

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of December 7, 2021
FACULTY SENATE

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

Approved @ FS on 1/18/2022

Summary of Discussion

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

President Bigioni: Okay, I have 4 o'clock, so I will call the December 07th Faculty Senate meeting to order and ask Secretary Nigem to call the roll.

Present: Anderson, Baki, Bamber, Barnes, Bigioni, Bornak, Brakel, Chou, Compura, Coulter-Harris, Day, Duhon, Edgington, Elgafy, El-Zawahry, Gilstrap, Green, Gregory, Guardiola, Hall, Hanrahan, Harmych, Hefzy, Insch, Jayatissa, Kistner, Koch, Krantz, Kujawa, Lammon, Lawrence, Lecka-Czernik, Lee, Lipscomb, Metz, Milz, Modyanov, J. Murphy, Niamat, Nigem, Pakulski, Pattin, Ratnam, Reeves, Reynolds, Rouillard, Shan, Smith, Stepkowski, Steven, Teclehaimanot, Topp, Van Hoy, Vesely, Wedding, Welsch

Excused Absence: de le Serna, Duggan, Huntley,

Unexcused Absence: Ali, Case, Chaffee, Chaudhuri, Garcia-Mata, Perry

Senator Nigem: President Bigioni, we do have a quorum.

President Bigoini: Great. Thank you very much, Secretary Nigem. So, our next item of business is the approval of the Minutes. The November 23rd Minutes have circulated. There were various late corrections that were done and so you haven't had them that long. But if anyone has any corrections to point out, please speak up. Okay. Barring corrections, we will approve the Minutes by general consent unless there are any objections. Okay, hearing none. We have approved the Minutes. *Minutes Approved.*

We can now move on to our next item of business, which is the *Executive Committee report*: I'll start with our meeting. The Executive Committee met with the Provost and covered a few different topics. The first topic of which was just the general RCM discussion since it is always on everyone's mind and people are constantly thinking of issues to pay attention to. The talk really centered around trying to build transparency into the governance structure of the new budget model. The concern there is if transparency in the sharing of information is subject to the personality, so to speak, of the dean of each individual college, there will be a lot of heterogeneity across the University and so some colleges will be more transparent than others, in other words. There's a desire to build-in a more rigorous structure so that that transparency is determined by that governance structure, rather than who is the dean at that time. I'll touch back on that point in a moment because we had a discussion following that meeting with the Provost that was insightful.

The Provost actually requested that we supply a person to serve on the committee to recruit the new Vice Provost for Online Programs. After some discussion we had decided that Senator Berhane Teclehaimanot would be an excellent choice since his research aligns very well with the

goals of that new position. So, he has since been appointed to that committee. And again, we, thank him for his service on that committee.

We also had some discussion about an apparently new process to bring about new program proposals. There's a step involving consulting with the Provost Office to prescreen the proposal before going about the usual mechanism of creating the program and passing through the CIM system and all the usual steps. And so we had a robust discussion around that. The concern on the Provost side is just to make sure that the proposal is relevant and doesn't step on other programs' toes, and so on. I don't know how well I am characterizing that from the Provost side, but from our side, the issue is quite clear, and that is curriculum is generated by the faculty. It seemed like perhaps a departure from our usual way of generating new curriculum, new programs, new offerings. That discussion continues, but that is something that we need to pay attention to and resolve.

I'll circle back to this issue of budget oversight. After that meeting we had further discussion about the RCM model and how transparency might work. It's clear that there's a lot of heterogeneity currently across colleges. Because things are early, there's a lot of uncertainty, a lot of flux, a lot of thinking through the problem that's happening at different rates in the individual colleges. But we did have an opportunity to look at a budget oversight committee for one of the colleges that had been proposed. We spent some time thinking and discussing it and noticed two points of concern.

The first is larger colleges will have many departments. So let's say a college might have maybe a dozen departments; if one wants to have faculty representation from each department, and perhaps even staff representation from each department, that already becomes a very large committee. It becomes unwieldy and perhaps might be ineffective under its own weight. So that might be a concern for larger colleges.

But the second point that was a more significant concern for us was that there has been a discussion that the Faculty Senate and the Graduate Council should have seats on these committees, in order to be able to report back to a more central audience to have some sort of more central oversight over this distributed process. It's not clear that is happening yet. That has to be paid attention to so that we can ensure the appropriate representation from GC and Faculty Senate in order to fulfill our constitutional obligations for budgetary oversight.

We spoke to Dr. Postel about this already and of course, he recognizes that that's certainly an important issue. And, of course, we'll have discussions with the Provost at our next meeting around this point as well. But again, I will emphasize that it is still very early. There's still a lot of change going on. A lot of flux. A lot of thinking through the problems. So no need to be alarmed by anything, but just paying attention to the details so that we can get this right as early as possible.

Moving on, President-Elect Inch and I had a meeting with President Postel last week. And of course, we talked about those issues, but we also talked about recruiting. He spent a bit of time talking about our progress in recruiting administrative positions, the VP of Advancement. The update there is that there is a final candidate that has been selected and there's some negotiation

going on now to settle that and get that person into their position. The Vice Provost for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion, that search is ongoing with about two dozen candidates. The goal there is to have that position filled and that person in place sometime this spring. The Athletic Director position is a little earlier in its search process, but there is a lot of interest. The target is to have that position filled by May 1st. And then there are other searches going on for the Pharmacy dean [and] of course, the VP for Online Programs that we talked about. Those committees have been formed and are beginning their work. There are other searches to come in Student Affairs, and Libraries, and other positions.

We also talked a little bit about the new infrastructure bill that the Biden administration has signed into law, looking to see if there are opportunities for us to access funds from that legislation. There were no specifics, but certainly the administration is working diligently to identify any opportunity for funding possible. Let's see. That covers the meeting with the President.

I would also like to note that we've since scheduled a meeting with the Board of Trustees to discuss the Constitution. We wanted to keep that meeting very small for different reasons. One, is just for scheduling purposes. But also a large meeting has a very different dynamic than a small meeting. I think it would be prudent to have the dynamic of a small meeting for this particular discussion. That is scheduled for January 5th. We will report on the results of that in our first Faculty Senate meeting in January. We'll also have a discussion about where we are on the Constitution later in this meeting. In principle, we would be doing a first reading of the Constitution, but there may be a shortcut around that. So that will be discussed during Mark Templin's presentation from the Constitution and Rules Committee later in this meeting.

I'd also like to report on the Academic Misconduct Policy that has been worked on, on and off for some time now. There's been an effort between Graduate Council and Faculty Senate to get that policy across the finish line. We've constituted a small working committee composed of three people representing each GC and Faculty Senate. The goal is to take the existing two or three-page proposal and modify it accordingly, as informed by all the work that has been done up until this point by the previous incarnation of that committee, and be able to report to both Faculty Senate and Grad Council around the end of January in order for those two bodies, the senators and the counselors, to provide feedback that then that committee can take and work back into that policy, and then present it about a month later for a final approval, and then pass it on to SLC in the usual process. So that is the goal. The six people on that committee, on the Grad Council side, it will be co-chaired by Mike Dowd, along with Patty Relue and Geoff Rapp. And on the Faculty Senate side, it will be co-chaired by Tim Mueser, along with Bob Topp and Dan Compora. So I thank all of those people for their service on that committee and their dedication to getting that policy wrapped up and back on the books.

Finally, I just like to point out that Dr. Bill Ayres will be leaving us to go on to bigger and better things. We appreciate his service to Faculty Senate. He chaired the Academic Regulations Committee this year. And so of course, I'll be looking to you to all to replace his leadership position. But nonetheless, we really appreciate Dr. Ayres' service to Faculty Senate and to UT

over the years. We wish him the best of luck as he goes on to do bigger and better things for Kent State University. Thank you very much, Bill. I really appreciate it.

That will conclude my Executive Committee report. Are there any questions?

Senator Krantz: President Bigioni, in the discussion of representatives on the Budget Advisory Committees, in previous discussions we've had in Faculty Senate it is going to be two levels, one at the college and university. To be clear, our representatives from Faculty Senate are still going to be on the college level committees, the university level committees, or all of the above.

President Bigioni: So the working idea that we have right now is that each of those colleges will have faculty representatives, but specifically a faculty senator, or at least a Faculty Senate representative on each of those college committees. Then each one of those Faculty Senate representatives would come back to a standing committee, a Faculty Senate committee, and report back to that committee. That standing committee, which would need to be created because it doesn't currently exist, that will be composed of all of those college representatives. Does it make sense? I don't know how well I said it.

Senator Krantz: Thank you.

President Bigioni: You're welcome. Thanks for the question. Any other questions?

Senator Rouillard: President Bigioni, this is Linda Rouillard. I'm wondering if the composition of those college level committees could be more representative, rather than appointed? I think that may have to be something that is stipulated by the President and the Provost. As you pointed out in your report, certain larger colleges with lots of departments might, in fact, generate slightly unwieldy committees. But, if at least departments could select their own representative to send to those college advisory committees, or if a couple of departments can select their own representative collectively, I think that would be more helpful. Right now, it looks like some of the deans are thinking that they can appoint. Even if there are nominations, it's still rather troubling that the dean appoints the members of that committee. I think that might be something that the President and the Provost could take up and establish more regular membership to those committees. Thank you.

President Bigioni: That's a great point. To take that one step further. In principle, that could be voted on at the college level just like a CCAP ballot, voting people onto the oversight committee. I suppose it could be limited one per department, but nonetheless, have sort of an organic kind of vote to populate. Your point is very well taken, the population coming from either the faculty or the departments. Up from the faculty or the departments, rather than down from the dean. Excellent point. Thank you. Any other questions or comments?

Assistant Dean Pollauf: President Bigioni, this is really for Dr. Ayres, but also for anyone who may have an opinion or information about it. With the change in the Graduation with Honor's policy to be University of Toledo cumulative GPA instead of higher ed., is it expected that other practices and standards that rely upon higher ed. GPA may also be examined?

President Bigioni: I will happily defer to Dr. Ayres.

Dr. Ayres: Kim, that is an excellent question. We've had discussions within the Academic Regulations Committee, as it currently stands about continuing this work. And yes, going on to look at other policies that are sort of in line with this. But there haven't been any specifics, and since I'm stepping out of that role, I don't have any specifics to offer. But I would encourage you to continue to ask that question of the committee going into next semester.

Assistant Dean Pollauf: Thank you. And congratulations.

Dr. Ayres. Thank you. Thanks, Kim. I appreciate it.

President Bigioni: Okay, thanks for the question. Are there any other questions or comments? Hearing none. We can move on to the Provost report. Provost Bjorkman, the floor is yours.

Provost Bjorkman: Thank you, President Bigioni. Good afternoon, everyone. We are fast approaching the end of the fall semester. Hard to believe. Although, on the other hand, I can believe it. With classes ending this week, and final exams next week, and in less than two weeks, we'll be holding our fall commencement where 1,977 students are scheduled to graduate with their University of Toledo degrees. That includes 85 doctoral degrees and 487 master's degrees along with the undergraduate degrees. I know that the last 21 months have been extremely stressful for all of us. And I am very appreciative of all your efforts on behalf of our students. I hope that you'll be able to participate in the commencement ceremonies on December 17th, which is the graduate and doctoral ceremony and the 18th, which are the two undergraduate ceremonies as we recognize our students' achievements and celebrate their success.

On another note, I wanted to remind you that this week the undergraduate research exhibition is being held. It's on the main floor of Carlson Library. Posters of student research, scholarship and creative activities projects will be on display for the entire week. I hope you'll be able to stop by and support our students. On Friday morning from 9 to 10:30 a.m., students will be present to talk about their research and answer questions. There will be a special closing ceremony at 10:30 a.m.

Also, I want to provide you with a brief update on the University's new strategic planning committee. As many of you know, this is the 5th and final year of our current strategic plan. The newly appointed Strategic Planning Committee has now begun its work to develop a new plan that will be in place by July 1, 2022. They're actually meeting right now. Last week the committee sent out a survey to all faculty, staff and students asking for input. They sent out a reminder again yesterday. I know it's a really busy time for faculty and everyone, but I hope you'll take a few minutes to complete that survey. Your thoughts and suggestions really are important as the Committee begins to consider what priorities and goals we want to set for the next few years. There's a link to the survey on the new strategic planning website at [www.utoledo.edu/strategic plan 2022](http://www.utoledo.edu/strategic%20plan%202022). The Committee is also planning to hold some town hall meetings and other input sessions during the spring semester. The planning process is intended to continue through June 2022, with hopefully a final strategic plan being presented the 1st of July.

I also want to mention to you that our Early Registration Campaign is still underway with the goal of getting our current students registered for the spring semester before they leave for winter

break. As of yesterday morning, we still have about 2,300 students who are not yet registered. But we have found that many of these students are being very responsive to reminder emails and other communications that they receive. So, I do ask for your help and getting this message out and reminding our students to register now before they leave for the winter break.

I also want to remind you that nominations for our 2022 Distinguished University Lecturers will be due on Friday, January 28th. We will be sending out an email this week to all faculty, announcing that deadline with a link to the Provost Office website for information on the guidelines for nomination.

In closing my remarks today, I want to take the opportunity to wish everyone a very joyful and restful holiday season. As I said earlier, the last 21 months have been extremely challenging and demanding, and I truly am grateful for the hard work and commitment you've had to our students. And with that, I'd be happy to take any questions that you may have Thank you.

Senator Lawrence: I have a question for the Provost. Have there been any discussions in the Provost Office regarding the academic events on campus in the light of the new parking operations that are on campus where, if we host an event, it could be a public meeting, it could be a seminar, it could be a conference, we, our colleagues in Music and Theater constantly host events, departments are now going to be charged some fairly excessive fees to secure parking lots for large events. I'm wondering if there's been any discussion about the implications and impacts that might have on our ability to afford and provide visitors opportunities to come to campus? I'm thinking of the larger events, not department guests or smaller events, but when large parking lots would be necessary. I assume athletics have some arrangements in place, including what is happening today and tomorrow. So, where does we stand in terms of provision for academic departments holding such events with a large number of our guests needing to park?

Provost Bjorkman: Thank you, Patrick. That's a very good question. And I will tell you that there have been many robust discussions because I, too am very concerned about that. We are a university and we want to welcome and embrace our community on our campus. I would say that some of those issues have been resolved. Some of those issues are still pending. We have had many, many discussions about that. I won't tell you that the problem has been resolved yet. It is still a conversation in process.

Senator Lawrence: Thank you.

Senator Edgington: I got a few emails earlier today from faculty, regarding the new vice provost for online education position that was talked about in the email yesterday. Some of the emails just asked about what the position is. But there's also some discussion about whether this signifies in any way a change in philosophy here at UT in online education. And if it signifies an increase in what online education will be here at the University. Can you speak to that at all?

President Bjorkman: Sure. Thank you, Anthony. That's also a good question. President Postel has been really committed to growing our online presence. We have a number of really robust and good programs online. A lot of good courses are online and faculty have done a lot of work

to have their courses Quality Matters certified. I mean, they are really good courses, but we haven't done a very good job with marketing them. So he felt it was important that we have a specific person whose job it is to pay attention to online courses and how we market it, how we develop it, and how we engage faculty in thinking about things that are well suited for online. We've had lots of conversations about the fact that we live in a community that has a very low rate of bachelor's degree attainment and we would like to help with that, and for people who are working, or who have aspirations to try to go back and finish a degree, or to even just gain some experiences or a certificate that might improve their capabilities in their existing jobs. Those are often things that are really right for online. But we haven't had necessarily the focus on the kinds of things that we've needed to do with that. So he has set this as a strategic initiative of his where we will be hiring a person to oversee that process. There was discussion about where the position should that live and ultimately, my feeling was, this is an academic process. It has to involve the academic world, and we have to have a lot of say in that. And so it was decided that it would be placed under the Provost's Office so that it signifies that this is an academic endeavor. It's not the kind of thing where you go out and you buy lock, stock and barrel, a whole bunch of courses, not that at all. It's really designed to have a person who can help provide leadership for our online presence. I will tell you also, I had a conversation with Dr. Postel about this just yesterday. And one of the things that we were talking about was that we need to grow our revenue. One of the things he was telling me was that much of the startup funding, will be coming from the Foundation. So he's already talked with them about this possibility. It is an initiative for the University. A lot of this is still, completely being worked.

Senator Edgington: Thank you very much.

President Bigioni: There are a number of comments in the chat box. I see Dr. Rouillard. Mostly pertaining to the parking and additional points. I'll just read two really quickly.

Senator Pakulski says, this is a concern for our annual graduate interview and open house, which generally includes more than 100 students. Without this on-campus event, our recruiting will be greatly impacted. Another important point about the availability of parking and the free parking for these important events.

Senator Gregory also writes, also departments do not have dedicated lines or accounts to pay for parking for spring 2022. So even if they were able to make arrangements for this fiscal year, that is some months where they must scramble to find this in their budget. So, other important points.

I guess one other short point. Senator Jayatissa points out that other universities don't give parking tickets on the weekends. So just a few additional comments.

I'll also point out that we, President-Elect Insch and I, actually did talk to President Postel about the parking issue as well. And just communicating the importance, as the Provost pointed out, that we're a University of our community. It is important that we have as few barriers as possible between us and our community. Being able to bring them onto campus and connect with our community is a vital part of what we do. The President seemed to fully agree and share that viewpoint. So just some additional points.

Senator Rouillard, thank you for your patience. You have another question?

Senator Rouillard: Yes. I just wanted to ask the Provost, given that we have this new position, this new Vice Provost for Online Programs, I take it that, that demonstrates the University's commitment to not engage in third-party vendors for online programs?

Provost Bjorkman: That is my understanding of the intent, yes.

Senator Rouillard: Very good. Thank you.

President Bigioni: Okay, thank you. Are there any more questions or comments for the Provost? Okay, then hearing none, we'll move on to our next item of business. Thank you, Provost Bjorkman.

Our next item of business is a Programs Committee's report from Senator Patrick Lawrence. Senator Lawrence, the floor is yours.

Senator Lawrence: Thank you. Just one second so I can share my screen with my report. So I'm bringing forth a series of recommendations from the committee. President Bigioni, I think the better process here would be to walk through the program modifications, do a vote on that set and then move on to the new programs. I think it is a better process given the number we've got to look through here.

President Bigioni: Okay.

Senator Lawrence: Out of the program modifications, we have a proposal for Biology for within an existing degree to add a new concentration. 120 hours, 34 hours a major. It comes with a series of required courses, a plan of study which is complete. We have the set of learning outcomes for the program that have been identified. The evidence here is that there are students currently running a pipeline. They are not designated from other students. This concentration will allow for better advising of those students towards courses and degree requirement, tracking of their progress towards degree. It comes highly recommended by the faculty, students Registrar's Office, and COGS. Students who choose this concentration will first need to be accepted into the pipeline. It is a new concentration for an existing program.

The next one is a modification to the Chemical Dependency Counseling Certificate. Simply will be adding Counseling 3000 to replace Counseling 2220. These are both existing courses so it is just a changes in a course requirement for that certificate.

Sexuality Studies, Minor. [This] is adding a course, Women's Gender Studies 3600. It is an elective option. It is recommended that would be a good fit for the program. Students [will] take it. And so too add this in among the choices of electives to fill a requirement of that minor.

We have Economics, BA. Adding ECON 1150 as a core required course option. ECON 1150 is already in there. It will stay. This will be added as another alternative required option that students can choose from.

And then finally, the last program modification is in the Data Analytics, BA. This is to include ECON 3300 as an alternative to an existing requirement, which is ECON 3810. So again, it broadens the course options and choices that would be available for students within this major.

Senator Lawrence cont'd: Are there any questions on these five recommended program modifications before we go to a vote? Hearing none. These come as a recommendation from the committee so it does not require a second. So, please go ahead in the chat and vote yes, no, or abstain. President Bigioni, can you just track the votes?

President Bigioni: I see it. Thank you.

Senator Lawrence: Just let me know when I should proceed.

President Bigioni: It is unanimous. I don't have a good tally, but it looks like it is a sufficient number to proceed. *Motion Passed.*

Senator Lawrence: Thank you. The next set of proposals are new undergraduate programs. The first one is a BS in Neuroscience. It comes with a set of requirements under the major. It fills 120 minimum credit hours for completion. It has a list of a series of required courses. Option courses from a list that total 88 hours for the major. We also have a detailed plan of study. We have learning objectives all outlined. We have learning objectives mapped as necessary so the proposal is complete.

We have a series of proposals from Economics. I'm just going to run through because there are sort of two groupings here. There are a group of certificates and a group of two minors. These are all new.

We have an Advanced Quantitative Economics certificate. It's a new certificate. A total of 9 hours, 6 hours are required, and 3 hours elective from a set of courses. We then have a certificate in Advanced Economics. A new certificate 10 hours, 6 hours required, and then 3 hours elective. I have an Environmental Economics certificate. It is a new certificate, 9 hours, 6 hours are required and 3 hours elective. And then we have a new certificate in Public Economics. A new certificate, again, 9 hours, 6 hours required, and 3 hours elective.

And then we have two new minors. One is in Environmental Economics. A new minor, 18 hours, 12 hours are required, and 6 hours elective. And a new minor in Public Economics. Again, 18 hours, 12 hours are required, and 6 hours elective.

Senator Lawrence cont'd: Just to clarify here in discussions with the department and other departments in the college. The idea here is again, to provide a wide range of opportunities for students within our college, and in fact, across the University to be able to select, to choose either a certificate or a minor that the minor would go along with the degree or the certificates, for that matter will stand alone. Covering a wide range of topics related to economics, both certificates and majors. The department feels that there's sufficient interest in demand to offer these. They can offer them based on existing instructional capacity and course offerings, so it's just creating more custom options for students to choose from, if they'd like to add essentially a certificate and or a minor to their undergraduate programs. I'll entertain any questions before we go to vote on

any of these proposals. Hearing none. The committee recommends these for approval. It comes from the committee so it does not require a second motion. So, proceed to vote yes, no, or abstain on these. I saw that there was a question that flashed up there. I didn't quite catch it. I don't want to stop sharing the screen to look.

President Bigioni: I can read it for you.

Senator Lawrence: Thank you.

President Bigioni: From Senator Jayatissa. What are the criteria for a recommendation of a program? If faculty know them, can they be beneficial to prepare program proposals better? It's sort of a side question, not to do with any of these particular program proposals for the vote.

Senator Lawrence: My suggestion there would be to start with a discussion perhaps with the associate dean within your college that oversees the academic programs. And also that might involve engaging, as was mentioned earlier the meeting, a discussion with the Provost Office. Just the basic requirements. They are all built into CIM when you fill out your proposal, but understanding things like the learning objectives, and having a plan of study, and what requirements. It would help, before you went into that sort of on your own, to have a discussion with an associate dean for Academic Programs, and/or someone from the Provost Office to kind of walk you through those requirements. And so that when you go to the effort to put it through your college for approval and it comes up through our committee, all of the elements are there. That would be my recommendation.

President Bigioni: Great. Thank you. To that point, I noticed Provost Bjorkman put a note [in the Chat] during my report. I had mentioned this additional step that you just alluded to, Senator Lawrence. So, Dr. Bjorkman's note is that this additional step is not a prescreening per se, but it's simply to make sure that everyone understands the steps required up through the ODHE level, heading off issues that sometimes derail new programs.

Senator Lawrence: I think it is important to know my role in terms of this committee. None of our work is interfered by that that step. In fact, it's helpful. Occasionally, we will see proposals to come up to CIM. It is helpful to have some of the Provost Office just checking because in the past, occasionally, proposals would come up and would be missing significant, for example student learning objectives or a plan of study. And then it would have to go back through workflow and have to go right back to the originator and be recreated. So, really what you're looking at here is not necessarily an oversight or approval. It's assistance essentially is what it should be viewed as. It just makes the process easier for when it comes through. And ultimately, yes, our committee reviews these, recommends them to Faculty Senate which has the authority over approving academic programs and program modification, so none of that process has changed. It may seem a little more up-front work at the front end by people putting proposals together, but assistants of associate deans or the Provost Office can make the proposal and be complete and will help the process. You can answer any questions folks might have about requirements that need to go in, particularly new programs. That completes my report, and we are up to date.

I just would like to make a general announcement to Faculty Senate that yes, time will move quickly in January and February as it usually does for us. And, if you are aware of your colleagues within your department or college who are considering submitting program modifications or proposals for new programs, [inform them] to get on that work early in the new year so that we can get those through in a timely manner. It will be impacted to some degree by our new move to one-year advanced scheduling for students to register and so we want to do the best that we can. If there are any program modifications that would affect students' course selections and impact registration, having those come through early in the new year would be helpful for all, especially for students. So, just a heads up to folks. No, I don't want you spending your Christmas break or holiday on these but, if you're thinking about it, you should be having those discussions at the department and college levels and plan on bringing those through our committee. We are all caught up to date, so we will be ready beginning of the new year to take new proposals. Thank you.

President Bigioni: Great. Two more points. One is, we didn't formalize the affirmative vote of the last set of items. It was unanimously in favor, 40 yes votes, so those proposals passed.

Motion Passed.

And then one other item Senator Rouillard had added to the chat, a comment related to what you just said, that college curriculum committees should also be reviewing these proposals for the presence of SLOs in the program proposals, as should the department curriculum committee. So, there's some additional information with regard to preparing high-quality proposals.

Senator Krantz: If I may add to that? Once we at the university college level and university level approve, particularly new bachelor degree programs, it ultimately has to be reviewed and approved by the State Department of Higher Education. Their review criteria are considerably different than what we are aware of down here at the level of the University. So getting advice from the Office of the Provost is actually beneficial, far more efficient in the long run in getting a proposed degree all the way through.

President Bigioni: Thanks for your comment. Any other questions or comments?

Senator Rouillard: Yes. Senator Krantz, could you give some examples of what those different criteria are? It would be really helpful for all of us to know that so we don't have to hold up a process. What kinds of criteria are you referring to?

Senator Krantz: It's been a quite a while since I've dealt with proposals at that level. I mean, it's like five or six years ago. It's not specific criteria as much as the emphasis they put on certain aspects of a proposal. They're trying to standardize, unify across the 14 universities in the State system. And they view things differently than we do here locally. Honestly, I can't give you specific details; for one thing, the politics have probably changed in the last five or six years anyway.

Senator Rouillard: Then perhaps what we need to do is to ask the Provost Office for that criteria. I personally, as Chair of my college curriculum committee, would greatly appreciate knowing that. So I'll ask for that. Thank you.

Senator Krantz: Well, Angela Paprocki is here. Angela, from your experience, can you fill in the details a little bit better? And maybe Amy Thompson as well.

Vice Provost Amy Thompson: I was just going to say, as we kind of walk through the process, I mean, we have very prescriptive steps. In the proposal that goes to the state. I mean, it actually walks you through the process as well. So, and David, that may have changed. The process I think is fairly transparent now with the program proposal, it actually goes to the state. So I think it's now very congruent and that's the purpose of why we meet with the program through the program proposal process, to kind of go through those guidelines with them. I think the state forms now are a little bit more transparent than they used to be.

Angela Paprocki: Senator Krantz, are you asking though, if there is a Provost level approval ahead of time?

Senator Krantz: No, the original discussion back in President Bigioni's executive report was interaction with the Provost Office, and Provost Bjorkman was emphasizing that this is advisory and not prescreening. So the point that I was making is that the best advice that can be given to the individual departments or programs that are putting forward a proposal will make it much more efficient in the long run, much more likely to gain approval all the way at the top. That was my point.

Angela Paprocki: Right. And these forms are very good, but what we have found and what we have been helping programs with is really helping them align the outcomes and their courses. I don't know if Dr. David Giovannucci is on here, but we worked through with him. He was the first, I guess, 'guinea pig,' but what we had found was people were getting all the way through the process and then having to go backward and it was just taking more time for them. So we found that this would be kind of helpful for them to work with us to kind of help them understand the forms and really work through that ahead of time. So it is just to help them and to guide them. That's really all it's meant to do.

Senator Krantz: I guess the only other philosophical point that I would make is that we all, in observing decision making, we all are aware that there are the written rules and then there are the individual decisions which are considerably more subjective. So those of you in the Provost Office, who more routinely talk with ODHE, probably have a pretty good idea of the individual personalities and the individual directions of decision making.

President Bigioni: Okay. Are there any other questions or comments on this topic? Hearing none, then, we should move on to the next item of business. So thank you Senator Lawrence, again, for your report.

The next item of business is a Curriculum Committee report from Senator Edgington.

Senator Edgington: Thank you, President Bigioni. I'm going to go ahead and share the screen here. Hopefully, you all can see this. Today we have six new course proposals we are bringing to you along with two course modifications. I will jump in here. The first five of these new course proposals are from the new Neuroscience program we just talked about during Senator Lawrence's report.

NSCI 1000, The Neuropsychiatric Patient. ‘Introduction to the diagnosis, disease and pathophysiology of the nervous system, with an emphasis on live patient interviews, didactic Q and A session with patients, and integration of basic disease pathophysiology with neuroanatomy and neurophysiology.’ This would be a core course for that program.

NSCI 4010, Functional Neuroanatomy. ‘The goal of this course is to provide the student with a detailed understanding of multiple aspects of functional neuroanatomy. The course will cover basic knowledge supported by case studies or relevant current research. Each topic will cover both gross and microscopic structure with an emphasis on understanding how the structure underlies the function.’ And again, this would be a core course.

NSCI 4510, Medical Neuroanatomy I-Topographic. ‘This course is designed for Neuroscience undergraduate students to study the anatomy of the central and peripheral nervous systems. The student will have a solid working knowledge of both the external and internal structure of the nervous system as well as neurological pathways, systems, and circuits.’ This would be an elective course.

NSCI 4710, Biophysics of Excitable Membranes. ‘Overview of major components and physical principles that define function of cell membranes including the structure of cell membrane, presence of pumps, channels and transporters.’ This would be an elective course.

NSCI 4100, Neuroinformatics. ‘Introduction to computational techniques as they relate to the field of neuroscience, with an emphasis on hands-on training and understanding of the processes involved.’ This would be an elective course.

And finally, **ECON 4900, Undergraduate Research Experience.** ‘Undergraduate students will participate in directed research or scholarship activities with faculty mentors.’ And the programmatic supplied here, kind of an overview of how this course will fit into their current program.

Senator Edgington cont’d: I’ll give you a second to look over that, and then ask if there are any questions or concerns about any of the six new core proposals? Are there any questions or concerns? Hearing none as this comes out of a committee and so it does not need a second. It’s going straight to a vote. Please put yes in the chat if you are approving and no, if you are not approving and ‘a’ if you abstain.

Senator Lawrence: I guess this is a point of order, and I apologize. My mistake. We should have approved the courses first before we approved the program, that is my mistake. With catch up, there is a reverse way we should do it. I apologize. I just missed that in the proposal that there were new courses.

Senator Edgington: That was my fault as well Senator Lawrence. Halfway through your report I was going to say something, but at that point, is kind of a moot point.

President Bigioni: I will claim at least some portion of that fault as well. I’m sorry about that. We should have put you guys in a reverse order, or the opposite order. We will do that in the future to avoid those things coming up.

Senator Edgington: It looks like we are okay though because I believe all those course proposals have passed.

President Bigioni: Yes. I lost count, but it looks like it is certainly unanimous. I will count them up. So while you move on, I will count them up. Those are approved. *Motion Passed.*

Senator Edgington: We have two course modifications today. The first is **ART 3950, NMP'D Methods and Practices.** 'Change to course title: Contemporary Design Methods and Practices. Change to long and short titles. Course is not repeatable for credit. No prerequisite for the course. NOTE: Changing title to more accurately reflect content and removing prerequisite which create unnecessary barriers for student registration.'

Then the second modification is **HIM 2210, Medical Linguistics in Ancillary Services.** 'Change to course title: Medical and Pharmacological Terminology. Change to long and short titles. Elimination of summer offering. Course not repeatable for credit. Change to catalog description. NOTE: Changing the title of the course will provide better description of the actual content of the course and many students from other pre-health and allied health programs will be able to benefit from.'

Senator Edgington cont'd: Those are our two course modifications. Are there any questions about either of these course modifications? Hearing none, we can go directly to a vote. So once again, please put yes in the chat if you approve these modifications, no, if you do not, and 'a' if you abstain. It appears those have passed as well. *Motion Passed.*

President Bigioni: Yes. That's unanimous and it looks like a sufficient number of yesses to count as approved.

Senator Edgington: Wonderful. Thank you very much. Just one more note, just to kind of echo what Senator Lawrence was saying. As a reminder with the change to the full year registration, we need to have course modifications in sooner than in the past. I believe the deadline we have said is at the end of February to have modifications in so they will get into the course catalog for when registration hits. So if you are planning course modifications, I would try to get those in as soon as possible. Thank you.

President Bigioni: Okay, thank you for your report.

Senator Lawrence: President Bigioni, point of order. There was a comment made by a senator in regards to no criteria for the Program Committee. I would like clarification if the individual would like to clarify what that comment referred to since I Chair that committee.

President Bigioni: The comment, I missed that. Thanks for pointing that out. The comment was from Senator Jayatissa that says, "That is why I am saying there were no criteria for Program Committee." Senator Jayatissa, do you want to expand on that point so we can better understand your point? Senator Jayatissa, can you unmute and speak? Well, perhaps not. Senator Lawrence, do you want to say anything about that comment?

Senator Lawrence: For the record, you know, there is criteria as to how our committee reviews these proposals. The items that we were expected to look through, we do often myself seek

guidance and recommendation from the Provost Office because there's a lot of experience there in terms of specific requirements. We do make sure that all the elements are in the proposal. We ask our committee members, which represent different colleges to make sure there's no overlap or inconsistency across colleges and course offerings. There is a rather clearer criteria procedure of how this committee functions. We've already pointed out one of the areas in terms of what happens beyond the University to the state level approval and hence the need to consult with the Provost Office. But just for the record, the Committee does have a series of criteria. I apologize for the misstep there in terms of the sequence of courses that should be approved before proposal. That is something that we've actually built into the system. I just missed it with this one here, but otherwise, yes, we do work from series of criteria when we look at these proposals. That's all I want, to make sure that Faculty Senate was clear on. Thank you.

President Bigioni: Thank you for your comments. That sort of thing has happened in the past too, when programs have gotten ahead of course approvals. We end up sorting it out just as we did today. In that sense, all these courses were approved. *Motion Approved*. It didn't invalidate a prior vote, so we're okay. I'll leave it at that.

So let's move on, barring any other comments. Okay. Hearing none, we can move on to our next item of business. And thank you again, Senator Edgington and Senator Lawrence.

Our next item of business is a Constitution and Rules Committee report from Dr. Mark Templin. Take it away, Dr. Templin.

Dr. Mark Templin: Okay. I am going to share my screen. This is the Constitution. My notes say from November 9th. I'm asking for a first vote on the Constitution, the Bylaws, and the Rules. Those are all right there. The Constitution, what we would like to do is go forward with the language that we talked about back in November, so that would be the language that is here in blue and green. There's another spot in the Constitution where changes were made. My understanding is that representatives from the Executive Committee, I believe, will be talking with people from the Board of Trustees at some point in later December or January. And at that time, we can get further clarification on whether these two areas need changing.

But it would be helpful to have Faculty Senate initial endorsement on this document as we move forward. Keep in mind, that a constitution needs two votes. What I am asking tonight, which is a little bit irregular is, at one of these votes we should have a reading of the full document. I've read versions of this to various Senates for the last three years. If I were to read the entire Constitution, Bylaws and Rules, it takes about three meetings to do that. So, I'm asking for an endorsement without the formality of actually reading the whole document at this point. 2/3rds of you know that we read it last year in its entirety, so it has been read in Senate, just not this year's Senate. The only two changes are those two areas that I pointed out in the Constitution. The Bylaws and Rules remain unchanged from last year. President Bigioni, this comes from the Constitution and Rules Committee, so it doesn't need a second. Are there any questions before we vote?

President Bigioni: Let me make a quick comment based upon our conversation yesterday. And that is the purpose of reading the Constitution before a vote is just to make sure that everyone

knows what's in it, what's been changed, and so on, so that no one slips in some sort of strange document and hurries a vote without anyone having an opportunity to see what it is all about. So it is essentially a point of transparency. To Dr. Templin's point with regard to having read it a number of times, there's been plenty of opportunity for transparency, and of course you've received all these documents about a month ago, on November 9th. I put in the chat box initially the 11th, but it was the 9th. So the function of reading through, spending three meeting reading through all these documents again, the value of it is limited. I would just like to put that into context.

Senator Barnes: I am wondering if you could talk a little bit about the change that you have up there right now under letter 'G?' I remember the last time we were discussing this, that there was going to possibly be some negotiation around this change. This seems a pretty substantial step back from the original every two years commitment. Is this sort of the 'best' you could negotiate with this?

President Bigioni: That conversation has not been had yet. That is the meeting that I was referring to on January 5th, when we will sit down with two or three of the Board members to discuss these two points; this, and there's a point just below it. Although, 'G' is the one that causes us concern.

This point in [Article X.] "Interpretation" reads a little clunky. It doesn't change anything for us, so I don't think there's anything for us to be concerned with. I'll defer to Mark if I am being too casual about that point. So that's more a question of just how it reads and how it makes the Trustees look. Point number 'G' is one where we would truly be giving up something, our ability to provide feedback on these various administrators in a regular and predictable way.

Senator Barnes: My understanding was that the hope was that we actually do have a convincing argument for why this assessment is helpful for us, and for the deans and for the upper administration. So, Dr. Templin, what prompted this change at this point before we may be really need to?

Dr. Templin: A couple of things. One, between the first and the second reading, if changes are made, we can bring that back at the second reading. Because we've accepted it here, it does not mean that we can't change it later for the second reading. But, the negotiation in my mind is strengthened if we go forward with, 'okay, this is the document that Senate has endorsed and then the representatives of the Exec. Committee can further negotiate, particularly this point 'G' here. If we can get language closer to or the language that's in red, you know, so much the better. We could put that back in for the second reading.

Part of what prompts this is, it becomes also a time problem. So, let's say Faculty Senate endorses this twice, it has to go out to a vote of the entire faculty and so that process would need to occur starting right around March 1st, in order to have a chance of getting the vote of the whole faculty by the end of the school year. Having one vote done in this term will allow us to move a little faster. I don't remember exactly when Senate is going to meet again, but it's probably going to be mid-to-late January at the earliest and if we've got to get two votes in the January/February time frame, that's really tough.

So, speed is a little bit of the issue and strengthening the hand of representatives who are negotiating is the other part of the issue.

Senator Barnes: Thank you. I really understand the timing issue in particular, and I'm very sensitive to the amount of labor that you've put into this. My question is, I'm not sure that I'm seeing, and I see Robert Topp is asking the same question, I'm not seeing how it's our negotiation advantage to give up the thing that we actually want for this first vote. In fact, it would seem to me that if we would vote in favor of the red language, which if that is in fact what we really want, that would be a stronger negotiating point to say the faculty are really committed to this review process, and in fact we voted for it, rather than to give it up and then try to negotiate it back. Can you say more about your thinking there, Dr. Templin?

Dr. Templin: Well, I guess what I'm thinking is if this gets stalled and strung out for another year, I mean, I suppose we could do that, but I was more counting on the idea that 'cooler heads would prevail' and the folks at the meeting could talk about why the language in red is necessary for Faculty Senate to function, you know, with a little bit more sovereignty. You know, that was my thinking.

Senator Coulter-Harris: Dr. Templin, I just have a quick comment. It seems as if what is written in green states that really there will be no input from faculty on any administrator's performance, unless it's specifically requested by the Board of Trustees. This then creates a deficit of power, doesn't it? The balance of power is then shifted in terms of assessing performances; the balance of power rests in the Board of Trustees heavily, rather than the faculty or the Faculty Senate the way it is written right now.

Dr. Templin: With regard to these reviews, that's correct.

Senator Coulter-Harris: Yes, and that is troublesome.

Senator Inch: I think the challenge, though, is that the Board of Trustees by virtue of Ohio State law basically has that power. So, no matter what we do they can say, 'no, you can't do that,' particularly when it comes to evaluation of administrator because that's their purview. That's what they're responsible for. So the thought process was that, go ahead and just get something passed that we know that they will go through, e.g. approve. Right now they've told us that the red language is not going to work. It has to be the green language. So we're trying to move the ball down the field and then if we get whatever we negotiate in the meeting with them on the 5th, then we can make an amendment and at that point, add that language in, and then vote on the new language.

I'll also probably say that I think part of this is just kind of a general misunderstanding, I hope. I don't think that their intent was to cut us out of the process. I think they were just trying to protect their right by law to be the person that does performance evaluations of administrators. And so I think they kind of thought this might be impeding upon that, and that's clearly their purview. I think that might be something we could talk about and say, that's not really the intent. The intent is basically to provide the faculty an opportunity to kind of opine about the administrators that are supervising them and then that information would be available to the

Board if they so desired. Anyway, that's just kind of my perception and if I've got that backward or something, President Bigioni, you might be able to help me out.

Senator Coulter-Harris: Thank you, Senator Insch. That is more understandable.

President Bigioni: No, I think you have it just right.

Senator Hefzy: I have a question, Dr. Templin.

Dr. Templin: Okay.

Senator Hefzy: Is the president considered a senior administrator?

Dr. Templin: Well, yes. The way the green language reads, it's the performance of the president or other senior administrator, which would be presumably provost, vice provost----

Senator Hefzy: This is what I am alluding to. If the president is considered a senior administrator, why not make the green language simpler by saying, 'on the performance of senior administrators' when their input on performances is easily requested by the Board of Trustees? That is under the assumption that the president is considered a senior administrator.

Dr. Templin: Keep in mind the green language is what we got from the Board of Trustees' legal team. So, the Constitution and Rules didn't wordsmith the green language, other than those three words that are in blue there, because there is an issue of time frame. Yes, if Faculty Senate has time it could go back to the whole faculty and do a thorough performance review. But if, you know, they come and say, within 48 hours, you need something. Well, that's going to be a matter more for just Faculty Senate itself. So, the only thing that was changed from the Board of Trustees' legal counsel language was the words in blue right there.

Senator Hefzy: Thank you, Dr. Templin.

President Bigioni: There are a few comments in the chat. There's some similarity, but I'll read through them all. Dr. Pollauf says, otherwise assessment is on the side at the request of the Board of Trustees, so they are the only individuals not regularly assessed. True.

Senator El-Zawahry says, this places the Senate at a position of no power at all with regard to these assessments. That's true. We would only be able to do the assessments at the request of the Board. He also states, what if the Board is not performing at the level of expectations, do they have infinite power with no limits? I don't know the answer to that question. Certainly not 'infinite power.' I think they are limited by the governor. Dr. Templin, do you have any comment to that?

Dr. Templin: Well, there is no formal process for that, other than, you know, notice the preamble to Article Two: "*The Faculty Senate may consider any subject pertaining to the interests of the university and to act in the name of the faculty in making recommendation to administration on these matters.*" So, 'power' is not through a formal procedure of review as much as it gives voice to the faculty. And so the preamble really protects our voice as Faculty Senate. What's being taken away is if 'G' is accepted as the green language and blue language

suggest, then there is no formal review of deans and senior administrators that Senate would have the power to do as a matter of routine business.

President Bigioni: With any kind of predictability and regularity.

Senator Barnes: I just wonder from a negotiation standpoint, it seems illogical to me that if we give up the thing we want in favor of the language that they submitted, it seems like, from my perspective we would have very little chance of regaining that territory in private negotiations. I think I would be in favor of striking the language altogether. And I would feel really comfortable saying that I really want the Executive Committee to negotiate with those Board members. But I think it sends a message that this is a really important priority for the faculty to have a say. And hopefully, those of you who will be doing the negotiations can explain to the Board where we have been as an institution historically and why this is really important to us. To me, to vote the language that they recommended even in principle is really giving away more than we need to at this juncture. Especially, Dr. Templin, I mean, I'm really hearing you say, getting a vote now is important because of the timing and the amount of 'agonizing' time it takes to hear this entire constitution and we really want to have a vote. So, I really get where you're coming from. From my perspective, though, I think it would be better to say we're not going to speak on 'G,' or leave in the red line and say we're voting in principle on the red line, knowing that this is a point that needs to be negotiated later. I hope that makes sense.

Senator Krantz: I agree completely and emphatically with Senator Barnes. We are conceding a negotiating point and it's not going to be returned to us even if we have a discussion with representatives from the Board of Trustees, we're never going to get that back.

President Bigioni: Dr. Templin, again, correct me if I am wrong. What we're proposing that we do now is to do two things: One, is agree to waive the first reading. And then two, do a first vote on this changed new Constitution, Rules and Bylaws documents. Is that right, Dr. Templin?

Dr. Templin: Yes, although it sounded as if Senator Barnes made a motion. That motion would need a second and then we could vote on striking the green and blue language of Article II, G. and then vote. So either that language stays in or it leaves, and however that vote comes out, then we can move to the vote on the main motion of the Constitution and Rules Committee, which was the endorsement of the documents as a whole.

President Bigioni: Is there no vote on waiving the first reading? Have I gotten that wrong?

Dr. Templin: I was just taking that as if people object.

President Bigioni: Do that by general consent?

Dr. Templin: Right.

President Bigioni: I see. Okay. Then we should deal with this language first.

Senator Krantz: President Bigioni, can we ask Senator Barnes, for clarity, to restate specifically what her proposal is?

President Bigioni: Please.

Senator Barnes: Well, you act like I can remember what I said. <laughter> What I was suggesting is that we not include the green language. You know, I am open to suggestions here. Perhaps it would be powerful to leave it in red line indicating that we recognize that the Board and the Faculty Senate have competing interests here and that we recognize that there's going to be some negotiating on letter 'G.' But from my perspective, I think as I already said, I don't think it's in our interest to capitulate on the language and then try to gain it back. So, how do you feel Dr. Templin about leaving in red line if we're going to offer some kind of vote in theoretical support for the rest of the document, which we've already read and negotiated? Would that work for you? Is there a reason not to do it that way?

Dr. Templin: It's fine with me. In essence, what we're doing is striking 'G,' but leaving it in there so that when it goes to the January 5th meeting, everybody at the table can see the various versions of. But as an official matter, 'G' is struck at that point and then some version of 'G' would have to be added in during the second reading, which is fine.

Senator Barnes: I mean, I'm curious to hear what folks think about that, if we strike it, are we already giving away too much of what we think is important?

President Bigioni: Can I ask a question? I thought, at least initially I heard your motion as to vote on the contents of these documents, including only the black and red text, omitting the blue and green text? Is that a simple way of stating your motion?

Senator Barnes: At least the green for letter 'G.' I mean I'm taking your word for the other green, that that's not highly problematic for us. I'm content with that motion unless somebody has a better idea that accomplishes the goal that we're trying to get here.

President Bigioni: So the way I stated it would set aside the Board request and changes; all the green and blue text, set aside that. Then we could vote on the contents of these three documents to include all the texts prior to the Board of Trustees requested changes, and so that would be the black and red text only.

Senator Barnes: What I heard Dr. Templin saying was that if we vote with the red line crossed out, we're in effect saying letter 'G' does not exist. I don't necessarily think that is in our interest either. Is that what you meant Dr. Templin?

Dr. Templin: Right. So, what you're saying is you would like to restore the original version of 'G'?

President Bigioni: That was the intent of my comment.

Dr. Templin: Right.

Senator Barnes: Yes, I think so. I was thinking, let's vote on it knowing that this is going to be negotiated. But I think we can vote on it, restoring 'G' to its original and still recognize that you folks are going to be meeting with the Board and hopefully [be] able to explain to them why this is really important to us. I'm good with that proposal, unless somebody wants to offer something else.

Senator Rouillard: I'm wondering about the following. What if we kept the green language, but removed the last phrase, "... is requested by the Board of Trustees?" The fact of the matter is, I'm looking at the Ohio Revised codes, laws and administrative rules. As of March 2019, there is a rule about university faculty rules. And one of those is that we establish an organized system of shared governance that is essential to the academic operations of the university, describing roles, rights, responsibilities, etc. It goes on to say, "*Shared governance is a process subordinate to federal and state governmental authorities, the authority of the Board of Trustees, and the delegated authority of the president.*" So that's already a law. But there is nothing that says that Faculty Senate can't solicit input from the faculty whenever we want, about whatever we want. The Board of Trustees is free to take it or not. And, you know, it's as simple as that. But, there's nothing in law that says that we, as Faculty Senate can't solicit input. The Board of Trustees can request it or not; they can listen to it or not. Period. So we could just take their green language and remove the last phrase.

Dr. Templin: It would be a little bit more than that, because you have this "when input." So, what would be removed would be ---

Senator Rouillard: Oh, I'm sorry, you are right. I see what you're saying.

Dr. Templin: It would be that. Then it would just simply say, "solicit input from the faculty or Faculty Senate on the performance of the president, or other senior administrator."

Senator Rouillard: Yes, that is my suggestion.

Senator Barnes: I'm curious to know what folks think about letting go of the sort of structural every two-year piece. I like your suggestion Senator Rouillard, but I am wondering about giving up that every two-year bit.

Senator Rouillard: The two-year part could simply be something that we establish. A cycle could be something that Faculty Senate simply establishes.

Senator Hall: And really, we should have the ability to do so whenever we feel like it needs to be done, regardless of two years.

Senator Steven: I just want to make a comment on what you're saying, Senator Rouillard. Yes, there's no law that the Faculty Senate can collect information and then the Board of Trustees can do what they wish with that information, but it is a law that the Board of Trustees can decide what is in our Constitution. So, they are in control of what wording is in our Constitution. Whether or not we can go ahead and do it even though it's not in our Constitution, that may be true, but they ultimately decide what goes in our Constitution.

Senator Rouillard: So, are you saying then that if we were to take it out of the Constitution, that we in fact might have more freedom to do this?

Senator Steven: I'm just saying that it is not going to influence what we do or do not do. What I'm saying, in terms of what is in the law, is that they can decide what is in the Constitution. And what's in the Constitution doesn't necessarily say what we will or will not do, decided on

independently in separate meetings. That is possible. We can decide to do things like evaluate, but they ultimately decide what is in our Constitution.

Senator Hall: Senator Steven, this is Senator Hall from Pharmacy. According to that logic though, we shouldn't have a constitution at all. I think it kind of argues that 'they do whatever we want' and we have no right to say anything. The idea of the Constitution is to say what we intend to do. And I think that we should put what we intend to do.

And you're right, legally they have the right to alter it to whatever they want, but we should make them do that over our objections for things that we consider to be important. Basically, what they're putting in here is something that is intended to suppress opinions that they don't want to hear. That's my opinion of the change and we do not want them to do that.

So, I think we should change the language "share." I don't think the two-year review cycle is necessary. That is something we just leave up to Faculty Senate as it needs to be determined. I think removing the language that Senator Rouillard had suggested would be the best way to proceed.

Dr. Templin: So, parliamentarily, Senator Barnes has a motion on the floor that has not been seconded. Senator Rouillard has a motion on the floor that's different. Senator Barnes, do you accept Senator Rouillard's changes as friendly amendments?

Senator Barnes: I'm happy to withdraw my proposal if folks think Senator Rouillard's suggestion is a better fit for our intent. I see Senator Topp is still arguing for keeping the red. Make the case, but I think we should decide collaboratively about which process makes the most sense. So my suggestion was to, in effect, leave the red and assume that there's going to be negotiations. And Senator Rouillard's is to accept the green, but strike the last phrase that is right now highlighted in blue (grey, below) on my screen.

Dr. Templin: Okay. So it sounds as if we could vote. If we vote affirmatively on what Senator Rouillard is saying, then it would convert it to the piece in green that it is not where I have underline. If that motion fails, then it would revert to what is currently struck through in red. I would just un-strike through it and put it in black and that would be the version that we'd go with. Does that make sense?

~~G. To facilitate formative assessments of the provost, vice provost(s), and deans at least once every two years (including those who serve in these positions on an interim basis longer than (two years), to ensure accountability and improve administrative performance.~~

Solicit input from the faculty, or faculty senate, on the performance of the President or other senior administrator when input on the performance of the President or other senior administrator is requested by the Board of Trustees.

Senator Barnes: Make sense to me Dr. Templin.

Dr. Templin: Alright. Senator Rouillard's motion, does anybody second that?

Senator Rouillard: Actually, Dr. Templin, I think there are two different things here.

Dr. Templin: Okay.

Senator Rouillard: The motion that I am making is that in the green language, strike the language that goes from "... When input on the performance of the President or other senior administrator is requested by the Board of Trustees." I'm moving to strike that and keep the green. If that fails, we're then back to all of the green, and then we would need another motion to strike the green language and put the red language in black.

Dr. Templin: Okay.

Senator Rouillard: That is sort of how I see it, but maybe others see it differently.

President Bigioni: So, maybe I'll ---

Senator Hefzy: I have a comment Dr. Templin.

President Bigioni: Hang on a moment. Maybe I'll frame this question in a slightly different context. So we will have this meeting in January. And, this Section 'G' will undoubtedly change in some way or another irrespective of what we do today. The question then becomes, what do we want to bring to the table in January? Do we want to start from the red language or do we want to start from the green language, less the highlighted blue (grey) part?

Dr. Templin: Right, so how do we have that vote? That's the problem.

Senator Rouillard: My motion is to take to the January 5th meeting the green language minus what's been highlighted in blue (grey). I think that needs to be voted on. If that fails, then we need to vote on whether or not we go back to the red language and put it in black.

Senator El-Zawahry: This may be another opinion. Can we keep the red and green together?

Dr. Templin: That would be a different motion, but yes, you could.

Senator Smith: Could we put the red and green together, but keep out this last part that has been taken out?

Dr. Templin: We could. So like I say, that would be another motion. I think if we break it down step by step, what I'm understanding, just with the green language, what Senator Rouillard is saying is, just eliminate what I have highlighted there. Can we vote on just that? Whether or not, we put it in the final document or not, does it make sense that if green is in, it would be edited down to, stop at the words 'senior administrator.' I think if we vote on that piece first, then we can decide, all right, then how does the final version that we move forward with include the green language at all? Or do we go back to the red? Or do we have both? I think we need to figure out what the edit is first. Does that make sense?

Senator Rouillard: Yes.

Dr. Templin: So, is there a second on just the edit? Is there support for Senator Rouillard's edit?

Senator Hefzy: I second.

Dr. Templin: So, let's vote on just the edit of the green [language]. Do people support Senator Rouillard's earlier edit of the green language?

President Bigioni: Well, I can do a vote count, but it is clear that the yesses have it. *Motion Passed.*

Dr. Templin: So the green is edited down to that one sentence. Now, do we want it at all? Do we do we want both to appear? Do we want only green to appear? That's the next series of motions to decide.

Senator Steven: I just want to make the comment that there is a huge difference, and we've touched on this before, a huge difference between the red and the green. If we have, as stated in red, consistent timing for the evaluations. That is a lot different than soliciting input at various times. It becomes, as it's been said in the past, a kind of weaponization of the evaluation. If you don't have regular evaluations, when are you going to have an evaluation? Who are you going to 'pick on' to evaluate if you don't do it regularly with everybody involved? So it becomes a very difficult situation if you don't have the red and you don't have it happening on a regular basis.

Dr. Templin: It could appear that way.

Senator Rouillard: So that would mean, amending the green language further to say, regularly solicit input from faculty.

Senator Steven: That would be better. Yes. Or just keep the red, but they don't want that, so that's the problem.

Senator Kistner: The green should end with 'other senior administrators,' plural.

Dr. Templin: Okay. I cannot make changes to the PDF, but I'll go back and change the original document. What we're seeing right now is a PDF, so I can't actually make changes to it on screen.

President Bigioni: Do you have the .doc file handy that you made this PDF from?

Dr. Templin: I can. I'm going to have to stop sharing to go get it.

President Bigioni: No problem.

Senator Rouillard: So, we would need to vote again on this amended language in green?

Dr. Templin: Yes, if we are making changes.

Senator Rouillard: Maybe Senator Steven could make that motion?

Senator Steven: I'm sorry, my thought was either to keep the red or keep the green as we already voted on.

Senator Rouillard: But you've brought up a very good point. What if we said something like, solicit information from faculty or Faculty Senate on a regular basis?

Senator Steven: Right. Yes, I agree with that wording, but I didn't have any wording in mind in terms of a motion. So, if that makes sense in terms of a motion, I would agree with that.

Senator Vesely: So what's 'a regular basis?' Every ten years or every five years?

Senator Rouillard: Something on a two-year cycle.

Senator Vesely: Well, then you are right back to the red. Why don't you just place red back in it and get rid of the green?

Senator Rouillard: Well, I am wondering if 'soliciting input' would be a little softer for the Board of Trustees, as opposed to 'facilitate formative assessments.'

Senator Vesely: I think they can handle it. They don't need it any softer.

President Bigioni: I agree that the softer language is more appealing.

Senator Hefzy: I believe two years is too short.

President Bigioni: It's been our regular practice for I don't know how long, since the merge.

Senator Hefzy: But it is too short. I don't like it here.

President Bigioni: So I don't want to change that many things.

Senator Hefzy: I don't like adding it, because I believe it is too short; I speak for myself.

President Bigioni: I think the fewer changes we make, the better, with regard to this negotiation.

Senator Lee: I'm trying to look at this as if I was one of these administrators, and it might be helpful to know the process and how often I'm going to be evaluated. Also, the statement about ensuring accountability and improving administrative performance, I think these evaluations serve another purpose in recognizing outstanding performance. So as we negotiate with the Board, we don't want to just have a way to provide less than positive feedback, but to really help people, especially if they're building their careers as an administrator, have a record that acknowledges their achievements and contributions to the mission.

Senator Rouillard: That's a good point.

Senator Chou: The green language currently states, 'solicit input from the faculty or Faculty Senate.' This is the constitution for Faculty Senate. So, the language sounds like it is not for us, because Faculty Senate can solicit input from the faculty, but how would we be soliciting input from Faculty Senate, which is ourselves, on the performance of the president or other senior administrators? I believe this language came from the Board, which is from their perspective, right? But I think this is our Constitution, so my suggestion would be, 'solicit input from the Faculty on a regular basis' if that would satisfy our concern, and maybe meet the Board's. I think they may object to "at least once every two years", but we can say, "on a regular basis".

President Bigioni: I think, and again, Dr. Templin, correct me if I am wrong, but I think the blue language was added because of the origin of the request being from the Board of Trustees. If the

Board of Trustees comes to us and asks for input on performance of some senior administrator, if the timeline is very short, then we may only have an opportunity to ask senators and not poll the faculty because of the complex nature of that activity.

Dr. Templin: Right. So ---

President Bigioni: Which means we could strike the blue language as Senator Chou has pointed out.

Dr. Templin: Well, the blue language comes from the Constitution and Rules Committee, the green language came from the Board's legal representation, and the red language is what it was to start with. So, Constitution and Rules thought the blue language was necessary, because as we currently operate, this is on a two-year rotating cycle and it takes a while to get everything together when you know that you need to do it. If somebody just calls the Faculty Senate president up and says, hey, can we have input on so-and-so? Well, you'd be starting from no process at all. You'd have to gear up really quickly. So, it probably wouldn't be possible in a lot of cases to have the faculty provide input. It would just be at best Faculty Senate. So, that was our thinking there.

President Bigioni: So if we are returning this language such that the process begins with the Faculty Senate, then it is very predictable and we don't need this sort of "out" that the blue words provide us.

Dr. Templin: Right. So, we could say, 'to facilitate formative assessments once every two years, the Faculty Senate will solicit input from the faculty on the performance of the president and other senior administrators.'

Senator Krantz: Also recognize that there's a poison pill in this in performance of the president. We, as the Faculty Senate have never done that, and I think that would be a huge no from the Board of Trustees. So, going back to the Senator Rouillard's suggestion and Dr. Templin just made basically the same comment, if we take the phrase 'solicit input from the faculty' and kind of blend it into the existing red, I think we're going to be safe there. But get rid of the 'performance of the president.' That's never going to happen.

President Bigioni: Well, can I comment on that. First, President Postel has said he is in favor of that language. And second, The Board of Trustees wrote that language.

Senator Krantz: Yes, but the Board of Trustees wrote that language with the proviso on their request only. Period.

President Bigioni: Sure.

Senator Krantz cont'd: In which case they will never do it.

President Bigioni: That is true. Again, I remind everybody that this is a starting point, right? And if they if they say strike it, we strike it and we move on. But I would change as little as possible before we talk to the Board of Trustees about it. It's my personal opinion.

Senator Barnes: President Bigioni, when you say change as little as possible, do you mean leave the green or just leave the red with the understanding that there's a negotiation that's going to happen?

President Bigioni: I see merit in both approaches. There is merit in the green in that we're accepting something that they wrote; and taking out the part that could potentially cause problems, the targeting of administrators and the lack of regularity and the lack of predictability in the process. So those are some of the most important negatives of the green as far as I see it. Maybe I'll leave it at that. I see there's a lot going in the chat that I'm missing. It is also getting late so we need to make a decision and take a vote.

Senator Bamber: I just want to say one thing. They want the ability to solicit that input from us. By striking the second half of that green statement, we take that responsiveness away. We could say, solicit input, etc. etc. on a regular basis, or as solicited by the Board of Trustees. And then we take a very tiny change to what they say, reserving our right and preserving their ability to ask us the question.

President Bigioni: This is a good point, because they can do that anyway. And so leaving that language in, I see the point. Leaving the language in changes less and it doesn't take anything away that they can't do anyway. Fair point.

Senator Bamber: Thanks.

Senator Barnes: Senator Bamber, can you say what the 'G' would look like with your suggestion? So maybe then you could make a proposal and we could take a vote?

Senator Bamber: It would help if I can see the original full size green language, but I'll just give it a try here. 'Solicit input from the faculty or Faculty Senate on the performance of the president or other senior administrators on a regular basis, or as requested by the Board.'

Senator Hefzy: Would it make a difference if we say, and/or?

Senator Bamber: I don't think it would be a problem to do that. I think it would be positive.

Senator Hefzy: You can make a friendly amendment to make that 'and/or' as requested.

President Bigioni: Do we want to keep the blue text in? Or is it no longer necessary? If we have 'as requested by the Board,' then maybe it is necessary again.

Senator Bamber: Yes, I think it is.

President Bigioni: Okay. Just as a little bit of sort of bookkeeping, I think this text should start with the word 'to,' 'to solicit.' And then it should end with a period.

Okay, do we have a proposal? Is this good enough for someone to make a motion?

Senator Bamber: Yes, I'll make a motion.

Senator Hefzy: I'll second that.

President Bigioni: Okay. Senator Bamber, can you state the motion?

Senator Bamber: The motion is to rewrite Article II. G to state, ‘To solicit input from the faculty, or Faculty Senate, on the performance of the President or other senior administrators on a regular basis, and/or as requested by the University of Toledo Board of Trustees.’

President Bigioni: OK, great. We have a second and so we can open up the chat box for a vote. Votes are slowing down. The yesses clearly have it, so that motion is approved. *Motion Passed.*

The approved language reads: ‘**To solicit input from the faculty or Faculty Senate on the performance of the president, or other senior administrators on a regular basis. And, or as requested by the University of Toledo Board of Trustees.**’

So we will adopt that green language for the purposes of the next vote. Dr. Templin, you can take it away from there.

Dr. Templin: So the next vote would be, should we keep the strikethrough red language in the version that is going to go forward for the January 5th meeting?

Senator Hefzy: What do you mean keep the red language?

Dr. Templin: Well, right now, this is how we have it. Do you simply want me to delete the language that is in strikethrough red? I suppose the clean version would be just green anyway, the more I am thinking about it. So, I suppose it is up to the small group to decide whether you want the strikethrough version or the clean version. I can get both of those to you.

President Bigioni: Yeah, I wouldn’t worry about that. I think the only vote that we have left is to endorse the documents with ---

Dr. Templin: The documents as a whole, right.

President Bigioni: Right.

Dr. Templin: So please vote on whether to endorse that. That would be this version of the Constitution, and the Bylaws, and the Rules documents, as the first reading of these documents.

President Bigioni: Should we also formally waive the first reading by general consent?

Dr. Templin: Yes.

President Bigioni: Okay, so - Well, go ahead, I don’t want to do your job.

Dr. Templin: Well, the general consent would go first because it is a lower order of motion. So, the issue is, can we vote on these as a matter of general consent without a formal reading?

President Bigioni: Are there any objections? Hearing none, we will waive the first reading. *First Reading Waived.* So now we can go on to the vote.

Dr. Templin: So now the vote is to accept the documents. There will be a clean version where I'll get rid of the red strikethrough and the green and the blue will then appear in black. So vote to approve the parliamentary documents.

Senator Rouillard: Second.

Dr. Templin: Well ---

Senator Rouillard: Oh, you probably don't need me because it's coming from committee?

Dr. Templin: I think the original approval had the committee's endorsement.

Senator Rouillard: Okay.

President Bigioni: Okay, so we just proceed to a vote.

Dr. Templin: Yes.

President Bigioni: Okay, I think votes have slowed down. We do have a few no votes, but the yesses have it. *Motion Passed*. So that will serve as our first vote of endorsement of our new Constitution. Thank you everybody for that.

Any other business to take care, Dr. Templin?

Dr. Templin: No, other than, President Bigioni, I will make the changes in the documents, send you PDF versions of these documents. And I'll send you the redline version as it appears here and the final clean version.

President Bigioni: Okay, thank you very much for your work on this, tireless work on this. We really appreciate it.

Okay, so we should move on with this late hour to Other Business. Well there is none, so just Items From The Floor. I know there was at least one announcement brought up earlier today.

Senator Murphy: I'm sorry, I was having a tough time unmuting. Thank you. Just to reiterate an announcement that the Provost had made about the Undergraduate Research and Creative Activity exhibition. I serve as the Director for the Office of Undergraduate Research, and I just want to encourage everyone to stop by the Carlson Library to see the posters. This is the first time in two years we're able to be face-to-face. We have over 30 students presenting from six different colleges. It's a great mix of non-STEM and STEM. We have 40% are non-STEM and 60% are STEM. So, a lot of variety there. Please consider stopping by this week. From 9:00 to 10:30 a.m. on Friday is when the presenters will be there. Thank you.

President Bigioni: Thank you very much. Are there any other announcements or items from the floor?

Dr. David Kennedy: This is David Kennedy from the College of Medicine. I just have one comment on the floor on the parking situation. Is this an appropriate time to do that?

President Bigioni: Yes.

Dr. Kennedy: Great. So I am aware of several students who are very upset, graduate students, undergraduate students, etc. with the parking situation. In fact, it seems that we've turned our parking over to a for-profit business, which is a conflict of interest with serving our students. I think our students are valuable. I know this disenchant a lot of the students. The students that I talked to have even talked about leaving in an environment like this, where we have decrease enrollment. And also, we will be reaching out to students as future alumni. I'd like to propose that the Faculty Senate address this somehow, maybe at a future meeting and talk about the wisdom of having the current parking situation.

As just a brief example, you know, they just sent around a notice and for me, it's how we could weld our serial numbers to our catalytic converters. I think they should probably spend more of their time and effort keeping our students safe so they don't have to weld their catalytic converters with their serial numbers. That would be a better use of their time, rather than disenchanting them with petty policies. That's my item and I'll mute myself, and I thank you for your time.

President Bigioni: I appreciate the comment. I'll just make one quick comment. In our discussion with President Postel, these sorts of things came up and I've heard various issues about overly aggressive ticketing. And his comment was that they're working through these issues trying to come up with the right formula. As long as we all keep applying these pressures that maybe we have an opportunity to influence that formula to better serve our students. So I appreciate you bringing that up and we'll continue to push on our end. Thank you.

Dr. Kennedy: Thank you for your time.

President Bigioni: Any other comments or announcements? Okay, then I will have one final announcement I suppose. First of all, I want to thank President-Elect Gary Insch for covering for me last meeting. I very much appreciate that and I appreciate all the hard work and support he's done and giving me over this past semester, which was challenging because I had no reduction in my workload when I took on this position and so it's been a challenging semester. I really appreciate his support and the support of all the EC. Next semester will be a lot easier. And, of course Quinetta too, because she's kept my head on straight when I've haven't been able to keep track of anything. So I appreciate all that.

And, of course, all you senators for your service. I greatly appreciate all your contributions to running this institution. And I hope everybody has a great rest of the semester and a great holiday break. You all deserve it. It's been a challenging year, so enjoy the break.

Thank you very much everybody. This meeting is now adjourned. Meeting adjourned at 6:22 p.m.

IV. Meeting adjourned at 6:22 P.M.

Respectfully submitted: Kimberly Nigem
Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard

Faculty Senate Office Administrative Secretary
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

