by the Board. They are Catherine Fisher in the College of Natural Science and Mathematics, Dr. Gene Kusina in the College of Arts and Letters and Dr. Caren Steinmiller in the College of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences. I congratulate all of them; they are wonderful representatives for our Distinguished University Lecturers. The Board also took action yesterday to allow for early graduation for medical and nursing students. This is optional for them,

for students who have completed all of their degree requirements and want to jump in and join the healthcare workforce immediately – so that is now in place as an option for them if they have completed their required coursework. There is a high need for nurses and other medical professionals at this time obviously in order to reduce the burden on the current healthcare workers, [who are] fighting the Covid-19 pandemic. Two hundred and seventy-five of our students are eligible to graduate early if they choose to do so. I have heard that a fairly significant percentage of them have already asked to do so.

I also want to provide you with an update on the request for extension on the tenure clock for pre-tenure faculty. An email was sent out today from the Provost Office that outlines how those requests should be made. The deadline for submitting those requests is Friday, April 24th. The request form and the guidelines that are compatible with the process outlined in the CBA are available on the Provost Office website, and also I believe that link was in the email that went out. We've also extended the deadline for Emeritus Faculty nominations to Friday, April 24th. That process is included in the email that was sent to all faculty this afternoon. We will be sending out an email, I believe we have sent it out to the deans. In addition, today we are sending out guidance on options for delivering final exams, and the deans will be distributing that to the faculty and chairs. Just a reminder, I really encourage you all to give take home exams if possible because there are a lot of complications for students if you offer timed exams. Over the last few weeks we have learned that many of our students lack regular or reliable access to a computer and/or the internet. It puts those students at a significant disadvantage for a timed exam. Also as a reminder, if you do use a timed exam, then you need to provide disability accommodations. And regardless of which option you choose, final exams may not be delivered during the final week of classes. They can go live at 5 PM on Friday of the last week of classes. The email that is going out includes some additional suggestions and links to some resources for dealing with the question of final exams, and our staff in the University Teaching Center are available to answer any individual faculty questions or provide any help or support you may need around that. I know that UToledo online is going to be providing some additional information about this, for example how to create a test in Blackboard Learn if you haven't done that before.

I just have one more announcement to make, and that is on our virtual commencement, which, you may recall will be coming up in May on the day we would have preferably celebrated in the Glass Bowl. Faculty and staff are encouraged to share a message of congratulations and best wishes for our students, our graduates. You can go to the commencement website – it is at www.utoledo.edu/commencement/ – and you can click on a link to share a message and you can either write a message or upload a video recording and it will be included in the University's social media postings that will be leading up to commencement and will be part of the virtual commencement. I know if you are like me, you really would like to give a heartfelt congratulations to our graduates. At that "share a message" link you will find some sample prompts to help get you started - a simple video using your cellphone is all you need or you can just leave a written message.

In closing my remarks today, I want to encourage all of you to try to be as flexible as possible as we continue to work with our students during this challenging semester. I also want to remind you that I know we've sent out a lot of communications and you're probably tired of getting inundated with them, but we're trying to keep you informed about what's going on. We are in fact keeping a copy of all of those communications, which are available on the Provost Office website; they are all titled and they have links so everything is in one place if you want to find it, including deadlines for incomplete grades, other temporary policies and procedures that we've put in place for the spring 2020 semester.

Finally, please don't hesitate to contact me or any of the staff in our office if you have any questions or concerns on these or any other matters. Thank you, Dr. Brakel. I am happy to answer any questions.

Senator Garcia-Mata: Provost Bjorkman, I encountered an issue these days that myself and other faculty are facing with, which is the issue of fees and waivers for doctoral students. We are trying to admit new students that are budgeted in our grants. I am hearing conflicting messages and I cannot get through with some acceptance letters. The Research Sponsor Office sent an email a week ago or so or maybe a little bit earlier that says if students are already budgeted in the RSD 100 and is signed and accepted, [these students] should get a tuition waiver.

Provost Bjorkman: And that is the case, Senator Garcia-Mata. I actually talked to Amanda just a bit ago; we had a conversation about this. I believe there is a memo going out to this effect that will spell all that out. But those students who were in grants that were already in, signed, and agreed to, they will be honored.

Senator Garcia-Mata: Okay, that is great to hear because the letter seems to be...at the moment and they have been sitting there for over a week now.

Provost Bjorkman: Yes, and I actually asked about that as well when I saw your email about that. It seems that there was a little confusion about whether they were new students or they've been grandfathered in or whatever, Amanda assures me that she will get right on those and get those straightened out. Please let me know if that doesn't resolve your problem.

Senator Garcia-Mata: Thank you very much.

Provost Bjorkman: You're welcome.

Senator Niamat: I have a question about the budget. The question is out of the \$29M, how much is the budget fall, the UTMC cut and how much is the share for the Main Campus?

Provost Bjorkman: That does not include UTMC; that is a completely separate budget than the Main Campus.

Senator Niamat: Thank you.

Senator Hefzy: Is it \$9M or \$29M?

President Brakel: It's \$29M which is what they said this morning. The UTMC deficit, it was stated yesterday at the Board of Trustees meeting was \$17M. Any other questions? If you have a question please unmute. Hearing none. Thank you, Provost Bjorkman.

Provost Bjorkman: You're welcome. Thank you.

President Brakel: That brings us then to Curriculum Committee reports. Chair Edgington is up next.

Senator Edgington: I am here. Thank you very much. So I am going to go through these. You should've gotten the spreadsheet yesterday. We have new course proposals and course modifications. I am going to go over the new course proposals first. I am going to do this rather quickly because we have a pretty heavy agenda today, but I am happy to answer questions during our discussion point.

To quickly go over, we have 15 new course proposals; six of those came out of the College of Engineering and those six courses are: EET 4600, Industrial Robotics; EET 4650, Industrial Robotics Vision; MIME 4380, Engineering Polymers and Rubbers; MIME 4390, Failure Analysis of Materials; MIME 4370, Advanced Materials for Automotive Structures; MIME 4350, Advanced Ceramics. We also have three new course proposals coming out the College of Pharmacy: PHM 3000, Integrated Pharmaceutical and Clinical Science 1; PHM 4000, Integrated Pharmaceutical and Clinical Sciences 2; PHM 4200, Integrated Pharmaceutical and Clinical Sciences 3. We have two courses coming out the College of Arts and Letters: LALX 2000, Introduction to Latin American and Latinx Studies; REL 4010, Islamic Law and Society. We have one from the College of Education: EDP 4240, Classroom Engagement and Behavioral Supports. We have one new course from the College of Medicine and Lifesciences: INDI 1000, Biomedical Research. Then we have two course proposals from the College of Business: BUAD 2940, Entry Level Internship in Business Administration; BUAD 4940, Internship in Business Administration.

Are there any discussion or concerns about any of the fifteen new course proposals?

Senator Molitor: I have a quick question about the College of Medicine course. It says it is just for high school students. Is that correct?

Senator Edgington: Yes. It says "*this course provides high school students the opportunity to build laboratory research and critical analysis skills in a hands-on setting while also conducting an original biomedical research.*"

Senator Molitor: Is there somebody from the College of Medicine who can provide a rationale for offering a course exclusively to high school students? I can understand offering a freshman course that high school students could take, but it seems unusual that we would offer a course specifically for high school students who aren't enrolled in our university?

Senator Edgington: If there's somebody from the college that can answer that question that would be great.

Senator Ratnam: I think we've always had these high school students coming in during the summer just to get them interested in pursuing a career in medicine, so, I am wondering if it is part of that program. I know that we have had students who have shadowed physicians in clinics and been involved in summer clinical projects. I have not been directly involved so I am not exactly certain.

Senator Edgington: I do believe the proposal does talk about this being kind of an independent study approach. In fact, they are working one-on-one with a small group of students, a very imperative time on a project.

President Brakel: Is Senator Giovannucci on?

Senator Giovannucci: Yes, I am. I have no information about this course really. I know there is a cross-listed course for undergraduate research in the College of Medicine with the Main Campus. I'm not sure how this course differs and why it is specifically for undergraduate. I don't know who put forward this course; I don't have any information about it.

Senator Edgington: It was put forward by Professor Keith. I can email him to get information about that.

Senator Molitor: My concern is that it is not for undergraduate students. My concern is that the description says it is just for high school students.

Senator Edgington: I can email her and get a little bit more background for our last meeting. Any other discussion or concerns about the other new course proposals?

Senator Giovannucci: In regards to this course for high school students, it seems to me that there already is this course for research for undergraduates on the Medical Campus. It seems like there should be maybe coordination between these two research courses.

Senator Edgington: Senator Giovannucci, can you tell me what the number is for the current core?

Senator Giovannucci: I do not know.

Senator Edgington: A course name maybe.

Senator Giovannucci: I think it is cross-listed with I think biology, but I am not sure what the course designation is.

Senator Molitor: I will take a look at the catalog to see what I can find.

Senator Edgington: I can do it later too. Senator Molitor, that is okay, I can research that.

Senator Taylor: Are you thinking Biology 4910, Undergraduate Research?

Senator Giovannucci: I think maybe that one should be cross-listed with the College of Medicine and I think Dr. Kennedy is the course director for the cross-listed version of that on our campus.

Senator Edgington: A quick question then. If it is Biology 4910, is that course for high school students?

Senator Giovannucci: Biology would have to answer to that.

Senator Molitor: There is a course called INDI 4000, Directed Research in Human Sciences.

Senator Edgington: I am not sure if high school students are eligible to take a 4000 level course, which is maybe why they've done this. I can research it and find out.

Senator Molitor: Thank you.

Senator Edgington: Any other questions or concerns with the new course proposals?

President Brakel: Senator Edgington, why don't we have everybody put a 'yes' in the chat box if they vote for it, minus that one course, and 'no' if they do not want to vote for it, and maybe for abstain.

Senator Edgington: So we are just doing the 14 course proposals, taking out the one from the College of Medicine.

President Brakel: It looks like we have an overwhelming 'yes.' *Motion Passed.*

Senator Edgington: We will move on then to course modifications. We have 22 course modifications and similarly, I am going to go through these and kind of chunk them together a little bit. Our first 12 all come from the College of Engineering. Basically, the modifications are in four areas. A number of the courses are looking to make changes to credit hours. There are a few courses that are zero to three credit hours and there are some courses that are three credit hours that are ultimately four credit hours. The rationale I believe[is] moving to do some lab work for those courses now. There's also a number of prerequisite changes with these courses over all of them, and the prerequisite changes, none of those affect courses outside the College of Engineering and the majority of those changes or removals are courses within the program itself. You have one name change which is right here, EECS 1000, which is currently called EECS First Year Design - the new name will be Introduction to Electrical Engineering. Then finally, there are a few courses that are changing zip codes for those classes. So those are the 12 modifications there.

We have one course in the College of Business, BUAD 2070, Business Analytics, and they are doing a change with their prereq. by adding Math 1850 as an option. We have one course from the College of Pharmacy, PHPR 4540, Pharmacy Practice II; they are going for a name change. We call it... We have five courses from Health and Human Services. Again as a summary, a few of these courses are changing, adding a restrictive, getting the instructor permission for students to be able to register for the course. A few courses are adding in some field experience hours, so they're changing credit hours to reflect that. There's one course that is deleting experience as well. We have three courses from Arts and Letters. As a summary, most are changing from lecture to seminars because of their hours. Two of the courses are requesting wa eligibility and the final course which is PSY 3000 is now doing a course number change to PSY 4000. It is also requesting it to be cross-listed with the graduate course PSY 5000. Those are our twenty-two course modifications. Are there any questions or concerns about any of those courses?

Senator Anderson: I'm on the Curriculum Committee and I have a concern, the EECS 1510, 2500, and 2510 going from three credit hours to four credit hours. I read over their proposals and basically they made the statement that students can't be trusted on their own to essentially do programming so they want to increase the credit hours. It is listed as being four lecture hours, not three lecture hours and a lab. I think almost any at the University probably will make the same argument for lower level courses to increase credit hours by one credit hour. Also, the EECS 90, again, I don't think they need a valid claim of why it needs to go from three credit hours to four credit hours. It would be interesting to know what is the standard of other universities- these three credit hour courses or four credit hour. Just courses. Just from a personal standpoint, as an undergraduate I took a one credit hour...course. The rule was for every hour in class you spend two hours outside, and to not apply [this] to that class. But basically I did the work needed to do the programming.

Senator Edgington: Is there anybody from EECS or the College of Engineering that can answer those questions?

Senator Molitor: I am not familiar with these proposals, maybe Senator Niamat can address them. I do know they struggle with these courses in terms of high DFW rates. It appears these proposals were designed to reduce their DFW rates.

Senator Edgington: Senator Molitor. The idea though, is that the extra credit hour would be added in would be a lab hour or some type of hour where they can do hands on work in the class?

Senator Molitor: I do not know. I am surprised they added an extra lecture hour vs. saying it's three hours of lecture and one hour of lab as Senator Anderson suggested. I think it would be probably worth going back and talking to them about it, unless Senator Niamat has some information that I don't.

Senator Niamat: I think we will have to go back and check again, you know I am not so sure. But usually four credit hour courses include a lab in it.

Senator Edgington: What I will do is, I will pull out the EECS courses and send an email and see if we can get a change for a four lecture, plus three, plus one lab hour with that.

Senator Molitor: Or they may have a justification for four lecture hours, I do not know.

Senator Edgington: You're right; I'll find out. Any other questions or discussion regarding these course modifications? Hearing none. What I think we'll do is, we will take out EECS 2510, EECS 2510, EECS 2500 and EECS 4790. So we will take those four out for this round so we will have 18 modifications we will be voting on instead. So again, taking out the EECS courses and voting is similar to the last time. Go ahead and put 'yes' in the chat if you accept the other 18 course modifications, 'n' for no and 'a' for abstain.

President Brakel: So that passed. *Motion Passed.* Thank you, Senator Edgington. Next up is the core curriculum reports from Senator Gregory.

Senator Gregory: So the Curriculum Committee has been meeting regularly in the spring semester. We've been working on assessment. If we can squeeze onto the agenda for the last meeting, we would be happy to provide a report which we're in the middle of drafting for Senate. Then our other job is curriculum which hit as I mentioned at the last meeting despite its many virtues. I have a really simple spreadsheet and I'll attempt to share it. Does everybody see that?

Past-President Rouillard: Yes.

Senator Gregory: Thank you. Let me just skip around a little bit on this. We have three courses that were put forward to the core: Astronomy 2010, Astronomy 2020 and Chemistry 1240. These courses are already in the core, but we are all being proposed with modified or new prerequisites. The committee looked at all of those very carefully and voted to approve that. Those three courses are the modified prerequisite courses. We also have two courses: English 2770 and English 4660. These are courses that were already in the core and we are simply proposing name changes: English 2770 was going from American Literature Minority Writers to Ethnic American Literature. The other course was going for African Literature in the 20th Century to African American Literature in the 20th and 21st Century. So, those were the two name classes. Then after that I think we are going to go through individually because sometimes they're being submitted for one diversity requirement and sometimes the other, if that seems okay.

So the first course that I want to direct your attention to is Chinese 1090, which is called Chinese Culture. That course is being submitted for both core arts and humanities and non U.S. Diversity. We approved this course for presence in the core, it parallels with some other world languages and cultures. The next course is FLON 2700 World Cultures through Literature and Cinema in Translation. This is a new course coming out of World Language and Cultures that is being proposed for both core arts and humanities and non US Diversity. We did double check with the Department of Film to see if they were fine with this course and if they perceived any conflict or overlaps, and they confirmed that it was good. The next course right underneath that is History 3660, Africa to 1800. This is a class that is being submitted for non U.S. Diversity. It is a three thousand level for non U.S. Diversity only and we approved that. LAX 2000, Introduction to Latin America and Latin X Studies is a brand new course that is being proposed for non U.S. Diversity. It does have very healthy Americans with a Latin X component, but the majority percentage wise of the course is Latin American. I will say that the committee sort of felt like this was a really good example of the way in which the U.S. and non U.S. Diversity split – it seems kind of nonfunctional and you have a course with a population that migrated and connected in all kinds of various ways. Anyway, we approved that course to go forward. Another new course right underneath it is MATH 2640.

This is a new course proposal, which is a version of MATH 2600, but it is actually more specialized for students who might be in disciplines, such as environmental sciences etc. And there are a number of courses like that where you have a specialized version, like math for education majors. So, we approved that to go forward. I am just going to keep going and then we can do questions afterwards. MATH 5200 right underneath that, World Philosophies. This is a course that is proposed core arts and humanities and non U.S. Diversity. By the way, what's being proposed for non U.S. Diversity, it is not a course European – it is a course for non-European World Capacities. Under that we have Political Science 2660, African Politics. This is a reactivation of an old course that is being proposed for non U.S. Diversity and the proposer also kind of cleaned up the language and we approved it. So these are all the courses that we approved and anything that is rolled back has already been rolled back. PSC 3240, African American Politics, and that is being submitted for U.S. Diversity only. So those are all the courses we have approved for the core. Do I have any questions?

President Brakel: Hearing none. Let's then vote on all these. So 'yes' in the chat box or 'no' or maybe for 'abstain'. 'That looks like that has passed. *Motion Passed.*

Senator Gregory: Thank you.

President Brakel: Was that it, Senator Gregory?

Senator Gregory: Yes. I think you may have sent around a couple of the memos that I sent to Faculty Senate Executive Committee, just updating you on our progress, which I don't think I need to report on here. If anybody wants to look at those, they are more than welcome to. And as I said, we would like to share our hopes to share the assessment report if we can. Thank you.

President Brakel: Yes. Alright, that brings us to the Program Committee's report.

Senator Bigioni: So there are 21 proposals to go through. To make the voting a little easier, I propose a small modification on what we did last time. There are three natural breaks, and we can vote yes for all the proposals that proceed that break, but, it is a lot to keep track of. So, as we do each proposal, if there are any objections or no votes, perhaps that is a good time to cast that. Does that seem reasonable? What do you think, President Brakel?

President Brakel: That is fine.

Senator Bigioni: Okay. So I will ask for no's and abstentions and then we will collect all the yesses in bulk. So the first two are new programs. They are Asian Studies and are a new minor. Asian Studies, and I suppose it is a relatively natural topic to create a minor around and so this is what, what has been done. You can see the list of minors. The total number of hours is 18, and that includes the three hour courses. It includes an additional six hours of requirements and then another six hours from this list of courses here. There are other options here too. There are a number of different types of courses that can be taken with 3000 and 4000 level and study abroad options as well, all with advisors' approval. So that is a new minor. Any discussion or any questions on this? Okay, any objections to it?

Senator Gregory: There's already a major in Asian Studies in existence too. So I just wanted to point that out, they just didn't have a minor.

Senator Bigioni: Thank you. Any other questions or comments? Any 'no' votes please cast them now and then we will move on to the next.

President Brakel: Seeing none.

Senator Bigioni: Okay. The next is a new certificate program in Material Science and Engineering. The MIME department has decided that its faculty members have a great deal of experience in this area and so they thought it would be good for our students to put together a certificate program on material science and engineering. It's composed of four courses. They are all new courses that we voted on earlier today. It is "advanced ceramics, advanced materials for automotive structures, engineering, polymers and rubbers and failure analysis of materials for a total of 12 credit hours." Any questions or comments about this new certificate program? Any objections? Any abstentions? There are only two

new program proposals and those were the two, and so this is a natural break to vote in favor of these proposals. So, if you support these proposals, please vote yes now.

President Brakel: That looks like overwhelmingly ‘yes.’ *Program Passed.*

Senator Bigioni: So we will move on to our modifications. The next series is eight proposals and so we will go through each. It is the same idea, voting no as we go through each and then yes at the end. The first proposal is program modification to the Data Analytics in Social Science Minor. The modification is simply to bring the existing minor in line for the new data. You can see the changes are small. It introduces these two seminar courses on data analytic in the science ethics course and it eliminates this course on cost benefit analysis. So that is the extent of those changes. Are there any questions or comments? Any objections, go head and cast that vote now.

President Brakel: People are voting yes.

Senator Bigioni: Save your yesses for now. The next proposal is Registered Respiratory Therapy. So this is an analogous to the nurse to RN proposal that we talked about earlier in the semester. So this is for people who already have accreditation to come and get a four year BS degree through this program. So it does two things. One is it changes the total credit hours to 120, and two, it changes a few courses to enable 100% online program. These are people already employed in the field. This is important because it is difficult for them to work around their clinical schedules in order to complete an in class program. So that eliminates the need to show up on campus and gives them a tremendous amount of flexibility. So you can see changes here. There’s some changes in numbers of hours, but also eliminating some courses that are important to be in a classroom for, and introducing some courses that are more easily taught online. Any questions or comments about this program proposal? Okay, hearing none. If there are any objections, go ahead and vote no now and I will move on to the next proposal as you do that. The next proposal is the Doctor of Pharmacy degree. It is a relatively simple change. What they’ve done is they’ve taken a series of courses and combined them into a single course. This is to simplify the process of financial aid disbursement. The content hasn’t changed. You can see those changes, those modifications here, combining the three courses in red into the course in blue in green each time. Any questions about this proposal? Okay. Go ahead and cast any negative or abstaining votes. Next we have a proposal for Exercise Science Pre Rehabilitation Sciences BS. This is simply taken a social science core elective and explicitly making it introduction to socialology. This is for advising purposes. So many students with limited staff is [really] challenging and so the goal here is to make the program less complicated. Any questions or comments about this proposal?

Senator Ferris: [*Indecipherable*]... I question whether administrative convenience was sufficient reason to limit student options in the courses they could choose from.

Senator Bigioni: You sounded quite muffled. I think the gist of your comment was that it’s not a great reason to limit student options. Is that right?

Senator Ferris: Yes.

Senator Bigioni: I don’t want to speak entirely for their department, but I think it is a question of resources.

Senator Ferris: Right.

Senator Bigioni: So their claim is that their resources are limited and they are unable to keep up and so this is their compensation. But, is there anyone else, I heard someone else chime in?

Senator Molitor: We have similar requirements in our Engineering degree programs. We require specific math and science core courses because they serve as prerequisites to advance into other courses within the major. I am wondering if they had been advising students over the years to take SOC 1010 because it was a prerequisite to advance into their courses in their major, and so now they are just formalizing that requirement.

President Brakel: That is what it appears from the summary.

Senator Bigioni: Any other questions or comments?

Senator Ferris: [*Indecipherable*]

Senator Bigioni: It doesn't appear that it is a prerequisite for anything in the program based on what is written in the rationale taken from the proposal. So, it appears to me that it is simply a resource issue that they just can't keep up the advising.

Senator Molitor: So, maybe it is worth going back to the program and asking them if this course is required for advancing into their program.

Senator Bigioni: We could do that. Perhaps, some helpful soul out there could also have a quick look at their program to see if they could identify the need for this as a prerequisite and then get back to us. I will set this aside otherwise and make a note

President Brakel: Yes, set it aside.

Senator Bigioni: Any other questions or comments? Okay, let's move on to the next and there is no need to vote. The next one is Exercise Science, a modification to the minor, and it is simply a swapping out of two courses – 2580 is being replaced by 3580. This is just an updating of the course content and in the program. Any questions or comments about this modification? Any negative votes? Any abstentions, please cast them now as we move on to the next. The next is a new concentration in Cyber Security for the Computer Science in Engineering Technology program. And so this is simply made up of these three courses, computer network security, network security and then a senior technology capstone course that should be cyber security related. There's also an accommodation in case the student is doing the ESEM track, they can do 5790. So this is the location of the BS to include this new cyber security concentration. Any questions or comments?

Senator Molitor: I don't know how you enforce this. I mean, the technology capstone courses required for all students in the engineering technology program, I don't know how you enforce that they need to take a cyber-security related project. So the capstone course students work on independent design, capstone projects, and you can choose from a range of projects, I don't know if they're going to plan on enforcing this by having different section numbers associated with the different projects. It just seems like it would be hard to police that on a transcript.

Senator Bigioni: Good point. So what does that mean?

Senator Molitor: Do you want to table this course? Perhaps I can follow up with the program director and ask how they plan on enforcing this requirement and you can bring it back to the next meeting?

Senator Bigioni: So that seems reasonable; it seems important enough that that should be sorted before it goes forward. Any other questions or comments? So we don't need to vote on that, that will be set aside. ***Proposal Tabled.***

Next, we have a Minor in Disability Studies. The goal of this proposal is to correct the math inconsistency, and you can see that here in the requirements, add a series of electives and then remove a deactivated course in red. Any questions or comments about this proposal? Hearing none. If there are any votes, please cast them now as we move on. Then the last proposal in this chunk is a Counseling Minor. It is simply adding one course to the list of possible electives for the minor, this psychology testing and assessment course, at the end. Any questions or comments about this proposal? Okay. If there are any negative or abstention votes, please cast them now and then we will move on to the yesses in just a moment. As that is happening, I will remind you that we are voting on Data Analytics Minor, Registered Respiratory Therapy proposal from Pharmacy. We are setting aside Exercise Science. The Exercise Science Minor we are voting on the Computer Science Cyber Security, but the concentration we are setting aside and the Disability Minors and Counseling Minors we are voting on. So, all those in favor of those six proposals, please go ahead and vote yes right now.

President Brakel: I think we got just about everybody. That passed. ***Proposals Passed.***

The last chunk is 11 proposals. The last few are easy so hopefully it will make it go quickly. The first is Early Childhood Education. So this is a modification of the program due to new state legislation. There are two important points. First, there is a new Senate Bill 2016. It is requiring that early childhood teaching licenses are transformed from currently Pre-K to grade three and they are now supposed to now be transformed to Pre-K to grade five. So that will require some changes to the program of course. And then there is also a requirement from House Bill 318, to include instruction of positive behavioral intervention and supports, and some other topics listed there. So you see the courses listed there. So this chunk of courses in green is to accommodate the higher level instruction, to prepare students with the knowledge they need to teach on those topics at the higher rate. There is an elimination of these two courses because they are no longer necessary. This was to give students flexibility or the possibility of augmenting their Pre-K to three licensure to include four and five. And of course, that is no longer necessary with these changes. This is the additional course due to that House Bill on classroom engagement and behavioral supports. So this is summary of the changes. Are there any questions or discussion on this proposal?

Past-President Rouillard: Yes, I have some questions. The raising of the credit hours to 139, I'm wondering if that is a miscalculation. All the courses that are listed in green, are those not core courses that could be counted in the thirty-six to forty-two hours? I think we are sort of duplicating requirements here. I can understand that they would want to include these as courses as pre-professional licensure courses, but I think they could count as core curriculum courses so we don't have to raise the required credit hours up to 10 credit hours more than we already have. Is there anybody who could answer that question?

Unknown Speaker (from the College of Education): You are absolutely right. We found a function in the CIM system that it automatically put that 36 hours under the University core, at the top of our check sheet here. So these courses that are in green are also going to count in the core. We are not really adding that many hours to their program. The actual program is actually going to be less hours in the long run than it currently is.

Past-President Rouillard: So you are not really going to 139 hours?

Unknown Speaker (from the College of Education): No, 127.

Past-President Rouillard: Oh, okay. Can that be indicated here because 139 hours is pretty daunting?

Unknown Speaker (from the College of Education): I didn't know how to fix that in CIM because, like I said, that 36 hours up at the very top of the University core is automatically in there and I didn't know how to manipulate that to distinguish what is going on.

Past-President Rouillard: Okay, I see. Thank you.

President Brakel: I have a question. Several years ago this program had proposed some changes and one of my concerns at that time was that these early childhood majors are certified to teach music courses in the public schools. And at the time they had previously were taken an early childhood teacher, MED 3330, I think was the number at the time. I lost that battle within the Senate, and it was supposed to be required within the gen ed. core that they take MUS 2200, Music Theory for the non-major. As I see this, this proposal further eliminates music totally from the curriculum and yet these people are being certified to teach music, which I have some grave concerns about.

Senator Bigioni: I'm sorry, I must've missed something. Where is music eliminated? Is it in here? This is the only course

President Brakel: It was previously voted on by Senate and the eliminated it, MED 3330 [I believe is the course number]. You see there was an art ed. course and they left that in, but they took out the music ed. course. Then the prerequisite for that particular course was MUS 2200, and Senate voted to continue the requirement that those early childhood majors would have to take Music Theory for the non-Major. But the way that this proposal reads right now, that course is even eliminated. It was just listed, "select a minimum of 36 to 42 hours in the University core."

Senator Bigioni: Someone want to speak to that?

Past-President Rouillard: I will support President Brakel's objection that there should be some inclusion of a music course for non-majors. As it stands with this program modification, even with the understanding that the actual total credit number hours will be 127, I will vote against this modification.

Senator Molitor: One thing I would like to note, and I would defer to Senator Welsch, but I believe this program is subject to licensure and state legislation requirements. I don't know if Senator Welsch wants to speak to this issue in terms of the other requirements that govern this program.

President Brakel: That is my point, Senator Molitor. These early childhood majors aren't certified to teach music courses at the kindergarten through grade three level. And while they may not actually do that, and I know that the professors over in the College of Ed. advocate to especially teach those courses, that is not necessary the case. All you have to do is go back a few years when public schools were cutting art and they were trying to do at that time, have those early childhood teachers teach music.

Senator Welsch: The one thing I could add to that, Senator Brakel, is that our teachers are held accountable for the accreditation standards for K, which is listed there in the top paragraph. The council for the accreditation of educator preparation states the new standards for elementary do not include requirements for math education within the program and it will be held to by the Department of Education in Ohio.

Senator Dinnebeil: I am not sure if the music is an oversight, I wasn't part of the discussions for this program modification. But I didn't see anything that was highlighting that it was a change. So I don't know, Senator Welsch may be the best person to be able to answer that question.

President Brakel: Again, my concern is the way that it is listed right now under the university course, it just says select a minimum of 36 to 42 hours which means that, at least to me, it is not requiring a music 2200 course.

Senator Dinnebeil: If you want, I can contact our early childhood faculty.

President Brakel: Well, my recommendation was, let's get this question answered and bring them to the next meeting. So that would be my recommendation, but---

Senator Bigioni: So, is that a reasonable thing to do, that we take it back to the Education faculty, and the proposal is to add music 2200?

President Brakel: Yes, 2200 is what Senate approved several years ago and within the UT core.

Senator Bigioni: What is it called?

President Brakel: Music Theory for non-Major.

Senator Bigioni: So the proposal is to see if the department, the faculty would be agreeable to adding that as one of the required courses. If so, we would then reduce this to 33, remove three hours of the university core ed. Wait a minute---

President Brakel: Yes, the university core is where that would be at; and so the hours wouldn't change, it would just be spelled out.

Senator Bigioni: Okay. How does that sound? Is it a reasonable proposal, to take this back to the department to see if they would agree to that so we can bring it back to the next Faculty Senate meeting?

Senator Molitor: They already require HIST 1060 and ENGL 2710 which satisfy core humanities requirements, as does the MUS 2200 course. If there are other courses in the program requirements that satisfy core curriculum elective requirements, then you possibly would be adding credit hours to this degree program to add MUS 2200. We would have to ask the program for verification of that.

Senator Bigioni: Okay, so we will do that. Any objections to that? Okay, so we will set this one aside then. *Proposal Tabled.*

Let's move on. The next proposal is a modification to the liberal studies. There are two changes, one is that they will not require nine hours of electives to be at the 3000 and 4000 level, simply because they already have a large number of credit hours at that level. In fact, the proposal report that I sent out neglected to strike that, and so there it is what you are seeing on the screen. The other change is the elimination of the orientation course, because it is seldom used. Most of their students are transfer students and so on, and so it doesn't serve a purpose to have it in the program. Any questions or comments about this proposal? Okay, hearing none. Again, if you have a negative or abstention vote, please cast that now as we move on. Mechanical Engineering Modification is next. You can see it is simply an adjustment of courses, an updating of the program. These two courses here are combined into one course - so these five hours become four hours in a single course and then there is an expansion of this introduction CAD course, increasing it from two hours to three hours. Any questions or comments about these changes?

President Brakel: Please move on, we are running out of time.

Senator Bigioni: Okay, Anthropology is next. The upshot here is that they want to include archeology more explicitly in the program, because that is a track that a lot of students end up taking. So they are going to introduce this course introduction to archeology and drop the world pre-history in order to keep the printed hours the same and then offer these possible courses to satisfy the requirement in the program. Plus, instead of nine hours of course work at the 3000 and 4000 level, it becomes six. Any questions or comments about these changes? Hearing none, so we will move on to the next. This is the Anthropology BA, and it mirrors what we just saw in the minor proposal. Any questions or comments about this proposal? Okay, hearing none, we will move on. This is a Spanish proposal and in fact the proposal is that they want to include Spanish 2140 and 2150 in the curriculum for the BA and similarly, we will see the same thing in the minor. When comparing the programs, I found some other differences. And when I talked to Senator Thompson-Casado about it, she said that this course conversation in composition to had been in the program for a while and haven't had a chance to talk to her again about this. So Senator Thompson-Casado, maybe you can make a quick comment about this.

Senator Thompson-Casado: Can you hear me?

Senator Bigioni: Yes.

Senator Thompson-Casado: The 3020 has been in our program since I got here, and that's been twenty-six years ago. Somehow it fell out of the catalog course description at some point, but that has been one of our three standards skill courses for decades.

Senator Bigioni: Okay, it is where we left it and 'falling' out of the catalog I think is the key point, because when I go back and I look at what's in the catalog, it is not... Perhaps it is an error in the catalog rather than an actual change. Is that a good characterization?

Senator Thompson-Casado: Yes.

Senator Bigioni: We will get that straightened out with the catalog or actually, it will automatically get straightened out with this proposal. So the only actual change is the inclusion of, and there's similar problems here that I imagine have a similar source. Am I right, I don't want to put words in your mouth? So the only actual change is the inclusion of these two courses.

Senator Thompson-Casado: That is correct. If the student tested to that level, they can be used as an elective; they are not required courses.

Senator Bigioni: Thank you. Any questions or comments about this proposal? Did I hear somebody? No. The minor is essentially the same thing. Any questions or comments about either the major or minor proposal? Hearing none. We will [now] move on to the last four, which are simple reductions and course hours so this will go quickly. So the first is English Creative Writing Concentration, a reduction from 124 to 120 hours by reducing electives in the program. Then English Literature Concentration is exactly the same proposal. Actually, the next two are slightly different. Any questions

or comments about these two English proposals? Okay, hearing none, I will move on. General Studies, the General Studies BA program also has the reduction in credit hours from 124 to 120. But it also has a change in the description of the program and they are small changes that you can read through the highlights here. Any questions or comments about this proposal? Mostly these are word changes, although there are some small number of changes here. Any questions or comments about this proposal? Okay, hearing none, we will move on to the last one which is Music, another reduction from 124 to 120 credit hours. This is accomplished by zeroing out the credit hours on the larger ensemble course for four of the eight semesters that the students would be taken would be in the program, and then also turning four elective to specifically a U.S. diversity elective? Any questions or comments about this proposal? Hearing none, we will vote on 10 proposals now, all except the Early Childhood Education proposal. All in favor of accepting these proposals, please go ahead and vote yes.

President Brakel: Those all appeared to have passed. *Proposals Passed.*

Senator Bigioni: Terrific. Thank you so much everyone. So we will have a few little tidying up on things next meeting, but it will be a whole lot easier. Thank you.

President Brakel: Senator Wedding is up next.

Senator Wedding: Do you want me to start?

President Brakel: Yes, please.

Senator Wedding: My committee has reviewed two policies that were given to us in the last few weeks. The first policy has to do with the departments of schools. So I'll read the preamble to the policy. It says, "the division of Academic Affairs at the University of Toledo will be organized into colleges with departments as specialized studies or schools with a chair for each department or school." Our committee has recommended that this policy be rejected for several reasons. Number one, the policy does not provide for Senate review of any of this, including these new schools. The proposed policy provides the chairs of the departments, it equates chairs of departments and chairs of schools as being the same. They can be appointed or removed. They can be removed without consulting the faculty. The chairs are defined as being administrator, not academics. It says that the chairs are administrative only and not subject to tenure. The chairs may be subject to outside peer review, but review by the faculty is not provided. I think this violates the shared governance and the CBA's. But what really is troublesome is that there are two reasons. One, the fact that the Senate is not really involved in the creation of this, no review. Two, that the chairs of the new schools are being equated. Now, I do understand that one college on campus, HHS changed some time ago all of its departments to schools and made them their chairs directors. We are not challenging something that was done some time ago and in place. I think any future schools on this campus should be particularly, whether they are new bodies altogether, should be reviewed by the Senate. This policy does not provide for that and I think the way it makes the chairs, not requiring them to be tenured – in fact, you could actually appoint outside people to become chairs of these departments has very little say in this – they don't have any review of them at all. You would have outside people reviewing and you can have peer review by outside persons, but not by the members of the department or the school itself. So I move that this policy be rejected by the Senate, and I guess a yes vote would be to reject it. It is now open for discussion.

Past-President Rouillard: I will also vote to reject this policy because I am very disturbed by the possibility of having an untenured person serving as a chair of a department. It leaves the untenured chair vulnerable and it leaves the faculty of that department vulnerable.

Senator Wedding: That was our concern too. I guess a yes vote would be to reject it President Brakel.

President Brakel: That would be correct because you are moving that this be rejected.

Senator Wedding: Right. And we are not against new schools. We are not against schools per se. We think that schools should go through the Senate. We just spent an hour looking at programs, which was done very well by Senator Bigioni. He amazes me with what he did. But here we are, we have schools which is actually a step above programs and there is no provision to have them reviewed by the Senate.

Senator Gregory: Can I ask a question? I feel like there is a little [*indecipherable*]... is slightly different than what was in the memo, which suggested that none of the schools had never been reviewed by Faculty Senate, and that historically is not really accurate. There are lots of evidence in the Minutes of that kind of conversation happening at the time that those two colleges were being merged together. So I guess, is the concern here that, well, I think it happened historically in past practice like the School of Visual and Performing Arts was in fact reviewed by Faculty Senate and you talked about it a lot. Is the concern here that there just isn't enough infrastructure in place to guide that process and make sure that it happens?

Past-President Rouillard: Senator Gregory, I think there is a difference between what happened with the School for the Visual and Performing Arts and what happened with this, the establishment of the School for Visual and Performing Arts. The School of Visual and Performing Arts didn't eliminate departments, whereas what happened in Health and Human Sciences did eliminate departments. And that was not brought to Senate as it was happening or before it happened for feedback. It was simply reported to Faculty Senate and I think that is the distinction here.

Senator Wedding: Yes, I think there are two things here. One, is the schools themselves and then the second is the business concerning the definition of the chair or the chair not being tenure. I mean, they are actually two issues here. We're not against schools per se. There is nothing to stop schools from being formed, but they should go through the Senate.

Past-President Rouillard: The other concern here is that it can affect tenure and promotion. So, the School for Visual and Performing Arts doesn't have a DPC for tenure and promotion and it doesn't weigh in on T and P that way. But the way the schools have been organized including Health and Human Services, they are now cutting across what would have been traditional departments. And so you may have somebody voting on someone's tenure dossier who is much more removed from that person's level of expertise than in a traditional department.

Senator Wedding: I think also another point is that the schools, HHS School did not have any change of academic content, it was a change in form, whereas new schools being formed would have academic content. I believe that they have to go through the Senate and I think the schools should be formed or can be formed, but they just would have to come through the Senate.

President Brakel: Anybody else? Hearing none. So Senator Wedding *called the question*. You will vote 'yes' in the chat box if you're supporting the motion to reject this policy and 'no' means accept.

Senator Hefzy: Can you repeat the instruction?

President Brakel: A vote of yes indicates that you are supporting the committee's recommendation to reject this policy. A no vote means that you are supporting the policy. That looks like that motion coming from the committee is being supported. The policy has been rejected. ***Motion Passed.*** Let's move on to the Faculty Consulting policy.

Senator Wedding: This Consulting policy was passed. It says faculty consulting and it was originally passed back during the Jacob administration in 2008, although it has its origins in the Medical College back in 2003. The policy applies only to non-union faculty in the Medical College. It does not apply to any of the faculty covered by the collective bargaining agreements. We do have a policy in the collective bargaining agreement, which is much broader and more permissive than this policy. This policy also applies only to the Medical School faculty and not to administrators. We don't understand. I mean, if you're going to have a policy that's going to be restrictive, it should not apply only to faculty, it should also cover administrators. In this case, the policy applies only to the Medical School faculty and not apply to any other faculty on this campus or to any administrator on this campus. I, we feel like that should not be the case and this should not be a discriminatory policy which is what we have here. If you look at our collective bargaining agreement, we have a more flexible policy. In the collective bargaining agreement of both the lecturers and the senior track, which applies to all faculty on this campus, except the medical school, which is not part of the bargaining unit. We recommend that this policy be rejected.

President Brakel: Any discussion? Hearing none. Let's go ahead and *call the question*. So this would be a yes vote to reject the policy and no to accept.

Senator Stepkowski: Can you mischaracterize the policy?

Senator Wedding: ‘Yes’ rejects the policy.

President Brakel: I see the motion has been supported. *Motion Passed.* Thank you, Senator Wedding.

Senator Wedding: Thank you.

President Brakel: Senator Ohlinger, we have a couple of policies here that we want to address and we will see where we need to extend time if need be to.

Senator Ohlinger: Hopefully we won’t.

President Brakel: Okay.

Senator Ohlinger: Does everybody hear me okay?

Senator Molitor: Yes, we can hear.

Senator Ohlinger: I am not going to share the first two policies; these were additional policies that just came through the last couple of weeks. The first one that I wanted to present from our committee is the Expedited Tenure Review policy. This is actually a new policy, but it is related to hiring faculty that are at an associate level or higher that have been granted tenure at another institution with standards, equal to or above our own. And instead of putting them through a tenure process and probationary period, they could be approved as having tenure upon hire. This has been reviewed by AAUP, thank you Senator Wedding, and it went to our committee and there were no concerns of objections expressed. So that was the first policy.

President Brakel: Please note that they would still go through all the levels within the University.

Past-President Rouillard: I had a little concern about the timelines. So this policy says that if the first level committee, which would be DPC fails to respond within ten days of receiving the official CV of this person, the dean will presume first level faculty support the candidates’ evaluation. Very often these requests come in through the summer when faculty are nine months. I would request that there would be at least an extra five business days. I am assuming ten days is ten business days, and that could still be pretty problematic to reach back on the DPC during the summer when they are not on contract. I would request an increase to fifteen business days.

Senator Dinnebeil: I actually have some concerns about that recommendation, only because very often hiring folks – you’re on a timeline anyway – and candidates who are hired for positions may not want to wait or maybe can’t wait for fifteen days at least to get that answer. That is three weeks. And it seems as if it could hamper hiring efforts. Again, I agree about the summer situation, but I do have concern about increasing the length of time that DPC’s have to review that.

Senator Molitor: I agree with Senator Dinnebeil on this. In a lot of cases, you are trying to make an offer to a candidate who is considering offers at other institutions and time is of the essence. Faculty, staff and students are part of the candidate review process and they would have a chance to provide feedback on those candidates during the hiring process. So if there are concerns about the candidates’ ability to achieve tenure, this should be part of the discussion if the position is for a tenured or full professor, I would assume that those discussions would have already happened even before it gets to the DPC.

Past-President Rouillard: Historically, I am not sure that the faculty, the entire faculty of a department, which that person is applying, have been invited to review materials. I think in the past its gone to DPC.

Senator Wedding: Yes, I agree with Past-President Rouillard on this. I’ve sat on UCAP and we get these coming in in the summer and we are frequently given very short notice to get people together to hear them and we are at the top level so to speak. So I can’t imagine what it would be like down below. You’ve got to give these people time to look at these.

These summer hires need to be looked at and so I don't see anything wrong with making it a full two weeks. So fifteen days will be two weeks, instead of just making it a week and a half. You may have some weekends in there too, but that is okay.

Past-President Rouillard: Well, I was proposing fifteen business days.

Senator Molitor: That is three weeks.

Senator Wedding: Well, I agree with that too. I support Past-President Rouillard all the way. I think that should not hold up someone who wants a position with us.

President Brakel: Would a compromise be 12 (twelve) days.

Senator Ohlinger: I am wondering if clarification that this would be ten business days be accepted

Senator Molitor: would like to point out that it says that these candidates had previously been awarded tenure at another institution.

President Brakel: I'm seeing in the chat box that Senator Lucy says that she agrees with Senator Dinnebeil, fifteen days is three weeks and that is sufficient time to lose a candidate. We have many things working against us already. This will only add to it. I just want to make sure everybody saw that.

Senator Gregory: I also agree with that. I think Senator Molitor's point about these folks having tenure at their previous institution, getting the opportunity to meet with departments, I don't see this as trying to slide people in without the proper vetting. I think if you have a candidate that you really, really want, you have to be very nimble. Yes, I would rather make sure we don't bog down the process.

Past-President Rouillard: I would agree that during the academic year ten business days would be sufficient. I am mainly concerned with summer.

Senator Wedding: And I agree with that.

Senator Giovannucci: I saw on the Medical Campus, we are twelve-month faculty and I understand the issue about the in summer maybe the Main Campus faculty have a problem with getting faculty to review these. I don't have a strong opinion either way about it. I would just bring up the point that whether it is two weeks or three weeks, it seems like nothing precludes people from moving things quickly because presumably the department wants to hire this person as well. So I think it doesn't matter if the faculty are trying to hire that person, they can make decisions faster than three weeks. You don't have to wait three weeks, is that correct?

Past-President Rouillard: That is correct. The issue is the default answer. The way the policy is written it says that if DPC doesn't respond within 10 days, then the dean can assume a positive response. And so for me, the DPC will have plenty of time during the regular academic year to respond within ten days. It will be more difficult when your DPC is made up of nine-month faculty. But absolutely, there is nothing that precludes people from working faster provided they've had time to review the materials.

Senator Wedding: This has come up. I've been involved in this type of thing during the summer and this very problem has occurred. I think maybe if you would, if you could say ten days during the regular academic year but during the summer, fifteen days – that would satisfy me.

Senator Dinnebeil: I still maintain my concern about basically making the process stop or an extra week to wait to see if faculty of the DPC will respond to email. I would have a different response if technology didn't permit us to be able to you-documents remotely and have conference calls and things like that. I don't think that there's necessarily a need for DPC members to get to campus to meet face-to-face. So I think two weeks would be entirely appropriate.

Senator Wedding: Are you saying you would go from ten days to two weeks?

Senator Dinnebeil: Ten business days would be two weeks.

President Brakel: So we are moving on here. So the motion on the floor from the committee is that the Expedited Tenure Review policy would be approved. Do I hear somebody *calling the question*?

Senator Hefzy: I call the question.

President Brakel: Thank you, Senator Hefzy. Okay, we will now vote on this. I am going to do this in separate entities. If you are in favor of approving this policy vote, please say yes at this time, otherwise, please hold back. It looks like the policy is approved. **Policy Passed.** Let's move on. It is six o'clock, can I extend for fifteen minutes? Thank you. Proceed.

Senator Ohlinger: The next policy is one that's been in place since 2017, and it is teaching by non-faculty employees. It is just the reaffirmation of the policy. It has been approved at all the levels. The motion is to approve for reaffirmation of an existing policy. Is there any discussion?

Senator Wedding: I am in favor of this policy. I think it is a good policy. However, I would like to see it followed because although it's been around, it has not been strictly followed and we do find administrators on this campus and staff teaching beyond the limits and lots of overload. I think that this policy, if followed will be appropriate.

Senator Ohlinger: Thank you, Senator Wedding. There is a stipulation that says any exemptions to this limit must be approved by the provost. What you are asking is that that actually be enforced?

Senator Wedding: I am asking that they follow the policy

President Brakel: Any other discussion? Hearing none. Place your vote in the chat box. Alright, that's been approved. We had previously talked about the emeritus policy and discussion, and the committee went back and did a little bit more work. Again, they are just going to present their information right now.

Senator Ohlinger: Can you see the policy on your screen?

Senator Molitor: Yes.

Senator Ohlinger: Thank you. I will go through the changes by the comments made from review from the last Faculty Senate meeting. I am just going to go through these [please read the policy]. All the remaining changes are similar, but they are just at different levels.

President Brakel: This is not really something we are voting on, it's a little bit of a discussion. This will go back to the Provost Office who will rewrite the policy.

Senator Gregory: May I ask a question, President Brakel?

President Brakel: You may.

Senator Gregory: I am curious about the phrase "failure to act shall be considered as approval of the request." I can understand wanting to try to make sure that a chair doesn't sit on a request, but I guess in terms of positive practices, I am not a fan of something didn't happen so you get to advance further. That doesn't seem like a great situation, especially when there can be legitimate reasons why something might fall through the cracks or somebody is a day late. I don't know if this means 30 business days or 30 regular days, if the chair interprets that one way or the other. I don't know. Maybe you could just tell me more about why, if the chair somehow doesn't manage to send that memo, the candidates just [don't] get on through?

Senator Ohlinger: Just as you mentioned, we don't want one action to actually stop the process. It actually happened in a case recently where the process just stopped because it was not forwarded for any vote, up or down. So that was the original intent in terms of the wording. The wording is actually very similar to the expedited tenure review that we looked at for hiring and that was drafted by the administration. Actually, the ones that drafted it, they used similar wording; it is not exactly the same, it's similar in that if there's no action that approval is presumed (maybe a different wording). That is

where it came from. If we have a better wording in mind so that it is a positive rather than a negative or equity assets, then I am all open to that.

Senator Wedding: I agree that we should not allow something like this to be pigeonholed at some level. It is just not right for somebody the Provost Office, in this case the dean's office, to just let this sit. That has happened on this campus with this particular situation where the dean didn't say yes or no, it just sat there forever. And forever means it's been there now for about three years.

President Brakel: Thank you. So that is the discussion of it. As like I said, I want to thank Senator Martin and your committee for your work on this. Right now, as I mentioned, it goes back to the Provost Office to finalize their policy and then they will be resubmitting that policy for an actual vote later.

Senator Ohlinger: Thank you to my committee members too; I appreciate you'll as well.

President Brakel: Alright, that brings us to the 'other business' that we need to take care of. Is President-Elect Hammersley still on?

Senator Hammersley: Yes.

President Brakel: I didn't know if you want to say anything or not.

Senator Hammersley: Folks I would like to announce my retirement at the end of June. I thank you for the opportunity to serve you for the last six plus years. I've got too many reasons for this. I have expressed my differences in the past with the dean, regarding the affiliation of the Medical Center, the loss of it. I'm also pushed by the opportunity to serve other manners for the Covid-19 pandemic. Thank you so much for this extraordinary opportunity. I've made a lot of friends in this body. A great deal of thanks needs to go to the Executive Committee, Quinetta and especially Tim for all their support and help for getting physician up to speed with undergrad and grad. So I just wanted to announce this. Thank you very much. I'm sorry this puts you in a bind of having to elect both, a president-elect and a president. Again, I appreciate all your help!

President Brakel: And we recognize your service and [I/we] really thank you for coming on board this year. You've been a big asset for me in being able to articulate issues from the Medical Campus, especially. I really thank you for everything you've done, Dr. Hammersley.

So just that we know what happens: We have our next meeting in two weeks that will be a split meeting, where we will finish up the old and the new Senate will be seated and that will be the group that will decide the officers and how they are going to proceed for next year. Is there any other business before us? Any items from the floor? May I entertain a motion to adjourn?

Senator Hefzy: So move.

Senator Ohlinger: Second.

President Brakel: All in favor say 'aye.' Meeting adjourned. Goodbye.

IV. Meeting adjourned at 5:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Mark Templin
Faculty Senate Office Administrative Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

