

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of December 04, 2018
FACULTY SENATE

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

Approved @ FS on 1/15/2019

Summary of Discussion

Dr. Andrew Hsu, Provost of the University of Toledo

Dr. Anthony Edgington

Dr. Denise Bartell and Ms. Margie Traband

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 Rouillard called the meeting to order; Executive Secretary, Mark Templin called the roll.

I. Roll Call: 2018--2019 Senators:

Present: Andreana, Bailey, Bigioni, Bouillon, Brakel, Compora, Dowd, Edgington, Emonds, Frank, Gibbs, Gilchrist, Giovannucci, Gray, Hall, Hefzy, Jaume, Jayatissa, Keith, Kistner, Kovach, Krantz, Lecka-Czernik, Lee, Longsdorf, Lundquist, Maloney, Modyanov, Molitor, Monsos, Murphy, Nigem (proxy for S. Ariss), Oberlander, Ohlinger, Ortiz, Reeves, Relue, Rouillard, Steven, Stepkowski, Templin, Thompson-Casado, Tiwari, Tucker-Gail, Van Hoy, Weck-Schwarz, Wedding, Weldy, Woolford, Zhu

Excused absence: Chattopadhyay, Duggan, Ferris, Gibbons, Hammersley, Heberle, Menezes, Sheldon, Niamat, Reeves

Unexcused: Ariss, Schlageter, Schroeder, Taylor

II. Approval of Minutes: Minutes from the Faculty Senate meeting held on November 20, 2018 are not ready for approval.

President Rouillard: Good afternoon. Since our last meeting, Provost Hsu has been named the President of the College of Charleston in Charleston, South Carolina. We congratulate him and thank him for his work here, though he will not start his new job until after the spring semester.

Executive Committee Report: There was a meeting of the FS ad hoc FYE committee on Nov. 27. Dr. Bartell shared some sobering statistics with us regarding student responses on the Nation Survey of Student Engagement. This survey addresses such topics as perceived student-centeredness, perceptions of instructors, perceived impact of courses on higher-order thinking, and perceived institutional emphasis, among other issues. Student responses to the NSSE are typically included in the self-study report made to the HLC. Dr. Bartell also shared with the committee her experiences at University of Wisconsin-Green Bay in re-visioning orientation courses and first-year seminar courses there. In case you are interested, one of the books she recommends is *How College Affects Students*, available as a Proquest Ebook through our library. We will ask her to speak more about these things in an upcoming FS meeting.

I attended the Provost Deans' and Staff Meeting of Wed. Nov. 28. There was discussion of registration holds, enrollment updates, and the Faculty Senate Dean Evaluations. Dean Barbara Kopp-Miller reported there would be 6 new cbe/pace courses in spring 2019. The hope is that by fall 2019 a version of the RN

to BSN program will start as CBE program, separate from the current online program. UT hopes to be the first public university in the state to offer a 4-yr. CBE program.

President-Elect Tim Brakel and I met with President Gaber on Thurs. Nov. 29. The issue of the deans survey came up there as well, and she expressed concern that the BOT might not ratify our revised constitution if comments are distributed to college faculty.

Dr. Hsu met with the FSEC on Thurs. Nov. 29. He confirmed that the tech and lab fees are indeed going to the general budget funds. This first set of increased taxes are projected to generate 1.5 million. While the decision to increase these fees was not made by Dr. Hsu, we expressed our concern that moving any portion of these fees to the general operating budget constitutes a tuition increase.

I'd also like to congratulate Dr. Kasey Tucker-Gail whose grant for the Center for Student Advocacy and Wellness has been renewed.

[Applause]

That concludes my report, does anyone else from the Executive Committee have anything else to add?

Senator Brakel: I have been reporting to the Faculty Senate off and on about student liability insurance and as of last Friday there are two policies that I want to bring to your attention that have been posted for public comment. The first one deals with student organizations can get liability insurance has been posted for public comments until January 2nd. It is my understanding, as I reported on last meeting, is that this issue is also going to be discussed at the January meeting of the IUC. Please comment on that. And another policy that I want you to be aware of is the registered student organization policy that also refers to some liability issues in there. Please look at those and make comments to them for next month.

Senator Molitor: Senator Brakel, could you find out why we are sending these policies out for review before the IUC has even met to discuss what they think our policies should be on this.

Senator Brakel: Earlier today I did put in a call to Dr. Flap Cockerel's office and I am waiting for his response.

Senator Molitor: Thank you.

President Rouillard: We do not have Minutes to approve this meeting, but we will next meeting. I did see Dr. Hsu come in and so we will listen to an update from the Provost.

Provost Hsu: Thank you, President Rouillard. I do have some report about, I think it was Senator Dowd who asked the question about the 26% and to talk about that. I can't believe it is already the end of fall. Time flies so quickly. I want to report to you that in the December Board meeting which is going to be on the 17th, I will be reporting to the Board of Trustees on the progress we've made on our strategic planning implementation. I am happy to report that we have 65 areas that we're measuring and we're reporting progress. So, of the 65 areas, 64 are on target and moving in the right direction. In fact, many areas are making considerable progress as I have reported to this body before in terms of student success. We are making tremendous progress in that area. I don't want to bore you with repeating the details, but we are certainly making good progress and built very good momentum. There's no doubt that by the end of the fifth year we will reach all of the goals we have set in our strategic plan.

Fall commencement is going to be December 15th. We have 1400 undergraduate candidates for degrees. That is much bigger than what we used to have. We have 641 candidates for Doctoral or Masters'

degrees. It is a very special occasion for our students and their families. I would encourage all of the faculty to come and help them celebrate.

We have an undergraduate research symposium exhibit currently on display in the library and it is going to continue until December 7, 2018. I would encourage you to stop by and talk to our students and encourage them to continue with their excellent work. The College of Graduate Studies is now taking on recruitment of graduate students. In the past we had enrollment management doing undergraduate recruitment and no one doing graduate student recruitment. We gave the pass to the Graduate School last year and they finally have the staff in place and the resources in place. So the first thing that they are doing now is some online searching and marketing and social media marketing within a 50 mile radius to working professionals. If you or any program directors in your college want to have specific messages sent out on behalf of your own program, please contact Cindy and she'll be more than happy to work with you to send out the messages.

Winter Intersession, last year we had seven intersession courses and 38 students. This year we have 11 courses and already about 110 students are registered. So, we are making very good progress. If we can triple it every year then we will be in pretty good shape in five years.

Finally, let me talk a little bit about the issue that President Rouillard just mentioned, and that is the 26% administrative cost that is being charged with student fees. In this particular case, I am just the "messenger" and whatever I say, please don't "shoot the messenger." If the Senate so desires, I will help invite our CFO to come and give you more details. The first one is that this is not a new surcharge, it is simply an increase because we've always had an 11% administrative surcharge on the student fees. When I say, "always," I don't know how long that "always" is. But the rationale for the 26% is because we negotiate with the federal government. The federal government allows a 26% administrative cost for all of their grants. We know the indirect cost is 50%, but 26% of the 50% is allowed for administrative costs. In our negotiation we actually submitted our calculation of what our actual administrative cost is, and that is actually 34%. The federal government admits that, but they are stating their cap is 26%. The increase in surcharge helps to balance our budget this year by generating \$1.5M. You know, our goal is always to protect our faculty and staff jobs first. So if you think about where we most likely will cut if we have to cut budget is going to be the low-pay staff assistants and that is going to be close to 20% that we will have to cut if we don't have these funds. That is the rationale behind it.

Senator Dowd: Congratulations on your new position first. I also want to thank you for taking the time to look into this issue. I have a couple of points. If you can have someone from the division of Finance come in and explain why this is necessary, it would be great. That is just my opinion. I will leave the discussion to the Executive Committee, but to tie this to grants, I just don't see the connection. Grant activities, you are looking for research and professional activities for the grants whereas an administrative fee on technology is a fee on monies that are dedicated to direct instructional uses. And so, whether you are talking about research overhead or anything, I just don't see the connection. The percentage may be similar—now, I want to be careful. I hope my tongue is not saying you did this.

The thing is that the 11.5% fee tax is only imposed a couple of years ago. We doubled it. Now one of the issues that is a concern to me is, is this a one-time grab at the money for 26%? Are we going to look forward to seeing the minimal, at the very least of 26% being taxed the way next year and the next year? In other words, was this money taken for this year only or is it in the plans from Finance that they will impose this fee every single year because probably most, if not all colleges are going to have to increase their tech fee to cover their own expenses now that they don't have the funds they were expecting? If that is the case, we are in a very slippery slope with regards to how much we are going to tax students.

Provost Hsu: Well, Senator Dowd, if you've noticed the last time I said I was going to come with a script and even though I didn't look at my script, I was following my script very strictly. I think it is a very good question, but I don't think I have the answer and I don't want to veer off my script. So I would be happy to pass on that question and then perhaps invite somebody from Finance to answer your questions.

Senator Dowd: I appreciate it. Thank you.

Provost Hsu: Thank you. By the way, I was told there's an "elephant" in the room and the "elephant" is me. I am going to be leaving in the next half-a-year or so. I just wanted to say I really do appreciate the collaboration, the partnership between the Provost Office and the Faculty Senate. I really do appreciate working with you and having an opportunity to collaborate and move the university forward. I want to say that we really did build tremendous momentum. The university is moving in the right direction and I look forward to seeing the university continue to move in the right direction. Thank you.

President Rouillard: Thank you, Provost Hsu.

[Applause]

President Rouillard cont'd: That brings us to our next report from Dr. Anthony Edgington, Chair of Faculty Senate Undergrad. Curriculum. I believe this list of courses was sent out to you yesterday.

Senator Edgington: So I hope you had the opportunity to take a look at these proposals. The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee is bringing three new course proposals to you today following nine course modifications. Let's start with the course proposals.

The first one is from the College of Engineering, EECS 4790, Network Security. This course description is: Theory and practice of network security. Topics include firewalls, Windows, UNIX, and TCP/IP network security. Security auditing, attacks, viruses, intrusion detection and threat analysis will also be covered.

The other two proposals come from the College of Arts & Letters. The first proposal is DST 4000, Global Issues in Disability. This course description is: This course will examine the history of treatment and creation of disability in the Middle East through a disability studies lens. We will explore disabilities through various periods of time/ from Ottoman Empire to today. And countries (Lebanon, Palestine, Afghanistan, Morocco and more). We will discuss representations of disability in contemporary in Middle Eastern film, in various ancient texts and religious, as well as policies regarding people with disabilities in the region. We will also focus on the 'insider perspective' to disabilities in the Middle East by learning about how people with disabilities discuss their lives and identities, discussing various disability social movements, as well as efforts for development and disability rights and the critique of these efforts from the perspective of people with disabilities.

The second proposal is DST 4690, Honor Thesis and Capstone. This course description is: Disability Studies does not have a thesis course coded for Honors, but we are to enroll students interested in seeking honors in the major. This course will allow that to happen easier and to show up on student transcripts. Are there any questions or discussion on the three course proposals?

Senator Lee: Just the comment that the disability studies, the global issues, this is for one syllabus, correct?

Senator Edgington: Yes.

Senator Lee: But it would be kind of a special topics course because it looks like on the---

Senator Edgington: Do you mean 4690?

Senator Lee: The 4000. The catalog description in curriculum tracking is more general. I am referring to the text, “The special focus would be on global---”

Senator Edgington: That is the syllabus description. It is very hard in curriculum tracking to copy and paste those in this, so I’ve been using the syllabus.

Senator Lee: So not every offering of this course would focus on disability?

Senator Edgington: That I am not sure. Is there somebody from Disability Studies who can answer that question? The syllabus that was submitted is focusing on that, but I can find out the answer to that.

Senator Lee: I will read the description for Senate. The catalog description from curriculum tracking is “*discussion focus will be on global and contemporary issues as they arise in changing political and social environments. Geopolitical area of focus may vary based on instructor expertise*”

Senator Edgington: So they vary slightly.

Senator Lee: Yes.

Senator Edgington: Are there other questions or discussion? All in favor of approving the three course proposals, say, “aye.” Any opposed? Any abstentions? ***Motion Passed.***

Moving on. We have nine course modifications. We have four coming from the Natural Sciences and Mathematics. The first modification is EEES 1020, Introductory Geology Lab. The modification here is: A change of EEES 1010 from a co-requisite to a pre-requisite. Being done to eliminate possible confusion among students.

The second modification is CHEM 3722, Recitation for CHEM 3720. The modification here is: A change to a minimum grade needed for the prerequisite. Change from D- to C-.

The third modification is BIOL 2170, Fundamentals of Life Science: Biomolecules, Cells, and Extension. The modification here is: Reflects changes in Placement Assessment prerequisite, and changes minimum grade in other prerequisites courses from D- to C-.

The fourth modification is BIOL 2150, Fundamentals of Life Science: Diversity of Life, Evolution, and etc. The modification here is: Reflects changes in Placement Assessment as prerequisites, and changes minimum grade in other prerequisites from D- to C-.

The fifth modification is MSL 3010, Leadership and Problem Solving. The modification here is: A name change from current to Training Management and the Warfighting functions.

The sixth modification is MSL 4990, Independent Study in Military Science. The modification here is: A name change from current to Independent Study in US Military History.

The seventh modification is EECS 4560, Database Systems I. The modification here is: Modifications include a change in title (to Database Management Systems), a change in course description, and change from course as elective to required. Changes being suggested align with current accreditation.

The eighth modification is EECS 4760, Computer Security. The modification here is: Modifications include a change in course description and change from course elective to required. Changes being suggested align with current accreditation.

The ninth modification is EECS 4460, Power System Analysis. The modification is: Modification include 1) eliminating EECS 4240 as pre-req; 2) add EECS 3220 as pre-req; 3) change in course title to Power System Management.

Are there any questions or discussion on the nine course modifications?

President Rouillard: Just a question for the EECS courses. Because those are also involving changes from co-requisites to pre-requisites and changing electives to requires, are you also putting those through program modification?

Senator Molitor: Yes, I believe the program modification was submitted with this.

President Rouillard: Thank you.

Senator Edgington: Are there any other questions or discussion on the modifications? Hearing none. All those in favor of approving the nine modification, say “aye.” Any opposed? Any abstentions? ***Motion Passed.*** Thank you all very much.

President Rouillard: Thank you. Next on the agenda we have a report from Senator Wade Lee on the Ohio Faculty Council.

Senator Lee: I will also be reading from a script just to make it easier for Quinetta so I can send this to her afterwards. The first few things that I would like to talk to you about that we’ve been discussing at Ohio Faculty Council are two bills in the Ohio legislature right now. In fact, there will be committee meetings tomorrow where these will be met on again. The first is HB 758, regarding Free Speech on College Campuses. This was introduced on Nov 1, and then referred to the Higher Education & Workforce Development Committee on Nov 13. At the Nov 28 Hearing, both OFC and Inter-University Council Chairs testified. Both brought up concerns over this bill and that it singled out university campuses which are already governed by First Amendment rights to free speech, as well as the costs associated with hosting controversial speakers, while affirming university’s commitment to the free exchange of ideas. The next hearing is tomorrow, December 5th and there might be a substitute bill or amendments introduced, according to the agenda. We can follow that online.

The other bill, Substitute House Bill 66 (now in Senate Committee) – This was to establish the Undergraduate Mission Study Committee to evaluate each state university's efforts to secure participation in the undergraduate mission by the university's tenured faculty members.

So you may remember because Drs. Rouillard and Thompson testified on this when it was in the House last year. It passed through the House and it is now in senate.

Ultimately, the bill sets up a committee of: Chancellor, President of IUC, Chair of OFC, 2 faculty members, 2 provosts, 2 students, 3 State Reps, 3 State Senators.

What that committee would do is have a lifetime of 6 months. According to the current text of the bill, the committee will create a report in 6 months that has a detailed summary of each institutions undergraduate mission and efforts to encourage tenured faculty to contribute, recommendations for

- participation and incentives
- an entity to conduct external reviews and “grade each state university as ‘exceeds expectations,’ ‘meets expectations,’ or ‘needs improvement’ with respect to the university’s efforts in encouraging tenured faculty to contribute to the undergraduate teaching mission”
- criteria for such a review

- how each could incorporate contributions into its annual review of tenure-track and post-tenure faculty

And finally, the committee would: “Review of the faculty composition at each institution based on employment status, including tenured faculty, full-time tenure track faculty, full-time non-tenure track faculty, and part-time faculty.” In his testimony, the Chair of OFC “suggest[s] that each of Ohio’s public institutions of higher education carefully consider what ratio [of full-time to part-time faculty] is most appropriate for its mission and then report annually as part of its Affordability and Efficiency filing with the Ohio Department of Higher Education the progress it is making toward arriving at or maintaining that ratio.”

This is likely to pass this month. Like I said, this bill has been kicking around the State House for two years. It is probably going to pass out of senate tomorrow and then be voted on by senate. They are likely to finish up all of their work at the end of this term. So the perspective is that this is likely to pass. The language of the bill, we don’t know what it will ultimately be, but it ultimately creates a committee that has 6 months to create this report and recommend an extra...to do some sort of assessment. So we might be looking at helping create those reports as to how tenured faculty contribute to the undergraduate education.

Currently, we are working on a white paper of how assessment of learning outcomes leads to pedagogical improvements among Ohio universities, and that our assessment activities are effective at improving educational outcomes. Basically, this is just from a concern of a member of OFC that we’re doing a lot of assessment. They want to make sure that our assessment activities are actually effective and efficient ways of translating into better educational outcomes and not just assessment. I will probably be contacting some folks in the Provost Office in assessment for answers on what tangible effects assessment have translated into changes in how we do things. Are there any questions for me? The next meeting of the OFC will be next Friday.

Senator Krantz: Senator Lee, on the first bill, in the discussion that the OFC had, was there any clarity as to why the legislature is pursuing this? What is the perception of fulltime tenured track faculty and how they contribute to the educational mission?

Senator Lee: The perception was that fulltime tenured track faculty do not teach many undergraduate students. That they are focused on teaching graduate programs and research, therefore part-timers are being used to pick-up the majority of undergraduate education. So that is my impression of why this bill was introduced. I am seeing the nods from both President Rouillard and Amy Thompson.

Amy Thompson: Well, and initially when it was introduced there were some concerns that it was kind of a way to study the impact of tenure and how that might play into keeping faculty. One of the other implications in the earlier version was to try to require all faculty to actually teach undergraduate education, even in professional programs which could mean someone even teaching outside of their discipline. This has been talked about for a while as a way to kind of put the foot in the door of the value of tenure in our state.

Senator Lee: What is interesting when reviewing some of the documents, like there is a fiscal impact report and a plain language analysis that was submitted with each bill, and so I was reviewing some of

those, they very specifically pointed out that workload including teaching undergraduate courses is the domain of the universities, the Board of Trustees, and not the legislature. So even in the analysis of the bill, that was kind of reaffirming, but that is never explicitly stated in the bill itself.

Senator Hefzy: Was there any data related to this perception? Do we have any data for our university?

Senator Lee: That, I don't know because I was looking at the testimony that was given in committee for this bill over the last year. This is its fourth hearing under the senate committee and it had at least two or three hearings in the House bill versions.

Senator Hefzy: All these hearings with no actual data?

Senator Lee: Well, not that I saw in any of the invited testimony. Basically, when people testified in front of the committee they are usually speaking not specifically to their own institution, but to principals. I didn't see any data either brought by the bill sponsors or brought by testimony kind of addressing that.

President Rouillard: These issues often come up not because there is proof of anything, but somebody gets an anecdote, somebody gets an idea and the legislators are often running. There is no specific incident, or chart, or data that precipitated this.

Senator Hefzy: So they may be saying something out of nothing?

President Rouillard: Yes.

Senator Ohlinger: Is that what this committee is supposed to be doing, putting together a report of actual data or no?

Senator Lee: The committee is not there to make recommendations or how data could be incorporated into the annual review process for tenured track and post-tenured faculty. They will be recommending the criteria by which an institution could be graded as exceed expectations, meet expectations, or needs improvement with respect to the university's effort on encouraging tenured faculty to contribute to the undergraduate mission. So I think that is part of why this bill to form a committee is to form a more limited duration committee because the purpose of this committee is to recommend an entity that would be external to the committee and to the universities to do this grading. Ohio Faculty Council's position is, without knowing the criteria that are coming out of this committee, we don't know how to grade those things other than to have each institution report what its institution's mission is and what contributions are being made towards that by tenured faculty.

Senator Ohlinger: What is the bill number again, please?

Senator Lee: It is called Substitute House Bill 66, but you will find that it is now in the senate and so it has already passed the House in the senate. The Free Speech Bill is House Bill 758, which was recently passed. I think that was in response to the University of Cincinnati and Ohio State. We've heard on this campus about our Free Speech policy, such as, who bears the security costs for controversial speakers on campus? I think that was the origin of that bill.

President Rouillard: Thank you, Senator Lee. Our next speakers are Denise Bartell and Margie Traband. Margie just came in. Please come in. Denise will be here in a few minutes. I think you are going to be talking about this service learning designation. You have a handout that I will distribute. Margie, could I also ask you to introduce yourself and your position as well?

Ms. Margie Traband: I would be happy to. My name is Margie Traband. I am the Senior Director of Community Engagement with the Office of Government Relations for the University of Toledo. I appreciate the opportunity to talk today about service learning. Service learning has had a different path at the University of Toledo. Around the late 90's/early 2000's, we had a designation process for service learning and then it kind of went to the wayside around 2006-2007. I am here today to ask if we can reinvigorate the designation process. I personally am looking for the designation process because part of my responsibilities is the Carnegie Engage University classification. There is a section within that report that asks: How many courses are designated? Do you have a common definition? How many departments? How many colleges? It is a bunch of data that is asked within the report. In 2025 when we have to re-designate for the Carnegie, we have to answer those questions again. When we turned in our application the last time they told us that we needed to do a better job of data collection—so, that is one of my goals. The service learning definition is at the top of the handout. That is adopted from the National and Community Service Trust Act. Then I added one bullet at the end of it to be a little more UT centric for the institutional service student learning outcomes.

When Dr. Bartell and I spoke at the Executive Committee meeting, we kind of discussed maybe having it mirror the research intensive course designation process. So within the research intensive designation it has the three areas, plus the approval process, and so that is where the rest of the document...Currently within the tracking system there is an academic engagement mark that you can have for designation, but we don't really know where it goes and how many have done it, so, we are trying to reintegrate that button.

President Rouillard: And this would be much easier in the new curriculum tracking system?

Ms. Traband: Yes, that is the goal.

President Rouillard: One of the things that I found helpful when the two of you came to the Faculty Senate Exec. meeting was the explanation of the difference between service learning and experiential learning.

Ms. Traband: Service learning is embedded within the curriculum of a course, so it is enhancing the curriculum by a project or a real world hands-on project within the community. Up at the top it kind of describes a little bit about it. It is about mutually beneficial partnerships within the community, that the students and the faculty in the course are not going into the community and kind of doing a research project on the community, but they are also not being free labor. It is a learning experience for them. Also, it is a little bit different than an internship vs. service learning because it is a class experience that is not an individualized experience that you are learning with your cohorts and your peers. There is time for reflection of what you're doing within the community and the project that you're having.

President Rouillard: And experiential leaning is more of an individualized experience?

Ms. Traband: The internship, yes, is more. So within experiential learning, the University of Toledo has service learning as one of those high impact practices along with co-op and internships, service learning, and study abroad. So all of those kind of different experiences that you can have within, this is just one example of those.

Senator Gilchrist: Could one course be designated as both experiential and service learning?

Ms. Traband: So if it is experiential learning, it is service learning. So experiential learning is kind of the bigger umbrella and co-op, internship, study abroad, service learning, all those kind of things fall into the umbrella of experiential learning.

Senator Maloney: Other universities have an Office of Service Learning that monitors not only the placement but the relationship with the community, what would be the plan for having that?

Ms. Traband: So we did have an office the first go-around of this and it was not deemed that successful of maintaining or building those relationships. One of my roles as the Senior Director of Community Engagement is help identify different community needs and areas that the university can help in that. I can help bridge some of those, but I don't want to be the gatekeeper, but being more of an aid.

Senator Maloney: Can we at least establish that for the students who are seeking outside connections, how will they find a site...?

Ms. Traband: Typically it is a class project, so therefore the professor is working with the community partner in establishing their needs and how it can benefit the class structure of it. So it is not an individual student going out and looking for a roundabout to put indigenous plants in or something like that. It is the class that is coming together to look at a certain project.

Senator Ohlinger: It is certainly no question to see the value in service learning. I am wondering how this process or another process will recognize what the students have done. Is it just through a public transcript that will show that this is service learning designation? Or is there some other way institutions tend to recognize service learning?

Ms. Traband: So my hope is to be able to put it on the transcript so that it is documentable for the student going forward. Some institutions do not do that, but it would be my hope that we could do that. There are other avenues besides the bridging curricular learning process. They have a lot of self-discovery within service learning courses so that they can see the real tangible aspects of what they are doing within their career and how it can apply to outside the classroom experiences. But there is also different award processes that institutions have designated such as different presentations that they give to different audiences, different marketing, different press releases, different connections within the community, and typically different personnel that might lead to a different kind of role or a job. Does that kind of answer the question? There are awards, but there isn't as many besides the transcriptable; there's not like money in it or credit hours.

Senator Ohlinger: I hope there wouldn't be money. I was just wondering if there was any other ways of recognition that other institutions do to earn a certificate in service learning through your undergraduate degree program. I know that may sound really "goofy," but---

Ms. Traband: I have not seen a certificate in service learning, but I have had mention that if you do certain things in a co-curricular kind of way that you can get certain different kinds of merit badges, or recognition within your transcript or within your co-curricular transcript. But that is hit or miss within different institutions. Typically, it is just the designation on your transcript.

Senator Keith: My question is, because I don't have any experience with this myself, is there going to be any oversight of community partnerships in terms of --- if somebody were to come to me and say I have a project that I think your students would be perfectly good at helping us with --- and if we really didn't

know anything about the organization, how would I know that it is legitimate? Is there any kind of vetting to make sure that these relationships with the community are legitimate and actually will offer our students the opportunity to do service learning?

Ms. Traband: Hearing from other faculty that went through the process or other institutions that have gone through service learning designation processes, what we have heard is that is one of the larger concerns, the logistics of the actual partnership and how to get the students to and from the different sites and some of those kinds of pieces. What I was hoping to do with the service learning committee that would be kind of reviewing the syllabus or the submission for those three areas just like research intensive that has an outside committee that look at those. Besides the curricular aspect of it, they would have support staff that would be able to look at some of the other aspects that require service learning such as if TPS wanted a service learning within their classroom, that would require different background checks and different legalities and things like that. So we will be able to look at those kinds of other factors that would be able to help in that unweaving of the project and the legalities of things.

Senator Keith: So maybe we do need a center.

Ms. Traband: I don't think that we have the resources for a center.

President Rouillard: But it does raise the question. We've had similar issues with liability for other things such as students doing clinical rotations or students doing co-ops, and internships and so forth, and so that would probably have to be vetted. There will have to be an identifiable process for that. But I think what you and Denise are here to talk about more specifically is the process by which the service learning courses would be specifically designated and how they will be reviewed.

Ms. Traband: Correct.

President Rouillard: Senator Krantz, did you also have a question?

Senator Krantz: No, Senator Ohlinger does.

Senator Ohlinger: Just a quick comment not to get too far off track from the course designation. Probably the college or the university that comes to my mind, first and foremost has been doing service learning for some time whether it is...or not and now it requires it through a community engagement course, is the Honors College and Honors 3010 now, Community Engagement required course. Have you spoken with the Honors College so maybe you can get some ideas?

Ms. Traband: So I've talked with the dean quite extensively of different aspects of it and helped kind of navigate some of the community relationships with her as well.

Senator Krantz: Just about everyone in here understands the external review by the HLC, Higher Learning Commission. You implied that there's some type of review by the Carnegie group, but I didn't catch the entire name. Do they have accreditation authority or what is their role?

Ms. Traband: It is an elective classification the university received in 2015. The university submitted a report on how does the university prioritize the community within the institutions. For example, is it within our value proposition? Is it within our leadership core values? It was a 75 page report.

Senator Krantz: So it is more like an informational resource than a pass/fail?

Ms. Traband: Correct. Only about 300 institutions around the nation have passed through this designation, but 1/3rd of the people that do apply receive it. It is prestigious.

Senator Hefzy: And we have it?

Ms. Traband: Yes, we do have it.

Senator Hefzy: [*Indecipherable*]

Ms. Traband: That is not my intention. I am truly just trying to get the designation on the books so that I can collect the data. If that is something that other bodies decide, then that would be, but, there is nothing of that on the books now. I believe the state legislature requires the opportunity to, not the requirement of.

President Rouillard: So maybe we can move to the bottom of your handout, which talks about the approval process. So what you and Denise are suggesting is that this would originate in a department. It would go through the usual curricular process at the department level and at the college level. There would be a separate committee, which you are calling here, the Community Engagement Committee, which would review and make a recommendation and bring it to Faculty Senate. Faculty Senate would approve or not approve and it will then move up to the rest of the hierarchy.

Ms. Traband: Correct.

President Rouillard: So is there any discussion of that proposed process?

Senator Gilchrist: Is this only undergraduate or also graduate?

Ms. Traband: Currently, it is only undergraduate just because I had to bite of a sizable, but it could grow to graduate.

Unknown Speaker: I see you are following the normal procedure per course modification, but somewhere in this process not just a basic description of how this project is incorporated in the class, is there going to be additional information on the educational outcomes of the project, how the students would be evaluated? You just made a mention of planting data grass on the roundabout. Certainly, there are things that can be associated with that. We can take our rec therapy students and use that as an opportunity for... However, beyond just the planting, information would need to be provided in terms of what are the objectives of this activity or the educational outcomes. It is almost like a separate syllabus to the course beyond a modification of just clicking a button and providing a brief description of what the students would do. I think there should be more detail for it to be reviewed.

President Rouillard: Presumably, that would start at the department level that whoever is looking to get this particular course designated as a service learning with those outcomes. It is not just "oh, well, my music class wants to plant---"

Unknown Speaker: I understand. I haven't been able to see the new curricular tracking system, but I am very familiar with the one that we use now. They are in the system, but will there be instructions of what an individual should provide, for example a sample outline like we have now for a sample syllabus for a new course?

President Rouillard: Right.

Unknown Speaker: So when these things are being evaluated, they are being evaluated on some bit of a more universal criteria than just my decision and my college's decision or my committee's decision. This explains enough. I just want to---

President Rouillard: Yes. And of course, that would also influence the Community Engagement Committee to make a recommendation. Is there anything else about process? So procedurally, I will turn to our secretary who is typically also our parliamentary. Do we need a motion or do we just do an endorsement of this?

Senator Templin: Well, it came in as a report or is it under "other business?"

President Rouillard: Other business.

Senator Templin: So Senate can receive it as a report or make a motion to endorse it or approve it.

President Rouillard: Is there anyone who would like to make such a motion?

Senator Hefzy: To endorse it?

President Rouillard: Yes.

Senator Maloney: *I move to endorse it.*

Senator Templin: *Second.*

President Rouillard: Is there any other discussion? Hearing none. All those in favor of accepting the outlined approval process from the Designation of Service Learning courses, please signify by saying "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? ***Endorsement Passed.*** Thank you.

Next on the agenda, we have items from the floor and Senator Gilchrist has already signaled that he has something that he would like to bring up.

Senator Gilchrist: I do. Thank you. I have a brief item following-up on our dean evaluation discussion from the last meeting, which I thought was an excellent discussion. After that, I received a call from Janelle Schaller, who is the Associate General Counsel in the Office of Legal Affairs here. I had not known Mrs. Schaller before our conversation last time; we had good talk about the legal issues involved. It struck me, but I haven't seen the Minutes yet, which I will, and so hopefully, this is unnecessary. I ought to make clear that nothing I said at our last meeting should be taken as disrespectful for either Ms. Schaller, her legal ability, or that of anyone in the Office of Legal Affairs. In fact, and I hope I am right about this, but my recollection is a key point that I made at our last meeting is we, as the Faculty Senate lack any legal opinion from the Office of Legal Affairs at this point of time. My comments aren't meant to be negative towards anyone else's legal views. And in deed, I can also say based on our phone call, Ms. Schaller seems like an outstanding attorney and I think we had a good dialogue about the legal issues involved. I just want to make that clear on the record in case it is not clear when the Minutes come out. Thank you.

President Rouillard: Thank you. Any other items from the floor?

Senator Tucker-Gail: I have one. It has been brought up in my college meeting and then in talking with other senators regarding some of the challenges that everybody is facing in bringing guests on campus or

accreditations teams for parking. It seems to be like just continuing to cycle and cycle. I just don't know if I can ask if the Executive Committee could maybe look at that and reach out to some of us who have had some exceptionally negative experiences with this situation. We want to be an open university where people could come and be a part of our process and be guest speakers in our class. We want to bring accreditation teams on and students on campus, but it doesn't seem to be a place for that to happen that doesn't cause a lot of issues. The constant response is typically, "oh, well, we have that Kiosk by the Student Union." Well, that is not enough space for what is needed. We shouldn't have to be shuttling people around. We shouldn't have to be doing all these loud and crazy things when we want them to be guests.

President Rouillard: Absolutely. Thank you for bringing that to our attention.

Amy Thompson: I had passed around a flier. Tomorrow from 12-2 pm. is the next future of higher education forums. Dr. Maggie Hopkins from the College of Business and Innovation is talking on emotional intelligence more from a leadership perspective. If you never heard her speak, she is fantastic. We will have some food and beverages available. It is in Carlson Library, room 1005. So I hope you can join us there tomorrow.

President Rouillard: Are there any other announcements?

Senator Bouillon: I have a question. This just came in my email. Are we aware that there may be some offshore printing that is going on? A proposal is being submitted for printing and copying for offsite vendors.

President Rouillard: No. Did this just come through in email?

Senator Bouillon: I just got it from a colleague in my college.

President Rouillard: Can you forward that email to me?

Senator Bouillon: I will, but I wanted you to be aware of this.

President Rouillard: Okay. Thank you.

Senator Krantz: President Rouillard as a follow-up to your Executive Report, have you gotten any feedback to the position of the Board of Trustees referring to our extended debate last session?

President Rouillard: The meeting that Senator Templin, President-Elect Brakel, and I attended with Steve Kavanaugh indicated that is something they are paying attention to, and President Gaber also suggested that they were as well.

Senator Krantz: It is a little bit disconcerting to hear that the Board of Trustees would deny it. Really what my question was, have they given their point of view and how is that different than what we discussed in Faculty Senate?

President Rouillard: It is quite different. I think faculty see it in many ways as a way of also congratulating their dean, recognizing their dean for positive accomplishments, which it can very well be. In fact, in the past I would say that is a major component of how these comments...It is as much about positive feedback to a dean than anything else. It is also a way for faculty in a college to have a sense of where their colleagues feel the college is going. I don't think that the Trustees necessarily see it that way.

They see it as public shaming, and they are forgetting those comments are very often positive comments about one's dean. So right now, that is all I can tell you. Senator Templin or President-Elect Brakel, do you have anything to add?

Senator Brakel: I would say that most of them are coming from a business background where comments are really not out to the public, it's between the employee and their higher-up. These comments are not necessarily disclosed to other members within the organization. So they see that practice there in that world; if those comments were distributed then that business could be held liable—I think that is the way they view it.

Senator Krantz: But that doesn't account for public records access. I mean, that is a very different culture, a very different point of view.

President Rouillard: I think the other thing that they are not taking into account is when faculty and staff are fired, that is indicated in a document in a personnel action form that is available off of the Trustee website with no authentication. So, certainly, people are identified as being involuntarily separated from the university, and that does not seem to concern them in terms of that person's future career prospects. So perhaps we need to bring that point into the discussion as well.

Senator Maloney: So after that session two weeks ago, I was considering the posting, even if it applies to individual colleges in one round. I was going to make a suggesting and I don't know quite how the procedure would work. One of the sidebar issues was other people being unintentionally...so that...redacting the comments to ensure that any name or any identifiable piece is redacted and that is not used.

President Rouillard: Certainly the instructions will clarify that as well. This is about commenting on a deans' professional activities and not any other third party.

Senator Maloney: But what if they did? I am not sure who would it be or how it would be done, but if somebody could make sure that other people are not named.

President Rouillard: I think that kind of redaction would be entirely possible by just blacking out the name. Is there anything else? Is there a motion to adjourn? **Meeting adjourned.**

IV. Meeting adjourned at 5:59 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Mark Templin
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard
Faculty Senate Office Administrative Secretary