Summary of Discussion

Note: The remarks of the Senators and others are summarized and not verbatim. The taped recording of this meeting is available in the Faculty Senate office or in the University Archives.

President Rouillard: Good afternoon. While we wait for IT to startup this new installation for us, I will ask Executive Secretary Mark Templin to call the roll.

I.   Roll Call: 2018-2019

Present: Bigioni, Bouillon, Brakel, Chattopadhyay, Compora, Dowd, Duggan, Edgington, Ferris, Frank, Gibbons, Gibbs, Gilchrist, Gray, Hall, Hammersley, Heberle, Jaume, Keith, Kistner, Krantz, Lee, Lundquist, Menezes, Modyanov, Molitor, Monsos, Murphy, Niamat, Nigem (Substitute for A. Said), Oberlander, Ohlinger, Ortiz, Reeves, Relue, Rouillard, Schlageter, Sheldon, Steven, Stepkowski, Taylor, Templin, Thompson-Casado, Tiwari, Tucker-Gail, Van Hoy, Weck-Schwarz, Weldy,

Excused: Andreana, Bailey, Emonds, Giovannucci, Hefzy, Jayatissa, Maloney
Unexcused: Kovach, Lecka-Czernik, Longsdorf, Schroeder, Wedding, Woolford, Zhu

Senator Templin: We have a quorum.

President Rouillard: Thank you. I am hoping that we will be able to straighten out the technology issues. Quinetta has gone to get some IT staff. Since we were moved from the other room, we are now with a new computer setup that doesn't work the same way the old one was. Senator Teclehaimanot is trying to help. Quinetta, were you able to find anyone?

Ms. Hubbard: No.

President Rouillard: Is there anyone from the Medical College that is familiar with this particular setup?

Group of Senators: No.

President Rouillard: All right, this is going to be a little problematic. While we let Senator Teclehaimanot do his technology magic we may have to invert some of the agenda items.
Faculty Senate Executive Report: I just want to let you know that we pushed back the second reading of the Constitution because of the logistics of scheduling a meeting with Trustee Steve Kavanagh who wishes to see the latest version before it comes to us for a second reading. The Elections Committee is finishing up rosters for the vote on the Constitution, the faculty dean surveys planned for the end of March, and our Faculty Senate elections at the end of the semester. I do need to address an issue today regarding the Missed Class Policy vote at the last meeting, which may require a change to the Minutes. The February 12th Minutes as they went out do not point out that there was a vote on the missed class policy begun by Senator Wedding; the affirmative votes were made, but then the voting process was interrupted. The voting process did not include the request for those opposed and abstaining. This event has been verified by Senator Mark Templin who listened to the minutes. I will now ask Senator Templin to fill in the details to this issue, along with remarks about parliamentary procedure in general about

Faculty Senate and policies so there will have to be some redactions to the Minutes. I am going to ask Senator Templin to fill in more of the details to this issue, along with some remarks about parliamentary procedure in general about Faculty Senate and policies.

Senator Templin: So there are two issues. One is the vote that didn't complete the entire voting process the last time. The other issue is more of a general sense of anxiety about actually approving these policies that are Provost Policies. Let me explain the general issue first and then we will get to the specific voting issue. I've done some research. I brought Robert's Rules today. Here is what I can determine from Robert's Rules. What we are actually doing is committing a committee to take an action. In other words, the Policy Committee brings it to us, we receive it as Senate, give feedback, and then we are actually committing the committee to pass it to the Provost Office either with recommendation for changes or without recommendations for changes. So the vote is actually a vote to commit our committee to take an action. Now, that is different than a vote to adopt or to endorse, which theoretically [even] all of our curriculum materials probably were also voted to commit because we are committing our committees to pass things on to various offices. I don't think we have as much anxiety when it comes to curriculum, but when it comes to university policy, that is where it doesn't feel the same. So the thing we are really doing is we are committing our committee to take an action for these policies. I would also recommend the vote is to commit.

Senator Dowd: Senator Templin, I am in no sense questioning your knowledge about Robert's Rules, that would be a remarkably stupid thing for me to do. However, when Senate is expressing this view on a policy that can only be approved or objected by the Board of Trustees, is it the Faculty Senate or is it one of the committees of Senate that is actually sending this policy forward? My understanding, past actions was it was actually the Senate. So, when you say vote to commit, is that vote simply a communication by a committee to say the Provost Office, but only a communication of what the actual full Senate has stated or voted to endorse?

Senator Templin: Right, because Senate has received it. So we are saying to the committee, go ahead and communicate with the Provost Office and send it forward. But that doesn't commit that committee to actually endorse it, just pass it on.

Senator Dowd: And the committee cannot make any further revisions or deletions. A vote to commit is simply a vote to communicate; it commits the committee to communicate to the appropriate body we're sending it to.

Senator Templin: Right.

Senator Dowd: Thank you.

Senator Keith: What are we communicating?

Senator Templin: Well, we are communicating either the recommendations for changes or the lack thereof.

Senator Keith: But what if it is a policy that's been drafted by Faculty Senate itself, because in the past some of our polices have come through Faculty Senate, not from the Provost Office?

Senator Templin: Well, but still we would have to communicate that to the Provost Office. I mean, in that case if it is our policy, maybe a vote to adopt would be in order.

Senator Keith: Waite, we have been putting on some of these policies, on the very last page, about part of the review process is Faculty Senate and it must go through Faculty Senate, not the Faculty Senate

Committee on Academic Regulations which is what I am hearing you saying, is that the committee is really above the full Senate.

Senator Templin: No, I am saying they bring it to us and we receive it and then it goes back to them to communicate it on to the next level.

Senator Keith: But again, are they communicating our approval or the fact that we are just telling them to send it on?

Senator Templin: They are communicating whatever we're telling them, either with no recommendations they are passing it on as they received it and as we received it, it is just moving forward. Or, they are communicating, here are the recommendations for changes that Faculty Senate has worked out.

Senator Keith: It seems to me that we are giving up some of our power by interpreting what you are saying that we are no longer voting to approve or disapprove a policy, we are just simply communicating with our committee to.

Senator Templin: Let's do the reverse. So we adopt something, we endorse it, and then the Provost Office or President ultimately says, no that is not. So now we've got something in place that they don't have. That is not a good situation.

Senator Dowd: What you were saying was if there is a vote to commit, a decision by Senate, whatever that decision is, the committee itself cannot revise that decision of the full Faculty Senate.

Senator Templin: Right.

Senator Dowd: That is a vote to commit.

Senator Templin: Right.

Senator Dowd: The committee cannot take further actions other than what is specifically communicated.

Senator Templin: Yes, to send it forward. It is ultimately the will of Senate that you want. The committee should bring forward, "we think we might want to consider these changes," but it is up to Senate to ultimately say these are the recommendations we want to move forward.

Senator Dowd: Right.

Senator Gilchrist: I hear Senator Keith's concern and I think Senator Dowd's response is nearly complete. Maybe the committee needs one additional step to clarify, that the committee lacks the authority to forward the policy to the Provost Office absent Faculty Senate approval, is that correct?

Senator Templin: Yes.

Senator Gilchrist: Well, in that case the Senate retains full authority over it.

Senator Templin: Right. Committees are working groups. Senate has a structure of a Board, but in this case we are also working with several other entities which is like the Provost Office, the President's Office and so on. We are a part of that process. We don't want our committee to take independent action, but we also don't want to pretend like we are the last entity endorsing this.

President Rouillard: Is there anything else?

Senator Keith: So what happens in the case that Faculty Senate votes against the policy, because I am very confused? If it is sent back to the committee, does it ever come back to Faculty Senate?

Senator Templin: It could. The Faculty Senate could ask the committee to look at it again and make further changes and bring it back later, that is certainly within Senate's purview to do.

Senator Keith: I am just very confused as to what we are actually doing. I thought I understood, but now I don't. I'll just leave it at that.

Senator Dowd: A vote to commit is saying to the Programs Committee to communicate with say, the Provost Office. In fact, it is no different than Faculty Senate voting to endorse, reject, or whatever and having the Executive Committee communicate that to the Provost Office if it is strictly communication. I learned from you many years ago, a vote to commit could also be to instruct a committee to take specific actions like, we don't like this section; do your due diligence, revise it and bring it back, which is something the Executive Committee is not permitted to do, that is the difference.

Senator Templin: Right.

Senator Dowd: If it is simply a vote to communicate, it could be by the Programs Committee, it could be by the Executive Committee, and it could be by any committees of Senate. But, if it is further action, it is further action, but they still have to bring it back to the full Senate. They can't speak with the authority of Senate.

Senator Templin: Right, to change the document.

President Rouillard: Is there anything else? Thank you, Senator Templin.

Senator Keith: I do have another question. In terms of the Missed Class Policy that we started to vote on two weeks ago, are we going to complete that vote today?

Senator Templin: So in looking that over, that is complex. If it were caught during the meeting so we could've reconsidered it right during that same meeting. Now, the question comes, we could reconsider it today which would mean someone who voted in the affirmative could move to reconsider. It would need a second and then it would be discussed should we reconsider this or just let it be as is and take a vote. Let's say the vote to reconsider was in the affirmative, so yes, we are going to reconsider this, then we revote on the original motion from two weeks ago. Now the problem is, a motion to reconsider is out of order if things have happened such as the way you are voting on would be moved. So let's say that, Robert's Rules uses the example of are we going to spend our money on "x" or our money on "y." At the original meeting they decided to spend their money on "y" and then the group actually spent their money on "y" and so they don't have any more money. Then if at a subsequent time somebody moves to reconsider, well, there is no more money and so it is moved to reconsider the vote and spend the money on "y" because you don't have the money anymore. In this case if that document already reached the Provost Office, I don't know if we could reconsider it and say, wait a minute, we need a redo. But that is what I researched. It is in order and so as long it is not a moot issue.

Professor Humphrys: So today we are changing how Faculty Senate is handling policies, is that correct?

Senator Templin: No, I am just saying if people are uncomfortable with a motion to adopt or a motion to endorse, there is such a thing as a motion to commit, which would be we are committing our committee to communicate to the Provost Office, but you are not taking a stand on whether ultimately Senate thinks this document is a good policy or not.

Professor Humphrys: So for every vote in the future that Faculty Senate will be taking on a policy there will be the option to either approve or to commit?

Senator Templin: Whichever people prefer. I am just saying this is an option.

Professor Humphrys: So when they are voting the senators will know in advance if they are voting on the option to accept or the option to commit, is that what we're saying?

Senator Templin: Well, I suppose it is up to whoever groups are doing the motion. The committee can ask for a motion to adopt or to submit from Senate.

Professor Humphrys: And then on that Missed Class Policy, if I understood you correctly, it stopped in the middle?

Senator Templin: Right. So technically it is parliamentary. It is not in order because the vote had started and then basically a point of privilege was raised, but that was during the vote. The point of privilege should have come before the vote.

Professor Humphrys: So you are saying the vote will go through as a positive because we never got to the---

Senator Templin: Well, no one caught it at the time, so apparently it didn't occur to anybody that day, "in fact, we didn't complete that vote." Someone who really passionately wanted to say no, didn't speak up that day. Now today if people want to reconsider, the question is, has that document already gone forward or not? If it has, then reconsideration would be moved at this point.

Senator Dowd: Wouldn't the determination of it being moved is whether the Provost Office acted on it? I wasn't present at the meeting two weeks ago. The determination of whether it is moved is whether the Provost Office acted on it itself. So if the Provost Office has not acted on whatever the Faculty Senate presented, it is not moved.

Senator Templin: Right. I don't know where we stand.

Senator Dowd: What is presented is that it is the pleasure of Senate whether they would like to revote on it or not.

President Rouillard: Vice Provost Ayres, can you tell us if anything was sent to your office?

Vice Provost Ayres: Well, we received the action of the Senate since we were here, but no further action has yet to be taken on that policy. So if the Senate wish to reconsider it, that would not disrupt any processes. It has not been posted for 30-day comment and it is not anywhere in the system.

President Rouillard: President-Elect Brakel, do you have a comment?

President-Elect Brakel: Provost Ayres, I think you might be incorrect because as I am looking here at the policy manual, the Missed Class Policy was posted, it looks like, February 27. No, that was 2018, sorry.

President Rouillard: It was posted on what date?

President-Elect Brakel: Last year, February 27, 2018.

President Rouillard: But that is not with the revisions that we were considering?

President-Elect Brakel: No.

Senator Templin: I remember voting in the affirmative so I will move to reconsider—that needs a second.

Senator Keith: Second.

Senator Templin: We can discuss whether reconsideration is warranted.

President Rouillard: Quinetta, do you have that policy by any chance?

Ms. Hubbard: Yes.

President Rouillard: If Quinetta can pull up the Missed Class Policy, we can take a look at it again. Do you want to proceed with the vote to reconsider? We got a *motion* and a *second*.

Senator Templin: The question is, should we reconsider it?

President Rouillard: All those in favor of reconsidering the Missed Class Policy please signify by saying, "aye" any opposed? Any abstentions? [2]. ***Motion to Reconsider Passed.*** So it is an affirmative vote. If Quinetta can find it, we can reconsider it. While we are waiting we could move on perhaps to Barbara Schneider who wanted to talk for a few minutes about campus surveys.

Associate Vice Provost Schneider: This is really just informational. I wanted to make sure everybody knows this is up. We have launched a new survey website through the Office of Institutional Research. On that survey website you will find a calendar of all the current big surveys that are scheduled for the spring. We are asking that anybody who is going to launch a survey to more than 500 people to use the survey coordinating tool so our office can make certain that we are aware that these surveys are running and that we can help stage them so that we are not running multiple big surveys at the same time, which has happened in the past. Then people get too many surveys to take, and we don't get the kind of robust response rates that gives us any kind of actionable information. That survey tool is up right now. We will strongly urge you, if you are planning on launching a survey that is going out to 500 or more and if you want to include smaller surveys that are going to go across campus, please do so. Also, somebody that is planning to launch a survey can look at the survey calendar and see whatever surveys are being run at the same time so they are not confused or they are not competing. This is simply an attempt to make sure that we are getting the kinds of robust data that we need for people who make the decisions in multiple venues. I do want to note that surveys that faculty are launching in support of their own professional research don't need to use this survey… Like if you survey first-year students about their study hours because you are writing an article for the first-year experience, that is for your own research agenda.

Senator Dowd: Just a clarifying point. Can any faculty member at any time can send out a survey to 500 individuals across the university without your permission or access to the email list?

Associate Vice Provost Schneider: Well, so I don't know where they would get their email lists from because those are generally generated by IR and they will probably have conversations with IR about the purpose of their survey. But we do not, to my knowledge, have anything that prohibits that. We are asking them to advise us and use the survey tool so we are aware of those kinds of surveys. Sometimes members of our campus community launch these huge surveys and get really rich data that might be useful for things like HLC accreditation, and we don't know if they launched them, nor do we have access to the data, nor could we ask them to draw some conclusions for us.

Senator Dowd: I don't have an issue with that. The notion of reaching out to 500 students without any sort of oversight, for a lack of a better term.

Associate Vice Provost Schneider: Well, for one thing, if they are surveying students for their own research, they have to do an IRB protocol. That is different than just surveying. But yes, if you are going to introduce your plan of survey to students like if you are doing budget research, it has to go through the IRB. So that is the oversight. That is not a survey committee concern, that's an IRB concern.

Senator Dowd: Well, it sort of…

Associate Vice Provost Schneider: Well, it shouldn't. We'll talk. Does anybody have any questions about it?

Senator Menezes: What is the website address?

Associate Vice Provost Schneider: The website the University of Toledo Office of Institutional Research/ Survey. It is: http://oir.utoledo.edu and then there's a link on the left hand column of the survey.

Senator Compora: I just wanted to say I used the tool already. It is more commercial. I am asking you not to ignore the surveys that comes from Linda, myself and Denise Bartell. It is very simple to use. It took about five minutes to survey all faculty; but ours is short, only two questions regarding the first-year experience. I can tell you, it is a very easy tool to use.

Associate Vice Provost Schneider: We are going to be launching a student survey this summer for incoming freshmen. The NSSE comes out this spring. It is going to take up a lot of head space for a lot of people. We are just trying to conduct the orchestra.

President Rouillard: Thank you, Dr. Schneider. Before we go to vote on this Missed Class Policy, I would like to ask for a round of applause for Senators Teclehaimanot and Duggan and Quinetta. I'll tell you, it takes a village.

[Applause]

President Rouillard cont'd: So we have the revised policy here. The two revisions that we were asked to consider were these two down here. Hopefully, this would be in compliance with federal legislation. Are there any comments or discussion on this before we vote?

Senator Tucker-Gail: I was the person who interrupted the vote and I apologize for all of this time. But I did some research with regards to my team and their confidential status. I have met with ADA and I have found out that my team, if they go through the counselor, can ask for ADA disability related excuses or accommodations. There is only one small subset that is involved and that goes to Student Affairs. The piece that is lacking in here, the language that we couldn't come up with on the fly last week would be: "Or other activities govern by Student Affairs," or something along those lines. There is a difference between a confidential advocate and a confidential counselor, and their ability to issue a diagnosis. So an accommodation that comes from an advocate, that could be separate because if a student takes accommodations through ADA, my understanding is that they have to meet with them and go over their accommodations and figure out all of their different pieces. If a victim is not willing to do that then you will have to go through the Office of Student Affairs to be facilitated. I have yet to find out if that needs to be added to the comment. I just wanted to share that with everybody since I am the cause of all of this.

President Rouillard: So if you were to suggest a friendly amendment to this, how would you word it?

Senator Tucker-Gail: "For other accommodations as deemed by the Office of Student Affairs."

President Rouillard: And that would go here under this one, number 8?

Senator Tucker-Gail: Well, that is pretty broad and I don't know if people are okay with that or not. If it was my center, it would include the Center for Advocacy and Wellness. It would include those two offices, but I haven't had an actual meeting with that office yet.

President Rouillard: Okay.

Senator Molitor: If I can comment? You are worried about being broad, but it does say to start, "*disability-related excused absences*." So it is not like any request from Student Affairs would---

President Rouillard: Couldn't fit under that rubric.

Senator Tucker-Gail: It is not a disability though, or necessarily a missed class because you are a victim in the hospital because you were attacked which is very different than, I am sure that comes with a lot of trauma and a lot of other issues, but the diagnosis of. So it is that line.

Senator Van Hoy: It could go in number 9.

Senator Tucker-Gail: Like I said last time, I am willing to put that comment forward. Dr. Bjorkman and I had a conversation and so I am more than comfortable with that.

President Rouillard: It could also be a comment that is included under the comment period when the policy is posted. Do you want to add a friendly amendment?

Senator Tucker-Gail: If I do, I will put it in the comment section.

President Rouillard: Okay. So, as it stands.

Senator Gibbons: So a friendly amendment to 1, where it says, "Doctor" through medical professionals. We have nurse practitioners, we have physician assistants, we have counselors; we have a thousand and one people who should be able to sign this as opposed to just MD's.

President Rouillard: That is a good friendly amendment. We don't need to vote on a friendly amendment, correct?

Senator Templin: No.

President Rouillard: Is there anything else?

Senator Weldy: I think that needs to be worded very carefully because there are all kinds of professionals who have no qualification to make that determination. We have podiatrist, we have chiropractors, we have all kinds of people so I think we need to be very careful how that is worded.

Senator Gibbons: All this does is authorizes us to recognize absence notes signed by somebody who is licensed by the state.

Senator Weldy: We still need to be very careful how that is worded. We will have all kinds of people who will find all kinds of people to write a note.

Unknown Speaker: That's true.

Senator Dowd: Would you have suggested language?

Senator Weldy: Not off the top of my head.

President Rouillard: Would you like to address that in the comment period when the policy is posted?

Senator Ohlinger: What about, "appropriate license professional," is that not specific enough? Specifically, "medical professional."

Senator Gray: "Medical" wouldn't work because I am a nurse practitioner and so we don't use medical.

President Rouillard: "Appropriate healthcare provider."

Senator Ohlinger: "License healthcare professional."

Senator Weldy: There are all kinds of people who are licensed who are not appropriate. I am comfortable with "appropriate."

President Rouillard: Okay, "appropriate professional?"

Senator Weldy: "Appropriate healthcare professional."

President Rouillard: Okay. So we will write that into the Minutes, "appropriate healthcare professional," and we will make that suggestion. Is there anything else? So now that we've had our discussion period, we can move to voting. All those in favor of committing or approving---

Senator Templin: We are committing that this policy with direct changes will be communicated to the Provost.

President Rouillard: Okay, it's what Senator Templin said. All those who approve, please signify by saying, "aye." Any objections? [1] Any abstentions? *Commitment Passed.* So now we can return to our previously scheduled program. We have Senator Anthony Edgington who is going to lead us through the new courses and course modifications.

Senator Edgington: Alright, so this time around we have 17 new course proposals. The first 15 are coming from the College of Engineering.

The first new course up is from Bioengineering, BIOE1410. The course description is "Basic concepts for biomedical devices and development and incorporating innovation and entrepreneurial mindset in freshman bioengineering students using team and project-based learning experiences."

We also have BIOE1420. The course description is "Basic concepts for biomedical device design and development and incorporating innovation and entrepreneurial mindset in freshman bioengineering students using team – and project-based learning experiences." These are basically two courses that are working back-to-back. They are each 1 credit courses that follow-up on each other.

We also have four courses from Mechanical, Industrial, Manufacturing and Engineering, MIME. MIME 4400, Mechatronics. The course description is "This course will give students hands-on experience with mechatronics systems and components. The laboratory will be used to demonstrate several mechatronics systems including inverted pendulums, suites of sensors and motors, and more complex systems. A major part of the course will be a semester-long project where the students conceive, design, and build mechatronics device."

We have MIME4430, Automotive Control Systems. The course description is "This course will cover the major aspects of automotive control, including engine, driveline, and complete vehicle control. This

includes applications such as fuel and ignition control, ABS systems, gear-shifting, and vehicle velocity estimation."

MIME4450, Automation Design. The course description is "This course will introduce the range of common components used in automation, including actuators, sensors, motors, linear guides, energy chain, industrial robots and light curtains. Students will practice (with feedback) walking through the design process in specifying, sizing, laying out and integrating these components. The course will use some CAD, where CAD experience would be helpful, but this would also be a good opportunity to quickly build competence with CAD."

Finally, MIME4460, MATLAB for Engineers. The course description is "This course will review the basics of using MATLAB, identify best-practices applicable to MATLAB and other programming languages, and provide examples of more advanced functionality such as image processing. Simulink control mechatronic systems, numerically solving differential equations, GPU computation, and optimization. Programming experience would be helpful, but this would also be a good opportunity to rapidly grow programming skills with easy-to-learn language."

We have another course coming from Civil Engineering, CIVE3720, Boundary Surveying. The course description is "Analysis of evidence and procedures for boundary location, Reaching local survey records, and Platting and Subdivision Design, Discussion of surveyor's liability and role in courts of law."

We have CIVE3730, Geodetic and Control Surveying. The course description is "Introduction to Geodesy and Control Surveying including State Plane Coordinates, Azimuths from Celestial Observations, Development of Control Network for Surveys, Introduction of Global Positioning Systems and Aerial Mapping, high accuracy measurements which account for the curvature of the Earth, and definitions of geodetic data for survey control."

CIVE3760, Route and Construction Surveying. The course description is "Route Surveying and Geometric Design including Horizontal, Vertical and Spiral Curves, Topographic Surveying and Mapping, Earthwork Volumes, and Construction Layout and Staking."

CIVE3770, Cadastral Surveys and Ohio Land Systems. The course description is "Study of the Official Surveys of the United States. Establishment and Retracement of Public Land Survey Systems and Colonial Land Surveys. History of Land Systems in the United States and Original Ohio Land Subdivisions."

CIVE4720, Boundary Control and Legal Principals. The course description is "Establishment and Re-establishment of Land Boundaries, Locating Points and Line for Boundaries, Historical Development of Boundaries, Introduction of Rectangular System of Public Land Surveys, Systems to Describe Properties, and Application of Legal Principals to Boundary Analysis."

CIVE4770, Legal and Ethical Aspects of Surveying. The course description is "Study of Statute and Common Law pertaining to Surveying and Property Rights, Interpretations and Methods to Describe Real Property, Minimum Standards for Surveys, Ethics for Professional Surveyors."

Then two other courses of MIME as well, GNEN1000, Exploring Engineering. The course description is "A course designed to explore the various disciplines of engineering in historical, present, and future context while incorporating basic design principals in an interdisciplinary model."

And then GNEN1010, Professional Development. The course description is "In this course students will gain a better understanding of the professional and ethical responsibilities of an engineer and the impact

of engineering solutions in a global/societal context. In addition, they will explore career opportunities available to engineers. They will develop a better understanding of the importance of effective communication, presentation, and team collaboration skills in securing employment and in being successful in the workplace as well as the importance of professional registration and life-long learning."

Our final course in Engineering is EET4300, Motors and Generators. The course description is "This course is an introduction to AC and DC machines, including generators, motors, single phase, 3 phase, variable frequency drives, stepper, and DC brushless motors. Safety topics are integrated along with application Codes and Standards."

We have one new course from the Business School, CMPT2500, Help Desk Concepts. The course description is "This course provides students with a core set of technical and communication skills. Topics include hard skills such as security, troubleshooting, working with networks and mobile devices. Personal computer hardware and operating systems and also discussed. Soft skills includes verbal and non-verbal communication, time management and active listening. After taking this course, students will be prepared for positions as a help desk specialist.

Our final course is UGR4910, Undergraduate Research Experience. This course is a zero credit course. The course description is "Undergraduate students will participate in directed research, scholarship, or creative activities with faculty mentors." "The long-term goal for this course is for all undergraduate students across campus that are involved in independent research, scholarship, or creative activities to be enrolled in this zero-credit hour course. Students are often involved in these activities even when they are not enrolled in an independent study course. Having a zero-credit course will enable the Office of Undergraduate Research to track their involvement and to facilitate communicate with the students about funding opportunities, conferences, compliance issues, and creating an effective mentoring relationship with faculty."

So I talked to Jonathon earlier today about this because I figure the zero credits issue may come up today. His explanation is basically it is for undergraduate research as a way for them to track students as they do research outside of the classroom. So if they are doing research for an internship, volunteering work or something that they started in the classroom and may venture outside of the classroom as a lab as well. This gives undergraduate research a chance to track that and also connect them with mentors or funding opportunities for help with IRB or whatever situation that may come up as they go forward. So those are our current 17 new course proposals. Are there any questions or comments about any of these proposals?

Senator Nigem (Substitute for A. Said): I have a couple of questions. Senator Molitor, are you speaking to the BIOE courses?

Senator Molitor: Yes.

Senator Nigem (Substitute for A. Said): Okay. Was there any discussion with our entrepreneurship program, an advisor in the College of Business relative to the innovation and entrepreneurship which we actually teach?

Senator Molitor: I do not know the answer to that. I can go back and make sure.

Senator Nigem (Substitute for A, Said): In the spirit of collaboration and cooperation because our two colleges have collaborated on this previously, I think it should have a discussion with parameters.

Senator Molitor: Okay, we will go back and do that. Thank you.

Senator Relue: I would just comment on that. That was a course that was actually embedded in our Intro-Bioengineering class that we did. Freshman Design is a separate parallel track within that course and we pulled it out just because of the time commitment for students. They actually work through a process very similar to what our senior design students work through, but at a lower level.

President Rouillard: I had a question about the Business course, Help Desk Concepts. That course description seems like it is a lot more advance than Help Desk. I am wondering if this title short changes our students. Maybe it is more like tech support or service and tech support rather than calling it Help Desk support.

Professor Humphrys: There was a committee that was put together that had representation from the various areas from the College of Business and that is what they came up with. There was a faculty member from the College of Business who had worked in this sort of area and thought that would be an appropriate name, that is the only thing I really know about it.

President Rouillard: I mean, help desk is a little bit different even from service support. I am not sure that this does our students any good on a transcript. This looks a little low-level given the description of the course.

Senator Nigem (substitute for A. Said): Professor Humphrys, what is the name of the new major that supports this?

Professor Humphrys: I can't remember. I don't know if it's coming up today; it was up last time, but that course wasn't approved and so we couldn't approve the---gosh, I don't know to tell you the truth what the name of it is.

President Rouillard: So this is part of a new major?

Professor Humphrys: It is part of a modified program. It is an existing program that was updated by the same committee that did this. At the last meeting the program was brought forward, but because that course had not been approved yet, it was held back. So I don't exactly know the name—I am sorry.

Senator Nigem (substitute for A. Said): The name is very similar to a two-year associate's degree.

Senator Krantz: Does the last sentence and the explanation get to the point that you are making, President Rouillard, "*After taking this course, students will be prepared for positions as a help desk specialist,*" in which case they would need to know enough technical details of the issues and the topics that are included up higher in the description, and have the decision making capacity to point the person inquiring in the right direction to talk with someone who knows more?

President Rouillard: It just seems that given the description, students who have taken this course could do more than help desk, that is sort of what I am saying-- Not "sort of," that is what I am saying.

Senator Steven: I was wondering with respect to the civil engineering courses, doesn't environmental sciences teach some surveying? Is there any overlap with those courses?

Senator Molitor: I hope they don't teach surveying because it should be an engineering discipline.

Senator Krantz: Definitely not at the legal level. In other words, this certification is for professional surveying and we do not do that.

Senator Edgington: Are there any other questions or comments?

Senator Lee: Just a quick question. Other than the one from Jonathan Bossenbroek, the other ones that are listed as zero to four---

Senator Molitor: I can address that. Those are setup that way because they have lab sections. When you schedule linked lecture and lab sections, you schedule the lecture for the full credit hours and you schedule the lab to be zero credit hours. The Registrar will code it as zero or three hours only, so they won't let us schedule these as one or two credit hour sections.

Senator Lee: Thank you.

Senator Edgington: We approved some courses earlier this year with that same discipline.

Senator Menezes: The last Senate meeting we came to understand the term about mechatronics and electronics. I thought it was very interesting to learn about this new thing and also why we need mechatronics and I found it was very interesting. I wanted to know with all these civil engineering courses, is there another course that is being developed?

Senator Molitor: Do you mean a program?

Senator Menezes: Yes, a program.

Senator Molitor: This is all for a minor in surveying that will allow Engineering students to obtain professional licensure in surveying?

Senator Menezes: We do not currently offer it?

Senator Molitor: We do not have a minor in surveying. My recollection is that we only require one course in surveying for our construction engineering technology and for our civil engineering students per ABET accreditation requirements. However, there is a demand for professional surveyors in this region. What we wanted to do is develop a program by which anybody pursuing or with an engineering degree can take these extra courses and then pursue a professional surveying license.

Senator Menezes: Thank you. Is there a *[Indecipherable]*…? I was listening to some of the explanations…

Senator Molitor: I believe that would probably fall within our structural engineering program in construction engineering technology or civil engineering, but I am not aware of the specific courses in these programs that would contain this content.

Senator Menezes: Thank you. I just wanted clarification. I have another question about the Honors Research course. As one who has had led a couple of these research courses with honor students, would there be any benefit to the faculty who meets that research because many of these courses like independent studies are all added on to the advisors workload without any credit of any sort?

Senator Edgington: One quick thing I will mention is, while this is situated in Honors, it is really only because that is where Jonathon's line is at. It is actually open to all students across campus, not just Honor's students. I don't know as far as the faculty workload issue though. Have they talked to you about that at all?

Senator Sheldon: The only thing I can think of is the instructor of record will be Jon, not the person that they are doing the research with. That would complicate adding credit hours to it. It would go to the instructor who is actually conducting the research with the student. Jon will be the faculty of record. Does that help clarify a little bit?

Senator Menezes: Actually, it makes it a little more confusing.

Senator Sheldon: Glad to do that <laughter>.

Senator Menezes: I can't understand why he takes control of that.

Senator Edgington: My understanding from the conversation with Jonathon was that this is more of a liaison in between the student and who can actually try to find resources on campus to help them conduct their research. So it is probably leaning more in line with students who actually doesn't have a mentor yet and help them locate that mentor and then from there decide what needs to be done and so on.

Senator Lee: My discussion with Dr. Bossenbroek was that this is an add-on so that number 1. would appear on their transcript, but they will still be signed up for independent study hours with their research advisor. This was described as, zero credit hours is not going to affect some of the hours they are taking, but it is designed to be added on to the credit bearing course that it is actually where the research is being placed. This was more so that number 1, the university could track all of these courses and have different numbers and different participations etc. It was also to go along with the research extensive designation, I think those could be also tagged with the students who would be pre-enrolled in this course for communication purposes. That was my understanding with talking with him.

Senator Molitor: And also there are compliance issues. We want to make sure anybody who is doing research on campus has proper training, medical records, etc. A number of students do research on this campus without registering for any courses and we need a mechanism to track them.

Senator Menezes: I agree with the principal. I just wonder if you have a course out there, how much work is going to come back to the faculty because…service for faculty. If there was a system that would also able faculty to give some time to the students who are registered for research, that would be a better move. I am okay with the course being there, but I think one needs to recognize the load that is coming to faculty.

Senator Relue: I think it is kind of partly for the course. I think this is already happening. We have a lot of students who work in undergraduate research.

Senator Menezes: My students are in it too. I do agree that it is good for them to have a course that is linked with the work they are doing. My question is why…becomes a course that we are actually seeing in the catalog when registering? There are going to be more students who would be attracted to the course and then the burden of advising then falls on the faculty who are taking...

Senator Relue: But I think the burden always falls on the faculty who is advising because they are---

Senator Menezes: Here's an opportunity to try to change the system a little bit to help them.

Senator Edgington: I will make sure to pass it on to Jon and make sure he knows. Are there any other questions or comments? I would like to suggest that we move forward with accepting the 17 new course proposals with two contingencies, one is the conversation we mentioned during Business, talk about the BIOE engineering courses and the second one, I will email Kathleen Fitzpatrick about the Help Desk title and give her an opportunity to maybe reflect on that to decide if they want to change that, in which case, it may come back to this group for a second round of approval. Do I need a motion for that?

Senator Dowd: No, it's coming from the committee.

Senator Edgington: Okay.

Senator Dowd: Just a point of clarification. You said contingencies, are we holding all the courses, except the ones where conversation have taken place?

Senator Edgington: At this point of the year, I would like to vote on all 17. I don't think either one of them necessarily overly affect the courses themselves. But I just want to make sure we get on record that those conversations need to happen.

Senator Dowd: I just wanted clarification.

Senator Edgington: I know.

Senator Nigem (substitute for A. Said): So if the conversations happen and, Senator Molitor, I am not saying this towards you---

Senator Molitor: Go ahead.

Senator Nigem (substitute for A. Said): The two Engineering courses have to be pulled.

Senator Edgington: Okay, we will vote on the 15 courses. We are going to take out BIOE1410 and BIOE1420. I am also going to make sure the email is sent out to Kathleen regarding the possible title change. All in favor of voting for the 15 new course proposals, say, "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? *Motion Passed.* Thank you.

Next, course modifications. We have 25 course modifications. We are going to start with Health and Human Services. This is MSL3990, Independent Study in Military Science. The modification here is to "move the class from HHS to University College; the major has already been transferred but this course was left off that move." They just want to make sure it gets put in the right college.

We have two courses from Pharmacy, PHRP4530 and PHRP4540, Evidence Based Pharmacy Practice 1 and 2. Basically, these are both course title changes. So the new titles will be "Evidence Based Medicine 1 and Evidence Based Evidence 2."

For the Business Program, first of all, we have HURM4710, Training and Development. The modification is to "course title and catalog description. Proposed title is "Human Capital Performances and Development."

Next, we have BUAD2060, Data Analysis for Business. The modification here is going to be again, "change to the course title, change to course description, and addition of prerequisites. Proposed title is "Business Statistics.""

Then BUAD2070, Business Statistics and Analytics. The modification again are "change to course title, change to course description, and addition of prerequisites. Proposed title is "Business Analytics.""

Then we have one from Engineering, EES1140, Environmental Problems Laboratory. The modification here is going to be "course title. Proposed title is Environmental Solutions Laboratory."

Then we have CHEE2110, Process Fluid Mechanics. They want to add this as a major requirement. It says, "students are meeting with academic advisors in chemical engineering and making progress in curriculum."

Next, we have CHEE2230, Chemical Engineering Thermodynamics I. They would like to "add Math1850 as prerequisite with minimum grade of D-."

Next is CHEE2330, Chemical Engineering Thermodynamics II. They want to make this a "major requirement so that the students are meeting with academic advisors in chemical engineering and making progress in curriculum. Addition of Math1860 with a minimum grade of a D- as prerequisite."

Next is CHEE3030, Separation Processes. They also want to make this a "major requirement. Students are meeting with academic advisors in chemical engineering and making progress in curriculum."

Next is CHEE3110, Process Heat Transfer. Again, they want to make this a "major requirement so that the students are meeting with academic advisors in chemical engineering and making progress in curriculum."

Next is CHEE3940, Co-Op Work Experience. "Addition of CHEE1010 as prerequisites with minimum grade of D-. Major requirement is added so that the students are meeting with academic advisors in chemical engineering and making progress in curriculum."

Next is BIOE3500, Bioprocessing Laboratory. The modification "include removing BIOL3030 as a prerequisite and adding BIOL2170 as prerequisites."

Next is BIOE4100, Physiology for BioEngineers. The "modification include removing BIOL3030 as a prerequisite and adding BIOL2170 and BIOL2180 as prerequisites."

Next is BIOE4120, Biosignal Processing. The modification here is "to change BIOE4140 from a co-requisites to a pre-requisite."

Then we have CET4350, Soils, Foundations, and Earth Structures. The modification here is to "change in credit hours from 4 to 3) and change in the catalog description."

Finally, we have a few modifications from the College of Arts and Letters. The first is THR2400, Theatre and Film. The modification here is "to add THR2200 as a perquisite."

Nest is THR2640, Voice and Movement. The modification is "to add THR2610 and THR1010 as perquisites."

Next is THR2660, Acting for the Camera I. The modification is "to add THR2610 as a prerequisite."

Next we have THR3340, Acting got the Camera II. The modification is "to add THR2660 as a prerequisite."

Next is SOC2410, Communities. The modification is "to change the course to a WAC course." That is one we went through the WAC Committee to make that decision.

Then we have PSY4500, Research in Development Psychology. The modification is to "change credit hours from 4 to 3-4) change in course format from lecture to seminar; 3) change in catalog description."

Then we have ENGL1110, College Composition I. The modification "is to Accuplacer Score."

Finally, COMM4910, Senior Portfolio. The modification here is to "change to course title (to "Communication Studies Capstone"); 2) change in credit hours from 1 to3; 3) additional prerequisite courses; 4) catalog description; and 5) change in grading from P/NC to A-F grading scale."

Senator Edgington cont'd: Those are our 20 course modifications. Are there any questions on the course modifications?

Senator Ohlinger: Just a minor typographical. The pharmacy practical courses are PHPR, instead of PHRP.

Senator Edgington: Okay, I will make sure it is changed.

Senator Krantz: For the two chemical engineering courses, 2230 and 2330, was it truly the intention of engineers to have prerequisite of a D- in calculous?

Senator Molitor: Yes, they are just saying you need a passing grade.

Senator Krantz: That is barely, barely passing. I cannot imagine taking fluid mechanics without being … in calculous.

Senator Molitor: There is another course that is a prerequisite. Has that course been removed or is this just adding the MATH course?

Senator Edgington: No, this is just adding the one course.

Senator Krantz: So that was the intent?

Senator Molitor: Yes.

Senator Keith: With the two BUAD courses, they got some new prerequisites listed there that we no longer teach.

Senator Edgington: I will check those to make sure.

Senator Keith: They are two math ones.

Senator Edgington: Okay. Any other questions or comments? Hearing none. So taking out the two BUAD courses, because I want to check those prerequisites, I will like to move that we accept the other 23 course modifications. All those in favor say, "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? ***Motion Passed.*** Thank you all very much.

President Rouillard: Thank you. That is a lot of work.

[Applause]

Senator Edgington: Don't worry, there is more coming.

President Rouillard: Next on the agenda is Terry Bigioni, Chair of Academic Programs.

Senator Bigioni: So this is going to be fairly short. I have six program modifications for you today and they are all relatively trivial. Hopefully, we can vote on a good number of them in a block. The first four that I will show you are just reduction in credit hours to these programs.

> The first is Communication Studies, Bachelor of Arts Communication Studies. We are eliminating four hours of electives. There are no change to any course requirements, and that is simply to bring the total number of credit hours from 124 to 120 hours.

> The second is Media Communications. It is exactly the same changes, eliminating four hours of electives. There are no changes to the core requirements. Again, we are bringing the total number of credit hours down from 124 to 120.

The third is Bachelor of Arts Economics. Again, we are eliminating four hours of electives. There is no change to the core requirements. We are bringing the number of credit hours down from 124 to 120.

We are going to skip the top one and move to the middle, a Minor in Women's and Gender Studies. This is reducing the number of credit hours, eliminating one elective. We are reducing the credit hours from 23 to 20 credit hours.

So those four are all a reduction in credit hours. The first three were for majors and the fourth was for a minor. Does anyone want to discuss any of that?

President Rouillard: I just want to comment that with the first two changes the rationale suggest that there is an upcoming state mandate. There is no upcoming state mandate to reduce to 120; there is a range, 120 to 126.

Senator Bigioni: Okay. Are there any other questions or comments? Are there any objections to voting on those four as a block? Hearing none. Let's go ahead and vote. All those in favor of approving those course modifications say, "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? ***Motion Passed.*** Terrific.

President Rouillard: All right, thank you very much, and thank you to your committee as well.

Senator Bigioni: I am not finished yet.

President Rouillard: I'm sorry. I thought you had gone through all of them.

Senator Bigioni: No, just four of six.

President Rouillard: Okay.

Senator Bigioni: The other two are a little different and so we didn't want to pile them all together.

The next one we should look at is this BS in Criminal Justice. So this isn't the credit hour modification; this is just changing the minimal requirements for grades from D- to a C or higher for criminal justice majors in the program. The rationale states: "This new requirement will align with other programs within our College. In addition, members of our Advisory Board have stated that they are looking for higher quality applicants. As a faculty, we believe we can provide higher quality applicants to these agencies if this requirement is increased from a D- to a C-. Lastly, we believe this change will help with our DFW rates as well as our retention rates of students. Consequently, this change will help us keep the integrity of our program." Are there any questions or comments?

Senator Molitor: Is this just for courses within the criminal justice major, or does this include general education courses as well?

Senator Tucker-Gail: Just the major.

Senator Molitor: Okay, thanks.

Senator Bigioni: Are there any other questions or comments?

Senator Templin: Is this a C in every course or just simply average to a C?

Senator Molitor: It sounds like to me every course grade within the major has be a C or higher.

Senator Tucker-Gail: It is a C or better in every required criminal justice course.

Senator Bigioni: Thank you. Are there any other questions or comments? Okay, let's put this one to a vote. All those in favor of approving this modification say "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? ***Motion Passed.*** Thank you.

> The final modification that I have for you today is this Minor in Disability Studies. So this proposal is to eliminate the requirement of an internship. The summary states: "This proposal seeks to revise the Disability Studies minor so that the internship is an option rather than a requirement. This does not change the number of credits in the minor." The rationale states: "Disability Studies has an ever-growing number of minors. These students often enroll in internships of practicums in their major departments. Because of this, doing a Disability Studies internship is often difficult." So this proposal seeks to reduce that burden from students if they are doing internships in major departments. That gives them the option of doing an internship in Disability Studies because it is not required any longer. Are there any questions or comments?

Senator Krantz: Just to expand, and Senator Ferris can probably address this directly, the major retains?

Senator Ferris: One of the things that we have been finding is as our number of majors and minors seem to have grown. This isn't prohibited by any sense, but it has gotten a little more challenging to find appropriate places for minors as well as majors, particularly when they are doing….for internships in their major departments. It can be a challenge and it can affect service for them to complete a minor in a timely fashion. So basically what Minors in Disability Studies will be doing instead, we will be having another upper division class instead of an internship.

Senator Bigioni: Thank you. Are there any other questions or comments? Okay, let's put this one to a vote. All those in favor of approving this program modification please say, "aye." Any opposed? Any abstention? ***Motion Passed.*** Terrific! Thank you.

President Rouillard: Thank you very much. We appreciate your work and your committee's work.

[Applause]

President Rouillard cont'd: This brings us to the last item of business on the agenda, and that is Senator Greg Gilchrist and Professor Lee Strang from the College of Law who have a statement on Freedom of Expression. I believe this was circulated to you yesterday if I am not mistaken, and I think that Quinetta has a copy that she can project.

Senator Gilchrist: Hello everyone. This is kind of fun, I think, for me. In 1644, John Milton published the *Areopagitica,* which has gone on to become the key philosophical justification for freedom of expression. Pretty much every argument you have in favor of free speech can be found somewhere in the pages of *Areopagitica*, which is kind of amazing. What is often forgotten is why he wrote it. He didn't write it just for theory; he wrote it because it was a political piece. He was saying, "look, there is a bad law in England and we need to change it." Was that law? It was a law that required the government to approve of and license books before they were published. One of Milton's main arguments in favor of freedom of expression has come to be known more modernly as the marketplace of ideas. When you have free expression, ideas would compete and the best ideas would prevail. Truth would prevail over the long arc of history, this is Milton's idea. What is cool is when we think about what he was writing about that particular law, it looks like he was wrong. He didn't prevail at the time. The law stayed in effect for 50 more years. As far as I know, Milton was dead when the law was repealed. He didn't get to see the

victory that came to be, and yet, in the end, that long arc of ideas, that long arc of history and truth prevailing, that did work because 50 years later the law was repealed and there was free press in England at that time to a degree. I love this stuff. I like freedom of expression. It reminds me of being an undergrad and as you can tell, there's some law school stuff as well. But, I am not an expert in this and so I was thrilled when my colleague, Lee Strang asked me to see if he could present to Senate on Freedom of Expression. Lee is an expert on Constitutional law and free speech and he is a Distinguished Professor at the College of Law. He is going to talk to you today about what I think has become colloquially known as the Chicago statement on Freedom of Expression. I should mention, Lee is here speaking here as Professor Lee Strang. He is not speaking on behalf of the College of Law. This is one of our faculty colleagues who is going to present to all of us. With that, I welcome Lee.

Professor Strang: Thank you, Senator Gilchrist and President Rouillard. And thank you to the Executive Committee for speaking with me two or three weeks ago. I actually approached Senator Gilchrist about this maybe a year ago or early last fall. The reason was, it is the same reason behind the Chicago statement itself. If you've been following the news, you know that at many campuses across the country there's been pressure on free speech and free expression on students and faculty members. The one that stuck in my mind was Evergreen State in Oregon where a faculty member expressed an unpopular view and eventually was run off campus. The Chicago statement was issued by the University of Chicago, as the name suggests, in response to that kind of phenomenon trying to affirm Chicago's historic commitment to Freedom of Expression. I approached Senator Gilchrist and then President Rouillard, and the Executive Committee were generous enough to meet with us a couple of weeks ago. My own view is that the Chicago statement is something that is affirming of what our University has held for years. Just thinking back to our most recent mission statement in 2017, the mission statement actually talks about us as a university, faculty, and students being engaged in research, scholarship and debate. It is the AAUP statement upon which that statement comes from stated back in 1918 and 1940 that freedom of expression of faculty and students is essential to that. Our mission statement also includes a commitment to diversity. One of the things that diversity requires is a variety of different viewpoints, and maintenance of that environment that is welcoming to different viewpoints, plus the ability to engage with people who have significantly different views than we have. One of the things that brought this to my attention was Dr. McKether was presenting to you all two years ago, 2017, about the first diversity survey of faculty, staff, and students. Here is his summary of the faculty's view on that survey. Dr. Mckether said, "*They,*" meaning faculty, "*need to be more tolerant towards diverse and political viewpoints.*" "*If you notice, more tolerance for diverse viewpoints* [this is Dr. Mckether speaking], *that was a theme that I did not anticipate seeing in the data. What people said in those comments, both students and faculty, people who have a certain viewpoint appear to be ostracized and/or silenced.*" He went on to say that he is not quite sure what to do with it, and so my thought was, a Chicago statement is a way for us as a faculty to reaffirm our commitment to that. One of the things we do as faculty is we model the ability to be good citizens towards students and the ability to be good employees, and good friends, and good Americans generally in all of the different facets and conversations that carries on. Adopting the statement of Freedom of Expression would be a way for us officially to model that and then in our classrooms and our interactions with students would be a way to help model that. So I think this is an expression of and recommitment to something that we already hold true. At the same time there's certainly been pressure. I think you all have been briefed in the past about some of the activities that are going on in the State House. So the people in the State House have both the will and the way, the means to be able to impose their will on us. I think their perception is wrong, which is that the University of Toledo among other universities is one-sided in its viewpoints. One way to respond to that is by a public statement that we affirm the Chicago statement, we affirm Freedom of Expression. Then we can take that to our

representatives and push against that misperception. Then relatedly, thinking about alumni and community members, maybe you all remember a couple of years ago, I think in spring 2017, there was the debacle/debate where former presidential advisor, Carl Rove, there was a protest against him and the protest was restricted. In response to that, an organization called FIRE made a big media splash about that and there was an editorial in the Toledo Blade which said, in March of 2017, "Why doesn't the University of Toledo, like other universities in Ohio adopt the Chicago statement?" So I think adopting it would be an acclimation of what we already believe and it will also put to rest claims from people in the legislature and people in the community that we are not welcoming students' viewpoints. So that is my short little spiel, and I am happy to talk or answer any questions people might have. I am not sure exactly what my role is, but I appreciate your time and I think the fact that you all are entertaining this is in itself a healthy sign. Thank you.

Senator Dowd: It is not a question. I am just looking for an example perhaps where the limitations of expression could be justified for the functioning of the university and be a rationale for limited expression. Do you have a specific example I can wrap my brain around?

Professor Strang: Sure. The language is abstract, there is a lot of things universities do. I was thinking about what would be some examples of limitations, so I appreciate your question. I think this brings to light two different ways in which this statement principals would manifest itself. One is the classroom, which is my direct response to your question. In the classroom, it is not just that students can say whatever they want whenever they want, right? Instead, faculty have the expertise and academic freedom to maintain the classroom for its pedagogical purposes. So sometimes when I teach free speech it would be appropriate for me in the context of discussion and purposes of free speech and the marketplace and ideas to have really wide open debate and conversation. But there is also other subjects in which unconventional viewpoints and unconventional ideas would not be appropriate to the subject matter at hand. So I think the classroom is a prime example of that. There is one other category where I think it is less likely for there to be threats to the institutional ability of the university, and that is the ability for student groups to host speakers. The university has a public space policy that was adopted I think a year ago in response to the Carl Rove debacle and I think that is right on point. It is a set of neutral—in other words, not depending on a viewpoint—time, place and manner restrictions. I know the College of Law, we have one for our internal usage; I assume most other colleges and departments have something like that as well. And so there, I think it is clear that having those neutral to have time, place, and manner regulations that is necessary for the function of the university; you can't have two groups at the same place at the same time. But I think those kind of conflicts are few and in between.

Senator Dowd: Thank you.

Senator Molitor: This question is for the Executive Committee. Suppose we approve this, what is the next step? Are we the only body that will look at this? Will it go to the Provost or the Board of Trustees next? What is the process?

President Rouillard: I assume it would go up the chain. I certainly would at least notify the Provost Office and the Trustees that we endorsed this. It would be up to them if they wanted to take any action of their own.

Senator Gilchrist: May I speak to that for a minute?

President Rouillard: Yes.

Senator Gilchrist: I think this would actually just be an expression from the Faculty Senate as it is written. I should point out as I read this, Professor Strang, correct me if I am wrong, this has no function. There is no actual mechanics. This is merely expressive and it is the expression of the Faculty Senate. The process I would envision, if Senate is interested in, is we take time for everyone to consider this and we have a motion to adopt the statement, second that motion at a future meeting, and then we vote whether to adopt the statement after that.

Professor Strang: That was my initial view of bringing it before the Faculty Senate was, this is the faculty as a body's view on this discussion.

Senator Nigem (substitute for S. Said): Just a quick question. Is this meant to supplant an already adopted expression on campus policy that was revised in 2018?

Professor Strang: It is not. This is not a policy so it has no juridical authority. I think that policy that was adopted supports this statement of expression. In other words, the policy deals with outdoor space usage and activities. I think that is clearly in line with this. In fact, I worked with University Council in drafting that policy and I also worked with FIRE, the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education to craft that policy, so I think this is their....

Senator Nigem (substitute for S. Said): Is this just basically the template that FIRE had. Are there any significant differences between the template from FIRE and Freedom of Expression?

Professor Strang: This is the template from the University of Chicago. I just basically cut and pasted their resolution, changed it to fit our mission more closely than the University of Chicago State did.

President Rouillard: Senator Heberle, did you have a question?

Senator Heberle: Yes. I am just wondering why we need this.

Professor Strang: Sure, that is a great question. I think one answer is, we don't need it; at least, I haven't seen a lot of evidence of needing it internally. I mentioned two sources of evidence external to the university that we need it. Before the Ohio legislature now, is the so-called FORUM Act and the FORUM Act ties public funds to the university adopting policies that we may agree with or we may not agree with, but it will certainly be a significant change in the legislature's historic approach to the university's own governance of its free speech. There's the public perception which I think the Blade editorial represented. Also, I have had our Student Government President come to us, the College of Law School Student Government President and one of the things he said was that students as a group, his impression is are reticent to have robust debates about issues that he had seen in the past or he would find conducive to his own education attainment. One example he cited was one of the student group's signs consistently gets torn down. It is a modest piece of evidence that some viewpoints are not as welcome as others, but I don't think there's a huge problem. It would be valuable in the sense of if you are one of those students whose group's signs are getting torn down or if you are one of those students in the class who perceive him or herself as being 'I am a minority viewpoint'—it could be a religious point or it could be a sexual viewpoint etc.—and having this statement behind you would build the culture of free speech that we already have commitments to and it would be a further strength of that culture. So I don't think there's a huge problem, but I think there are external problems and some modest internal problems.

Senator Heberle: I just want to clarify if you don't mind, President Rouillard that we are not voting on this today, right?

Professor Strang: No.

Senator Lee: I can give a little bit of a perspective from the Ohio Faculty Council because they are looking at the legislation with that format since we have a new general assembly we have to reintroduce now---

Professor Strang: It was reintroduced.

Senator Lee: Okay. So what OFC is looking at is, is this necessary because it basically is saying, yes, we affirm the freedom of speech supported in the Constitution. OFC and other statewide bodies in education are looking at it and saying, well, no, it is not necessary because passing these sorts of things reaffirms why we don't need an extra legislation in Ohio to try to find public spaces for freedom of expression or especially to define the university as a separate public space than other public spaces when it comes to freedom of expression. So from the Ohio Faculty Council's perspective, and I would say from the perspective off the Department of Higher Education, they tend to look at this as more evidence for legislatures to say that the universities in Ohio are not one-sided and are not trying to indoctrinate with regard to free speech allow for views on all sides

Senator Heberle: I just looked up the Forming Open and Robust University Minds Act. Is that what we are talking about? It was sponsored by the American Legislative Exchange Council, ALEC, so if any of you are familiar with ALEC, you would know what spirit this Forming Act is. Always, myself very wary of the principle things like this, where they are coming from and what they mean in terms of why they would be there. I don't know how I feel about that, but I think I know how I feel about this and so that is informative.

Senator Gilchrist: I don't know about ALEC, but I have heard about this legislation both from Senator Lee and Professor Strang. I think it might be useful because it sounds very problematic to me. To put a point on it, one of the expressive values of this is insurance against legislation that I think we really do not want to see. It might be useful. I think Senator Lee and Professor Strang gave a little more information about what sorts of things are being proposed.

Professor Strang: I am definitely not an expert in that, other than over the last few years every session there has been legislation introduced like the (unintelligible) Act to rectify perceived one-sidedness universities---I don't know if that is Senator Lee's perception.

Senator Lee: That definitely fits ~~is~~ my perception. I don't know what previsions remain to be reintroduced because as you know, they provide the template and then once it is introduced then the individual states modify that in committees and such, so I don't know what provisions are in effect. I know one concern would be, the IUC and the Department of Higher Education is looking at, to see if any legislation goes forward that it would include a cap on individual institution's contributions towards security costs for events so that the cost doesn't become a way for the university to deny an event. They are looking to kind of introduce almost a poison pill into it that says the state will pick up the cost over the cap and remove that incentive from the university denying events due to security cost… (unintelligible).

Senator Nigem (substitute for S. Said): I would like to thank you for bringing this forward. I've been a longtime supporter and advocate for FIRE. I highly recommend that we seriously consider endorsing this because we are not alone; we are in great company with other major universities that have adopted the Chicago statement and have found it to be for a very worthy cause.

Professor Strang: Thank you. One comment on that. I was at Princeton this year and Princeton was the first adopter after Chicago. That adoption grew out of the intellectual climate, they have that. Now, of

course, it is not just due to that, but I think it manifests that when you have that vibrant intellectual climate, this is the kind of statement that expresses one of the reasons for that.

Senator Keith: So if we are not going to vote on it today, I suggest that you, Linda, as President of Faculty Senate send it out to the full faculty so that we can bring it up at department meetings and have conversations with each other about it; because if it is going to be limited to just Faculty Senate voting on it, I am not sure the information is going to be disseminated to quite the extent that it would be if it went to full faculty.

President Rouillard: Sure, we can do that. Anything else?

Senator Gilchrist: Is there any further action, I guess the question should be?

President Rouillard: I think we should wait on that. We can bring it back once the full faculty body had a chance to look at it. We could perhaps do that at the next meeting which would be on March 12.

Professor Strang: Thank you so much. Thanks, President Rouillard.

President Rouillard: Thank you both. Is there any other business? Items from the floor? Are there any announcements? Is there anything else? Is there a motion to adjourn? Meeting adjourned at 5:38 pm.

IV. Meeting adjourned at 5:38 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by: Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard

Mark Templin   Faculty Senate Office Administrative Secretary.

Faculty Senate Executive Secretary