

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of November 09, 2021
FACULTY SENATE

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

Approved @ FS on November 23, 2021

Summary of Discussion

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

President Bigioni: Okay, I have 4 o'clock, so I will call the November 09th, Faculty Senate meeting to order and ask Secretary Nigem to call the roll.

Present: Anderson, Baki, Bamber, Barnes, Bigioni, Bornak, Brakel, Chaffee, Chou, Compora, Coulter-Harris, Day, de le Serna, Duggan, Duhon, El-Zawahry, Garcia-Mata, Gilstrap, Green (Ray Zhao-sub), Gregory, Guardiola, Hall, Hanrahan, Harmych, Hefzy, Huntley, Insch, Jayatissa, Kistner, Koch, Krantz, Lammon, Lawrence, Lecka-Czernik, Lee, Lipscomb, Metz, Milz, Modyanov, J. Murphy, Niamat, Nigem, Pakulski, Pattin, Ratnam. Reeves (Wade Lee-sub), Reynolds, Rouillard, Shan, Smith, Steven, Teclehaimanot, Topp, Van Hoy, Vesely, Wedding, Welsch

Excused Absence:

Unexcused Absence: Ali, Case, Chaudhuri, Edgington, Elgafy, Kujawa, Perry, Stepkowski,

Senator Nigem: I believe with the people in the chat, President Bigioni, we have a quorum.

President Bigioni: Great. Thank you, Secretary Nigem. It did look like there may have been a few people with microphone unmuting problems too. If so, please enter your presence in the chat room.

Thank you. Our next item of business is the adoption of the agenda. You see before you the proposed agenda. Unless there are any objections, we will adopt it by general consent. Hearing no objections, we will adopt this agenda. ***Agenda Adopted.***

And our next order of business is approval of the Minutes from the last meeting on October 26. Are there any omissions or corrections to be made to the Minutes? Okay, again, hearing none. If there are no objections, then again, we will approve those Minutes by general consent. Hearing no objections, those Minutes are now approved. ***Motion Passed [for "Minutes Approved" since there was no motion].***

Okay our next item of business is the Executive Committee report.

So we'll start off with our Executive Committee meeting that took place after the last meeting. So that would be Friday the 29th, where we met with Vice Provost La Fleur Small. This was really a 'get to know you' kind of meeting, but we did cover some interesting points worth reporting. So, a useful question when somebody is arriving is, what are we most worried about? What are the major areas of concern for faculty? I could break that down into two things.

One, is sort of an historical thing, left over feelings of disenfranchisement and lack of transparency that are from earlier administrations. This is very typical of faculty with longer tenure here, so we need to keep that in perspective. Younger faculty, faculty with shorter tenure, don't necessarily have that same scar tissue. But, it's certainly something that needs to be acknowledged, especially since most of us here at Faculty Senate are in the longer tenured category.

The more recent financial pressures that we've experienced, particularly some of the cuts that were made a couple of springs ago, I think we pretty much all felt. Taking away support staff, for instance, or reducing the support staff's service to faculty and students is something that we've all felt. Losing some funding for participation in conferences and career development was also mentioned as a concern. And certainly, the pandemic played a role somewhat in curtailing travel. So, perhaps, that is something that is unique to that time period. But nonetheless, these were areas of concern that were brought up.

On the positive side, though, because, of course we need to hear that too, is acknowledging that we've got a lot of really great students here who are happy and engaged. And particularly, as we go back into the classroom after the pandemic is sort of abating, and I will use that term very cautiously. That provides a lot of opportunities for renewed interactions and relationships with our students and a much richer educational experience, and so everyone was quite happy about that.

An interesting comment that was also made was the notion of an Ombudsman person for faculty matters. This is an interesting point that currently doesn't exist. So, this is something that might be discussed more in the future.

We also would like to report that our meeting left us with a strong impression that the Vice Provost is generally very supportive of faculty and faculty matters, and also of the Faculty Senate and our business of shared governance within the institution. So, it was very positive and very much appreciated, the Vice Provost's candidness with us and really strong support of faculty.

We also met with the President, although this was just President-Elect Gary Inch and I. We talked about three topics. The first was the Federal COVID mandate, which I am sure the President will spend a bit of time talking about, so I will not. We also talked a little bit about the Constitution. The Board of Trustees has provided us with some feedback on our Constitution and some suggestions that will be discussed later in this meeting. So again, I'll leave the details of that for later in this meeting. But nonetheless, we had a very constructive conversation about that and the possibility of discussing this a little more with the Board of Trustees. But we'll revisit that later in the meeting.

The final topic that we spent time talking about was RCM, which, of course, is a very common topic these days. And in particular, a recurring theme has been the role of Faculty Senate and faculty in general, but Faculty Senate specifically, in budgetary planning matters, because of course, this is part of our constitutional duty. It has been difficult to try to figure out how Faculty Senate, a very centralized body, can play an active role in such a decentralized budgeting model. It was suggested that, I guess there's been some discussion, that each college could have a Faculty Senate representative. This is just a proposal of course, or an idea. Each college could have a Faculty Senate budget representative that could then report back to a Faculty Senate committee and that might actually be a way to solve that decentralized problem and maintain that role of Faculty Senate in long term budget planning. So that's an interesting idea. That concludes that meeting report.

Senator Eddie Chou, John Napp and Hermann Von Grafenstein and I met with the Provost and some of her staff to discuss replacing one our support staff from the Faculty Senate Office who retired this spring. She played a very strong role in supporting UCAP and the Sabbatical Committee. And a lot of paperwork goes through that committee, letters prepared, dossiers reviewed and so on. A lot of communication back and forth, and a lot of clerical support work was done by that person. She needs to be replaced and so that discussion was had, and this sort of touches back to the earlier point of faculty needing those support staff so that they can do what they do best. And in fact, two of the key points that were made with regard to supporting this position was, of course, faculty shouldn't be doing clerical work. That's a very expensive way to do that work and it takes away from what faculty do best, which is engaging with students and

promoting their educational experience. So, the other part of it was Faculty180 was perceived to take a lot of that work away, but we've had Faculty180 for a few years, and of course, that didn't take the need for that position away. In fact, it made very little difference to her job. So that's where we are in those discussions. I think the Provost appreciated those points and that those discussions continue. But I wanted to give you an update on where we are with that because supporting those two committees and the heavy work that they do is very important.

Next on the list is the HLC visit. Again, the Provost I'm sure will have a lot to say about that so I will leave those comments to her report.

Then finally, the Constitution. There's been a lot of discussion among us about where we are with the Constitution. I think we're in a very good position to wrap up our work this year and actually get those constitutional changes ratified by the faculty. But again, we will visit that toward the end of the meeting, and start digging into the details of that, and start that process of going through all the steps necessary to get to the final ratification vote by faculty.

And that concludes my Executive Committee report. Are there any Executive Committee members who would like to add anything to that report? Hearing none. Are there any questions about the report? Okay, hearing none, then I will turn it over to President Postel. Sir, the floor is yours.

President Postel: Good afternoon. President Bigioni, thank you so much for the invitation to join all of you today. I'm very happy to be here with you. I'm also glad that that you, Vice President Inch, and I continue to meet as often as we can. And, of course, I also try to attend some of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee meetings. I believe there may be one later this week. So, we're, we're looking to find more and more ways to keep robust communication channels open as there are so many wheels in motion right now, we can afford to lose contact with one another about so many important things. I'll start with a couple of words about the HLC since they just departed a couple hours ago. I'm sure the Provost will have more to add. The team met with the Provost and me today at noon at the completion of the formal part of their one-and-a-half-day review of the of the two campuses. They gave us an informal view of their impressions and if you will, an informal preview of the report that will follow. I am very pleased and very relieved to say that it was an extremely good conversation. We heard many compliments about so many different aspects of the way we do business. They were complimentary of the way the institution had handled the COVID crisis. They were pleased that we had continued to make progress on many initiatives even during the COVID crises, that we did not allow that stagnate our other work. They were impressed with our agility and transparency as we pivoted to deal with the many issues related to the pandemic. They were also very pleased about the RCM budget conversion or as some now refer to it as IBB. This is something that is near and dear to the hearts of accrediting organizations and so it was a big topic of conversation during their visit here Monday and Tuesday. They were complimentary about our financial stability despite enrollments being down. They were complimentary about our assessment, our mission, our community service, so many things. Of course, they had some recommendations and they were good ones, but none of them were in the category of deficiencies or concerns. They were really just the recommendations. And so you know they didn't come right out and say it but it sounded to me like about as good a report as one could hope for. At the conclusion of such a review, we should see a draft in 10 days. We'll have an opportunity to correct that draft with actual errors and then, within about a month, there will be a final report.

The Provost and her team are to be complimented and thanked on a truly outstanding effort, in particular Heather Huntley who heads our accreditation processes. [We] just did a tremendous amount of work over the last couple of years, believe it or not preparing for this. I know many members of the Faculty Senate

were involved, and many deans and other administrators across campus as well. Thank you all. Anyone who participated in this, it's clearly one of the most important activities for a university and will serve us well as we approach now the next phase of our strategic planning. While we're talking about accreditation, I want to also want to mention, on the Health Sciences Campus, the College of Medicine and Life Sciences had a successful LCME accreditation process very recently. That is the liaison council on medication education received a full eight-year accreditation, which is the longest time period possible. So, congratulations to Chris [Cooper] and the entire team at the College of Medicine and Life Sciences. That's a very, very big deal for the Medical School to get through that difficult accreditation process. I also want to compliment Interim Dean Monica Goodman, who has done a phenomenal job preparing monitoring reports for the College of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences. One was due just this past month, not long after she accepted the role as interim dean. So that was a tough assignment to take on shortly after accepting the post. A lot of good work is going on there with that continued accreditation process and in Pharmacy. So, Monica, thank you for your hard work there.

I want to mention a couple of words about the upcoming strategic planning process. I think all of you are aware that our current strategic plan is now in its final year, and as such we have convened a team to begin the preparatory work for a successor strategic plan to begin in the end of the current academic year. These processes take several months, as you know, to be performed properly, so we have gotten started here. This month. The committee has been named. There are 22 people on this committee. The faculty said it was kind enough to submit two names. Thank you. One of those individuals, Jason Huntley has further graciously agreed to serve as a co-chair for this strategic planning committee. So, you'll be glad to know that the Faculty Senate is not only represented on the committee, but is represented in the form of one of the two leadership positions for this important process. I am focusing our new director of institutional research will be the other co-chair, so that way we have a faculty member and a staff member and a staff member representing us as the co-leads for this committee. The work will go on all through the winter and spring with a date of conclusion, anticipated to be sometime around May of 2022 so that it can then dovetail with our current strategic plan, which will end. With broad representation on this committee, there are students, there are graduate students, there are faculty members, there are staff members, there's a trustee as a community member. This is a very broad committee. It's also critical to understand that the members of this committee do have a significant responsibility to report back to their constituents about progress that's being made so that there could be a good iterative process between the entire campus community and the preparation of the strategic plan, not simply the individuals who are on the committee. So, we're going to pay a lot of attention to the communication. We want everyone to be aware of what's going on and have an opportunity to provide input.

I do want to say a couple of words about COVID-19, a topic that unfortunately just won't go away. Our disease prevalence on campus remains slow. Amy and Linda continue to do a great job co-leading our COVID team, which meets weekly with innumerable meetings and activities in between the weekly report out. So, it's still a very time-consuming process for those who are closest to it. Our numbers of asymptomatic surveillance tests on campus remain in small single digits. So, we're pleased about that. Our number of faculty, staff, and students who have entered the vaccine registry and uploaded their data continues to increase for around 70% at this point. People are still uploading data. People are still receiving the vaccines. So, the numbers are continuing to go up. We heard this morning that there are quite a few people that still are having some technical problems getting their information loaded into the system. So, we know that once those issues are resolved, the percentage will go higher, still. So, we're, very pleased about this campus wide response to the vaccine requirement that was put in place.

Now, I will say, I think many of you are aware that there has been further development around this topic, and that very recently the Biden administration issued a series of emergency executive orders, which are essentially mandating companies with over 100 employees in several different categories to receive vaccinations. So, there's an OSHA requirement which for us is, is probably not germane and which also has been temporarily blocked by a Louisiana federal court judge. But there is another requirement around institutions that have federal contracts, which, of course, we do. And there is yet another set of requirements around healthcare, both physician practices and hospitals where treatment of patients takes place and where federal funds are received for those procedures and visits. And of course, Medicare is a federal funding source and so that automatically makes us susceptible to this particular policy. There's a lot yet to be learned about the details of these. There are legal challenges underway by the Attorney Generals of about half of the states in the United States, including ours. So, it would be interesting to see how that plays out. The Biden administration is of the opinion that state, and local laws, and union negotiations are of no consequence, and that due to a supremacy clause in the United States Constitution that the federal law prevails. And, of course, will be argued, but that's the federal position. On the contract side of the matter, for those who choose still not to be vaccinated, there is an option for weekly testing. On the CMS side for healthcare, there is no such option for weekly testing. It's a vaccination requirement, period. The concern is the fact that the philosophical exemption that we have allowed will not be allowed under either the federal contract piece of this, or the CMS piece. They will allow valid religious exemptions and medical exemptions, but not philosophical exemptions. So, Ohio State [University], I'm sure some of you are aware has already pivoted on its policy and has submitted a new set of requirements to campus in response to these emergency mandates. We have not done that yet. We are choosing to study the matter further to be sure we understand the full extent of it, to see how the Attorney General is going to interface with the federal government on this specific to Ohio law and local law. And, all I can say is that we'll keep you posted. I'm very concerned about this. It has very significant consequences for us. I think we'll have to be revisiting this topic soon as more details emerge.

I do want to say a couple words about enrollment. I'm thrilled to say we are continuing to make progress. I had a meeting, as I do every week with Dave Meredith, this morning to review our statistics and our tactics and understand what's working and what's not. I am happy to say that as of today, we have 2,400 more applications for next fall admission, direct high school than we did at this time last year. This is the highest number since 2018, which was a high mark over the last several years. So, grant[ed], this is very early data, too early to celebrate. But I think the number is so significant that it is not simply a blip on the radar. I think this does represent a meaningful inflection in a long-standing pattern of decline that we have been earnest about reversing. I'm very encouraged that this initial data is looking so positive.

President Bigioni touched on RCM budgeting. I won't say much other than to reaffirm what he said in his Executive Committee report. I am fully supportive of the Faculty Senate being involved in the budget planning process. It's essential and it is required. I will make sure it happens. Our pivot from central to more peripheral budgeting at the University in the IV remodel will cause us to have a different view of what this committee structure could look like as he alluded. So, we will have to think through the details of that, but we need to find a way to do this and I just want the Senate to know that I'm supportive of that.

We have a lot of searches underway for critically important leadership positions on campus. As I think you know, we have two finalists interviewing at this point for our vice president for advancement position. One, interviewed today, and then we have the other interviewing next week. So, we are very close to the end of that search. This will be the first time that position has been filled in almost five years. So, we're very excited about that development. We have an active search under way for our vice president for diversity, equity and inclusion. That search is going well. Candidates are emerging. There are a lot of

good candidates coming onto the radar screen for that position. We have a search that has started for the Dean of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences. Dean Merit from Health and Human Services is chairing that search. We have a search underway for an athletic director and vice president for inclusion and athletics. And we will be doing a search soon for a person to lead enhanced online efforts for the University of Toledo, to help us find ways to maximize our opportunities to offer online education for hopefully a growing population who wish to secure their education in that way.

Couple of miscellaneous things. I know the Provost was very pleased yesterday. I support very much her announcement of Thomas Atwood is the Interim Dean of Libraries. Thomas will do a great job, and we're pleased to support him. I wanted to make a comment about parking lots. My hats off to Jason Toth and his team. You'll recall that not long ago we demolished two garages for which were both about ready to fall down on their own. much to the consternation of some of our students who understandably were concerned about adequacy of parking in the aftermath of those demolition projects. Happy to say that the replacement paved lots in both locations are nearly finished. So if you drive by either the East or the West site, you will see that the curbs are in and the asphalts going down. We're pushing the envelope a little bit here with the weather, but we've told the contractors that we must have this parking in place to provide adequate opportunities for faculty, staff and students to park as close as possible to their place of study. So, I'm pleased to report that that's moving along very nicely. We had at first thought that the branch on the East side of campus wasn't going to be paved until Spring. So, it's actually well ahead of schedule.

I think that with that, I know you have a considerable agenda ahead of you. I will wish all of you a pleasant afternoon and be happy to answer any questions you might have.

President Bigioni: Thank you. Are there any questions for President Postel? May be a quiet bunch today. Well, I think that'll do it. We appreciate your coming and talking to us and giving us all of these updates. Sounds like a lot of good work is underway. We appreciate it and look forward to seeing you again. Thank you.

President Postel: Thank you.

President Bigioni: So, we can move on to our next item of business, which is the Provost report. Provost Bjorkman, the floor is yours.

Provost Bjorkman: Thank you, President Bigioni. Good afternoon. I want to begin my remarks today by thanking everyone, faculty and staff who served on the criterion teams for the HLC accreditation over the last two years. Just as a reminder, we began preparations for this with a kickoff breakfast on October 15th of 2019, which seems almost like forever ago. So, over the last two days, as you know, we had the opportunity to meet with six of the peer reviewers. They came from all around the country. They visited our campus. They asked lots of questions. They learned a lot more about our programs and our initiatives. And I just want to say for over two years our faculty and staff have really worked hard to develop the documentation (the assurance arguments) that demonstrate how we are meeting the criteria established by the HLC, how we are focused on our mission and vision, and how we are carrying out our goals in those areas. So, I really want to thank all the faculty who attended the open forums that were held this week by the HLC review team. I think your viewpoints were very well received. And I think you did a great job of talking to them about what we were doing. Hearing directly from our faculty and staff was important to the reviewers. They learned a lot more about the actual implementation of the HLC criteria on our campuses and the things that we are doing to support our students and further their education. As Dr. Postel alluded, our exit interview with the site visit team today was very positive. I was really pleased. They seemed very enthused and complimentary, about many of the things we're doing. Obviously, they do have some suggestions for us, some places we can continue to improve and we'll be looking to all of

you to help us to do that. They said that we will hear back within 10 days, at least a draft report. So, we'll know a little more at that point. And then, of course, we will be able to respond to any errors that are in that report. The draft report will then go forward and they will write their final report, which will be submitted for the full HLC consideration. I think that all of us here at UToledo should be very proud of this work. The HLC site visit I think was a really excellent opportunity to tell our story and to share some of our best practices with our higher education colleagues from around the country. I can tell you, that during the conversations with them there were a number of times when they said, "We really love hearing about this." "This is really interesting." "I'm going to take this back to my institution." And I thought that was a really good sign." So, the next steps, of course, will be completing the report, making their recommendations to the HLC's decision making body, which is their Institutional Actions Council. So, we will be hearing in the not too distant future more of that. So again, a huge, thank you to all the faculty and staff for the enormous amount of work that went into the reaccreditation process, and I want to echo President Postel's comments - a special shout out to Heather Huntley, our Assistant Vice Provost for Accreditation and Program Review, who did a masterful job of "herding cats" and keeping us all on track in preparing for this visit and making sure that everything was spot on when the site visit team arrived.

On another note, I want to give a shout out to our student success coaches and our academic advisors. The student success coaching model at UToledo recently received some national recognition and was selected to be featured in a recent publication of the National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience. The director of our student success coaching program at UToledo, Dr. Julie Fisher-Kinney, will serve on a panel at this year's annual conference of the First-Year Experience in February at the University of South Carolina, along with other presenters from institutions that are featured in the publication. I'm really pleased to see that our success coaches and academic advisors are receiving this national recognition. They really do amazing work as they work tirelessly to support our students and the work that they do is critically important.

I know you have a busy agenda today so I am going to keep my remarks short. I do want to mention a few events that will be taking place on campus this week. On Thursday, of course, we will be celebrating Veterans Day. The University will be honoring area veterans with our annual appreciation breakfast and resource fair in Savage Arena. The doors open at 8 a.m., and the event begins at 9 a.m. All veterans and their families are invited. There will be free parking in lots 3, 5, and 6 near Savage Arena. This is a long-standing tradition at the University of Toledo, and this year marks the seventeenth year the University of Toledo has collaborated with the Red Cross and the Lucas County Service Commission to host this event.

This week, we will also be holding Green Zone training for faculty and staff. Green Zone training is a national program that provides training to faculty and staff on how they can best support military connected students on college and university campuses. That training is going to be held tomorrow, November 10th from 1 to 2 p. m. on the Main Campus in Rocket Hall, Room 1530, and from 4 to 5 p. m. in Collier, Room 1050 on the Health Science Campus. So, registration for that is available on the website of the Military Service Center. So, if you're interested in that, I encourage you to sign up. I will also tell you that it is available for online learning. If you would prefer to do it that way, you can request that you be signed up for the Blackboard version of it, and then you can do that anytime during the month. I also want to remind you that our Early Registration Campaign for spring semester is underway. We really need your help to get the word out to our students. Our goal, as you may recall, is to get as many of our current students as possible registered before they leave for the Thanksgiving and Winter breaks. Enrollment is now open for all graduate students, undergraduate seniors and juniors. Next week on Wednesday, November 17th, the enrollment window opens for freshmen and all currently enrolled

students. So hopefully people will be getting registered before Thanksgiving. And just as a reminder, early registration does not affect the date tuition fees are due. The January due date still remains the same.

A few more deadlines to remind you about, because they are coming up soon. Nominations for Distinguished University Professor are due by Friday, November 19th. And nominations for the MAC faculty award for student success are due by Wednesday, December 1st, both through the Office of the Provost. The guidelines and applications forms for both of those are available on the Provost Office website.

So that concludes my report today. Thank you. And I would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

President Bigioni: Thank you. Are there any questions for the Provost?

Unknown Speaker: I've got a question.

President Bigioni: Sure. Go ahead.

Unknown Speaker: With the vaccine mandate getting here, is there any talk about unmasking on campus at all? I guess I could have asked Dr. Postel this as well.

Provost Bjorkman: I actually don't know the answer to that question. I'm sure that that's going to come up in the general conversation, but I do not believe there's been any conversation yet about that as far as I know.

President Bigioni: Any other questions? Okay, then, I think somewhat quiet. We really appreciate your report, Provost Bjorkman. Thank you. So, we can move on to the next item of business, which is the OFC report by Senator Linda Rouillard.

Senator Rouillard: President Bigioni, I thought I was giving that report at our next meeting.

President Bigioni: Oh, I am sorry. Sorry for the confusion. If you want to, we could push you back and you could give it today or you could push that to the next meeting. It's up to you.

Senator Rouillard: Yeah, let's do it for the next meeting because in fact, there's another OFC meeting on Friday of this week.

President Bigioni: Okay, fair enough.

Senator Rouillard: Thanks.

President Bigioni: No problem. Let's see. So, I don't have the agenda in front of me. So the next item of business then is the Core Curriculum report from Senator Melissa Gregory.

Senator Gregory: Thank you, President Bigioni. So, this will be pretty short. I just want to let people know that the Core Curriculum Committee has been active. In the Summer of 2021, the Chair of that Committee, that was me, met with the Provost Office as part of the program review process. You may recall that at the end of last year, the Core Curriculum Committee had successfully kind of managed the first ever external review of the core. We actually got a report on that from our three external reviewers; it was very useful. We met together to discuss that. And then we also, I met with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee in July of 2021 to discuss some of the things that were in that report. So, you know, that's been kind of an ongoing conversation. Then this fall we started up again. We've had, I think four

meetings thus far. We had a kind of welcome, an orientation for new members of the committee, which included a review of the past two years work, and the core student learning outcomes, and the committee duties. We also had a kind of group review again of the results of the external evaluation of the core, which it occurred last spring. That conversation helped us to setup priorities for the 2021-2022 academic year, which is kind of ambitious and we will see if we can get to all of them. We decided as a committee that we would like to see if we can recommend some process improvements to the way that the Core Committee evaluates courses. We would like to continue with our ongoing process of assessment and core class assessment, which is part of the work that we did at the Value Institute last year. Something that everybody is kind of excited about, which is sort of the front end of assessment, which is redesigning and realigning the student learning outcomes to the core. The committee was thinking that we would go through each of the student learning outcomes that are currently attached to the core curriculum right now and kind of talk about them, and see if we think they're still relevant as they once were, see if we can align them a little bit more successfully with the institutional learning outcomes, and maybe make some recommendations to send about revisions. And then we would also like to focus particularly on the multicultural requirements. As you know, we have two in the core here at the University of Toledo. We had talked about possibly using a special task force for that work since we have all these faculty at the University who are really cutting edge and trained in relevant fields. The goal for that task force would be specifically to realign our multicultural requirements with some of the new state language regarding diversity, equity and inclusion, or to take that at least as a starting point to the conversation.

One more thing that we'd like to work on this year, if we can get it, is to do a little bit more analysis of core completion rates. We were having a conversation on the committee about students who sometimes expect core requirements to be waived. They think that that's something that everybody does and everyone gets to do. When we reviewed some 2018 data, it was kind of clear that the completion rates of the core varied really, really widely from college to college. Like, some colleges are kind of in the upper 68 percentage, and some colleges are at 95%. And while we think there are likely some really solid reasons why that might be happening in some places more than others, it seemed like it would be a really good idea to identify, why. You know, what some of the reasons are for that kind of widespread. Right? Some students are completing all the core and some of them seem to be completing like, 60 [something] percent of it. And kind of investigate that a little. I think some members of the committee were particularly worried about, you know, are there kind of equity gaps coming up here. Some students essentially getting exempted and getting an easier time of it than others, and when does that happen? So, we actually asked the Registrar's Office to pull some data for us in advance of our next meeting. Our goal with this isn't to call anybody out. It's not to immediately jump to some kind of corrective action. It's more just to kind of gain some information so that we can start a solid conversation about that. And that is what we're doing. And that concludes my report. Any questions?

President Bigioni: Thank you. Any questions for Senator Gregory?

Senator Rouillard: Senator Gregory, this is Senator Rouillard. I do have a question for you. How are people graduating if they aren't meeting our UT core requirements, much of which is dictated by the State?

Senator Gregory: Right. Well, you know, let me give you just like one example because it turns out when you start sort of running through examples, there are some relatively solid reasons. So, for example, our science requirement is attached to a one credit lab requirement and those two courses are separate. Sometimes when students transfer in, they have actually taken a course, a science course that aligns with ours where the lab was actually embedded within the course. Right? So that would be an example when I think a decent advisor would actually say, 'we're going to let you count this class, because it had the lab

and it essentially is the equivalent of what we're actually asking students to do.' However, I think what happens is when it gets audited, it shows up as something that didn't get completed on our end, right? Because it is like, the single credit wasn't completed in the same way. And there are lots of different kind of transfer related issues where I think, again, kind of perfectly reasonable kind of exemption is being made that actually fulfills the spirit of the core requirement. It just doesn't work out quite the same way on paper. But I think, Senator Rouillard, that doesn't necessarily count for, like I said, there's a really big spread there and that's what we are kind of interested in, to sort of figure out. It is also possible. I mean, one hypothesis that I had was that colleges with large international transfer populations may be coming in with co-requirements already. I am not actually sure how well the audit captures all of that. So, it's possible that even though they've actually done those requirements, they may not always be showing up. So that was another thing that we hypothesized. So, again, it would just be nice to know what's going on there and to make sure that if these things are happening that there really are kind of good and legitimate reasons, and that we're capturing those on paper and that we know when and why they're happening, rather than just a kind of mysterious range, I think, in core completion.

Senator Rouillard: Well, I think the other question to ask is how many of these exemptions are being given to a particular student? I mean, if it's a question of waving a requirement for a specific lab course when the lab component was embedded in a course, that's fine. But is it just that? Or is it that, you know, this student is getting that requirement waived and five other requirements waived? I think that's the other question to ask as well.

Senator Gregory: That's an excellent question. And again, we're kind of hoping that maybe some of that will show up in the data, like we'll be able to see it. Maybe a very simple next step would be to ask folks to start coding these when they get made so we could kind of collect those. I don't want to make a recommendation and I don't think the committee wants to make a recommendation too quickly, in the sense that we don't want to impede what advisors are trying to do. They're trying to get students in the door and on to their next thing. But, yes, we wanted to look. We thought that seemed like a really solid project to kind of take on that we could explore and figure out what might be happening there.

Senator Rouillard: To what extent are faculty being involved in waiving these requirements? It sounds like this is happening at the professional advisor office level. Shouldn't there be faculty in these different disciplines who weigh in on these waivers?

Senator Gregory: I think all colleges are a little different and that decentralization may be part of the issue. I know that in my own college, I, sometimes get asked if that's an okay substitute. Like, if someone says, can I count this class for the one credit lab because it already had a lab in it? I'm going to say, yes. I do think that sometimes advisors are able to make those calls themselves. I think sometimes it happens at a kind of middle management, you know, associate dean level. So again, this is the kind of thing that we thought that if we explored it, we could start maybe asking some of those secondary questions, like, when does this happen? And is there anything that you have to do that might check it a little or not?

Senator Rouillard: Well, I would also argue that faculty in the disciplines involved should also be looking at the possibility of these waivers. Do we want the College of Engineering deciding that 'no, they don't need composition anymore? They wrote something over here, so we are just going to exempt them from the English composition requirement.' Does the Math College really want our college to say, 'well, you know, you did math in high school and you are having a rough time, so we are going to exempt you from the math requirement?' I think we need to have a little bit more faculty input in this.

Senator Gregory: To be fair, I have no idea if that's the kind of cavalier attitude that is happening here. Like I said, some of the examples that we thought of were pretty reasonable. Yeah, I mean, like I said,

I'm hoping that when we gather these data, that is just a really good first step in terms of identifying. It may be that once we actually get the statistics, it's quite obvious that maybe there's like, one class that doesn't map neatly onto the transfer process and that's why it happens a lot, and it may affect some colleges more than others. I just don't know yet. We've asked for some information and the Registrar's Office has been kind enough to pull it for us and we'll see what happens when we get it.

Senator Rouillard: Thank you.

Senator Barnes: I have a question too, Melissa. Thank you so much for this detailed, clear, well-articulated report of what you've been doing. Yes, you are an 'A-plus person.' My question is about the analysis of the multicultural requirements. I'm just wondering if you could talk a little bit more about what's going on there? Do you know what the changes are at the State level? ---

Senator Gregory: Yes.

Senator Barnes: What is making you do this beyond ---?

Senator Gregory: Yes, I can. So, two things. One, and I wish I had queued up the links to drop them into the chat, although I can send them out later. So, the State of Ohio has rebranded its Ohio Transfer Model. So, it is now called Ohio Transfer 36. Many of the changes are in fact rebranding. The State even says that in its PowerPoint. So rebranding is one part of it - they freshened up the model. Another part of it is they have changed some simple things like, the goals of the course to outcomes. They would like all syllabuses that are in the Ohio Transfer Module, now Ohio Transfer 36, to have outcome statements instead of goal statements. So, some kind of simple work like that, that they would like to do to modernize Ohio Transfer 36. But, as they did this Ohio Transfer 36 work, one of the things that they also did was to come up with some new diversity, equity and inclusion language for the electives that can be included in the Ohio Transfer Module. So that if you've taken an elective and it meets certain DEI outcomes as defined by the State, then that is another course you could transfer in. Right now, that language is for elective courses only, but I get the feeling from the way that they're laying everything out in their documentation on this matter that they are sort of laying the ground to maybe ultimately work it in one day into the transfer module as a kind of requirement. So, there were three reasons we thought we might get back to the multicultural requirements in the core. The first is just, I don't think anybody selected them in a really long time and I think they seemed cutting edge when they were new and now, they seem kind of out of date. So, it is just like any healthy curriculum process, that it is good to review and reflect. Then the other reason is that if students now start taking classes with the DEI link that meet the DEI requirements from the state and they want to transfer here, if our multicultural requirements align with that language, we would actually be able to transfer students in with that multicultural requirement actually already aligning. This is advantageous to us in terms of enrollment. But it's also advantageous to the students since sometimes that multicultural class is a thing that they have to scramble to find room for. And then the third reason was just that, like I said, if that language becomes a part of the sort of required transfer module, it seems like it's better to get out in front of that. And since the language that the state is using actually seems more current than our own, we actually thought it might make sense to start creating some alignment there, drawing on the expertise of the people who, the many faculty in these disciplines who really know about them. We have not started that process though. I got to get that ball rolling.

Senator Barnes: Thank you.

Senator Gregory: Thank you.

Senator Huntley: Hi, Senator Gregory. I have two quick questions. As you know, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee reviewed the external program review. There's two things, and perhaps I missed it. And so I apologize if I did. But one thing was that the external reviewer recommended benchmarking our core curriculum. I think it came up, at least during Faculty Senate Exec. that our core curriculum has "300" and something courses. And that is just a beast, right? It is not a core curriculum. I didn't hear mention that. The second thing was assessment.

Senator Gregory: Yes, so let me just take the first thing. You know, I said the process was one of the first things we wanted to work on. We're hoping if we do that front end of maybe doing some revising of the student learning outcomes and then if those revisions seem fine to everybody, if they get endorsed, we could also start to build more process attached to them, if that makes sense. So, for right now, the Core Curriculum Committee does not actually have like, a detailed rubric that it uses to evaluate whether or not courses are actually meeting the outcomes that they say they're meeting, right? We have outcomes in the catalog, and then we have these courses. There's not a lot in between, right? I think that's one of the reasons that the core has gotten big, because if all you're using is the broad student learning outcomes in the catalog as a way to determine if the course should be in the core or not, a lot of things are going to get in. There's not a lot of opportunity I think for conversation there, or for revision, or exchange, or dialogue. I think it's going to contribute to that bloat. So, we were hoping to address the front end. Like, if we made some revisions on the front end then that would help lead to a tighter core on the back end, than if we tightened up the processes. I think that was the hope there. And as far as assessment is concerned, that's actually something that we're continuing to work on. Alaina Malik has been collecting core artifacts and working with faculty to submit student samples to the Value Institute, which is run by ACE, American Council on Education. So, in that sense, I think we would still like that assessment process to be more coordinated and more targeted. But I don't know, there are only so many things we can do at once. Som this is where we are for now. Does that sort of answer your question, Senator Huntley?

Senator Huntley: Yes. I mean, I guess it sounds like you're going to be working on that, but again, a core to me means something much more specific than 300 courses. I'm thinking 30. Right? I mean, that is a 'core.'

Senator Gregory: I feel like the committee in many ways shares your sentiments. But, we were also feeling that if we just came at the core with the mission of cutting it down, that, that was going to lead to a lot of conflict, and stress, and potentially unintended ripple effects. Whereas if we started with again, a revision of learning outcomes and a stronger process for how courses get attached to the core, which could then also lead to a review process, which give people the opportunity to say, do we really want this course in the core? Is it doing what it's supposed to do? Do we want to remove it? What impact does that have in our department? The conversation might be more of a conversation if we started that way than if we just say, hey, Faculty Senate, we would like to whack out everything, but 30. It seems like that would be stressful for the group.

Senator Barnes: Senator Huntley, is your concern that there are courses in the core that are not doing the work of the core, or [are] you just upset because there's so many courses that meet the cores because there's maybe 30 credit hours to think of, rather than 30 courses?

Senator Huntley: Listen. I'm not upset. You heard Dr. Postel talk about recruiting new students and, you know, we talk about with the strategic plan being relevant. We have to benchmark to other institutions. If you look what a core curriculum is at other institutions, it is not 300 courses.

Senator Barnes: We're not asking them to take 300 courses, though. We are asking them to pick from among more choices. I mean, I remember this during the Jacobs' administration, they were saying, 'students have too many choices.' I think the courses need to fulfill the requirements, but I think if students have choices that are more relevant to their future pursuits, I don't see that as a negative really.

Senator Huntley: Let's be clear, I'm not an expert in this area. I'm just kind of relaying what were the concerns from the external review committee, which are experts in this area. I'm trying to reemphasize what was in that report, which we went through in Faculty Senate Exec.

Senator Barnes: Thank you.

Senator Gregory: And, you know, Senator Huntley, one of the things I could just add to our list is, I mean, a really simple benchmark would be to benchmark the number of credits. Right? So, like, in Ohio, you know, 36 to 42, that's a pretty easy investigation. So, let me just add that to my list of things we can do. It doesn't necessarily address how many classes are in the core, that's a more complicated issue. But the credit issue is something we could look at.

Senator Rouillard: Another way of looking at it is also that there are different ways of achieving certain institutional core goals. I think we do need to offer students choices to reach those goals, to demonstrate mastery of those goals in a variety of ways. And not just in ways that we've selected for them.

Assistant Dean Pollauf: Senator Gregory, if I could just jump back to the procedural question about why things perhaps are always shown as complete in the core, or seem to not be fulfilling the core? There is a good reason for that. There is some definite category of things that fall into there. For example, the transfer module does not require that you have two sciences from different disciplines and we do. We have to honor the transfer module for every student that brings those courses in. So right there, that is one large category of violation, or whatever you may want to call it. But in actuality, it is mandated by a law that supersedes our own or a process that supersedes our own. Composition is another category where students have a variety of reasons that it was waived, accredited in a different way, or passed through some kind of examination at a transfer school and then transcribed. And again, we are obligated to take those. Then the third thing I would say to you is, is looking at the number of courses vs. hours. This is a very common thing, or perhaps better stated, it used to be a much more common thing that schools have moved away from quarter hours. But, if someone completed two courses and ends up with 5.32 hours vs. 6, then have they met the spirit or letter of the law in that case? And these are some common things that happen over and over. From my experience, no advisor is empowered to make decisions about core requirements in and of themselves of their own authority.

Senator Gregory: Thank you so much for that, Assistant Dean Pollauf because I think those are great concrete examples. This is honestly the kind of thing that we expected to see. It is more just knowing if there's a preponderance of, you know, exemptions being made about one thing. Because the truth is, if we know when and why it's happening, we might be able to solve it in a way that's less behind the scenes, more intentional. Anything we could do to be more intentional about the core to make it more focused to really make sure that it is a kind of coherent, but also flexible experience for students, I think is good.

Assistant Dean Pollauf: Thank you. I agree, there are rules that could be hard wired into the audit process too if we see over and over again. Like, for example, the two sciences in one subject vs. two. That should just be something that can be taken care of by a system rule, rather than somebody having to do an override. And I think in fact, it may be for certain schools, just for what it's worth.

Senator Gregory: Thank you. Like I said, we're just investigating in a preliminary way, so we will see.

President Bigioni: I would like to point out that Provost Bjorkman added a link to the chat, which is a link to the Ohio Transfer 36 website [<https://www.ohiohighered.org/Ohio-Transfer-36>] for anyone who wants to check that out. Are there any more questions for Senator Gregory? It's been a good discussion. Okay. Well, hearing none.

Senator Gregory: Thanks.

President Bigioni: Thank you very much again for your report. And, we appreciate all the hard work you're doing on it. It's a lot to grapple with so we appreciate it.

Senator Gregory: It's a great committee. They're wonderful. Thank you.

President Bigioni: Thank you. Now that I do have the agenda in front of me, I see we made a mistake. So, I apologize for that. It was actually Senator Patrick Lawrence next with the Program Committee's report, so my apologies Senator Lawrence.

Senator Lawrence: No problem. This is a short report. I am going to share my screen. It shouldn't take us very long. Okay, so the Committee has reviewed seven proposals. I'll go through them one at a time and then we can take some questions and vote as a whole. These are all fairly minor changes, and in one case, a new undergraduate program. So, starting off, we have a change to the existing minor in Stage and Screen Performance. It is simply to add a course, Theatre 2020, as one of the optional courses available for the minor. That course already exists.

The next one is a modification to the BA in Theatre. Likewise, the modification is to add the class option, Theater 2020 to the concentration in stage and screen acting, which is part of the BA.

The third one is a modification to the BBA in Entrepreneurship and Innovation. It is simply a modification that changes the program name, modifies the course offerings. This is based on market research basically to streamline and make the program more compliant. It still stays at 120 hours and at the 36 credit hours of the core. No structural changes in terms of credit hours.

We have a change to the English, minor. This one here is just a clarification. That fact that certain majors outside of the College of Arts and Letters that offer as a minor concentrations that require English courses. This is just a streamline in terms of the courses that can be used for a major and then also in a minor from a separate college. It does not affect majors in CAL, but will have an impact of minors at the colleges. These are overlapping that needs to be clarified and corrected with that one.

We have a modification to the minor in Counseling. It is adding a new course, Counseling 3000. That course has already previously been approved by Faculty Senate. So that course will be added to the minor.

We have a modification to the existing Certificate in Intercultural Competency. This is to add an elective, ASST 2100. Introduction to Asian Studies will be an elective added into that certificate.

And then our final proposal is we have a new undergraduate program, a minor in World Cultures has been proposed. Quickly, that is 18 to 19 credit hours for completion. There are a series of two courses, a total of six to seven credit hours, depending on the course selected in the core, and then a series of electives you chose for a total of 12 hours to meet the 18 to 19 hours. There is a plan of study learning outcomes and all the other requirements indicated for a program have been completed as submitted.

I present these as recommendations from our Committee. I'll entertain any questions before I call the motion for a vote.

President Bigioni: Are there any questions or discussion?

Senator Lawrence: Okay. Hearing none. This is a motion from a committee so it does not require a second. The motion is to approve the six program modifications and new undergraduate program. Vote yes, no, or abstain in the chat. Thank you. President Bigioni, that completes my report.

President Bigioni: Okay, great. Thank you, Senator Lawrence. It looks like the vote has passed. *Motion Passed.* Thank you again to you and your Committee. The next item of business then is a report by Dr. Mark Templin on the Constitution and Rules Committee's work from last week in reviewing the Board of Trustees proposal. Dr. Templin, the floor is yours.

Dr. Templin: Thank you, President Bigioni. I'm going to share my screen here. Hopefully everybody can see this. A little background is in order here. Last school year we actually had a first-round vote on the parliamentary documents for Faculty Senate. My records indicate that occurred somewhere around, I think the 10th of November of 2020. Then on the 19th, my records indicated that I developed clean versions of all parliamentary documents. 'Clean' meaning that there were no strikethroughs in it so you could read it as a document like it would appear on the website. I forwarded those to then President Brakel, who subsequently forwarded them to legal and the Board of Trustees, 'people in charge.' And that is where it was until recently when we got word that there were a couple of changes that they would like to see. So, what I am going to show you is basically a preview of what the changes are, and we can go ahead and have a first reading for this Faculty Senate, for this school year, hopefully next meeting and consider all the parliamentary documents, and particularly these proposed changes.

There are two changes. The first one occurs in Article II, which is the responsibilities and jurisdiction of Senate. The strike through language, and this is 'G,' the original language was "To facilitate formative assessments of the provost, vice provost(s), and deans at least once every two years (including those who serve in these positions on an interim basis longer than two years) to ensure accountability and approve administrative performance." And then the suggested language to replace that was (it appears is green), and I'll talk about the blue in a second, but the language in green is, "Solicit input from the faculty or faculty senate, on the performance of the President or other senior administrators when input on the performance of the President or other administrators is requested by the Board of Trustees." Now, where that language comes from, I am going to jump over to the Faculty Senate Bylaws draft and go down to Article IV. So, Article IV has to do with the officer duties, and then IV 'A' is the duties of the President of Faculty Senate. Then number '9,' if you see here what I am highlighting, that is the same language. So, in other words, the suggested language has historically been part of the President of Senate's enumerated duties. The part in blue, if we go back - or Faculty Senate - the more I am reading this, I think it has to be in there, but probably in the bylaws more than here. One of the things is 'G,' here in the Constitution was sort of every year we're going to do some reviews and basically half the deans each year are going to get reviewed and so on. This would put it as we would have maybe a little bit of note of advanced notice, maybe very little advanced notice, and then a review would be requested. If there's very little advanced notice, particularly for the President of Faculty Senate, seeking input from the Senate might be all that could occur in the short time window that the request would occur within. So, I'm asking Senate to think about that. We don't have to vote on this at this meeting at all. But be thinking about that for the future.

The other change is all the way down in Article X, which is the article that deals with interpretation. So, basically, if there's some ambiguity, how does Senate handle that? What's in green here is the suggested language. The real change is this and I am going to highlight it here. "Possible ambiguity where the spirit, meaning, or conditions of interpretation of any provision of the Constitution." In other words, the suggested language goes into further detail about what ambiguity means. A lot of it is what we already

had in the interpretation article, and then the rest of it comes straight out of the Board of Trustees' Bylaws. That is what that entire second paragraph really is. It is referenced there that it is 3364-1-10B. Much of that is not really a change, but just [a] more of a clarification, you know, that the Board has the ability to overrule the interpretation. And that was it. I don't know if you want me to continue to share. I'll stop sharing for the moment and then if anybody has questions, I might re-share later, I guess.

President Bigioni: I was going to say you can keep sharing.

Dr. Templin: Oh, okay. I can.

President Bigioni: That's okay. I can share too if you like. Before you open it up to questions, I just want to make a quick point. That second paragraph that came out of the bylaws of the Trustees, it is not clear that the request from the Trustees was for us to include that. We'll have to get clarification on that.

Dr. Templin: It looked like it was.

President Bigioni: So, the reason it is not clear to me is the text that they refer to as coming from, or going into, the Constitution was italic.

Dr. Templin: Right.

President Bigioni: That text wasn't, although the flow of the document made it ambiguous.

Dr. Templin: Right. I erred on the side of more.

President Bigioni: All right.

Dr. Templin: And if they say, oh, no, it's not necessary, we can take it out. I mean, that second paragraph is not anything new. You know, that's fine. I thought they wouldn't have put it in there if they didn't want us to have it. So that was what I was interpreting it to be.

President Bigioni: Okay.

Senator Steven: Can I make a comment?

Dr. Templin: Sure.

Senator Steven: My interpretation of that letter was that the second paragraph was for us to recognize that they have the opportunity to do what they want. That's in their bylaws. The changes were in the paragraphs above. And as President Bigioni said, it was not in italics. I think the first paragraph was something they wanted to change and then the second paragraph was to let us know that, hey, the Board of Trustees are the ones really in control. We have our bylaws in terms where we have the say, in terms of what the Constitution is going to say. They're kind of just saying, hey, please make these changes because that is what we want. That was my interpretation and that they didn't want that paragraph in because that paragraph is already in their bylaws. It's not something that would make sense in our Constitution.

President Bigioni: Perhaps just reminding us of their supremacy as we consider these changes.

Senator Steven: Something like that.

Senator Templin: Like I said, I erred on the side [of more]. I had all those thoughts, and I said, I can put it in there, but we can always take it out later. That second paragraph is nothing different than what the Board of Trustees bylaws are.

Senator Steven: That makes sense.

Dr. Templin: We could just attach that reference number. [It] might be very helpful, you know, instead of that whole paragraph just have the Board of Trustees reference number there. Because you can literally put that into Google and it'll take you right to it. You can get to it very quickly through that number.

President Bigioni: Super. If your report is concluded, then perhaps we should transition to just the general discussion of the proposed Trustees' changes. Shall we do that?

Dr. Templin: That would be fine.

President Bigioni: So, I'll just make some comments. The Constitution and Rules Committee studied this last week and met to discuss it, and now we have an opportunity to discuss it on the floor of the Senate today. I put together some documents that I got from Senator Templin as well as some documents that I prepared for context, and that was sent out just a couple hours ago, sometime this afternoon. The idea is to get the discussions started. We're not voting on anything today. There's far too little time for you to contemplate these changes. But the goal is to begin the discussion of what we think about these changes. Then, of course, you have a couple of weeks to think more about it and discuss with your colleagues, get feedback from non-senators, and then have a more robust discussion at our next Faculty Senate meeting where we could actually take a vote as to whether or not we would like to adopt those changes, and push the document and the changes forward. Not just the Board of Trustees changes, but incorporate them into our updated Constitution, and Bylaws and Rules and push that forward. Or if we'd like to seek some changes. So that's the idea.

Of course, I guess we need to consider what these proposed changes are asking of us, and what we might give up, and what we might gain from accepting them. So that's the context of this. And, of course, you know, as Senator Templin mentioned earlier that the broader context of this has been a several year process of trying to update these. This constitution met with several delays along the way. Now, we seem to be in a position where we might be able to conclude this process this year and so that weighs into the discussion as well as to what we may be willing to accept or not. So that's the context.

Then I'll just open it up for discussion. Dr. Templin, do you want to just share the document again just so everybody has it in front of them? Of course, all the senators, you got it in your email earlier this afternoon so you could pull it up yourself. We'll at least have it here for people to see as we discuss. Okay, so, I see a comment from Senator Hefzy. Go ahead.

Senator Hefzy: Thank you, Dr. Templin for your hard work. I have a question. And you may have addressed, [but] it is not clear to me. What do you mean when you say, requested by the Board of Trustees? There was somewhere where you said, requested by the Board of Trustees. I cannot hear, Dr. Templin. You are muted.

Dr. Templin: So basically, what the change is, my understanding of this would be rather than Senate just doing assessments on an ongoing rotating basis and just having a calendar for that, those assessments would stop and Senate would only do assessments when requested by the Board of Trustees.

Senator Hefzy: Okay.

Dr. Templin: Did I come through?

Senator Hefzy: I guess the Board of Trustees would send a request to Faculty Senate?

Dr. Templin: Yes. One time a request was made during the summer. During the summer, that's when the President of Senate, because the Executive Committee meets over the summer, was asking faculty who were there and so on and trying to get information. I don't know if it was [the] president or provost, or who it was, but somebody asked, can you, kind of get some information so that we can make a better decision? When that happens in the summer, while Faculty Senate isn't meeting in normal times, of course, the president would have to do his or her best. But if this is going to occur during the school year, it depends on how, like, if the request comes and then they say, you got 48 hours to get us something. Well, you're not going to pole the whole faculty in 48 hours. I wouldn't think. But you might be able to ask Senate for some information. The key difference here is that a planned review process would stop and this would be more of a, when the situation presents itself, then Senate would get involved in some sort of a review.

Senator Hefzy: Thank you.

Senator Insch: Dr. Templin, I've got a question. So, our current Constitution has the red line language in it. Correct?

Dr. Templin: Right.

Senator Insch: And it looks like it was put in there so that the Faculty Senate would have some way to ensure accountability and prove administrative performance so that we could help nudge along the process of having our deans and administrators be evaluated by the people that they're supervising. Is that correct?

Dr. Templin: I think that's the intent.

Senator Insch: And so, this would, in essence, stop us from doing that?

Dr. Templin: Yes, until asked.

Senator Insch: And how often would they really ask? I mean, it seems to me that this is to protect us and give us an opportunity to evaluate our leaders, just like we're evaluated in a systematic way. And I don't know as a Faculty Senate if we want to give up that right. That's my concern with this, is that it's in there currently. I think maybe a conversation with some of the Trustees, we could kind of tell them why it's there. Because both of these things are kind of like you're overstepping your bounds, 'because this is our responsibility as the board of trustees.' Yes, it is. You're supposed to review the president and the provost, but we're doing this from a different standpoint as a way to kind of help protect us as a faculty, or at least be able to be part of that review process rather than waiting to be asked about it. So, that to me, seems to be a pretty big change, and we're giving up something that we currently have the right to do, and I don't know if the Senate's comfortable with that or not.

Senator Coulter-Harris: I find this sentence rather draconian in its articulation. The way I read it, it's saying, don't give us any input about the President or senior leadership, unless we ask for it. So, perhaps they might want to rearticulate exactly what they mean. And as Senator Insch said, we would be giving up some of our rights here. So, I don't like the way that is articulated at all.

President Bigioni: And I can add to that, Senator Krantz put a comment in the chat box to that effect. It says, stating the question in a different way, "We would be prohibited from initiating a review. Correct?"
Dr. Templin?

Dr. Templin: I would think so, because this reads, it's 'upon request,' really.

President Bigioni: Another quick comment that I'll make is that I've always seen this review process as analogous to the course reviews that our students do for the courses that we teach. It's feedback. Certainly, there's an accountability element to it, but the idea is really to improve -- and of course, there are no real 'teeth' to it.

I see more comments in the chat box. Senator Smith asks, "is 'other senior administrator' ambiguous in a way? Does this include deans?"

Dr. Templin: It could well be. I don't know. Like, it could even be Center Directors too, I would think.

President Bigioni: Anyone they request, in principle?

Dr. Templin: Yes.

President Bigioni: To be defined by them?

Dr. Templin: Right.

President Bigioni: Senator El-Zawarhy made a comment. Can we add "or by the Faculty Senate" in the end?

Dr. Templin: So, in other words, either party could initiate a solicitation for input, is that what you're asking?

Senator El-Zawarhy: What I mean, it is basically requested by the Board of Trustees or Faculty Senate. So, the Faculty Senate will still have the ability to solicit the input.

Dr. Templin: Oh, I see.

President Bigioni: I guess if we cut right to the point, the question is, do we do we feel comfortable with this [proposed] change? Do we feel comfortable giving up this regular process of yearly review of half of the administrators? So every two years, we evaluate everyone. Are we comfortable giving up the evaluation process? Because in principle, the Board of Trustees may never request us to review them. I see a comment. Senator Wedding wants to speak. Senator Wedding, go ahead.

Senator Wedding: This is just a question. How many of these have we done in the last year, two years? The only one that I clearly remember is the one that the Board of Trustees did of [Dr. Lloyd] Jacobs. That was back around 2013, I think. We were told we couldn't do it and they did it. I have a copy of it. It was a very quiet, private, kept confidential, but somehow or other, it ended up in my possession. It's a terrible, terrible evaluation of Dr. Jacobs, very, very bad. But, it never was made public. So, the Board does do these themselves, apparently, but don't bother to tell us. What do we do on our side? I mean, we are allowed to go up through the deans. What deans have we evaluated in the last several years? And what has happened to those evaluations? In other words, how real is all this? How real is it? We get the right to evaluate, but what do we evaluate and what happens to these evaluations? That's my only comment.

Senator Insch: Senator Wedding, I can answer that, because when I was the Dean of the College of Business, my third year they did one of these. They did it on four or five different deans. And I found it pretty useful. One of the Faculty Senate guys who ran it, whose name is escaping me and I feel really bad about it because I see him all the time, he came and we had about an hour of discussion of what the questions were and what the comments were. So, I got good feedback from it. As a Dean, I was interested and wanted to know. So, there was value to me as a Dean, both knowing it was happening and also, after the fact of what the comments were. I don't think they published it as part of the process. They told me

this was not going to be a public document; it was going to be a document for me, for improvement and feedback from my faculty. I don't know if you want to make it more than that. But I know I was evaluated and my faculty had the opportunity to evaluate me on a number of items, and they did, and some of it was positive and some of it wasn't positive. But, it was useful. So, it has happened, but I don't think it was ever intended to be public and that's why you didn't see it public published anywhere. But I had a conversation with a member of the Faculty Senate who ran the survey.

Senator Wedding: What value are these if we can't, as a faculty, get to see what the results are?

Senator Insch: Well, it depends on what's the point. Most evaluations are for development of the employee, not for public consumption, right? Isn't there a privacy issue there? When I got evaluated when I worked at a bank, that was for me and maybe my superiors in a file somewhere. It wasn't meant for public consumption; it was a development process to give me feedback on how I could improve.

Senator Wedding: These are public employees, public administrators, and these documents are available under public records.

Senator Insch: I'm sure you could have it if you wanted to dig it up, but why would you? But, I'm not going to argue with you, Senator Wedding. Like I said, we are giving up the rights to evaluate deans. I mean, the Board is never going to ask us to do this. And if they ever do, it's going to be that they're going to target a dean or target an administrator that they're going to try to get rid of, probably. I just feel that it seems weird that we're going to be giving up something that actually has some value. It had some value to me when I was a dean and maybe it will have value if we decide to make it more public. That's something that could be possible. I think it's something that had some value. But again, I'm just one voice out of how many faculty that we have? I don't have a dog in this race anymore. But, you know, for me, it seems that we don't want to give up rights that we've had historically, just because they have this concern that we're overstepping their bounds. We're not doing anything. They still have the right to do what they want with the president, the provost and the deans. We just want to have an opportunity to evaluate them and let them know how their faculty think they're doing, which as a Dean, I thought was useful.

Senator Barnes: I want to second and endorse Senator Insch's position here. I too remember receiving as a faculty member [a] deans' evaluation a number of years ago, and it's been a while. You know, that may be something we want to look into. We were on a schedule at some point, and for maybe a lot of different reasons we have lost that schedule. But I think there's no reason for us to give away something that could be potentially very valuable. We appreciate their evaluation. So, why wouldn't they appreciate ours?

President Bigioni: Thank you. Senator Steven has a comment. Go ahead, Senator Steven.

Senator Steven: Thanks, President Bigioni. I just wanted to bring up the point that we discussed this a little further in our Constitution Committee, where it was something that we don't want to give up as Faculty Senate, but it came down to the point where we understand that we have no choice. They included that paragraph where, 'hey, we suggest these changes' and in their last paragraph that we were just discussing previously, it's essentially stating the BOT has the ability to change anything the way they want it to be. And so, if we don't accept this change, essentially they're just not going to accept the Constitution modifications without it. So that's what we feel is a problem. As a committee, we recommend this change just on the basis that we really don't have a choice. Yes, we would prefer to have that in there. I made a suggestion that maybe we could have article 'G' left in as is, but add that it would not be made public so it doesn't become an issue. With respect to looking back upon previous evaluations, there were issues with the comments. It's being done to help the people that are being evaluated. It's input, feedback that we agree is going to be useful, positive or negative and it is useful to have. But

maybe it would be helpful just to keep it private. Just like our student evaluations, they're not broadcast to the public, it's kept private. The only issue with that is that it is discoverable. We are a public university so if someone wants to know, they can find out. But, as Senator Insch was saying, who would want to, essentially?

President Bigioni: I see more comments in the chat box. Senators Jayatissa and Rouillard made a couple of comments. Would either of you like to speak on them?

Senator Rouillard: I would like to point out that these evaluations can just as easily be a positive thing, and be a support for a dean who, for some reason is being subject to some political decisions or pressure. This can be an important way to signal support for that Dean. Secondly, I also put into the chat box a link to Miami University, where they have on their university Senate page, a description of an all university faculty committee for evaluation of administrators. So, you know, if we're going to benchmark our curriculum, we might also want a benchmark some of our procedures, and look at what other institutions are doing. But at the same time, this is an opportunity for the University of Toledo to make room for a call for responsibility. Deans need to be responsive to their faculty when faculty have issues. This is one way to keep everybody accountable.

President Bigioni: Thank you. Senator Gilstrap also has a comment. Would you like to speak on it?

Senator Gilstrap: Sure. So, I just have a question. Why [does] this have to exist in the Constitution as opposed to Faculty Senate just having a standing two-year evaluation, and the report is ready for the Board whenever they like? I guess, why do we need the blessing of the Board to have an evaluation?

President Bigioni: Dr. Templin, do you want to comment on that? Why does it need to exist in the Constitution?

Dr. Templin: That is the change that they are asking for. In other words, the status quo, the existing way we're doing things is deans are evaluated two-year rotating basis. So, in theory, those documents are being generated every other year for any particular Dean. This change would in fact, stop that process and simply have it as when we want input then we will tell you. Keeping it in the Constitution in some form is protection because the parliamentary document is guidance and it says, look, we thought we could do this, and we can point to this document where it is indicating that we can do this. So, having it in the Constitution, I think is an important protection for the people who are engaged in the review process. Really what it is, is it is changing the circumstances under, which a review could occur.

Senator Gilstrap: Thank you.

President Bigioni: Senator Topp made the comment [in the chat], "This change is inconsistent with shared governance." Would you like to speak on that point, Senator Topp?

Senator Topp: *[Indecipherable]*

President Bigioni: I don't know about everyone else, but that was pretty choppy for me. Dr. Templin, did you hear it?

Dr. Templin: It broke up. I'm sorry.

President Bigioni: Okay. Sorry, Senator Topp. Perhaps you can just make the comment in the chat box. I'm sorry about that. We just can't hear you. Okay, so, it is getting late and I want to give everyone more opportunities to say things. But I'm going to remind everybody about at least one or two points that have been made, but I'd like to make them again in perhaps a clearer way.

Somebody made the point that they can pick and choose who they want to evaluate and, of course, this is a way of weaponizing our Constitution. Right? And if I were an administrator subject to such review, I probably wouldn't be very happy about it. I haven't given that a great deal of deep thought, but it makes me concerned about unintended consequences that could be bad.

The other point is the regularity of our current plan of review. It is very predictable. We can plan for it. It's the machinery of it. It's no small task to get it done, as Senator Templin mentioned earlier. So to get a proper review by all the faculty of each college, perhaps would be very challenging to do in a short period of time. So this predictability and this uniformity serves the process very well. And so, to deviate from that could be very problematic as well.

Okay, I just wanted to emphasize those two points. Are there other comments? I see a few more things in the chat. Perhaps additional points from Senator Rouillard. Does anyone else have any comments to make?

Senator Steven: I was wondering about the feasibility, you mentioned earlier that, well, maybe you didn't mention it to the Faculty Senate, but you mentioned it to me, that you are going to be meeting sort of informally with some members of the Board of Trustees and the President on these changes. I was wondering if at that time, you could suggest that we leave that in and maybe modify it in some way to make it acceptable to them, that we continue to have these reviews in place in our Constitution or the statement that we will do these reviews. Because it seems to me the sentiment so far of Faculty Senate is that we would like to keep them in. I think that's fairly clear. It's my sentiment as well. But the problem is pretty clear that the Board of Trustees doesn't want it in there. So, is there any chance that it can be modified and be left in there? Can you ask them if that is possible in your meeting?

President Bigioni: So, to be clear, no such meeting is planned. But the possibility of such a meeting exists, depending on how this discussion went. If everyone was quite happy with leaving it as is, there would be no need for such a meeting. But if there's a general feeling among the senators that we should engage in such a conversation with the Trustees, to at the very least better understand what their intentions are, and talk about all these different issues that people brought up, unintended consequences and so on, then I would be quite happy to have that meeting with them and set that up. They seem to be quite happy to have that meeting with us. So that possibility exists if the senators want that to happen, I can arrange it.

Senator Wedding would like to speak again. Go ahead, Senator Wedding.

Senator Wedding: I would like to have you and Senator Inch together to go meet with the Board of Trustees representatives. I think if you're going to do this, it ought to be you and Senator Inch together making the presentation. I mean, I agree with what we're saying, but I think it's a practical matter. If they are really hard nose about this, then our Constitution, for which we've put five years in, is gone. We will not get it through. We'll just be left with the old constitution for what it is. And it has good points in it. There are things in the new Constitution we wanted, but they will be lost. Nonetheless, I think if you're going to make a stand, you've got to have your two top people in the Senate making that stand, and that would be you and Gary Inch.

President Bigioni: That is a very practical comment. I appreciate that. Thanks, Don. And in principle, Mark Templin as well since he knows this inside and out, and knows the issues, and is our parliamentarian. So, given the time---

Senator Barnes: President Bigioni, really quickly. I would endorse the meeting too. And I just want to say that I think that the concerns that folks have raised, I see Senator Krantz's posting that having them explain their position is important, but I think it's also useful for them to hear from us. There are the implications of this decision, and not just shared governance, not to minimize that, but there are also the things that Dr. Rouillard raised, you know, that there are ways in which this --I mean, 'weaponize' is a powerful word--but there are ways in which lack of a process such as this really could be very damaging to the institution. And, you know, we've been there before. So, for them as stewards of the institution, they might want to consider some of these implications before they make this decision. I mean, they've already made the case, obviously, but before they stick to it, if we object.

President Bigioni: Thank you for that. I suppose, let me see, we still have a pretty good population here. Why don't we just take a vote to see how everybody feels about it? Should we accept what has been proposed by the Trustees, or should we talk to them and try to preserve our ability to do reviews? I am not sure how to pose that in terms of a yes and no question. Perhaps the question should be, "Should we meet with the Board of Trustees to preserve our ability to do reviews?"

[chatroom poll responses were unanimously "yes"]

I think the sentiment is clear that we will engage with the Board of Trustees and have that discussion and try to come to a mutually acceptable conclusion to this point.

With regard to the second point, I think it is primarily semantic and I don't know that there needs to be anything negotiated there. So, if anyone feels otherwise, please speak up, otherwise we'll put that point to rest.

Dr. Templin: Well, we don't know if that second paragraph was intended or not.

President Bigioni: Right.

Dr. Templin: So, we probably should seek clarification on that.

President Bigioni: Okay. But the spirit of what they would like, I haven't heard any objections towards [it]. If you feel otherwise, please speak up, otherwise we'll wrap this up.

Okay, hearing no further comments, we will try to setup this meeting, such that we have more to tell you by the next meeting in two weeks. I believe that's on the 23rd. In the meantime, you can review the changes. Certainly, the ones proposed by the Board of Trustees that are included in the email that you received earlier this afternoon, but you can also look at the broader changes to the Constitution, Rules and Bylaws that is in that same email in the Word documents. Then we'll be prepared to have another discussion and perhaps a vote in two weeks' time. Any further comments?

All right, then. That was our last scheduled item of business.

I'll open it up to items from the floor. Are there any items from the floor? Okay, hearing none, then we can move to adjournment.

If there are no objections, we shall adjourn. Hearing none. We will adjourn this meeting.

Thank you very much everyone. We will see you in two weeks. Thanks everybody. Meeting adjourned at 6:07 p.m.

IV. Meeting adjourned at 6: 07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted: Kimberly Nigem
Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard

Faculty Senate Office Administrative Secretary
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary