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

President Brakel: Welcome to our fifth Faculty Senate meeting in the fall semester. At this time, I will ask Executive Secretary Kim Nigem to call the roll.

Present: Ali, Anderson, Bailey, Barnes, Bigioni, Brakel, Case, Chaudhuri, Chou, Coulter-Harris, de le Serna, Duggan, Duhon, Elgafy, El-Zawahry, Garcia-Mata, Gibbs, Giovannucci, Gregory, Guardiola, Hall, Insch, Jayatissa, Kistner, Koch, Krantz, Lawrence, Lecka-Czernik, Lee, Lipscomb, Lundquist (substitute for A. Edgington), Metz, Milz, Modyanov, Molitor, J. Murphy, Niamat, Nigem, Oberlander, Wood (substitute for Pakulski), Pattin, Ratnam, Reeves, Smith, , Steven, Taylor, Teclehaimanot, Thompson-Casado, Tiwari, Topp, Van Hoy, Wedding, Welsch, Zietlow

Excused Absence: Day, Heberle, Kujawa,
Unexcused Absence: Chaffee, Longsdorf, L. Murphy, Perry, Stepkowski

President Brakel: Do we have a quorum?

Senator Nigem: Yes.

President Brakel: Thank you. The agenda was sent out this morning. May I have a motion to adopt the agenda?

Unknown Senator: So moved.

Unknown Senator: Second.

President Brakel: So the agenda is adopted. Next is the **Faculty Senate Executive Committee report**:

The Executive Committee met on October 2nd to plan today's meeting. At that meeting, we discussed the Campus Vote Project that is on today's agenda. We had limited information at that time concerning this and was concerned that this might be viewed as leaning toward one party or faculty being told what to do. I heard Dr. Cockrell's presentation on this last week during the Provost's Staff and Dean's Meeting and also had a discussion with Dr. Cockrell about our concerns last Friday. We agreed upon the information points to be presented in today's meeting and placed it on today's agenda as an information only item.

The Executive Committee also reviewed the White Paper Position Statement from the Ohio Faculty Council and instructed your OFC representative, Allison Day and myself to vote in favor of the position statement.
At the Provost's Staff and Dean's meeting last Tuesday, we heard a presentation from Research Engagement Librarian Wade Lee that previewed a Research Portal that is under development in our University Library. This looks like it will be a useful tool to faculty and the public would be able to more

easily discover faculty experts from our university. We will plan to have a presentation on this at an upcoming Faculty Senate meeting.

As you are aware, the university is beginning to examine some form of responsibility centered management. Huron Consulting was scheduled to meet with the Dean's yesterday to discuss the Evolution of Budget and Planning.

I attended the Strategy and Finance meeting last Wednesday. This meeting addressed changes that have occurred or are in process within the move to Chartwells Food Service. You have seen some e-mail announcements about new food service options. From a finance standpoint, there are some capital improvements that are being made as well as other cost savings measures from the Chartwells agreement. This agreement is expected to provide over $50 million to UToledo over the life of the contract.

The Strategy and Finance meeting also mentioned that there are new leaders within the Human Resources Department that are working on improving efficiencies within that office. One specific area mentioned was the paperwork surrounding the hiring process for new employees and other annual employees (part-time, VAP, etc.). More information on these efficiencies will be provided as the year progresses. Last item to mention from the strategy and finance meeting is that while university related travel is limited this year, the university is moving to using the Christopherson Business Travel agency for booking all University related travel. Other Ohio universities use this agency through the IUC (Inter University Council). There will be more details on this throughout the year.

This concludes the Faculty Senate Executive Committee report. Does any Executive Committee member have anything to add?

Senator Smith: I don't think so, President Brakel. I do have a note about minors on campus; something that we discussed concerning that. I don't know if you need to---

President Brakel: That is on our agenda. That is the presentation that Dave Cutri and Elliot Nikeson will be doing in a few minutes.

Senator Smith: Okay.

Senator Niamat: President Brakel, I have a question.

President Brakel: Yes, go ahead, Senator Niamat.

Senator Niamat: The question is about limited travel. Is that respected to university sponsored travel or travel spot obtain through…grants also?

President Brakel: The Provost may want to dive in that a little bit, but my understanding is that it was any university sponsored travel. I'm not sure how that plays out in the grant travel.

Senator Niamat: All right.

President Brakel: Okay. Any other questions? Since I have mentioned in my report about the campus vote project, and because Dr. Cockrell does have another meeting that he has to get to, I am going to shift for a moment to the campus vote project. So, Dr. Cockrell, why don't you go ahead.

Dr. Cockrell: Thank you so much, President Brakel and good afternoon Colleagues. I want to start off by saying thank you all so much for the opportunity to present to you all today about our campus vote project, but most importantly, thank you for what each of you all are doing in the classroom to support academic success. I know our students are very appreciative of the work that you all are doing there.

As it relates to the campus vote project, the University of Toledo applied for a mini grant that we were awarded a couple of weeks ago, about $1,000 dollars to increase our civic engagement efforts at the University. The mini grant will be used to aid our efforts in registering students to vote and getting them to a ballot box. I think most of you know we are coming up on a presidential election within upcoming weeks, and so we want to make sure that our students have the resources they need in order to vote. Ohio State, Bowling Green, University of Cincinnati are other recipients of this grant. We've communicated to our student organizations. We've been strongly encouraging them to ensure that 100% of their members vote in the upcoming election, and a lot of our student organizations have already communicated to us that 100% of their students in their respectful organizations are registered to vote. We are giving them a lot of kudos and praise for their efforts there. As it relates to early voting purposes, we will be transporting students to and from the polls every Thursday and Friday, beginning this upcoming Thursday and Friday. The times will be between 3 PM. and 5 PM. for the next three weeks. Transportation will start at the Office of Multicultural Student Success, which is located in the Student Union, Office 2500. Students will have to sign up indicating they want ride the vans down to cast their ballot. So, we are providing that as a resource for our students. Although we are unsure when the election results will be finalized, my team and I with the division of Student Affairs, we start reserving space on campus from November 2nd through November 11th, just to allow students to participate in some small group dialogue as it relates to the upcoming election and to process their feelings. We did something similar during the 2016 election and we want to provide the same thing during this time. Of course, we are utilizing appropriate PPE and social distancing guidelines. Within upcoming weeks, we will be sending our email to campus asking faculty and staff members to participate in small group facilitators. My division will be training faculty and staff members to serve as small group facilitators. Again, this is just an opportunity for students to process the upcoming elections, as well as the election results.

Lastly, we have absentee ballot request forms and stamps available, not only in my office in University Hall 3630, but also in the Office of Multicultural Student Success, again, which is located in Student Union 2500. We want to make sure the students who do not have adequate transportation where they would like to mail their ballot back home to their respected county, I want to make sure we are providing those students with those resources. Lastly, I also requested for stamps and some absentee ballots to be placed at the Health Science Campus and the student services offices. President Brakel, that concludes my report. Thank you so much for the opportunity.

President Brakel: Thank you. Are there any questions for Dr. Cockrell?

Senator Bailey: President Brakel, I have a question. Just because of what he said earlier in terms of introducing this, I'm just curious as to what element of this initiative could make it appear to be favoring

one party or another? It seems to me that any student, regardless of his, or her, or their persuasion could take part in this initiative. So I am just curious as to why it might have had that image.

President Brakel: Well, I just know from following some of the political talk out there that there are some people that think that some groups are trying to really target college students because they think they are going to vote more one way or the other, and so that was kind of a potential issue there. As a Senate, in my position I try to make sure that we are walking a very good line, not to cross over into political matters, unless we really have to. But, yes, we do need to make sure that our students are engaged and that they are participating here and so that is why we were just making sure we weren't crossing the line.

Dr. Cockrell: President Brakel, I most certainly agree with you. It is most certainly about civic engagement. We are not telling students who to vote for; we just want to make sure that students have access to the polls. We do have a number of students who live on campus who do not have transportation and they've expressed interest, making sure they cast their ballots. So, we saw this grant opportunity available for us to apply for resources to assist our students getting to and from the polls. A lot of our students have financial insecurities where they do not have the resources to not only get to the polls, but to purchase a stamp to send in their ballots. So, we want to just make sure that we are having those resources available to students. But we are not favoring any candidate at all. We've been very clear in our communication. This is just an opportunity for students to be civically engaged in what's happening, not only in the city of Toledo but also global.

Senator Insch: Where did the grant money come from?

Dr. Cockrell: Through one of our national associations within Student Affairs, known as NASPA, which is the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. They find a lot of different projects through colleges and universities from time-to-time and so we had an opportunity to apply for the grant and we are one of the recipients. As I mentioned earlier, BG, University of Cincinnati, Ohio State and other institutions within the state of Ohio are also recipients of this grant.

President Brakel: Also, keep in mind when I gave my report, the initial concern was based on we had very limited information about what this project was. Once we had more information then it became clear, and that is why I got it on the agenda today.

Dr. Cockrell: And lastly, I will share if I may, President Brakel, we do have a number of students who might be at home in isolation or quarantine. We are isolating and quarantining students, residential students on campus in Carter Hall. So we are starting to communicate to those students as well that if they are diagnosed with COVID or may have been identified through contact tracing, we also are going to make sure that those students have access to the absentee ballots, as well as stamps, as well as they are interested in casting their votes.

President Brakel: Thank you. Senator El-Zahawry, I do see here that you've asked a question here in the chat about why the University doesn't have a poll site. Those sites are determined really by the Lucas County Board. That is all I know.

Dr. Cockrell: I will share, President Brakel that Dr. Michelle Soliz is chairing this campus vote project. I just had a one-on-one with her right before this call. She is calling down to Lucas County to see if this is an option for us, maybe to set up a polling station in our Student Union. So, if we are able to get a polling

station on campus, I most certainly would share that with you and you can share it with the Faculty Senate representatives.

Senator Gregory: I read that other universities actually make themselves, or get granted leave to become early polling sites. This is just one person's opinion; I think that would be great if we could do that here. Maybe for the future [we can have] an early polling site.

Dr. Cockrell: Dr. Gregory, very good point. At my former institution the students were able to get a polling site on campus. So, we are crossing our fingers and hopefully they will grant us an opportunity to have one in this upcoming election so our students won't have to travel far for voting purposes. Thank you.

President Brakel: Okay. One last question here I see. Are students being told that they can only vote in Lucas County if they are registered in Lucas County? We don't want them to be disappointed to be transferred to an early voting center and not be able to vote.

Dr. Cockrell: Correct. Yes, we are most certainly having those conversations with them once they sign up identifying where they are registered to vote. And then that is why we have the absentee ballots and stamps ready to go, so if those students show up they can make sure they get their ballots in the mail prior to the election.

President Brakel: Right.

Senator Coulter-Harris: President Brakel, I have a quick question for Dr. Cockrell. Is the originator of this grant a partisan organization? Meaning, are they a strictly Democratic organization or a Republican organization, or are they nonpartisan?

Dr. Cockrell: They are nonpartisan. I've been a part of this organization now for almost 20 years. They are most certainly nonpartisan. Their model and their vision has always been about equity, diversity and inclusion and so they are most certainly a nonpartisan organization.

Senator Coulter-Harris: Thank you, Dr. Cockrell.

Dr. Cockrell: Thank you so much.

President Brakel: Okay. We need to move on with our agenda. Thank you, Dr. Cockrell.

Dr. Cockrell: Alright. Thank you so much, President Brakel. You all have a good day.

President Brakel: This will bring us to the Provost report.

Provost Bjorkman: Good afternoon everybody. Fall is definitely in the air if you haven't noticed. I hope everyone has a chance to take in the beauty of the season. It is one of my favorites, the fall forward, the changing colors, and even right on campus and so it is great. We all kind of need those moments of beauty, especially now when we're dealing with the challenges of living and working with COVID-19 as you all know.

Let me begin my remarks today by reporting on some of the adjustments we've made to the spring academic calendar. I think you are aware of this. I spoke about it briefly last time. We have sent out an email to all faculty, staff, and to the students with the new detail of the adjustments. That is posted on the

Provost website. So classes are going to begin as planned on Tuesday, January 19th. We will continue to offer a mix of face-to-face, remote, online and hybrid so that we can accommodate the social distancing and provide some flexibility for our students. We have cancelled spring break for this year. Instead there will be several instructional break days during the semester. They've been arranged so they are exactly the same number of instructional days during the semester as there would always be, with no single day of the week effected more than any other. Plans are under discussion for the Counseling Center and some other programs such as Student Affairs and others to offer some optional wellness activities on campus for students during the break days. We will also be continuing tutoring services and other students support services during those days if students wish to take advantage of them during those days. So the last day of classes, or classes will end on Wednesday, April 28th with the Thursday and Friday of that week as reading days to fill out the week. That will allow students time to prepare for finals. The dates for final exams and commencement will remain the same as were originally scheduled: Exams from May 3rd through May 7th and commencement on May 8th. I will share our plans for our virtual commencement this fall is coming along very nicely. We've just gotten confirmation of a wonderful commencement speaker, virtually. More information about that will be coming shortly. I look forward with sharing that with you.

Last week I participated virtually in our monthly meeting of the statewide provost group, which is convened by the IUC in Columbus, virtually of course. From the discussion with the provost colleagues, it is clear that most of the public universities in Ohio are doing similar things, cancelling their spring break and making other changes to their academic calendars for the spring semester. We are all taking to mitigate against the spread of COVID-19, with our highest priority being the safety of our faculty, staff and students and following the direction of the State Health Board.

I also want to announce our campaign for early registration for the spring semester. As you know, we've done this in the past. Our goal is to try to get about 90% of our current students registered before they leave campus for the winter break. The priority registration begins on Thursday, October 22nd, so that's coming right up, and continues until November 18th. I hope you will join me in trying to get the word out to our students to register early during that four-week period. We know that students who register early are more likely to be retained and continue to make progress toward their graduation. And in addition, they are more likely to get the courses they want and the courses they need for their majors. Regardless of when a student registers for spring, tuition would not be due until January. We will be sending out an email to all of you about the spring semester registration campaign, but I just wanted to share that with you today. And of course, we always encourage students to schedule an appointment with their academic advisor to discuss those options. Any students who are considering a change of major can contact their advisor or the Center for Success Coaching for some assistance with that. Now, before closing my remarks, I want to make a few additional brief announcements.

Just a reminder for you that nominations for this next year's class of Distinguished University Professors are due by Friday, November 13th. The nomination guidelines are available on the Provost Office website. I also want to mention that the University will be distributing some free paper KN-95 face masks tomorrow and Thursday, from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. and next week, Tuesday through Thursday, also from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. on the Main Campus and on the Health Science Campus. These masks are being provided by the Ohio Department of Higher Education in partnership with FEMA. They were just delivered on a big truck a week or so ago. So the distribution of masks for students will take place at several locations, on the Main Campus, including Carlson Library, the Office of the Dean of Students, the Food Pantry, the

Rec Center, the front desk of each of the residence halls; on the Health Science Campus, the Morse Fitness Center for students there. For faculty and staff, distribution of these masks on the Main Campus will take place in Carlson Library, the Rec Center, the Office of Multicultural Student Success. On the Health Science Campus, again, the distribution will be at Morse Fitness Center. And in addition on the Health Science Campus, masks will be available for faculty, staff and students in the lobby of the Collier Building tomorrow, Wednesday, October 14th, and next Tuesday, October 20th, and then next Thursday, October 22nd, from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. So the announcement, the dates, times and locations of that were just sent out today in the UToledo News. Finally, just a reminder that the open enrollment at University of Toledo ends on Saturday, October 31st. This is really important. Please remind all your colleagues and your staff to make any needed changes in health plan selections before the deadline. Any of those changes made would go into effect on January 1st. I also want to encourage everyone to get your flu shots to protect yourself and others as we enter flu season here in Ohio. I already got mine and I encourage you to do the same. So, with that, I thank you and I'm happy to answer any questions.

President Brakel: Just a reminder, the flu shots will be given here on the Main Campus on October 14th and the 21st, if I am not mistaken, over in COBI.

Provost Bjorkman: Yes. Thank you.

President Brakel: Any other questions for the Provost? Hearing none. We are going to move on now. We are skipping for a moment down to minors on campus and then we will come back to the assessment report. So, Dave Cutri and Elliot Nickeson.

Mr. David Cutri: Thank you, President Brakel. As you mentioned, my name is David Cutri, and I am the Executive Director of Internal Audit and Chief Compliance Officer of the University. With me is Elliott Nickeson who is the Institutional Compliance Officer, specializing in Clery Act Compliance. We were asked to review with you the process the University currently employs regarding registering events that hosts minor participants as well as our Minors on Campus website. The registration tool on the website was launched shortly before the pandemic hit so we are finding ourselves needing to re-familiarize the University community with these tools. I am going to turn the floor over to Elliot in a minute, who will show you these tools in action, but before I do, I want to remind you that the University last revised the Minors on Campus policy about a year ago and the website is well aligned with the revised policy. The event registration tool aligns with best practices in providing a centralized data repository that tracks the activity of all participants by minors at University-sponsored events at any given time. While the ultimate owner of the minors on campus process is the Risk Management Department in Legal Affairs, the Compliance Office provides collaboration with and significant support to them. We encourage you to review the Minors on Campus website and policy. Both resources are very data rich. But since our time is limited today, we only have time to review the registration tool and the website during this meeting. But certainly, if you have detailed questions specific to an event and whether the policy applies to it, we encourage you to contact Elliott or me offline and we will be happy to guide you through the process. Thank you again for your support and the opportunity to present to you today. I'll now turn the floor over to Elliott, who will jump right in. Elliott?

Mr. Elliott Nickeson: All right, Dave. Can you hear me, Dave?

Mr. David Cutri: Yes.

Mr. Elliott Nickeson: Alright. Perfect. At this point you should be able to see my presentation. Is that correct?

Mr. David Cutri: Yes.

Mr. Elliott Nickeson: Okay. Perfect. Well, that worked better than the last time we did this. As Dave said, we do have some growing to do now. We were expecting to launch this almost a year ago, and we were planning to have a good test group of cases slowly trickle in, and then obviously, something happened in the March timeframe where we were not able to do that. We have not been having a lot of people on campus. So, as Dave stated, I'll go ahead and walk you through [quite quickly] the tools that you would see as someone who would be putting in a request to have a program with Minors on Campus. I'm sure, and we've done this many times, the main questions we will receive are, is this specific situation going to have to go through this process? What is a minor? You know, anything related to this. I'll remind you what Dave said is that we do not own the process or the policy. I would suggest reviewing the policy if you do have specific questions to this. Also, Legal Affairs and the Office of Risk Management are the ones that have the final say in this, but we were collaborators in building the tool and the website design for this. So, I'll go ahead and start going through this. We'll quickly go through the Minors on Campus website, which is a great tool. The online request module, which everybody loves protecting the youth training module, which is of course, the compliance training through the universities Foundry system, I know everybody is a big fan. Then, we will have questions and answers.

So this is just a snapshot of the University's Minors on Campus webpage. The easiest way to get to it, because I know most people aren't going to type in the full name, we have actually utilized the search bar and search utilization to anytime you type in minors, minors on campus, camps or anything like those keywords into the University's website search function, the first thing that will pop up is the Minors on Campus webpage. So, almost any combination of minors, minors on campus, students on campus should be able to get you there in the first place. We have a link to the policy, which we usually will refer individuals back to if they have questions. We have a button here, which will take you to register your program and the actual data repository, and you'll go through the process. We have a very large amount of frequently asked questions. I'm sure once this process kind of kicks off and we get camps come in we will be able to add to this. We've also got information from parents and families of those students that may be coming on to campus.

The frequently asked questions page, like I said, we've got a lot of information there now, but we are going to adapt as the times move forward and we get more camps coming on campus. We'd like to see what works and what doesn't work. Like I said, we will continuously update this. We got all the forms that any program may have to go through: the employee volunteer rosters, the attendee rosters, and any other kind of forms that a camp may or may not have to use. The features of this online request module, and I will show you snapshots of, it can be accessed by anybody with UTAD credentials which is good for tracking this when we get them turned in. It has guided step by step process for registering your events, either submitting the documentation required on the policies. You can save progress, return it at any time. It will also give you the status of your request. You can communicate directly with the requester and the approver and at any point as accurate recording of youth on UToledo campuses. What it boils down to is senior leadership actually pose the question and actually brought up the need for this because they wanted to know at any time if they were to ask who do we have on campus, especially if there were to be some incident that occurred, we have a central data repository where we can pull what camp we

have on campus now, and what camp we have upcoming, and any rosters for those working the camp and attending the camp as well. Dave, go ahead and stop me if you need me to go back to anything, but I'll keep seaming along because I know we will have questions.

When we click on the website to submit a program request, you'll come to this page. As you can see, I already started a program request so you can see the status is in progress. I could resume that at any point. So if you come in and you realize you don't have all the information you need, it will always save the progress that you have and you can go back to it, or you can complete a new search if you need to at any point. There will be some, I'm sure, that have multiple camps that will have to create multiple submissions and you'll be able to go back and look at what you did previously. For as long as we keep the system we will have everything you've ever put in on here. Anytime we ask you for information we will provide a template for that information to make sure that we have data accuracy and data integrity. We will also immediately after giving you the template, give you an option to upload that file of the templates that we're asking for. You'll see throughout this there will be uploads, there will be program registration forms, waiver forms, medical information and release authorization forms. Not all forms are always required of every program depending on what kind of program you're having on campus. Again, that is a question that if you're not sure what to put in that will be something to work with Risk Management or to look back at policy to see which required forms you'll need.

Background checks. This is another question we get quite often. Dave, I went through and reread the policy just to make sure I was up on it. Background checks are required every four years. So if you have had a recent background check and you believe it is on record with the Human Resources Department here at UT already, you can go ahead and request Barbara Monroe, who is the main contact over there. But really, if you have a contact with Human Resources, you can contact them. If it is from an outside source as well, assuming you provide a copy and upload your copy here it is not much of an issue either. But again, it is every four years we need an updated background. Protecting youth training, we utilize through EverFi or Foundry, which is the platform EverFi is the company. I'm sure almost everybody is aware of is this. We utilize them for almost all our other compliance trainings. Protecting youth is required of anybody who will be hosting or working at the event that has minors on campus. It is approximately 30 minutes in length. It is required of all the employees or volunteers that work in the programs. It is an annual requirement. You're not given two weeks to complete the training; you must complete the training at least two weeks prior to the event. You are usually given 30 days from when it is assigned to be able to complete. It must be completed before your program can occur, and that is anybody who is working in the program. Throughout this, we all keep talking about the policy and we have to verify that you opened, read, and understand the policy, and free to abide by it. And that is something that you'll see in the training as well. Now I know I went through that very quickly, but I also respect your time and so I wanted to make sure to get through it. If anybody requests additional information, or they'd like to see this PowerPoint, I can always provide it to Dr. Brakel to be able to share it with any of you. So, Dave, if you want to go through anything that I missed, and maybe put me back on track to cover anything I missed.

Mr. David Cutri: Well, you've covered everything very well, very quickly - again, being respectful of everybody's time. Certainly, if you have specific circumstances, please reach out to Elliott or me, or the Risk Management Department. I saw that there were a couple of questions in the chat that have been answered. I agree with the answers. So, unless you all had anything for us, we'll stop for questions. Again, thank you for letting us present to you.

President Brakel: I'm just trying to follow. I'm just making sure everybody's seen what was in the chat. What constitutes minor, an individual under 18 years old? Does a UT student under 18 years old, does this apply? No, it does not because it is a different entity. And Senator Gregory just put in college credit plus students are covered under our regular student policies, I believe because they are UT students. That is correct. Are there any other questions for our presenters on this subject? Hearing none. Thank you. We appreciate the presentation. This is an important issue. We need to make sure we are staying within the legal confines that are out there and sometimes we forget those. We need to make sure we stay within the policies and all the legal ramifications that might be associated with having miners on campus that we just don't think about. Thank you.

Mr. David Cutri: Thank you; and have a good rest of the meeting.

President Brakel: Alright. So that brings us to the Core Curriculum Committee assessment report. Now, let's bring you up to speed. As you may recall, last spring at the last meeting, we accepted the report from the Assessment Committee. But we did not have the time in that meeting to actually go over the details of that report. So that is what is being done today. The Core Curriculum Committee Chair, Melissa Gregory, you're on.

Senator Gregory: Thanks, President Brakel. Let me see if I can share some content. Can everybody see the Faculty Senate Core Curriculum Committee report?

President Brakel: Yes.

Senator Gregory: Excellent. So, as President Brakel said, the Core Curriculum Committee last year did a variety of things, in addition to our regular reviewing of submissions and modifications to the core. We also wanted to think more closely about assessment. We thought this was an urgent issue given that the HLC, Higher Learning Commission is coming to visit next year in 2021. So we decided that we will do a couple of things. I'm just going to walk you through this report with apologies, because I know you all could have read it in your copious free time before this meeting. But just in case you didn't, I thought maybe we can go over it. My goal here is really just to solicit any feedback that you have since the committee, like I said, wrote it and got it into the Minutes at Faculty Senate, but never actually heard from anybody about it. So our job is obviously to interface with the rest of Faculty Senate and to make sure we are getting lots of good feedback.

So, what we decided to do with the assessment piece of the core curriculum was to review the departmental assessment reports that had been submitted between 2016 and 2019. Everybody on the committee took a chunk of reports and used them to identify some trends in the methodology and also the data that we're using for core assessment. And so we were looking for strengths and weaknesses in our current assessment methodology. We were also looking to see what specific data we can glean from past reports. Our goal with all of this is to try to improve the evaluation process for core courses in the future and also to improve the quality, and validity, and the reliability of the data that we're gathering in the future so it can actually be used. I think there's nothing more frustrating than gathering a bunch of data that don't seem to mean anything, because that is a lot of wasted time and effort. So, as it says here, the current assessment process asks departments to provide annual assessment reports of core courses. We looked at all of those again, from 2016 to 2019 and we identified both some strengths and some weaknesses. So, I just wanted to share those with you. The strengths include transparency in our current reporting mechanism. I feel like the committee decided that we really liked the way the data from each

department's assessment report posted online so that anybody can see them and read the reports. It is a very transparent process. We also felt like the reporting mechanism that is used for assessment of the core is relatively simple and user friendly like the website, it is kind of doable. Right? Everyone appreciated it. We also felt like we were on the right track in the sense that the report does in fact require departments to demonstrate a clear connection between the broad outcomes of the core curriculum and individual course outcomes. We are definitely doing the right thing there, although I think the quality of those responses sometimes varies. We also felt like there were some reports that were sort of super high quality and that those reports, you could see the connection between those reports and the changes in instructional strategies that departments then adopted. It is clear that if you do have accurate and detailed assessment reports about student learning and courses, that can actually lead to meaningful change and we saw that in some cases. So, when it comes to weaknesses, we felt that the overriding weakness was that we had a bunch of data that just weren't useful. Like I said, that is kind of frustrating for everybody. We also felt like there was some weaknesses. We broke down the weaknesses into two parts: Process weaknesses. We felt like there was a certain amount of inconsistency in responses to core assessment. There seems to be this sort of diffuse responsibility and that there isn't kind of a clear hierarchy or structure for assessment of the core because the courses are spread across so many departments. We thought that the report form used some misleading instruction. So, a question for example, a kind of broad question about what are your student strengths and weaknesses often led to responses like, well, my students are too busy working their jobs, which is true, but it doesn't necessarily tie to one of the educational objectives. Right? I think the breadth of the question kind of leads people to that sort of response. Also, there seems to be little evidence that changes are actually being made in response to the reports, and so that seemed like kind of a process problem to us. As far as weaknesses in the data included, there seemed to be some lack of clarity regarding what is being assessed and the method or process for conducting that assessment. For example, some departments would say, well, we assessed an assignment, but it wasn't clear what the assignment was or how it was connected to the student learning outcome and so forth. There seemed to be a lack of specific data; definitely a lack of quantitative evaluations. I know as someone from the humanities, sometimes it can feel difficult to sort of take what you do and refer to it in quantitative ways. But I think we were seeing things like if there were an assignment that had been given to students, it would be useful to know how many students. Like, what was our sample size? Were there two students or one student or fifty students? You know, some really basic kind of quantitative information would be helpful. A couple of other things. There seemed to be some confusion about the difference between affective and cognitive outcome. There is a lack of clarity in the reports about knowledge that is sort of associated with attitudes or feelings and knowledge associated with specific skills and understanding. Finally, there was just a lot of uneven reporting on individual core outcomes. The data collected tend to cluster around certain specific outcomes from the core with much emphasis on a couple and not enough on others. I'll tell you right now that we are all very good at thinking about critical thinking. One of the core objectives we seen, if you were to step back and look at these reports, we would seem infinitely less interested in the other objectives of the core. I don't think we are actually less interested. It is just that everybody has gravitated toward critical thinking as something that maybe they can assess. So, I understand that, but it also kind of seems a little bit less than helpful. Should I stop there? We have some recommendations and we should give you a sample, but I am happy to take questions at any time. Let me know, President Brakel if you think I should plow-on.

President Brakel: Go ahead with your recommendations.

Senator Gregory: Okay. As I skip past this, this is just an example of how the data is sort of put into various reports. Alana Malik, the Director of University Assessment does that. She is very, very good. I'm sorry if I am skimming through this in front of you; just try not to look at the screen. I'm trying to get to the end of this report to find the recommendations. So, these were the conclusions of the committee based on this report. We feel that core assessment is a process that really needs more accountability in the sense that right now we don't have any systemized steps for responding to the data collected about the core courses. And most of the feedback for assessment reports remains internal within departments in spite the core being universally required across campus. I think that is one of the reasons some of these reports lack a certain amount of energy because if you just feel like it is not going anywhere, it is less motivational. And so as a committee, we thought that the University program review process might be a good example of the system that has really helped to acknowledge the information that is being received from external reviews, which leads to specific steps that are taken in response. Right? The provost meets with the deans, and department heads, and the committee and they talk about the external review and a specific plan is generated. That is the kind of thing we think could really benefit the core. The other thing we discussed as a committee is whether or not it would be good to have a single assessment coordinator of the core curriculum meaning an individual who coordinates between departments who supports departmental reporting and who reports to the Faculty Senate Core Curriculum Committee. It just feels like the current structure where the entire weight of managing the core is placed on a committee that has to be populated on a yearly basis and which has regular leadership changes from year to year, it is just less effective than it could be. We also thought that each department should probably have a single assessment coordinator. We thought the assessment questionnaire could be revised to perhaps be a little more pointed. Some of the questions as we said, are a little bit broad. We also thought that whenever core assessment data is being discussed, it is kind of useful to talk about it in relation to retention. I think that as a committee, we were very cognizant. We did not feel that core courses should be evaluated exclusively on student retention. The core is an educational mission and retention can be related to so many things beyond the classroom. At the same time, core courses do in fact play often a very important role in a student's early academic career. So we would recommend that departments kind of take a look at their core courses, not only in terms of their student learning outcomes, but also within the context of student success as it is more broadly defined. Okay. So that is the end of that report. I do want to say that as the result of that report, one of the decisions that the Core Curriculum Committee made this semester, because we've been meeting bi-monthly, is to actually request an external review of the core much if it were a department or a program. We have made that request at the Provost Office. We are asking for resources, and we are engaging in that conversation right now about whether or not we could get an external review of the core managed this academic year. I think [it] would be a huge assist for us to bringing people to look at it with fresh eyes. So I will stop sharing this content. Any questions.

Senator Lawrence: Will this report be shared with the assessment committees and departments?

Senator Gregory: You know, that is a good question. We shared it with Faculty Senate and I shared it with the University Assessment Committee, but I didn't distribute it to individual departments. I can certainly send it, for example to college deans and ask them to send it out to their departments. Maybe that would be a good process, or if you have another suggestion, let me know.

Senator Lawrence: No, that would be fine. I think it would be helpful for us to be able to get a big picture, and maybe some of us can learn from some of the success of our colleagues when it comes to assessment that we can incorporate it in our plans. That would be very helpful. Thank you.

Senator Gregory: I am seeing a question in the chat. Do we collect data in such a way that one can analyze it statistically? And more statisticians should be involved in this process. You know, I don't think we had any statisticians on the committee. I would say the answer is not always. Right? That was part of our analysis of these reports was that sometimes there was a fairly unevenness to them. Some people were able to kind of come up with some responses and some people weren't. I don't think statistics, well, they may not always be the answer, but yeah, certainly we would like to see more quantitative data and analysis.

President Brakel: Any other questions?

Senator Gregory: I would also be happy to take feedback via email from any who has thought about this and thinks of something. Again, the committee just wants to make sure that we are not just some operating in a vacuum that everyone knows what we are doing and if they have anything to contribute, we would love to help.

President Brakel: Right. As we are thinking about moving forward, we still need to remember that faculty and us as Faculty Senate really controls the curriculum. I know you were talking about having a point person there that kind of overseeing, kind of coordinating some of the assessment. We really need to have [I think] some good discussion about that, as to where that is. I understand the view point and the potential value of doing that, but I think we also need to make sure that the curriculum aspect stays with the Faculty Senate.

Senator Gregory: Well, and you know when we thought about that, President Brakel, I think the committee was sort of thinking that would be a faculty person. Maybe that would be someone who received a course release or maybe got some compensation for taking on that role. We weren't actually imagining that it would necessarily go outside of faculty at all, but we did feel like it was--- the Core Committee itself as a large and diverse committee, and like I said, it was more of a regular rotation of members that makes a certain amount of continuity and kind of consolidation, a challenge, I think.

President Brakel: Right, and I understand that. Any other questions for Senator Gregory here? Hearing none. Thank you, Senator Gregory. We appreciate the hard work that the committee did last year and what you are already starting to do this year. Thank you. So that brings us to the proposed bylaws. So, Chair Templin.

Senator Templin: I am here. Can everybody see that?

President Brakel: Yes.

Senator Templin: Okay. Today I am bringing you the Bylaws. Much of this has been seen before by previous Senates. The things in red are changes that were made in January, February timeframe, for the most part based on what came out of the process with the Legal Affairs Department. Remember, this structure, the Constitution has certain Articles and that basically says who we are and what we are about. Then the bylaws govern the things that Faculty Senate does. The first thing is, what is the size and the apportionment from the colleges of Faculty Senate?

President Brakel: Senator Templin, by chance, can you enlarge that screen?

Senator Templin: I can try. Hold on here.

Senator Molitor: Senator Templin, you can click that arrow on the mid-right to get rid of the panel and then you can zoom in a little bit.

Senator Templin: Here we go. Click on this one?

Senator Molitor: Yes.

Senator Templin: Is that better?

President Brakel: Yes.

Senator Templin: Let's see if I, -- no, that made it smaller. Well, let's see.

Senator Molitor: Try Fit Width.

Senator Templin: Fit Width. Hold on, I don't actually have a -- oh, here we go. Okay. So there are five sections to the first Article. In essence, it is saying that we are going to have a Faculty Senate of 64 members, and then it talks about, no college will be more than 14 seats, except in the case described in Article 3, Section 2, and that has to do with sometimes it can be a 65 person Faculty Senate if the Past-President is past their term of office. Any questions about Article I?

Senator Molitor: Senator Templin, my apologies if I missed the previous conversation on the Bylaws. Just out of curiosity, the old Constitution guarantees two seats for the Library. Now that is down to one seat in the amended version.

Senator Templin: Yes. I forget why that was. Oh. It is each college, including the University Library shall have at least one. The reason was that the Honors College, the old rule was two and the people from the Honors College said, we can only give you one; there aren't enough people to go around. So, we reduced it to one. That doesn't mean that the Library only has one. It means the minimum apportionment from any college, and we are recognizing the University Library as a college. So, the minimum is one seat, not two seats.

Senator Molitor: So if the apportionment works out they would only get one seat vs. the two seats they would get with the current Constitution?

Senator Templin: Right. So that is where the situation we were at with the Honors College, where a very small number of faculty and rather small number of students and so on, and the apportionment was two, but there weren't enough faculty to fill the seats and so we just went to one. It seemed more sensible than borrowing. There was some language in there about borrowing a senator from another college and it just seemed rather tedious.

Senator Molitor: And the current process, we combine University College and Honors College. The way this is written, it says, "*The remaining seats will be apportioned among Colleges that have 10 or more eligible faculty members.*" Right now, I believe the Honors College only has five eligible faculty---

Senator Templin: Right.

Senator Molitor cont'd: And the University College has one.

Senator Templin: Yes.

Senator Molitor: They will have no representation on the Senate.

Senator Templin: Which college?

Senator Molitor: Honors and University College.

Senator Templin: That is a problem of small colleges with very few faculty. When it comes---

Senator Pattin: This is Carla Pattin here representing the Honors College. Could you please clarify on your statement, the Honors College has no representation on Faculty Senate?

Senator Molitor: You currently have representation. If these Bylaws changes are approved, you will no longer have representation on the Senate because your college does not have 10 eligible faculty members.

Senator Templin: But, Senator Molitor, it is saying, *"…each college,"* So Honors College would still be a college and so it would get one.

Senator Pattin: That is what I was thinking.

Senator Templin: So, Honors College would get one and the Libraries would get at least one. It is depending on how many faculty there are.

Senator Molitor: Got it.

Senator Templin: It is depending on how many there are, it could be. But the minimum number for any college is one.

Senator Molitor: Right. That first bullet takes precedence, and then the remaining seats after everybody gets one seat will be apportioned of colleges that has 10 or more. Right?

Senator Templin: Yes.

Senator Molitor: Thank you for clarifying that; that makes sense.

Senator Templin: Then we have a maximum, which was this other part. I hope people can see the blue. Most seats could be 14; the same [situation] as the US Constitution where you run into the big state, small state problem.

Senator Anderson: Last meeting we had problems with the idea of allowing associate and assistant deans to be on the Faculty Senate. I was wondering if under Section 4, we could add a bullet that would allow [like two] assistant and associate deans university-wide. And I don't think it would be a power grab with them being university-wide.

Senator Templin: You mean, sort of like a representative at-large kind of seat?

Senator Anderson: Well, we would just add a bullet. We have the bullets indicating memberships under Section 4. I don't know if you put in the administration or specifically address assistant and associate deans would be allowed two members on Senate, or something of that type.

Senator Templin: Oh. Okay. Well, I got to think about it.

Senator Anderson: Well, that would seem to be the solution possibly to last week where essentially assistant and associate deans could come from each college, but then you are just adding a bullet that they would allow two or, I don't know, three university-wide in terms of membership.

Senator Templin: But would that be a separate vote then so the assistant and associate deans would vote amongst themselves separately to send two or three representatives?

Senator Anderson: You know, I am not sure. I mean, I guess they can decide who they want their representatives to be, and it is just the matter that you're a small number -- maybe two university-wide? I don't know. I'm just trying to think of something under this Bylaw in Section 4 that talks about membership that would open up to assistant and associate deans, but yet, it is not called for each individual college, it would be university-wide.

Senator Wedding: Point of Order. President Brakel.

President Brakel: Yes. Senator Wedding, go ahead.

Senator Wedding: That was a violation of what we passed two weeks ago. It is the second time this Senate has voted, two weeks ago, to keep associate and assistant deans out of the Senate. We are not a university senate; we are a Faculty Senate. And now we are doing a 'back door' approach to try to put assistant and associate deans back in the Senate. We don't want that. We voted against it now twice, and it is in the Constitution. The Bylaws can't just override the Constitution.

Senator Coulter-Harris: I have a question. Wouldn't that require an amendment to our Constitution?

President Brakel: It would not require an amendment. But let's back-up for just a moment and think about what the process actually is. What we did at our last meeting is that we voted, at that time, that it was basically department chairs on down that would be members of Faculty Senate. That was during the first reading. That is not final yet, until after we go through the process of having a second reading and then ultimately a vote by the entire faculty of the University. So, at this point in time, I think from a parliamentary standpoint, we have voted with regard to excluding assistant and associate deans and above not as voting members of the Faculty Senate. So, that is where that stands at this moment in time.

Senator Insch: I think Senator Wedding's point is that if your Constitution specifically says you can't be an assistant and associate dean, as that amendment said, then you can't have a bylaw that supersedes the Constitution because the Constitution is what it is. So, the point of the story is, this is not the place where that would be. If there is a desire to have two or three associate deans on the Senate, then it would have to be in the Constitution part and not in the bylaws because I think the Constitution supersedes the bylaws. You can't write a bylaw that violates your constitution and that would under the currently past version of the Constitution that we are looking at.

President Brakel: That is correct. I was just trying to work through the parliamentary procedure in my mind as to where we are at. We are not voting or re-voting on that particular issue that we've already voted on, on the first reading. Senator Anderson, I think that is out of bounds. However, I do want to remind everyone that, at least the way we voted last time, assistant and associate deans still could participate in Faculty Senate meetings as they are open meetings. They can comment as I understand the rules and they would not necessarily be prohibited from that. They just would not be voting members.

Senator Pattin: I will just say this from the floor, and you all can agree to disagree or what-have-you. I am not for any sort of backdoor methods that cut down a process; I truly respect the process. But what I will say is that I am for an additional bullet point under Section 4 that will say if a college has 10 [faculty] people or less would allow membership of an assistant or an associate dean to participate in Faculty Senate. But again, that is just my opinion. But we can move on if everyone is irritated, and just in desperate need to move on.

President Brakel: Well, again, at this point in time, as part of a parliamentary procedure, we are not voting on that part of the Constitution at this time and thus, we are moving forward [from] where we are at, at this moment. I think I am correct in stating that. Correct, Senator Templin?

Senator Templin: Yes. I think at least for now that would cause an issue within the internal consistency of the documents. Let me move on. I'll talk with the Constitution and Bylaws Committee further and we'll further clarify that. But I think for now, I need some think time on that.

President Brakel: Right. And let me just acknowledge Senator Jayatissa. I do see your question here. You put this in the chat a couple of times regarding the percentage of faculty tenure track. I'm not sure if that is an issue at this point in time, but we will bring that back in a little bit. Thank you. Go ahead, Senator Templin.

Senator Templin: So, this second Article [II] is the Terms of Senators. It is a three-year term. And then, "A representative who has served for more than two years of the second consecutive term shall be ineligible for re-election for one year……" So, there is a term limit where you sit out for one year before you can come back in. Then Section 2 has to do with: "As near as may be possible one-third of the membership shall be elected each year…." That is what we've been doing for as long as I can remember. Then Article III. The first section is in red and I don't remember why it is in red, but there has got to be some change there. "*The Executive Committee of Faculty Senate shall consist of the Faculty Senate President, the President-Elect, the Past-President, the Executive Secretary, one member of the Senate elected to the Ohio Faculty Council of the Ohio Department of Higher Education, two members of the Senate representing colleges from the main campus, and two members of the Senate representing colleges from the health science campus. The Faculty Senate President and President-Elect shall also serve as the representatives of the Faculty Senate at meetings of the The University of Toledo Board of Trustees.*" President Brakel, do you remember why I have that red? I don't remember.

President Brakel: I don't. As I am looking at that, that is our current practice right now.

Senator Templin: Okay. Moving on. Article III, Section 2 has to do the Past-President, I believe – yes, the President-Elect, and the Executive Secretary. "*The immediate Past-President shall be ineligible for immediate election to the office of President-Elect, but there shall be no limitation on the possible reelection to the other elected positions described above,.....*" This is where at some point you can have 65 people on Senate because a Past-President can actually go into a fourth year. So, if you are elected so that you become President in your third year, you would stick around for a fourth year, but then a new person would be elected for your Senate seat. So that would raise the entire group size to 65. Article II, Section 3, "*The President-Elect shall continue to serve as a member of the Faculty Senate throughout such person's term as President and Past-President.*" So, in other words, a person moves from President-Elect, to President, to Past-President. Again, we are talking here about, even though we have these special rules for President-Elect, President, and Past-President, there still is a year of ineligibility that ultimately

does need to be followed by such persons. Article III, Section 4, "*The Executive Committee shall prepare the agenda for the Senate meetings,......*" That's about it there. Any questions about Article III? I don't think there are very many changes than what we do now in Article III.

President Brakel: No.

Senator Templin: Article IV has to do with officer duties. Article IV, Section 1, has to do with the President and number 9, in red there, was basically from the last Senate meeting from [I think] September 18th: "*…Solicit input from faculty on the performance of the President and other senior administrator when input on the performance of the President or other senior administrator is requested by the Board of Trustees.*"

President Brakel: Senator Templin, let me address that for a moment. I totally understand that. If I was in that role in the future, I will try to make sure that would be done. But, I know the Board of Trustees does not necessarily give you a lot of heads-up. You may only have just a couple of days, and that is to really be able to solicit a lot of input from faculty. The logistics of that are a little troublesome from the standpoint of the presidency here. That is just my concern for whoever's in this position moving forward.

Senator Templin: Well, we (when I say 'we,' the Constitution and Bylaws Committee) kept it purposely vague because "*solicit input*" could be any number of things. So, I think the point here is more of the reverse, that whoever is President does have the power to engage in that kind of activity however much or little time you are given -- At least we are acknowledging the President has some role in that.

President Brakel: Right. I am just wondering about maybe adding the words, 'go solicit input, when possible.'

Senator Templin: Okay.

Senator Anderson: In that 9 [Article IV, Section 1, 9], I was wondering if you changed "*when"* in the second sentence to 'if,' that would seem like the President could solicit the information at any time - basically, be prepared. When you have "*when,"* it seems like the request for the input has to be made before you could actually ask for it or solicit it from the faculty. It would seem like if you change that "*when*" to 'if,' it is allowing the President to solicit information any time to be prepared to submit to the Board of Trustees.

Senator Templin: Possibly. Let me take that suggestion to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee. We will bring that back. I have it down in my notes.

Moving on. The other duties, this is B [Article IV, Section 1, B], as President-Elect. I believe this is all straight from what we do currently. So D has to do with what the Executive Secretary duties are. And then E, is the Representative to the Ohio Faculty Council. Any questions about Article IV?

Article V has to do with meetings. Section 1 has to do with the schedule. It is 4:00-6:00 p.m. in the afternoon. Section 2, this was Legal advice to add, "*The University of Toledo President may call special meetings of the faculty under University Board of Trustees, bylaw3364-1-10(B)."* That is what they wanted in there and that is consistent with what we put in the Constitution. So, there is no problem there with consistency between the two documents. And then Section 3. Legal said, "*…privilege of non-members of Faculty Senate to speak in regard to matters before the Senate shall be exercised at such times and under such rules as the President of the Faculty Senate may impose, although those rules will*

be imposed without regard to viewpoint." That is an extra piece [starting with although to viewpoint] from Legal, what's in red there. Section 4, "The *Faculty Senate may meet in Executive Session by majority vote, and by separate vote may designate specific pending matters to be held as confidential by the members.*" Section 5, "*A majority of the membership of the Faculty Senate shall constitute a quorum for transacting business,…..*" Section 6. "*The Executive Committee shall assist the President of Faculty Senate in preparing the agenda….*" Section 7, says here is the order of the meeting. Section 8. "*A motion to change the order of business shall be in order any time, and may be adopted by a majority vote.*" Section 9. "*An elected member of the Senate---*"

Senator Anderson: Senator Templin.

Senator Templin: Yes?

Senator Anderson: I was wondering in Section 7, since we have to approve the agenda, should that be added in there or does that just follow from Robert's Rules of Order?

Senator Templin: You know, that is something President Brakel has been really good about doing. If you have the Executive Committee bringing forth the agenda, then, I mean, it doesn't need a second or anything because the Executive Committee is already approval. We could put in there that approval of the agenda is step two, after roll call.

President Brakel: Senator Templin, my preference is to have Senate always adopt the agenda because in my own thinking, that helps everybody by reminding them that these are the topics that we have, and this is our business before us. It keeps meetings more on track. That is just a philosophical viewpoint from my point of view.

Senator Templin: I am writing a note to myself. Section 8 has to with changing the order of business. Section 9 has to do with, if we have someone who has accumulated unexcused absences what happens. It is whoever accumulates four unexcused absences from regular special meetings in one year shall be deemed to have vacated his or her office. Basically, the Executive Secretary can notify the college and can replace the Senator with someone else representing that college. Section 10. "*The Executive Secretary will notify the Executive Committee when a Senator has missed four regular special meetings during one academic year.*" So, this says it is the Executive Secretary who keeps track of that. That is just more information about that set of events when a change needs to be made. Any questions about Article V?

Senator Insch: Yes, this is Senator Insch. I would like to go back to number 1, Section 1. I've had some conversation with some other senators, and I would just like to propose and get the Senate's vote on whether or not we should go to a monthly meeting, rather than bi-monthly. I think that having a monthly meeting might have us have a more succinct agenda. That we will have more people who would be willing to participate in Senate. Twice a month can be somewhat taxing for some, particularly when we start meeting again in person if that ever happens. I would be curious for a vote. I mean, I would advocate for it, but I don't want to create a huge argument. I'm just curious if there are other Senators who feel that it might be a more effective use of all of our time if we went to a monthly meeting, rather than a bi-weekly meeting. So, I would move that that be changed to monthly. It may 'die' without a second.

Senator Gregory: Could I?

President Brakel: We have a motion on the floor first, so I have to see if there is a second on this motion.

Senator Wedding: Second.

President Brakel: Okay. So now there is discussion on the motion.

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

President Brakel: Yes.

Senator Gregory: I think this is interesting and I would certainly want to consider it, but I guess I rather consider it with more hard evidence. For example, like, if we could do some voting and maybe think about a range of possible models. I mean, it is one thing to drop from two to one, but there are other possible models that we could go for. For example, the whole group could meet once a month and then the committees could meet during that same time during the other part of the month. So, yes, Senator Insch, I am with you. It is a good time to review all of those things, but I guess to just drop down to one [meeting a] month right now does seem really abrupt to me. I'd rather get a little bit more evidence about whether or not people think that that's valuable, and maybe take a vote, or maybe put out a survey to faculty that we represent to see if that is what they would like. I mean, one of the things that I hear from my constituents, for example is we don't move fast enough with curriculum, that they are always complaining how things get stalled at Faculty Senate. So, if a model change could help with that, that would be great. But again, I'd kind of like to collect that information first.

President Brakel: Okay. Other discussion?

Senator Tiwari: I certainly like the idea of moving this to one month, but my concern is whether we will be able to achieve everything in a month time. I am assuming the timing would be two hours, even though we meet monthly, or would it be more timing to accomplish everything that we do in two week time?

Senator Insch: I can just respond to that. What we do primarily is curriculum and those kinds of things, and we haven't voted on curriculum for a while. I mean, if that is the argument is we have all these curriculum issues. But we are not really voting on them. If you go back and look at the last we've met, how many times so far this semester and what have we done? Some of those things could be done quickly, quicker than it has been, but we really haven't voted or really discussed curriculum or those kinds of things at all so far very much, which is why I really think the idea of having a once a month meeting and then have the other two hour block that everybody on the Senate knows about, and that can be the time for committees. I think that is a great idea. It is not the Senate vote that holds up things, it is getting it through the committees because they have a hard time getting together and getting enough people to get their work done. So, for me, I think it answers a lot of questions. I know that where I was at before, we met once a month. We seemed to get through everything pretty well. The other thing, because we met monthly, the President of the university came to every Faculty Senate meeting, and so we had access to the President because it was once a month. I mean, it is time consuming for the Provost to show up twice a month also. Anyway, that is just my thought on that. I think the basic business that we do, we could easily get done in two hours.

Senator Bigioni: I would like to speak to that point. This is Senator Bigioni. The point of curriculum and programs in particular, and I share Senator Gregory's concerns. Sometimes it can be challenging to get courses and new program or modified programs through the system. It typically all piles up in the spring

semester when the deadlines come and everyone rushes their new courses and programs, and so on, through the system. Of course, to your point, Senator Insch, things are quiet now. So, it is really a workload distribution issue. If we were to go to once a month, it would be very challenging to meet the requirements of the programs and the curriculum committee to get proposals through in a timely manner.

Senator Templin: One possibility is we meet monthly in the fall and bi-weekly in the spring. Because if you notice the first sentence of Section 1, is "*Shall be held bi-weekly during fall and spring semesters.*" We could say, 'shall meet monthly during the fall semester and by-weekly during the spring semester.' Typically fall is the slower semester for Senate meetings. Now, the other thing that could happen is, I have seen it where the Executive Committee has discretion to be able say, the Executive Committee can call a second meeting in a month when it deems that, that is warranted. So, it would put a little more power in the hands of the Executive Committee to say, if we don't need the meeting in the fall, so we'll just have September, October, November meetings. But if we do need a second meeting in November, the Executive Committee could call it.

Senator Gregory: Again, I would love to entertain different models. I mean, maybe Senator Insch, would you want to run a working group to maybe look at what other institutions do, like benchmark some other models, put together a small report on different kinds of structures, because, like I said, I am more than happy to entertain the different models for Senate? I just don't think I could vote on this today without sort of knowing a little bit more about how other places work and what some effective practices are, and how we might sort of benefit from that knowledge before we just change it up this fast. I feel like I am wary of, every time I've made a change that quickly to an administrative structure, I feel like it always bites me later because I realize there are these unintended consequences that I hadn't thought of. So, that is why I thought of maybe a working group to kind of do a little bit of research might be valuable.

Senator Insch: I would be happy to do that.

President Brakel: Another thought also is related. I know here in my role as the President, I feel kind of a sense of obligation to make sure there is stuff that is coming before you, at least on information, [even] if we're not actually voting at every meeting, and then our time is used wisely. If the Executive Committee would feel a little more empowered to not hold a particular meeting and skipping meetings at some point in time, if they feel like they were just putting things on the agenda to essentially have a meeting. That is another thought. But I do agree. I think kind of rushing this right now to going down to one meeting a month might be a little bit more than what we want to do at this point in time.

Senator Insch: Well, I would just point out that this doesn't mean it goes into effect right away. We are in the reading and trying to put together the Constitution and the Bylaws as we would like it to read. So, that is all I am saying. I mean, if there's a majority of people now who think that might be a better option, then that is all this is for. This isn't going to happen next week. It still has to go to the full faculty and have a second reading. I guess the issue, maybe you can, or maybe I can through you, or someone can just do a real quick poll and just get a general feeling about do people feel like a bi-monthly meeting is value and could be as useful as some other point. I guess that is something that maybe you and I can do offline and maybe you could send that out to the Senate and just get a sense of that.

President Brakel: I think I would rather do that indication by email, rather than tally that up in the chat right now.

Senator Insch: Oh. That is what I am suggesting. I am not recommending doing it right now. I'll do the research and I will be happy to remove the question at this point if you want just so we can move on. We can bring it up later when we go to the second reading.

President Brakel: You are the person that out forth the motion, and thus you can withdraw it if that is what you want to do.

Senator Insch: Well, in the sense of keeping valuable time going, I'll be happy to do that. And with more information, we probably will have a better discussion. So, I'll be happy to do that as long as we're open to it.

President Brakel: I think that would be a wise decision. So, the motion has been withdrawn. Senator Templin, we are back to you.

Senator Templin: Sure. I think I was at the point of any other comments about Article V before moving to Article VI? Hearing none. I'll move to Article VI. This has to do with voting. "*Voting shall be by show of hands or voice vote or electronic tabulation.*" And then we took out, 'unless a member of the Faculty Senate shall request a secret ballot.' Right now secret ballots are not really possible, although at the last meeting we sort of invented a quasi-secret ballot system. But I would argue that that's really a form of electronic tabulation. The other way that creates a secret ballot in effect is, for lack of a better term, the clickers that we've used in the past where you pass out the little buttons and you either select A or B and that kind of thing. So, an electronic tabulation can lead to a secret ballot.

Senator Molitor: Senator Templin.

Senator Templin: Yes.

Senator Molitor: In the past before electronic means, we used to distribute little pieces of paper and fold them up and throw them in a bucket. So that was another form of a secret ballot.

Senator Templin: Yes. And I think that is what we were thinking, eliminating in favor of electronic tabulation.

Senator Molitor: I think it is important to leave the request for a secret ballot in, because you can do electronic tabulation in such a way that reveals who voted for what.

Senator Templin: That is true. So, if people want what is crossed out in red to be left in, I mean, we can.

Senator Molitor: I would recommend that maybe you just end the sentence, "…*electronic tabulation*," period. And then say, indicate a separate sentence, that a member of the Senate can request such a ballot be conducted anonymously or in secret.

President Brakel: You could also think of it Senator Templin that the electronic tabulation or other specified by Robert's Rules of Order. You know, kind of refer it back to that.

Senator Templin: Okay.

Senator Steven: I thought maybe it was eliminated because that is completely outlined within Robert's Rules already, so it is not something we have to worry about that. Any vote can be requested by secret ballot according to Robert's Rules.

Senator Templin: That is true. The question is whether we want to actually clarify that here or not. One of the things is we want the bylaws so that if somebody is a brand new senator, they've never been on Senate before, they should be able to read the bylaws and get a sense of what they can and can't do to some extent. Because not everybody is an expert on Robert's Rules right from the very start. So, it is one of these bullets. The bullets may be on their way out, but we still need some way of voting secrecy occasionally.

Senator Anderson: Could you put the sentence as 'according to Robert's Rule of Order, a member may request a secret ballot?'

Senator Templin: I've got a note and I will send it to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee. We will work on that and bring something back. I have 'according to Robert's Rules of Orders, a member may request a secret ballot.' Anything else for Article VI? Wait a minute. There is more. This is just some more things to do with the voting. This is basically what we call straw polling, [where] we test the sentiment of the Faculty Senate body by a show of hands. Section 4. "*The motion to limit or close debate shall require an affirmative vote of two-thirds of those present and voting.*" [Section 6] Voting by proxy is allowed, if it is so defined by the college's constitution/bylaws. In other words, sending a proxy member to Senate who can vote for a senator. Section 6 has to do with "*All Faculty Senate reports to the faculty on recommendations requiring faculty action shall list the names of those Senators voting, yea, nay, and abstaining, unless the vote was taken using a secret ballot…..*" So that basically in Robert's Rules is when you call for division, you have to write down who voted yes, and who voted no, and who abstained. That is basically saying we can call for division when we want to. Section 7 is, "*In determining whether a sufficient percentage of votes have been cast in favor of any matter before the Faculty Senate, . only those votes cast in favor or against that proposition shall be counted. Abstentions will, nevertheless, be considered to determine whether a quorum is present*." That is a Robert's Rule thing as well. Abstentions are not a vote; they are an action. Section 8, "*Except as otherwise provided in the Constitution, these Bylaws, or the Rules of the Faculty Senate, any matter voted on by the Faculty Senate shall be considered approved* if *more votes are cast in favor of adoption than against adoption.*" So that is in essence, a simple majority. Section 9, "*In the event of a tie, the President of Faculty Senate shall cast the deciding vote, but shall otherwise refrain from* voting," and that is also consistent with Robert's Rules. The presider of the meeting is always the tie breaker in Robert's Rules. Section 10. The "Past *President of Senate may vote regardless of whether or not Past President's eligibility has been extended.*" So, in those cases where we have 65 members of Senate because of the Past-President, that Past-President may cast votes. Any questions about Article VI?

Senator Anderson: I just have a question. Earlier up it said required 2/3rds of a vote to stop a discussion.

Senator Templin: Right.

Senator Anderson: So would that be 2/3rds of counting just the yea's and nays, and not the abstained votes?

Senator Templin: Right.

Senator Anderson: Okay.

Senator Templin: Other questions to Article VI? Hearing none. Article VII has to do with the log and calendar of Faculty Senate and there are no changes here. "*The Executive Secretary of the Senate shall*

maintain a record to be known as the Faculty Senate Log, consisting of all properly defined proposals for possible action by the Faculty Senate. Such proposals may originate from any university source, and must be presented in written form. The Log shall record an item number, title, origin, and date of entry for each proposal." Section 2. "*The Executive Secretary of the Senate also shall maintain a record to be known as the Faculty Senate Calendar of Questions consisting of those log items submitted to the Faculty Senate by the Executive Committee for Senate consideration. The Calendar of Questions shall record the Log item number, title, origin, and committee assignment, due date and eventual disposition and date of each item placed thereon.*" Then Section 3. "*The Faculty Senate by majority vote may place any other matter on the Calendar of Questions and give it such priority as the Senate deems appropriate.*" So in other words, Senate itself can change the priority of things coming up for votes. Questions about Article VII? Hearing none. I'll move on. So [Article VIII] Section 1. *"The designation of any committee created under the particular auspices of Faculty Senate shall be "Senate Committee on…."* That is like a title of nomenclature. "*Such committees shall report through the Executive Committee directly to the Senate."* Section 2. "*Senate committees shall be chaired by members of the Senate only;"* So, the chair of each committee has to be a Senator. *"…provided, however, that a committee may [be] chaired by someone who is not a member of Senate upon the approval of Senate. The Senate committees shall be composed of members of the Senate and faculty of The University of Toledo eligible to be elected to the Senate.*" So, if you don't have a Senator who is the chair, it has to be a faculty member. Section 3. "*Senate committees shall be of two types: Standing and ad hoc. Standing committees are permanent ones, listed in the Rules. Ad hoc committees are temporary ones created for special or unique concerns that do not need continuing study. Their lifetimes shall not extend beyond the end of a Senate year*; *if they are to continue beyond that time, the next Senate shall reauthorize them."* Section 4. "*Except as provided in the sections describing particular standing committees provided for a longer term, appointments to standing and ad hoc committee(s) and appointment of chairs shall be made anew each year following Senate elections.*" Any questions on Article 8?

Alright, Article IX This has to do with the implementation and reconsideration of action taken by the Faculty Senate in the name of the University Faculty. The change there is in red, and that is from Legal. Section 1. "*Unless a later date for effectiveness is given or the approval of some other body is necessary for its effectiveness, any recommendation or proposal approved in accordance with the Constitution and Rules of the Faculty Senate shall go into effect ten (10) days after the minutes of the meeting approving such action have been distributed to the University Faculty, subject to the provisions below. In the event a later date of effectiveness is specified, for example, by the University of Toledo Provost, President, or Board of Trustees, such date shall be controlling, and in the event the approval of some other body is necessary, such action shall become effective immediately upon the receipt of any and all such approvals.*" Section 2. "*The Secretary of Faculty Senate shall distribute to the members a copy of all recommendations proposals in a timely manner. Following their adoption, the Secretary also distributes to the members of the University Faculty a copy of any report prepared by a minority of the Senate and filed with the Secretary in a timely manner.*" So in other words, this allow for minority reports, which is consistent with Robert's Rules. Section 3. "*The effective date of such measures may be postponed for thirty (30) days from the date of enactment if at least ten percent (10%) of the members of University Faculty sign a petition requesting reconsideration of the same and file it with the President of the Faculty Senate not later than ten (10 days) after the minutes of the meeting approving such action have been distributed to the University faculty. Upon receipt of such petition, the President of the Faculty Senate shall notify the President of the University of the need for a special meeting of the University Faculty. The*

President of the University, or the President of the Faculty Senate in the event the President of the University fails to act, shall call a special meeting of the University Faculty to vote upon the matter to be reconsidered prior to the expiration of the thirty (30) day period of postponement described above. If a majority of those in attendance of the University Faculty approves the measures enacted by the Faculty Senate, they shall go into effect immediately upon the action of the University Faculty, and if a majority of those in attendance of the University Faculty disapproves the measures enacted by the Faculty Senate, they shall be null and void." Section 4. "*The University Faculty may rescind at any time any action taken by the Faculty Senate in the name of the University Faculty. However, such action taken by the Faculty Senate shall remain in effect, subject to the conditions stated above, until repealed or modified by the Faculty Senate or rescinded by the University Faculty.*" Section 5. *"The quorum for any University Faculty meeting convened by petition for reconsideration of Senate action shall be a majority of the electorate of the University Faculty, as described in Article III of the Constitution of the Faculty Senate."* So, that is Article 9. Any questions about Article 9? Hearing none. I will move on to Article 10.

President Brakel: Senator Templin, we only have about four minutes left and I know we have about three more pages or so to do.

Senator Templin: Do you want to stop there?

President Brakel: I think I want to stop there and we will pick it up there at the next meeting.

Senator Templin: Wow. I am sure everybody will be awaiting breathlessly for how this turns out<laughter.>

President Brakel: Yes <laughter>. I thank you. Unless senators want me to extend the meeting by, let's say 10 minutes.

Senator Templin: I'm tired reading.

President Brakel: I prefer to bring it on to the next there. So thank you Senator Templin.

Senator Templin: Okay.

President Brakel: Are there items from the floor for the good of the cause? Hearing none, I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

Senator Niamat: So moved.

Senator Smith: Second.

President Brakel: Go ahead and enter yes in the chat box or no. Thank you everyone. We stand adjourned. Meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

IV. Meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,
Kimberly Nigem   Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary   Faculty Senate Administrative Secretary