

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of April 24, 2018
FACULTY SENATE

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

Approved @ FS on 8/28 /2018

Summary of Senate Business

Dr. Linda Speers, Chair of the Department of Family Medicine: Tribute to Jake Judkins
Dr. Melissa Gregory, Presidential Fellow: Tenure and Promotion Guidelines

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.

I. Roll Call: 2017-2018 Senators:

Present: Ariss, Atwood, Bjorkman, Bouillon, Brakel, Chattopadhyay, Compora, Duggan, Edgington, Emonds, Ferris, Gilchrist, Giovannucci, Gray, Gruden, Hall, Hammersley, Haughton, Hefzy, Humphrys, Kippenhan, Kistner, Kovach, Krantz, Lecka-Czernik, Lee, Lundquist, McLoughlin, Menezes, Modyanov, Monsos, Niamat, Nigem, Oberlander, Ohlinger, Ortiz, Randolph, Relue, Rouillard, Said, Schneider, Sheldon, Steven, Thompson, Van Hoy, Weck-Schwartz, White, Wittmer,

Excused: Bruce, Dinnebeil, Frank, Hottell, Hoy, Jaume, Leady, Maloney, Parker, Weldy, Xie,

Unexcused:

President Thompson: I would like to call the very last meeting of Faculty Senate. I would like to invite our Executive Secretary, Dr. Fred Williams up to call the roll.

Next on the agenda, I would like to call Dr. Linda Speer, Chair of Family Medicine up to do a tribute for Jake Judkins. Jake Judkins was one of the faculty members from the Health Science Campus who recently passed away, so we've asked her to come today to share a few words about him. Thank you, Dr. Speers.

Dr. Linda Speers: Jake Judkins was the Director of the Human Donations Science Masters' Degree Program, which is in the Department Physician Assistance Studies, which I also chair, and that was how I was asked to do this. What I would really like to do is read a statement from his closest colleague, Linda Miller. Linda Miller was the one who began that program, trained him, and groomed him to take that role in preparation for her own retirement, which she expects to do in about one-year-and-a-half. Unfortunately, Linda is out of town this week, but she really had the words that needed to be said at this time:

“Thank you for the opportunity to share a few words about my friend and colleague, Jake Judkins. I will miss him greatly, and I suspect that many of you will miss him too. He was so bright and interested in everything, but mostly he was interested in people. Jake had very strong interpersonal skills. He was very warm and was always very interested in the person he was interacting with. He listened well and he was by nature an encourager. He was quick to compliment and identify the strengths of those around him. He had an abundance mentality and instinctively understood that as others grow and improve, it makes the environment a better place as opposed to a scarcity mentality that creates an environment of unhealthy competition and offensiveness—that is why he was such a good teacher—he was able to explain complex

issues in a very understandable way without talking down to the listener. Jake was also so smart. He had a scientific mind. He was very interested in the “why” and how the human body works. He was so excited to be starting his journey toward earning his PhD. Jake was a devoted family man with a beautiful wife and daughter who were the light of his life. I will miss his quick and easy smile and the twinkle in his eye. As I said before, he was my friend and colleague, but he was also my former student, and he was like a son to me. He will be missed by many.” Sincerely, Linda Miller.

President Thompson: Thank you, Dr. Speers. He was one of our doctoral students in Public Health as well and so he will be very sadly missed.

So moving forward on the agenda. You should’ve received two various sets of Minutes, one from March 27 and one from April 10. I would like to start out with the March 27 meeting Minutes. May I have a *motion* to approve the March 27 Faculty Senate Minutes? Is there any discussion on the Minutes? Are there any additions or changes? All those in favor of approval of the Minutes from March 27, please say “aye.” Any opposed? Any abstentions? **Motion Passed.** Do I have a *motion* to approve the Minutes from April 10? Is there any discussion on the Minutes from April 10? Are there any additions or changes? Hearing none. All those in favor of the April 10 Minutes, please say “aye.” Any opposed? Any abstentions? **Motion Passed.** Thank you.

Executive Committee Report: Welcome to the final meeting for the 2017-2018 Faculty Senate!! We have come a long way this year through your leadership and hard work. On behalf of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, we thank you for your service as Senators this year.

Last week, I hope many of you attended the State of the University Address given by President Sharon Gaber. This was an uplifting account of the many outstanding accomplishments by our faculty, staff, and students. I think there is certainly a lot of momentum and renewed energy on our campus, and all of you are a part of that progress. If you missed Dr. Gaber’s speech, it is available online through the university website.

The UT Faculty Senate has had a very productive year and accomplished the majority of its goals that were set for the 2017-2018 Academic Year. In my final report as your Faculty Senate President, I would like to provide a brief summary of the outstanding work we have accomplished together.

As you may recall, we had set four overarching goals for this academic year. Our first overall goal, was to increase faculty engagement. This year, we hosted a faculty senate Homecoming social, held a faculty forum on issues and higher education, co-sponsored faculty crisis training, hosted two tenure and promotion workshops and an Advocacy and Government Relations Workshop. Through these collective events, we reached well over 350 attendees. Other faculty engagement efforts included the president and the president-elect of the Faculty Senate visiting each of the 13 colleges and meeting with faculty at their various college meetings.

For our second goal, to improve the access and affordability of textbooks, Faculty Senate worked with the campus bookstore and Bonnie Murphy from Auxiliary Services to host several faculty information sessions on the services available through the bookstore. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee, with the assistance of Senator Tom Atwood, distributed an evaluation survey to all faculty regarding perceptions and overall satisfaction with the campus bookstore. These results have been shared with the members of senior leadership and will be presented at today’s Faculty Senate meeting.

For our third goal, which was to revise our Constitution and Bylaws, Senator Mark Templin and his committee have completed revising these documents and they have been reviewed by our Faculty Senate

Executive Committee. High level changes to the document, as well as the processes for approval, were shared with the Senate at the last meeting. These documents will come to the floor of the Faculty Senate in the beginning of the Fall Semester for a vote of approval. The Faculty Senate Constitution will also need a vote of approval by the faculty as a whole and the UT Board of Trustees.

For the fourth and final goal, we wanted to make sure that the Faculty Senate remained current with reviewing all policies that were submitted to the Academic Regulations Committee. This committee did indeed accomplish this goal and was able to pass some very significant policies. Some of these policies included, a research misconduct policy, a textbook policy, missed class policy (this policy had been proposed but not approved for the last several years), a dual degree policy and an academic standing policy.

I would also like to highlight the work of our curriculum and program committees. This year, the Faculty Senate passed 65 new courses, 143 course modifications, and awarded 1 new course with an undergraduate research designation. There were also six new core curriculum courses approved and 65 new program modifications passed. We have been busy indeed.

Past-President Humphrys: *Point of order.* President Thompson, I would just like to state all of these wonderful things that you just mentioned that we've achieved this year, we achieved with your leadership. We all appreciate the job you've done. I'm just glad I came before you because I don't think I could match, but I know Linda will be able to match up to your level, but I don't think I could. You've done a great job and we would like to award you with this plaque that says, "*With thanks and appreciation to Dr. Amy Thompson for her service and leadership as the President of the University of Toledo Faculty Senate, 2017-2018.*" Thank you for the great job.

President Thompson: I appreciate this, but I will have to say that it is all because of your leadership and being a team. We are all a team together and we've been able to accomplish a lot. I thank all of you for your hard work. Thank you.

Past-President Humphrys: You were a wonderful leader. As it is custom, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee has some gifts for you now that you will now have a chance to relax a little bit, at least.

President Thompson: I am curious what that is.

Past-President Humphrys: It is a garden wind-spinner.

Senator Keith: It will need to be assembled.

Past-President Humphrys: We did not do it.

President Thompson: That will take me some time. In my spare time I can put this together. Thank you very much.

Past-President Humphrys: The other things that will help you relax, there is a wine club membership.

President Thompson: Wow.

Past-President Humphrys: So you can drink wine and you can listen to your wind spinner.

President Thompson: I will never get this put together <laughter>.

Past-President Humphrys: Also there is an audible membership, a gift certificate I believe it was.

Senator Keith: Right. We think you'll probably still will always multitask and we are not sure that you will sit and watch a wind spinner and drink wine and read a book, but we thought maybe you could listen to a book, watch the spinner, and drink wine.

President Thompson: That's a lot going on there.

Past-President Humphrys: Also, Amy has two dogs which she loves very much. I think they are sheepadoodles. Is that right?

President Thompson: That is right.

Past-President Humphrys: There is Eleanor Roosevelt and Lincoln Jefferson is the other. So in order to record your memoirs of your year as Faculty Senate President, we have some notepads that have their pictures on the back. So while you are out after you have assembled this and you're drinking your wine, and listening to what...

President Thompson: Thank you. I feel like I've won a cash explosion or something.

Past-President Humphrys: Well, you've done a wonderful job. Thank you very, very much.

[Applause]

President Thompson: You interrupted my report.

Past-President Humphrys: I am sorry.

President Thompson: Thank you very much. Executive Committee Report cont'd: All right, so as this is my final report to you, I would like to recognize our committee chairs who have helped lead the important work of our Faculty Senate Committees. Would all of the committee chairs please stand up and be recognized.

[Applause]

President Thompson cont'd: These leaders have worked tirelessly and really got tons done with their committees and I am very grateful. On the flipside of that, if you have been a member of one of the Senate Committee, would you please stand and be recognized?

[Applause]

President Thompson cont'd: She is walking around right now, but I would like to thank our Faculty Senate Secretary, Quinetta Hubbard for her work in our Faculty Senate Office. She really helps keep us organized with the Faculty Senate Office. She is responsible for transcribing our minutes, responding to emails, maintaining our website, and certainly a point of contact for you. Can we give her a hand?

[Applause]

President Thompson cont'd: Next, I would like to thank the incredible members of our Faculty Senate Executive Committee. These members have spent thousands of hours of their time working hard to serve you and advance our university. These individuals provide their collective wisdom and guidance and are always willing to step up and lead. I would like to call each member of the Faculty Senate Executive Forward at this time to provide them with a certificate of recognition.

As this is our last meeting, we have some final items to address before we adjourn for the year. I have asked President Elect Linda Rouillard to present the new deans and provost evaluation and Past

Presidents Mary Humphrys and Dr. Kristin Keith will present the new procedures for the administrative evaluation process. We will also hear from Senator Tom Atwood regarding the results from the bookstore evaluation. We will also have a discussion and a possible vote on the University Tenure and Promotion Guidelines.

After completing our business for the meeting, we will adjourn and then call the 2018-2019 Faculty Senate to order. We will then conduct elections for our new Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

In closing, these are exciting times at UT, our team is committed and our future is bright. It truly has been an honor and a privilege to serve as your UT Faculty Senate President this year. I am humbled every day by the talent, passion, hard work and dedication of our faculty. Through your service this year, we have advanced our great university and fostered a culture of “together is better.” Thank you, and that concludes my Executive Report. You may have noticed that Provost Hsu is not here today. I think he’s on the beach somewhere having a little vacation, so we will not have our academic update from him. However, we do have a couple of reports from our committees, Holly Monsos with curriculum proposals.

Senator Monsos: You’ve already approved the first item, however the Provost Office needs the accuplacer sentence skills added to the placement recommendation. This has to do with high school students who have not taken an ACT. They have no score that can be used and so the accuplacer has to be in there as well. In addition, both 1010 and 1100 set ACT score at or below 18. They can’t both be at 18 because then the computer don’t know what to do. This is below 18 and 1100 will be at or above.

Senator Schneider: 1110.

Senator Monsos: I’m sorry, it is what she said. This is a change to the placement information prerequisite for a course that you have already approved. We are trying to clean this up before it goes into Banner. All those in favor say, “aye.” Any opposed? Any abstentions? ***Motion Passed.*** Thank you.

The second thing is. This is currently in the tracking system, but it do not have the accuplacer sentence skills part in the curricular tracking system. It is this text that you are approving, not the text that is in the system, which I will have Kathy Zinger update pending your approval. So for 1110 new placement standards prerequisite for that course, this is a modification only. In addition, these three Comp II classes would add English 1010 as a prerequisite because right now, it is just 1110. So now it would be 1110 or 1010. Am I getting this right, Tom?

Senator Atwood: Yes.

Senator Monsos: Are there any questions on that set of English course modifications? We will get to math in a minute. All those in favor, please signify by saying “aye.” Any opposed? Any abstentions? ***Motion Passed.***

All right. There are new prerequisites for all of these gen ed. courses. You have already approved them once. In the process of this however, we did discover Math 1320 and 1340 when talking to the registrar, and those require that students have taken Algebra II in high school, correct, Don?

Senator White: Right, if they don’t have a high school diploma.

Senator Monsos: If they have a high school diploma, there is no problem and everything goes the way it always does. However, Banner cannot use a high school course as a prerequisite; it can’t find it and it doesn’t know how. This will impact tech students and college credit plus students. They will not be able to sign up for Math 1320 or 1340, unless they have had algebra II. They will have to be manually placed in at this point, unless between now and next fall the registrar figures out a new way to do it. We are still

working on exactly how this will be implemented. The new prerequisite for 1320 and 1340 does include if they haven't graduated high school yet and gotten algebra II, because that is part of the core, then they have to have had algebra II. Does this makes sense to everybody?

Senators: Yes.

Senator Monsos: Good. The other classes change some of the standards for the placement tests on Alex scores and ACT scores.

Dr. Molitor: I'm sorry, I didn't have a chance to reply to the thread that was going by today, but I still think we are potentially violating state rules about transfer. We are treating internal and external students differently if we put this tag on about high school graduation. I just say we would have to include it as, this course requires high school algebra II regardless whether someone has a diploma or not.

Senator Monsos: It does say that. It says, "high school graduation *or*"

Dr. Molitor: Oh, it's in "*or*." I thought you only check for the high school algebra if they didn't have a high school diploma. I thought that was how you were explaining it.

Senator Kippenhan: That is how I understood it.

Senator White: That is certainly what we would want that high school algebra II be part of the core. We have always assumed they had high school algebra II, but [if] college credit plus students show up, we don't want them in this college level course if they haven't had high school algebra II. So, are you saying we are violating rules relative to transfer students?

Dr. Molitor: Well, yeah. College credit plus students would be internal to the University of Toledo. You would not necessarily look for the same prerequisite if somebody was external to the University of Toledo when they were coming in. So again, that is where I'm worried about, that we're violating native vs. external students. I think the fix is just to say, the prerequisite is requiring high school algebra II for everybody.

Senator Monsos: Well, the problem with that is that very thing I just mentioned, and Banner can't do that. So that means every student who wants to enroll in 1320 or 1340 has to be permitted in. If we say "this" or "this" then it would be a much smaller population that is going to have to be put in.

Senator White: Furthermore, these number of students have the equivalent of a high school diploma if they were foreign students or so forth, and we have no intention of changing the requirements relative to those students.

Dr. Molitor: I understand.

Senator White: So your proposal, , wwould that do with students from foreign countries?

Dr. Molitor: I don't know. I think we need to consider this specific issue about how to implement it. I mean, I agree with the principal, I think it needs to be there as a prerequisite. Practical implementation of this without violating state rules on transfer is something we probably should talk about.

Senator Monsos: Well, you are requiring the same thing of all populations, everyone has to have algebra II. If you graduated from high school, you have algebra II because it is a core in high school.

Dr. Molitor: We are assuming. What if you had a GED or if you graduated from high school before there were core requirements? This is what I am concerned about. I am concerned that you are going to end up

with students who can take the course without high school algebra II and then somebody who is in high school and hasn't had high school algebra II would say, why would you allow that student to take that course?

Senator White: So in your previous message, I didn't understand the issue relative to transfer. I will confess that I am slow on the uptake, and so I don't necessarily understand it yet. Do you understand the issue or is this something that is...?

Senator Monsos: Not entirely. I think it is all processed and not a prerequisite. How we code it is a matter to be worked out with the registrar, I think. The requirement is the same for all populations that they have had algebra II—now, how we say that in the placement perhaps still needs a little finessing.

Dr. Molitor: Would the prerequisite potentially be high school algebra II, or a high school diploma, or GED?

Senator White: That is what it says.

Dr. Molitor: But then you will still have that issue with how to code it in Banner.

Senator White: Right. Is that the purview of Senate today, which is to figure out how to code it in Banner?

Senator Monsos: Would somebody like to take a stab at that? I don't. I would ask that we approve the prerequisite with the understanding that the text may need to change slightly so it could be coded correctly in Banner. Is that acceptable? Otherwise, we wait here. That mean students coming in on college credit plus or text, most of whom have had algebra II, they are fine, but, a small window of people who think they can sign up for the class anyway there won't be a way to check that until they are in the class.

Senator Van Hoy: Is that a motion?

Senator Monsos: Let us do these four. These four have nothing to do with high school classes, they just alter the placement testing in Alex and ACT scores slightly. All those in favor of those four, please signify by saying, "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? ***Motion Passed.*** Thank you. Alright, these two: Let me propose that we approve those today pending the registrar finding a way to accurately code them.

Senator Hammersley: *So moved.*

Senator Kippenhan: *Second.*

Senator Monsos: Any discussion? All those in favor, please signify by saying, "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? ***Motion Passed.***

President Thompson: Thank you very much. Dr. Keith, you have a couple of policies, right?

Senator Keith: We have a policy. After I asked Amy to send out this policy last night, I heard from the registrar and she said we absolutely had to make this one change. She said the forms are not available on the Registrars' website; where we will find those forms is on the faculty and advisor tab under the teaching tool kit in myut. The policy I am asking you to approve today has this change in it, but everything else is the same as what I sent out yesterday. I haven't gotten my committee's approval to bring this modification to the floor of Senate, so I hope I have their approval.

I saw Mark Templin do this at the last Faculty Senate meeting and I thought this was really a good idea, but, I couldn't figure out how to do the...He thanked his committee, so the first thing I want to do here is thank my committee because I personally think this is probably the hardest working standing committee of Faculty Senate. Now, I'm sure that Holly and Diane would probably disagree with me, as well as the chair of the Programs Committee would probably disagree with me, but we have put a lot of time and effort this year in to trying to actually work on these policies and get them in shape to where we actually can bring them forward for your approval. One of the members had a baby and could not be here and other people managed to become full professors during this year. I especially want to thank Don Wedding and Colleen who were mid-year replacements for faculty from their colleges. So, thank you so much.

[Applause]

Senator Keith cont'd: I also have a real quick announcement about the textbook policy. Linda, Amy and I met with the provost last Friday and he told us that he is going to hold back on bringing the textbook policy that we passed a month ago to Senior Leadership, and then have it be posted for comment because he found out that the June 30th deadline that we had really wasn't a state deadline. Remember, the June 30th deadline was for the BOT approval—well, it was [actually] an IUC deadline and so he feels fairly comfortable that we can just violate that deadline. What he wants to do is make sure that the policy we pass is similar to what our peers are doing. Once he knows a little more about that, he will either send the policy forward or it may actually return to us in the fall. Now, in terms of the policy that we're doing today, this policy is kind of an odd policy. It has been hanging around for a couple of years and it was called, Grade and Quality Points. It was a revision of the grades and grading policy that actually expired in 2014. They have somehow stripped out the grading part, and so I asked Vice Provost Ayres if they were intending on having a separate grading policy, and he said, "No, there was no intent to do that." He told us to work with the registrar to try to come up with a policy that everything we actually needed to have in it. In terms of the revision, we weren't exactly revising the current policy as much as we were revising this policy that we had that stripped out the grading. We changed the purpose of the policy, although the current language is from the policy website that I sent you yesterday. We changed the purpose; it just made more sense in terms of what the policy was actually doing. It applied to undergraduate students, but it doesn't apply to graduate students. There were some minor edits. In the policy statement we included a definition and the purpose of quality points. We also struck the S/U grading option because much to my surprise, graduate and professional courses, if students take a...credit, they actually get an S or U, and with undergraduates, they get the PS or the NC. We also made some minor edits under procedures to be audit. At the request of the registrar, we added in that if you want an audit you have to request that the course be in audit by the 15th day of the semester. The Incompletes, I don't know if you remember, but we spent a long time a few years ago talking about trying to modify the Incomplete Policy, and partly because the policy that we had basically said that students had to complete the work by the end of the following semester, otherwise, the grade will convert to an "F." They will have one opportunity to request an additional semester, and once the "F" was given, the student will have to re-register or retake the course. In March of 2016, we finally updated the Incomplete policy to give faculty the opportunity to put in a grade different from an "F," if the student was earning that grade prior to asking for the Incomplete. Students now have the opportunity to ask for two extensions. The last thing is, once the default grade roles over, the student can still choose to re-register or retake the course in consistent with the university policy on grade completions. Now, I don't know where this policy went because I couldn't find it posted anywhere, so, if there is one reason today to pass this policy, is so that we actually have some place...Faculty Senate policy on Incomplete that we passed a couple of years ago. What is new, and this is at the request of the registrar, is with the progress and review, the old PR. There are very few courses where instructors can actually give a PR grade in terms of undergraduate courses.

They are designed for research courses, special topics, or for study abroad. The list of courses you can actually assign a PR grade to is very limited. However, unlike an Incomplete, a PR never goes away because there is no time limit associated with it. So, if a student does not complete the work then it stays on the student's transcript as a PR until the instructor put in a change of grade, but if the student does not complete the work, they will not put in the change of grade. There are some minor exceptions that matriculated in certain Master programs that had a PR on their transcript at UT, but other than that, students cannot graduate with PR on their transcript. The registrar asked us to get something about it, and this was a suggestion that a bunch of people came up with, and the committee was fine with it—The PR grade have two parts, basically two grades. It could be a PRS if the student is earning a passing grade in your research class or it could be a PRU if the progress is unsatisfactory. If the student completes the course by completing the work, then the instructor will change the grade in the usual manner and give the student the letter grade he/she has earned. If the student does not complete the work at the point of graduation, the PRS will convert to a PS for just a pass. If the student is passing he/she will get credit for the course, and if it is a PSU, the student will get an "F" and receive no credit for the course. This would allow for the student to actually be able to convert into something like an Incomplete at the point where the student is applying for graduation. So that is really the only major change to this policy. I am interested in comments or discussion. How does Senate feel about this change?

Senator Oberlander: I have a side question as far as the grades and quality points. Is it expectation at all that colleges realize the plus/minus? Or is it their discretion to just do letter grades at the undergrad level?

Senator Keith: Well, I do not know. I always thought it was at the discretion of the instructor to determine if they wanted to use pluses or minuses.

Senator Oberlander: Okay, I understand it was in the policy, but I was not sure---

Senator Keith: This is what was inserted. Again, I am not really sure why they decided to add the quality points in here, but these are all the grades that we, as instructors can actually issue to undergraduates. If we approve this policy, then I did insert the new PR grade. I think within this policy it does say that colleges can have their own grading policy, so it may be true that different colleges have different thoughts about plus or minuses.

Assistance Dean Pollauf: Well, I have two questions. One is, what triggers the PRS/PRU? Is that just graduation if nothing happens in the...interveningtime?

Senator Keith: It would be up to the instructor. A PR is usually given for a course where there is an expectation that the work is going to continue across semesters, right? If you have a student who is doing a research course and you believe they have done enough work up to that point that you will feel comfortable giving them a passing grade, give them a PRPlusS, but, if they haven't done enough work, give them a PRU. It is up to the instructor. What would trigger it, and I talked to the registrar, and she said it would have to be manually triggered. When they were doing the graduation check and they saw these PR's on the transcript, given that the student had applied for graduation with no expectation they are going to complete the work, what would kick in will be the two grades, either the PS if they passed or the "F" if their work up to that point had been "unsatisfactory."

Assistance Dean Pollauf: So they will enter those at the time they are assigned the grade rather than sometime later on?

Senator Keith: Well, the faculty would. Just like with an Incomplete, you would assign either a PRS or a PRU and not worry about it until the student came back with the work and you then get a change of grade or not.

Assistant Dean Pollauf: Then the standard rules about appealing grades would apply to the final grade that was the outcome of one of those two categories?

Senator Keith: Well, I mean, I don't know, if the student graduated perhaps.

Assistant Dean Pollauf: But this will only happen in the case of graduation, there will be no other situation?

Senator Keith: No, there will be no other situation. What would trigger it would be the student applying for graduation. Again, this is very rare. It used to be more common because we used to be able to give PR's for all of our undergraduate courses and that is simply not the case anymore. They are limited. They are research courses, thesis courses, and courses where there is an expectation where you can continue to work over different semesters. Well, I don't hear any questions for further comments, so I think I am going to take the opportunity to ask if you are willing to vote on this policy. All in favor of this policy, please say "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? *Motion Passed.* Thank you very much.

President Thompson: Thank you so much, Dr. Keith, I appreciate that. Alright, next on the agenda, we have an update with President-Elect, Linda Rouillard on the deans and provost evaluations.

President-Elect Rouillard: Okay, this will be short. My committee which revised the dean's evaluation and created a provost evaluation instrument based on that consisted of representation well across the campus. We had Chris Cooper, Kevin Egan, Susan Batten, Wade Lee, Mary Powers, Ben Davis, and Patty Relue. We revised the instrument and we forwarded it to all the deans and the provost. We had subsequently gotten some feedback from the deans, which will consider as a committee in terms of what will fold into that and into the final version. We also had received information or feedback from a separate committee that was formed to consider the process of the evaluation. We have received that report and it has been forwarded to my committee members and we will consider how we will fold in that information. What I plan to do in the fall is bring the instrument and bring to you our recommendations for how to administer the survey and have Faculty Senate vote on that since it is Faculty Senate's name that is associated with that instrument. That is my update.

President Thompson: Thank you, Dr. Rouillard. I am very pleased at you also got dean input on this instrument. I think we all want to be very transparent in how they are evaluated. As Dr. Rouillard mentioned, it is kind of a two-step procedure. The first was appointing their committee to actually look at the instrument and make changes and develop that. The second piece was a committee that I had appointed Past-Presidents, Dr. Keith and Mary Humphrys to basically convene a survey of all of the faculty senate presidents across institutions in Ohio, and actually look at how their evaluations are conducted so we could use evidence-base to be able to make recommendations in how we might use procedures in terms of our campus evaluation. So, I've asked them to update us with what their committee been doing with these processes and recommendations in how to carry out the evaluation.

Past-President Humphrys: Just to kind of give you a brief overview, the committee consisted of the following people. Actually, Kristen made a report to Faculty Senate in October or September and that was prior to the survey that Amy just referred to that we sent out. We do have survey results, but instead of coming to you and showing you those results because it is pretty lengthy, what we are going to be doing

is kind of following through what our charge was. We are going to take the results of that survey from the various presidents. I think we got 28 responses or something like that.

Senator Keith: I think we surveyed 44 universities and colleges in Ohio and got about 28 responses.

Past-President Humphrys: So it was a pretty good response rate. It provided a lot information and a lot background on how the other institutions in Ohio look at administrative reviews. It was everything to, “we don’t do anything like that” to things that probably pretty much are parallel to what we do here at The University of Toledo. Of course, the frequency, and as President-Elect Rouillard said, her committee looked at actually the instrument itself and writing. The constitution, which of course is in the process of being looked at will also specify some parts of this, which will be how frequently the reviews are going to be conducted and who will get reviews. So our committee didn’t look at any of that; we were basically strictly looking at the survey results and then making a recommendation, especially on the comment portion. If you recall, that was an issue that came up when we did the reviews last year—should there be comments and what form should these comments take and also, who should receive the written comments in whatever form they are going to be put into. Our committee has met and we actually had a teleconference last week. If you want to give a summary of what we have kind of decided to do.

Senator Keith: Well, during the teleconference we mostly talked about the survey instrument. Certain members of the committee had some issues with the survey instrument, just simply because she wasn’t quite sure really what we were trying to accomplish with the survey—were we trying to give instructive feedback to administrators or were we trying to give the provost information that he would need if we were evaluating deans. So, some of it had to do with what was the purpose of this. The other part of the discussion that we had was what to do with comments. The comments are very controversial I think given what happened with our last dean evaluations where there were some comments that we didn’t redact and they were not very professional and people were singled out in unfair and unprofessional ways. We had a meeting and we are trying to schedule another meeting face-to-face because it was decided that a teleconference was not going to work and it would better to sit down as a committee and talk about some of these things face-to-face. Unfortunately, that is why we are not able to give you a final report today, but we will be able to give president Rouillard at that point a final report with recommendations, hopefully by the end of May, but if we have to push it out a little bit, by the end of June.

President Thompson: I think just to clarify much what President-Elect Rouillard said, the whole process is to make the recommendation that is discussed on the floor of Senate and get input from everybody so that everybody can feel that they have some say, right?

President-Elect Rouillard: Yes.

Senator Keith: I think one of the things that held us up a little bit, and it took longer than I expected is we...did it right, we got permission to get it out and we pre-tested it. We made sure it was a valid survey and that took a little longer than I think we thought, which is why we are a little bit behind than what I thought we would be at this point. Linda will get the recommendations soon.

Senator White: What was the answer to the question? [WFE1]

Senator Keith: We don’t know.

Senator White: Is it for informative.

Senator Keith: I don’t know the answer.

Past-President Humphrys: That is something that is a concern to many members of the committee. They felt that they needed to talk about it as well look at the survey results. *[Garbled]* Right now what happens is, the comments are put into a document in verbatim, just the way they are typed. Then they are presented to the faculty as well as the dean of the college that is being reviewed. So in other words, you don't see other colleges' comments, you see only your college comments about the dean, and of course, the provost sees those as well. So that is currently and that is traditionally, I guess historically how we have done it.

President Thompson: I am asking is it the same thing with the provost evaluation because he should be coming up for an evaluation? All of the faculty would evaluate them and then all of the faculty in the past have seen comments from him or her, correct?

Senator Keith: Right.

Past-President Humphrys: Are there any other questions?

Senator White: One other small one. From the survey, the 28 that responded, did you get a good representation from the four-year universities?

President Thompson: They were all four-year.

Senator Keith: We surveyed faculty senate presidents, or university council presidents, or whatever faculty governance body they had at the institutions.

Senator White: Were these from Ohio?

Senator Keith: Yes, from Ohio.

Past-President Humphrys: These are just the state schools.

Senator Keith: Well, I think there are some private schools in there as well.

Past-President Humphrys: Right.

Senator White: So not the private two-year?

Senator Keith: No.

Senator White: So these are all private four-years?

Senator Keith: Yes, they are all private four-year institutions.

President Thompson: Basically, it was a list that went out to all institutions and finding out which one would have either faculty senate or university council or something parallel to that. We contacted them individually and if they said yes, then they received the survey. Like they mentioned before, it was like 43 that qualified and 28 responded. It was very interesting as they were mentioning it. Some people's faculty senate doesn't do any evaluations whatsoever. I would say a large proportion, the faculty never even see the results, period—none of the mean scores and not of the written comments. I can't remember a single school or maybe I am wrong, maybe one or two that maybe did written comments, but that was pretty rare occurrence. Am I right?

Past-President Humphrys: Yes.

President Thompson: So it was a pretty rare occurrence and it really varies who they evaluate; some people only evaluate the provost they don't evaluate the deans. Again, a lot of them didn't even have a role in that. We even asked about who developed their instrument, and I would say that most don't even develop their own instrument. We are a little bit rare, which I think is good that we develop our own instrument. I don't know if that answered your question.

Senator White: 44 sounded like the right number of institutions that are public.

Senator Keith: Well, a lot of the branch campuses don't have their own faculty senate.

President Thompson: Okay, moving forward, while you are already up there, can you please talk about the changes to the university's exam schedule?

Past-President Humphrys: Sure.

Senator Keith: Do you want me to start?

Past-President Humphrys: Sure.

Senator Keith: If you remember or perhaps you didn't know this, the Friday before the spring classes started, what went live is a brand new exam schedule which was quite different than what was posted up to that point. Amy ended up getting it pulled. The problem was it was the Friday before classes started and people had already contacted their students and they had already printed their syllabi. The exam schedule that we had been using was the one that most people was familiar with. So following up on that, Peg Traband and Julie from the Registrar had a meeting with Mary and me, and we were part of the team that helped put together the 15-week semester. Just to kind of follow-up on what was going on with this exam schedule, they knew there were problems with the exam schedule in the fall, but it just took a long time to try to figure out how to resolve that. It was too late, so what they were doing is they said, this is the exam schedule that we are now proposing for fall 2018 and we want to notify faculty much sooner than the Friday before classes start. So we had a meeting with them in the middle of March and we were due to talk about this at a Faculty Senate meeting, but we ran out of time. We are here today to tell you that in fall there will be a new exam schedule, which is "A," easier to read so you can actually figure out when your final is and "B," was meant to solve some of the problems that they knew existed in fall of 2017 and consequently, in spring 2018, because again, they know there are problems with the current exam schedule.

Past-President Humphrys: I talked earlier today with the registrar, Julie Quinonez. She was unable to be here. She said this exam schedule incorporates into the issues that they found with the original exam schedule of fall 2017 when we went to 15-weeks. It takes into consideration a lot of the issues they found that had something to do with rooms and overlapping some of the exams for both students and professors, and so this is the result of that. She mentioned that if people see, and maybe President Thompson or President-Elect Rouillard could put this on the website so people can see it a little more closely. She [also] said that if anybody had any specific issues with this, she would love to hear them because she said that although they've spent a lot of time and they got new software programs and all kinds of stuff like that, , ttwould like to be able to catch anything that maybe they didn't catch when putting this together. So, if you are able to review it and if there are issues that you see, you can let Kristen or I know and then we can make sure that they are forwarded on to her. This is what it is going to be in the fall.

Senator Kippenhan: Just out of curiosity, has anybody surveyed the students to see if we have more problems with our new 15-week semester with students having two or three finals on the same day vs. our

old schedule? Because I am hearing from more students that they have three finals on the same day, but I don't know if that is truly represented across the board.

Senator Keith: Peg talked about putting a committee together with Faculty Senate. Hopefully, President-Elect Rouillard will hopefully put that committee together because they would like to have a committee that establish guidelines for finals. For example, we were told that everybody believes that we have this rule that says students cannot take three exams on the same day, and that is not true. We don't have a rule that specifies that at all, but if that is a rule that we would like to have, then we need to create it so hopefully, that committee will get formed. I don't know if they will have to survey the student; I think they might be able to do an audit of students' schedules to try to figure out how to... But, they still should know the answer to that question.

Past-President Humphrys: I don't think they've done that yet. Hopefully, this committee will look at that type of thing. After we had that meeting I looked at some websites, some specifically stated other Ohio state institutions, and it was pretty impressive, they have guidelines, but we don't.

Senator Keith: Are there any questions?

Senator White: Well, I would think it would be imperative that we get to see this right away and look at certain features of it. It sure do look... I would like to give my faculty a chance to think about it if it really is. Of course, I would like to look at all of those common times, math ones in particular to make sure there is no overlap.

Senator Keith: Well, we have a PowerPoint and we can send it to you and perhaps send it to everybody in the room.

[[View PowerPoint](#)]

Senator White: And then we can distribute it as we wish.

Senator Keith: This is it.

Past-President Humphrys: I would encourage that actually because this is going to be it if somebody can't point out some major issues.

Senator Keith: Yes, we will get you the schedule.

President Thompson: Okay, thank you very much. Next, we have Senator Atwood with the bookstore evaluation.

Senator Atwood: I am going to scroll through this really quickly and then get to my executive summary. As President Thompson mentioned, this information has already been shared with senior leadership, the president, AVP, Bonnie Murphy who is over axillary services, as well as Connie Strayer, who is the General Manager of the bookstore. They seemed very pleased with this information. To my knowledge, this is the first time we ever done a university-wide survey, so I think this gives a really good baseline moving forward. Just in general, and I will show you with my executive survey, for all the questions I think except for one "we strongly agree", and "the agree"ment combine, equals over 50%. This survey went out electronically for two weeks in March. Thank you for taking the time to fill it out and encouraging your faculty to fill it out. We had 160 responses, which I think is really good and 61 comments. It should be noted this went to all full-time and part-time faculty. Overall, I think the knowledgeable courteous helpful and responsive—all of the respondents were more or less very positive. We have 68% of our faculty meet the deadlines most of the time or occasionally—that number falls

below 50% of the different price points. The comments I thought was really interesting; there were a handful of misconceptions, the price points being one of them—such as how...the bookstore actually goes about ordering materials which I know will help Colleen when she does presentations as she has done probably for many faculty leadership in the past. There were a lot of positive comments. There was some bookstore “bashing” unfortunately, but for the most part, people were fair and pleased with the bookstore. Some of the concerns that were brought up was related to availability pricing and basically how the bookstore communicates. One of the best comments that I know because I talked to Bonnie personally [about it] and she really appreciated it, was they wanted to actually put the actual ordering deadline dates on the academic calendar. The absence of the bookstore on the Health Science Campus was brought up by several individuals having communications with the bookstore. I think overall, this is a good place to start. I think we done a really great job this entire year having better communications with the bookstore. This is sort of surface data. We really can’t drill downs. Maybe in the future it might be nice to do a survey that talks about what percentage of these 116 individuals who responded to... a certain college, and how long have they been at UT. We might find out that younger faculty respond different than senior faculty. But just to be clear, part-time faculty are just as important. Are there any questions I can answer related to the bookstore survey?

Senator White: I actually didn’t know there wasn’t a bookstore on the Health Science Campus. I know there is some kind of agreement between the university administration and the bookstore that arose from several years back. Why is there not one on the Health Science Campus?

Senator Hammersley: Well, they closed the bookstore after the union of the two campuses together. To be honest with you, it may be a moot point now because of the senior year—year three and four are largely going to be on the Toledo Hospital campus and other areas around. They actually go to the Main Campus bookstore for the first two years and it has really been a big issue. At the moment it is where it was previously, at the bottom of the library, which has become student space. We would have to ask them what they would like to do. The students strive a fair amount anyway for the Medical School and I think it makes a big difference to have it on board.

Senator Atwood: I know a lot of comments from the survey mentioned that faculty on the Health Science Campus doesn’t use the bookstore anymore because there no ...on the Health Science Campus.

Senator Williams: I will just announce that the medical faculty and the medical students are not the only ones on the Health Science Campus. I know a lot of our students would probably use the bookstore more often if there was a bookstore.

President Thompson: This is very useful, Tom. I think this is the first time you’ve ever done something like this and so I think it is at least a good starting point. I think we can kind of tune in on the areas and we can encourage them to do a better job.

Senator Atwood: Thank you for taking the survey and encouraging your faculty to take it. Lastly, the University Libraries is partnering with Bowling Green State University Libraries, and we are looking to find faculty who teach high enrolling courses who have high cost textbooks. Each one of the campuses including the library campuses is looking into investigating open textbooks and open educational resources. If this is something that you’re interested in working on or if you know a faculty member in your department that is interested, please contact Lucy Duhon and she can give you more information. Thank you very much.

President Thompson: Let’s give Tom a hand.

[Applause]

President Thompson cont'd: All right, Dr. Gregory, you are up with the tenure and promotion guidelines.

Dr. Melissa Gregory: So once again, thank you very much for your patience and having me repeatedly at Faculty Senate. I don't feel like I'm a sitting senator, I feel more like an enthusiast at this point <laughter>. This document is an attempt to kind of clarify some principals and expectations about the evaluation of tenure and promotion that would apply to all of the colleges on campus and kind of offer a broad model of guidelines from this moment forth. It is a faculty written document. It's been a product of much conversation and compromise across colleges up till last week. I think it is to a point now where it kind of been seen sometimes more than once by all of the different colleges. There were some final edits that the College of Medicine made to it. When it was sent out two weeks ago, I think we circulated those and they are highlighted in yellow. Is this something we need to go over, these edits? Or did everyone get the chance to see them?

President Thompson: I think everyone has been sent this document several times.

Dr. Gregory: We can really go line-by-line and I know everyone looks kind of excited about that possibility, but I'm ready <.laughter>. What I was hoping to ask for is a recommendation from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to endorse these guidelines as belonging to us as faculty here at UT.

President Thompson: This is coming from the Executive Committee.

Dr. Gregory: Right. I am not a senator.

President Thompson: Is there any discussion on this document at all?

Senator Hammersley: The faculty in COM, the committee evaluated this document Friday and voted in favor of these guidelines. The faculty from the Medical College received word that the College of Law has no problems with it at this point. The changes we requested do have to do with the system in the College of Medicine, and it is still allowed to work somewhat different than going through UCAP. We are going through a standard mechanism and this provides an overarching document that supports all faculty members.

President Thompson: Is there any other discussion on the document? Hearing none. Are we ready to vote on this? All those in favor of approving the university guidelines of faculty evaluation for tenure and promotion, please say, "aye." Those opposed? Any abstentions? *Motion Passed.* Good work, Dr. Gregory.

[Applause]

Dr. Gregory: So we voted to endorse these, and like all tenure and promotion guidelines at the department and college level, they are subject to the provost's approval, but this is really our document. It was written by faculty and it has been the result of conversations across colleges. I guess with that in mind, I would like to ask senators for three things. One, if you can make sure that it get back to your constituents and you bring it up in future conversations about evaluating tenure and promotion at the local level and the department and college level. Two, that you sort of take stock of what aspects of the document seem to look like they're an asset or what aspect seem less effective, so when it comes time to revise it, the college can be a part of that conversation. Three, the Faculty Senate has President Rouillard get together with the Provost Office and identify the timeline for when these guidelines will be evaluated and revised. The only way that this document is going to be relevant is if it is kept fresh and updated. I

feel like that would be a really good thing for us to do, because no disrespect to any administrators in the room, but I feel that we all know that personnel changes and senior leadership is common these days, right? I would like UT to be in a place where we have a set of expectations and standards related to the evaluation of tenure and promotion that we could present to whoever comes next, and to say to them that this is something we agreed on across colleges and across both campuses, and here are our standards and we are showing them to you proactively rather than just being in this kind of reactive position, so whoever comes next says here is our new vision.

President Thompson: I agree. As far as the communications plan, I think all faculty should be aware of this, and how this aligns with their college collaborations is really very important.

Senator Atwood: May I ask that it be put on the Faculty Senate website?

Dr. Gregory: Yes, and I will talk to the provost to follow-up about where it is going to be posted and if he is going to send it out.

President Thompson: Great. Good work. Are there any items from the floor before we adjourn? Do I have a motion to adjourn the 2017-2018 Faculty Senate? Meeting adjourned. The 2017-2018 final meeting adjourned at **5:19 p.m.** We will like to call now to order the 2018-2019 Faculty Senate, of which, I would like to pass the gavel over to President Rouillard. Let's give her a warm welcome.

[Applause]

President Rouillard: I would like to call the first meeting of the Faculty Senate, AY 2018-2019 meeting to order. I ask Dr. Fred Williams to call the roll.

Present: *Kathleen Thompson Casado, Daniel Compora, Anthony Edgington, James Ferris, Michael Kistner, Sara Lundquist, Barbara Schneider, Tim Brakel, Friederike Emonds, Kristen Keith, Holly Monsos, Jerry Van Hoy, Ainsworth Bailey, Donald Wedding, Sonny Ariss, Amal Said, Vijaya Devabhaktuni, Scott Molitor, Mohamed Hefzy, Mohammed Niamat, Patricia Relue, Eric Longdorf, Caroline Menezes, Lucinda Bouillon, Mark Templin, Gregory Gilchrist, Joan Duggan, David Giovannuci, Jeffrey Hammersley, Laura Murphy, Patrick Frank, Ruli Xie, Juan Jaume, Beata Lecka-Czernik, Nikolai Modyanov, Jorge Ortiz, Terry Bigioni, Kevin Gibbs, Edith Kippenhan, Jon Bjorkman, David Krantz, Sibylle Weck-Schwarz, James Oberlander, Temeaka Gray, Dawn Woolford, Amit Tiwari, Martin Ohlinger, F. Scott Hall, Elaine Reeves, Wade Lee*

Absent: *Susan Maloney, John Schlageter, Janet Hoy, Glenn Sheldon, Laurie Dinnebeil, Kara Bruce, Joshua Park, Jason Schroeder, David Weldy, Keith Crist, William Taylor, Robert, Steven.*

Past-President Thompson: Right now, we are going to go ahead and pass out the clickers that we're going to use for our election. Only if you were on the 2018-2019 Faculty Senate should you take a clicker and be eligible to vote.

President Rouillard: While the clickers are being passed out, I want to remind you which positions we are voting for. These are members of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, so we will be voting for: president-elect, secretary, two at-large- representatives from the Main Campus, two at-large- representatives from the Health Science Campus, and the Ohio Faculty Council representative. That council meets once a month in Columbus or there is the option of a phone-in to that meeting, which is what Thomas was doing this year as the current rep. The Ohio Faculty Council is made up of

representatives from faculty senates around the state from public institutions. It also now convenes in conjunction with faculty councils from community colleges as well, so there are some overlapping conversations between those two bodies. Who is operating the computer for the nominations for the elections? Dan and Sibylle.

Past-President Thompson: Does everyone has one that need one?

Group of Senators: Yes.

Past-President Thompson: Listen up everybody please.

Senator Weck-Schwarz: The first thing you should do with your clicker is make sure it is on.

President Rouillard: And where do we point the clickers? Is it just at the screen?

Senator Weck-Schwarz: Yes. I would say at the computer, it seems to be a good idea. Just click one of the buttons so I can see that all clickers work.

Past-President Thompson: Any button?

Senator Weck-Schwarz: Yes. It doesn't matter which one as long as you pick one.

Past-President Thompson: Three people have not activated their clickers yet numbers, 28, 34 and 39.

Dr. Kovach: Amy, you gave me one and I don't need it.

Past-President Thompson: Is there anybody else that have one that shouldn't have one?

Senator Kippenhan: Linda, can you scroll so we can read that and also make it a little larger?

Past-President Thompson: Does anybody have number 44?

Prof. Humphys: The numbers are at the top.

Past-President Thompson: I just want to make sure that you have a chance to vote. Are you ready, Sibylle? Number 44 is the only one that is not working. All right, let's start out with president-elect. If we can please open for the nominations.

President Rouillard: I would like to nominate Tim Brakel.

Senator Devabhaktuni: Second.

Senator Brakel: I accept

Senator Bouillon: I would like to nominate Kristen Keith.

Senator Keith: Yes, I accept.

Past-President Thompson: Are there other nominations? Hearing none. Is there a motion to *close* the nominations? Second? All those in favor of closing the nominations, please say, "aye." Any opposed? We have president-elect Tim Brakel and Kristen Keith as nominees. If you want to vote for Tim Brakel, push 1A and for Kristen Keith, 2B.

Senator Wedding: Where should we point this at?

Past-President Thompson: Point it at the computer. Have everybody voted?

Group of Senators: Yes.

Past-President Thompson: It is simple majority, right?

Senator Weck-Schwarz: Yes.

Past-President Thompson: Congratulations to Tim Brakel.

[Applause]

Past-President Thompson cont'd: All right moving on to the secretary position. Let's open up the nominations for the secretary position, please.

Nominees: *Mark Templin was nominated and accepted the nomination*
Kristen Keith was nominated and declined the nomination
Martin Ohlinger was nominated and accepted the nomination
Scott Hall was nominated and accepted the nomination

Past-President Thompson cont'd: Are there any other nominations? Do I have a motion to close the nominations? Second. All those in favor of closing the nominations, please say, "aye." So we can vote now. It's 1A for Mark Templin, 2B for Martin Ohlinger, and 3C for Scott Hall. Congratulations to Mark Templin.

[Applause]

Past-President Thompson cont'd: Okay for our first position, and we will do these one-at-a-time for Main Campus at-large rep. You can have a nomination for anybody, but only if you are Main Campus can you vote for that particular person.

Nominees: *Jerry Van Hoy was nominated and accepted the nomination*
Friederike Emonds was nominated and accepted the nomination

Past-President Thompson cont'd: Are there any more nominations?

Unknown Senator: I *move* to close.

Past-President Thompson cont'd: Is there a second? All those in favor of closing the nominations, please say, "aye." Any opposed? ***Nominations Closed.*** So Jerry Van Hoy is 1A and Friederike Emonds is 2B. Congratulations, Jerry Van Hoy.

[Applause]

Past-President Thompson cont'd: Okay, for our second Main Campus nominations.

Nominees: *Scott Molitor was nominated and declined the nomination.*
Friederike Emonds was nominated and accepted the nomination
Kristen Keith nomination and declined the nomination
Anthony Edgington was nominated and accepted the nomination

Past-President Thompson cont'd: Are there any other nominations?

Senator Van Hoy: I move to close.

Past-President Thompson cont'd: Do I have a second? All those in favor of closing the nominations? *Nominations Closed.* So Friederike Emonds is 1A and Anthony Edgington is 2B. Congratulations to Friederike Emonds.

[Applause]

Past-President Thompson cont'd: Now, on to the Health Science representatives.

Nominees: *Temeaka Gray was nominated and accepted the nomination
Martin Ohlinger was nominated and accepted the nomination
Joan Duggan was nominated and her proxy accepted the nomination
David Giovannucci was nominated and accepted the nomination
Jeffrey Hammersley was nominated and accepted the nomination*

Past-President Thompson cont'd: Go ahead and vote. Congratulations, Temeaka Gray.

[Applause]

Past-President Thompson cont'd: All right, nominations for the second Health Science Campus representative.

Nominees: *Joan Duggan was nominated and her proxy accepted the nomination
Martin Ohlinger was nominated and accepted the nomination
Jeffrey Hammersley was nominated and accepted the nomination
David Giovannucci was nominated and accepted the nomination*

Past-President Thompson cont'd: Is that everybody? Is there a motion to close the nomination? Second. All those in favor of closing the nominations? *Nominations Closed.* Congratulations, David Giovannucci.

[Applause]

Past-President Thompson cont'd: Okay, opening up for nominations for Ohio Faculty Council. As President Rouillard mentioned, this is the individual that travels down monthly to Columbus and sometimes may skype-in.

Nominees: *Wade Lee nominated and accepted the nomination*

Past-President Thompson cont'd: Are there any other nominations?

Unknown Senator: I move to close the nominations.

Past-President Thompson cont'd: All those in favor of closing the nominations? Congratulations, Wade Lee.

[Applause]

President Rouillard: Congratulations to all the members of the new Faculty Senate Exec., and “thank you” to all the people who were willing to be nominated, it’s an indication of your generosity to the institution and to your colleagues. I do need to speak to the new Faculty Senate Exec. Before we close, Jeff asked me to remind you that we will be bringing the Constitution up to Senate in the fall. Is there any other items that people want to discuss before we close?

Senator Schneider: Will we get a chance to see that Constitution over the summer?

President Rouillard: Well, I think it is already finished. Mark did a report that will be in the Minutes. At the last meeting Mark Templin did a report of some of the changes. I can ask Mark if you want to do that or if you want to wait till the fall and we will send it out again as a read and...Is there anything else? May I have a motion to adjourn? Meeting adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

IV. Meeting adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Mark Templin
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard
Faculty Senate Office Administrative Secretary

