

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of February 04, 2020
FACULTY SENATE

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

Approved @ FS on 03/03/2020

Summary of Discussion

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

President Brakel: Welcome to our second Faculty Senate meeting in the spring semester. We are going to be cutting it close with quorum right now. Hopefully some people are just tied up in some of the traffic issues between Main Campus and here, and so I am going to proceed with the calling of the roll by our Secretary, Mark Templin.

Present: Anderson, Bailey, Bigioni, Brakel, Bruce, Chou, Compora, Coulter-Harris, De le Serna, Dinnebeil, Dowd, Edgington, Ferris, Frank, Garcia-Mata, Gibbs, Giovannucci, Gregory, Hall, Hammersley, Harmych, Insch, Kistner, Koch, Lammon, Lecka-Czernik, Lee, Lundquist, Menezes, Modyanov, Molitor, Murphy, Niamat, Oberlander, Ohlinger, Pakulski, Reeves, Schroder, Steven, Stepkowski, Taylor, Templin, Thompson-Casado, Weldy, Zhang

Excused Absence: Barnes, Case, Duggan, Gray, Heberle, Hefzy, Jayatissa, Longsdorf, Maloney, Nigem, Phillips, Sheldon, Tiwari, Wedding

Unexcused Absence: Park, Ratnam, Rouillard, Roseman, Schlageter, Welsch

President Brakel: Do we have a quorum?

Senator Templin: Yes.

President Brakel: Thank you, Senator Templin. So you have today's agenda before you. I'll entertain a motion to adopt today's agenda.

Senator Niamat: So moved.

Senator Ohlinger: Second.

President Brakel: All in favor say, 'aye.' Any opposed? Any abstentions? *Adoption of Agenda Passed.*

You also received a copy of the Minutes. What was sent out did not include my Executive Committee report from last time. I can show that to you. The new Minutes is with that report. It is here if anybody want to look at it closely, otherwise I'll ask if there's any corrections or additions to the Minutes. Hearing none, I'll entertain a motion to approve the Minutes of the January 21st meeting.

Senator Hall: So moved.

Senator Dowd: Second.

President Brakel: All in favor say, 'aye.' Any opposed? Any abstentions? *Motion Passed.* Thank you.

That brings us to the *Executive Committee report:* The Faculty Senate Executive Committee met on Friday, January 4. The meeting started with an update from Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs Amy

Thompson about the second phase of the on-line course evaluations that were conducted last fall. You will hear from Dr. Thompson about the fall expanded pilot program and the plans to expand the on-line course evaluation system to all courses this Spring term.

Given the last Faculty Senate meeting in which there were several questions regarding certificates, the FSEC had a lengthy discussion about Certificates. We looked at the guidelines that Faculty Senate last approved in 2008. Given when those guidelines were approved, it was decided that we need to look further into this issue. An examination of other Ohio institutions provided information that was forwarded to Academic Programs Chair Terry Bigioni. Some of these links were also shared in today's agenda for discussion today. Additionally, HB2 creates the TechCred Program and the Individual Microcredential Assistance Program (IMAP) to provide grant funding to support industry sector partnerships for workforce training. The final bill was signed by Governor DeWine on January 13, 2020.

President-elect Jeff Hammersley and I met with President Gaber on January 27. We discussed the Constitution, which has been at least partially reviewed by the Office of Legal Affairs, and reminded Dr. Gaber that the goal is to approve the Constitution, Rules and Bylaws this year but time is running out.

As I reported in our last Executive Committee report, a committee had been formed before the semester break regarding the university's Learning Management System but that there had been some developments over the semester break that we needed to look into. We asked about the current status of the Learning Management System update. To be brief, the upper administration is examining the best way to proceed with the Learning Management System upgrade that not only saves the university money but also minimizes transition issues as we move to a cloud based system. A specific concern is the number of changes that are being asked of faculty regarding technology systems such as the Curriculum Tracking, Concur purchasing program, printers and the Scantron replacement.

We also asked about whether a faculty member is serving on the admissions committee and issues related to the budget. We continue to represent concerns from the Health Science campus.

At our Feb. 18th meeting, Board of Trustees chair Mary Pisanelli is tentatively scheduled to be with us. Dr. Gaber is tentatively scheduled to meet with us at the March 3 meeting.

Does any Executive Committee member have anything else that should be reported on? Hearing none. That concludes my report.

Senator Dowd: President Brakel, I would like to have for the benefit of the Senate Minutes a comment regarding last Faculty Senate meeting. Vice President of Finance Matt Schroeder gave a presentation with some very useful information. But at the end, I asked a series of questions dealing with what he had on his program which is cash flow. That actually refers to the days of cash on hand. Now, for the benefit of the Senate Minutes the days of cash on hand is what the University uses to pay its bills to keep the electricity running, pay faculty and staff salaries etc. So the comment when I asked how many days of cash on hand he remarked "30 days" – now, for a university of this size I asked what is, by the rating agencies, "comfortable" and he had said "90" days. Now, for all my years dealing with Finance and Strategy Committee, it is typically between 120-140 days. Now this just isn't trivial. The days of cash on hand changes throughout the semester. Once students pay their tuition, this is the high point for the semester. Then the University of course pays its bills and spends down cash. But what Vice President Schroeder was saying that there were only 30 days cash on hand, that is only two weeks after the students pay. I left the meeting and I talked with Vice President Schroeder [outside the meeting] because I wanted to ask a couple of third party questions, for example has the University changed the measure by which it rates to use the cash on hand which could account for a lower number? That is not the case.

Under President Jacobs the days of cash on hand was 68 or 69 days of cash on hand—this was almost crisis. 30 days of cash on hand I have never seen; I have never seen anything close to this. I don't know the causes. I don't know the rationale. All I know is that number is exceptionally low. If we were to get hit with a snowstorm and our energy cost go up, if they have to pay overtime for plowing or shoveling or any reason at all, 30 days of cash on hand means the University could pay two pay periods. If some emergency due to the weather came up, it's going to eat into that. All my comments here is to make a request. Faculty Senate appoints individual to the Finance and Strategy Committee. That committee was created by the Board of Trustees so that the administration is obligated to report to the Senate representatives the financial status of the University. Now, I asked a couple of members of that committee and the Division of Finance did not at any time report this 'dwindling' of the days of cash on hand. There may be a rationale for it; I really don't know, but I've never seen it this low. So my request is, the Senate representatives to that committee at the next meeting could raise this very important issue. This isn't just a financial issue. This is a matter of paying our bills. During our 'Jacobian' period when we had 68/69 days of cash on hand, the University wasn't paying its vendors. Now we are at 30 days. So, I don't think it is just me who should be concerned about this. If the Executive Committee wouldn't mind, please ask the representatives to raise these issues with Finance and Strategy, and if you don't mind, could you incorporate the results of that into a future Executive Committee report?

President Brakel: Yes, I will do that. I believe that committee meets tomorrow afternoon at 3 o' clock and I will make sure those questions are raised.

Senator Dowd: Thank you.

President Brakel: Any other questions or comments? Hearing none. Provost Bjorkman was coming from another meeting which is supposed to go right up to 4 o'clock and so we are going to go on to the course evaluations at this time.

Dr. Amy Thompson: Thank you. So, just a thank you to all of you who participated in the course evaluation, either in last summer or in the fall. We have some great results to report to you today. A special thanks to Dr. Fox and...who have been working throughout this process with us in terms of looking at the psychometric properties, the questions that we've been piloting, and also Elissa Falcone who has worked very, very hard with us to make sure that the interaction with the various courses and faculty members that everything was included as should be. Just to give you an idea of what happened in the fall, it was a little bigger than a pilot because we had an overwhelming response by the colleges, departments, and individual faculty who wanted to partake in the course evaluation pilot. So roughly about 50% of the campus actually participated. Again, that being the second semester that we've done this. We had over 2,281 course sections that actually had the new 12 questions deployed as well as using the new software platform by campus labs that we have purchased. So throughout that process, about 42,839 student evaluations were deployed. We did have a significant number of students obviously – each student might have four, or five, or six classes that they might have had the new course evaluations open-end. We were able to calculate an overall response rate of about 48.27%. In doing our homework and talking to UTOonline and asking them what an average response rate would be for the courses that they do online course evaluations in, and they gave us the number between 40-50%. So, actually our numbers were a little bit higher than what their typical response rates were and we will talk about that in just a second in terms of some things that we learned throughout this process.

Obviously we want this to be as seamless of a process as possible, and we are learning lots of things as we go along throughout these two semesters of pilot work. What we learned: The response rates from the course evaluation pilot were highest in the courses where the instructor either sent out numerous reminders to the students or they actually devoted class time in the beginning of class. So if they said, 'all right, everybody bring their smart device [and] the first ten minutes of class we are going to fill this out,'

in some sections we saw over 90% response rate in some of those courses. Also, as part of the new software package there were three reminders that were sent out to the students that were automated. Once they completed that course evaluation they were automatically emailed. With this new software instructors can also go in and send reminders to their students to complete the course evaluations as well. So again, really some interesting data in terms of how the instructor approach the students with completing the course evaluations. We also saw some variation in the wishes of faculty in terms of how and when the course evaluations were deployed. I will tell you that we were really working very hard up to the moment of building the new software platform. So we deployed this in fall semester, the last week of classes, and then also during finals week. That is not ideal and I know that, but we were really up against a tough deadline. We got lots of feedback on that, and actually some faculty like to deploy it during finals week. The recommendation based on our committee, from faculty state that it is really optimal to have it at the last two weeks of courses. So moving forward we would like to make this available at the end of April, April 20th which would be at the last two weeks of class. Then if individual faculty want that adjusted based on their wishes in their course they can basically ask for that to be adjusted for them individually. But that would be the default is it would be deployed and open the last two weeks of class. When we looked at some of the questions that were submitted, and I bring this up moving forward, there was some overlap or duplication from some of the questions that were added additional to the 12 core questions. I bring that up as those of you in your departments, or department chairs, or some of the associate deans that moving forward it might be a good idea to look at your existing questions and say, ‘wow, do we still need to ask question two, three and four that we have asked forever since that information is actually captured in the 12 university-wide core questions?’ Just a point to bring up that we did see a little bit of redundancy. Again, any time that you add more and more questions there is a possibility that responses can go down from students and so I just want to bring that up as a learning point.

Overall I will have to tell you – I was nervous about this and I was hoping that it would go well-overwhelmingly this was very positive. I got lots of feedback from department chairs and we talked about this at some of our meetings, lots of emails from faculty etc. I know I see some of you across the room who have had good experiences with this and I really appreciate your feedback on this. So in terms of what we would like to have happen and next steps, so moving forward with full implementation, campus-wide of the 12 questions that now have been piloted and psychometrically tested. Dr. Fox and...continue to work with the data that was just collected in fall semester to make sure the questions are as clean and psychometrically sound as possible. They are continuing that work this semester. As I mentioned before, we would like to deploy this on April 20th, the last two weeks of classes. What will happen with this is department chairs and associate deans will be receiving information on trainings. Basically what we will be asking for them is if they have individual department questions that they want to have added that they will be trained on how to upload those into campus labs. Also within that training we will go over with the chairs if there are certain questions that should not be evaluated – let’s say you don’t want to evaluate thesis or dissertations or practicums, whatever that culture is of your department, the chairs can remove those so that there is not an automatic deployment of the course evaluation. For example, if you have a procedure on low enrolled courses, that would be up to the chair in working with the faculty to make those selections, not the Provost Office. So those trainings will begin March 2nd. Following that and those of you that participated in the course evaluation pilot, we sent out a very detailed email to faculty on where they can access their course evaluations, both through the link and through their Blackboard site. We gave video clips and small kind of vignettes on how to access your course evaluations. Those can be downloaded and actually saved as a PDF so you have those forever that you can score. They are also left within campus labs that you can access much like they would be in Blackboard now; you can go back to your course and you can see those over time. The raw data can also be obtained and downloaded if you need that in an Excel spreadsheet, much like you would do now with our current enterprise survey through Distance Learning. So also moving forward, we really are trying to create a student centeredness focus with the course evaluations, and I know you have heard me talk about that before. And one of the

things we want to help provide is for department chairs, departments who really want to look at their department questions that they are using. We wanted to offer the expertise of Dr. Fox and Dr. ... Do you want to talk a little bit about your efforts?

Dr. Fox: Yes. It says here 'best practice guide will be developed for these additional course evaluation questions.' We are working on that; that will be done by the end of next week that you can disseminate. But also, a few department chairs last semester had asked for individual guidance on writing some additional questions and disseminating them. That is something you can do one a one-on-one basis, just contact me or Dr...and we can come to you and work with you individually. If you don't want to look at some guide and you just want to work one-on-on on your set of questions, we are there willing to do that for you this semester as well.

Dr. Amy Thompson: Again, we want to provide all the support we can moving forward with this. Again, we really appreciate all of your support and help with this. I will like to take any questions you might have.

Senator Niamat: Feedback from the faculty was good/great and so that is good news, but was there any feedback from the students on whether they prefer to use the new system or not?

Dr. Amy Thompson: That is a great question. We actually solicited that from faculty in terms of asking your students. Again, we got great feedback from the students as well that it was relatively easy; especially for the faculty that provided a little bit more guidance initially because it was new with the students and especially the ones that were done in class and the faculty gave devoted time. So, that is really the idea if that is possible.

Senator Niamat: Was there a survey or something taken from the students?

Dr. Amy Thompson: Not from the students, but it was more solicited from the chairs or from faculty.

Senator Bailey: Dr. Thompson.

Dr. Amy Thompson: Yes.

Senator Bailey: Quick question. This is going to be deployed in the spring this semester. If we have face-to-face classes could students do this outside of class like on the weekend sometime whenever?

Dr. Amy Thompson: Absolutely. It really depends on the faculty.

Senator Bailey: As long as we advise them of its availability and stuff like that.

Dr. Amy Thompson: Absolutely. Great question.

Senator Dowd: This fall I was teaching back-to-back classes, one at 8 AM and the other at 9:35 AM or whatever time, and my students couldn't access it on the first day. So, just a suggestion---

Dr. Amy Thompson: Sure.

Senator Dowd: If this is going to go live on that Monday, could you make it go live at midnight and not at 8 AM just so that the 8 AM classes could actually catch this?

Dr. Amy Thompson: Sure. That is a great recommendation; we are happy to do that.

Senator Dowd: Thank you.

Dr. Amy Thompson: Any other questions or comments?

Senator Anderson: I have two. You had indicated if you wanted to be open during final exam week to let them know. Is there any reason why in general it is not the last two weeks in final exam week to do that for everyone?

Dr. Amy Thompson: Well, if you look at the literature it talks about the fact that there is more likely to be a student bias in the way that they answer the course evaluation if it is given during the final week, so we just recommend that as a best practice. But again, if the faculty member wants to do that, that is totally between them and they can indicate that to their department chair.

Senator Anderson: And then the second thing. I always look at student's time as being as important as my time is. Now with this being done electronically, if there's some type of record of the students that have done the evaluations, is there any way to actually put them in a drawing for some type of reward like gift cards or something that we actually do for them to reward their time to do it?

Dr. Amy Thompson: That is an interesting question and we gotten that before. There are some concerns sometimes about awarding for filling those out based on things like extra credit or any type of compensation. There could be some ethical concerns with that and so that is the only thing I would say about that.

Senator Coulter-Harris: I'm just wondering if faculty are going to be responsible for uploading these evaluations to Faculty 180?

Dr. Amy Thompson: That is a great question. So I will tell you that right now we are not there to the point where they would be able to integrate with Faculty 180. There's talk about that, but we are not close to that. Correct Dr. Ayres? So at this point it would be the faculty member saving it as a PDF and uploading it, much like you would with your current Blackboard course evaluations - same process.

Senator Coulter-Harris: Thank you.

Senator Molitor: If I am not mistaken, I believe an individual faculty member can download a single report that shows how they did for all their courses together. I thought it was actually a lot easier for faculty to upload this to Faculty 180 than it would be for regular course evaluations that were done on paper.

Dr. Amy Thompson: Thank you. Anything else? Thank you very much. We appreciate all of your help and support.

President Brakel: We will move next to the Academic Programs Committee chaired by Senator Bigioni.

Senator Bigioni: I'm going to start out our report addressing this question of double-dipping that came up last meeting when we were talking about some new certificate programs out of Communications. The upshot is in this question right here. The question was raised, if the required courses for a certificate program also satisfies the course requirements for a major or minor program whether or not elective or required then can a major or minor student also complete the certificate? The answer is yes. Some gathering of information from different sources, there's a Faculty Senate document on this, we had some discussions in Executive Committee [meetings] and also a phone call to Max Exline in Columbus who is the Director of Program Approval Operations to sort of settle this question which wasn't much to discuss. The certificates aren't treated like a degree program, a minor or major degree program where a degree is conferred. It is rather a way of identifying that a certain set of skills were acquired by the student and quantifying that in a way that it can appear on a transcript and of course provide some leverage advantage to a student who is seeking a particular job opportunity. So that is the function of the certificates. And of course they can be standalone too, they don't have to be part of a degree program, but they can certainly overlap with degree programs. An interesting example of that is, certificates in some cases can be stacked into a degree program so you can satisfy the requirements of the degree program by completing a series of

certificates. So clearly if that is the case then this question of double-dipping just does not apply in the case of certificates, sorry. I think we are quite clearly settled on that. Any questions about that since this was a topic of discussion last Faculty Senate meeting?

Senator Molitor: So last year we disallowed a group of my engineering students to participate in a certificate program in mechatronics and instead we called it a concentration. Can we go back to reverse that decision now, and if so, how do we do that?

Senator Bigioni: I think the answer is yes. Well, I meant to say a little bit more and maybe now is a good time. I was going to introduce three certificate programs from Communications now that the question is resolved, at least in that regard. There may still be some discussion because of the contents of that Faculty Senate document. There still may be some things to shake out and I think the prudent thing would be to step back from that. I am not going to present those three new certificates this meeting. I will bring them back next meeting once we are sure about how we feel about the content of the document and so on, which probably need to be modified. So there still need to be some ongoing discussions.

President Brakel: And we will talk about that a little bit later here.

Senator Bigioni: Right, and we can address more directly those sorts of questions. Any other questions on this topic? Then as I said [at least for now] we will skip over these new certificates and get to the first two proposals I want to bring to you two name changes. They are from the Arts Department and they both are just trivial name changes. We can go through them. This discussion is the same in both cases and I will read it to you: *“The Department of Art is actively trying to craft contemporary and accurate program names that actually reflect the program's content. We strongly believe that by doing so, we will actually be able to recruit many more students as the new names will help students identify programs of interest (we are constantly being told by both Admissions and by visiting students that they can't find either Graphic Design or Photography when they search our websites).”* So both of those programs are being renamed to make that clearer. This is the first of them. This first proposal takes the program that is currently called “New Media Design Practices” – and I should point out that both of these are Studio Art BFA’s and two particular concentrations – and the proposal to change that name to “Graphic and Interactive Design Concentration.” That emphasizes the graphic design content of this particular concentration and then the second one here will change the name of the program that is currently called “Digital and Photographic Art Concentration” and change that name to “Photography and Digital Media Concentration.” The Art Department believes that both of those name changes will make it clearer to students and they are hoping that students find the programs that they are looking for. I should point out this note here just to be clear. This is *“change of Major title only. All other aspects of the program remain unchanged.”* Any questions? Hearing none. All right, then let’s put it to a vote. All those in favor of this program modification please say “aye.” Any opposed? Any abstentions? ***Motion Passed.***

Next, there are four program modifications that are simply reductions in credit hours from 124 to 120. They are all essentially identical. One is from Disability Studies. I will just read this - they are all the same. The goal *“To reduce the degree program requirements from 124 credit hours to 120 credit hours by reducing general elective credits by 4 hours.”* So no part of the major requirements are changed, only elective credit hours. The first one is Disability Studies. The second is Philosophy. And again, identical description, identical goals and rationale. The third is Psychology BA. The fourth is the Religious Studies BA. Any questions about any of these four programs? Hearing none. Great. Let’s put it to a vote too. All those in favor of these program modifications please say “aye.” Any opposed? Any abstentions? ***Motion Passed.***

The next program modification is another one from the Art Department. In this case it is Studio Art, Minor. The goal here is to simplify the program and also drop the number of credit hours from 21 to 18. The rationale here is *“The existing requirements have been too restrictive and the number of courses required have presented a burden for students.”* We will go through the changes here. Here is the

program. There is a set of courses; select three of five totaling nine hours. These five courses are the proposed set of five courses. It was previously four, but this Art Studio Technology Program was added. So, select three of five of those. And then a nice simplification follows. There is a set of 12 hours of elective courses here described. I will read through that. *“Upon completion of the required foundation courses, students must take 12 hours distributed in any of the following subject areas: 2D Studies, 3D Studies, New Media Studies with no more than nine credit hours in one studio area. A minimum six hours must be events arts studio courses at the 3000 level and above.”* That is now simplified to be this set of two courses for a total of six credit hours. So the students are now to take any two studio classes from these three categories, 2D Studies, 3D Studies and New Media Studies. So that simplifies the requirements and reduces the credit hours by three. Well, actually, I didn’t say that very accurately – but it simplifies that requirement. That was 12 hours and this is six hours and the extra three hours is picked up in Art History. Previously the requirement was as follows: The description is that it is strongly recommending the following Art History Survey courses be taken: History of Western Art, History of Western Art II, one course in History in non-Western Art, one additional course in History of Western Art. Again, those are optional so they did not contribute to the number of credit hours, but it just contributed to the complexity of the description of the program. So instead, that’s been eliminated and it’s been replaced simply taken one course in Art History. The description for the program is simpler and we have a reduction in credit hours of three. Any questions about these changes?

Senator Lee: I have one question in regard to what we just voted on. You’re still using the language ‘New Media Studies’ and not ‘Digital’ or ‘Interactive,’ so is that going to be updated to reflect the new names of the concentration?

Senator Bigioni: So this was a minor program. I am not sure if I fully understood your question.

Senator Lee: It’s just that the ‘New Media Design Practice’ became ‘Graphic Design’ and ‘Digital and Photographic Art’ became ‘Photography and Digital Media.’ So if they are going to be using those names for the concentrations, do they also for clarity not use, if they are going away from using the term ‘new media?’

President Brakel: Scroll down and you will see where they have ‘New Media.’

Senator Lee: I didn’t know if they wanted to take that now that we are a foreign language and it should be consistent throughout the catalog.

Senator Bigioni: Good question, and I do not know the answer to that. I don’t think Barbara is here. She had a conflict and could not make it.

Senator Lee: I mean, it is not a question of substance, it is just a question.

Senator Bigioni: Right.

Senator Dowd: Is this just an issue of the names of the concentration Senator Lee?

Senator Lee: It is just an issue of if they are changing things in the catalog in one place then they should be consistent in how they describe it.

Senator Dowd: No, but they are presenting it as property. They can’t modify this proposal that is on the screen now without first Senate approval of the stuff being approved two minutes ago. This will have to change automatically. The other stuff had to be approved first before they can modify this.

Senator Bigioni: I’ll bring it up with them in and see what they want to do with that.

President Brakel: You could just add the word ‘two’ after “any” – ‘choose any two studio art courses.’ I think that would make it clearer to students since this would be a catalog copy I assume.

Senator Bigioni: Right, and I did ask Barbara about that and she said that all of those courses are three hours, so there's no way of---

President Brakel: I know, but the six hours is down there by 'New Media Studies.'

Senator Bigioni: Yes, but that is just my editing. But, I'll suggest that.

President Brakel: I just want to be clear for catalog copy.

Senator Bigioni: Right. I appreciate that. Any other questions? Then let's go ahead and vote on this. All in favor of this program modification please say "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? **Motion Passed.**

Next we have a modification to the Political Science, Minor. This is just a reduction in credit hours from 21 to 18. The change is really captured in this paragraph here so this is a description of the program: "*Students seeking a minor in political science must complete at least 18 ~~21~~ hours of course work at the 2000 level or above in the discipline, chosen in consultation with a departmental adviser. It is recommended that minors include in their undergraduate program the introductory course in American Government (PSC 1200) and three of the four gateway subfields. At least 9 of the 18-credit ~~21-credit~~ hour minimum must be at the 3000-4000 levels.*" It is just a reduction of one course in that general description of what constitutes this minor. This little bit here is just an example plan of study, it is not any kind of a requirement course. Any questions about this program proposal/this modification? So it is just dropping one course from the requirements in this program. Any questions? Hearing none. All right, let's put it to a vote. All those in favor of this modification please say, 'aye.' Any opposed? Any abstentions? **Motion Passed.**

This is the final one. This is basically the same sort of modification in the Public Administration, Minor, reducing from 21 to 18 credit hours. This is in support of the reactivation of the MPA program. They are trying to generate more interest in this public administration minor because it can nicely lead into the MPA program for some of our students. "*The minor of Public Administration is comprised of 18 hours of course work of which at least 15 hours shall be taken at the 3000 or 4000 level. Political science students minoring in public administration may not utilize 3000 or 4000 level public administration identified courses to fulfill their political science major requirements.*" So that is the description and again, it is just a reduction in hours from 21 to 18.

Assistant Dean Pollauf: And assuming that they don't duplicate courses or overlap the courses between the two minors, it is permissible to get those, right, as long as the coursework...?

Jaime: At least you can't double-dip the 'Public Administration, Minor' with the 'Political Science, Major.'

Senator Bigioni: Any other questions? Okay, then let's put this program modification to a vote. All those in favor please say "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? **Motion Passed.**

This really is the last one. This is the last program modification. The program is BA in Liberal Studies. So the purpose of this program modification is to remove the 3000 and 4000 level requirements for nine of the credit hours in concentration courses. Here is the rationale: "*Upon review, the Curriculum Committee discovered that the total requirement for hours at the 3000-4000 level has grown to 52, which is significantly above the number required for most programs at the University. This has created a barrier, particularly for transfer students interested in the Liberal Studies program. No other aspect of the curriculum is being altered.*" Any questions about this program modification? Hearing none. All right then, let's put it to a vote. All those in favor of this modification please say, 'aye.' Any opposed? Any

abstentions? *Motion Passed.* Great! So that passes as well and that concludes this report. Thank you very much.

President Brakel: Now that we have Provost Bjorkman here we will proceed with her report.

Provost Bjorkman: Thanks. And I apologize, I got hung up at another meeting. So good afternoon. My remarks will be brief today. I wanted to first just give a shout out to our Art faculty because they are having an exhibit right now at the Center for Visual Arts on the Museum of Art Campus. There are 15 works by University of Toledo Art faculty being exhibit there. So, I wanted to give you that information and ask you to consider going and seeing the wonderful work by our artist scholars. It is a great opportunity for our students to see some of the activities that our scholars do. The exhibit will be there until February 21st so you don't have a long time, but the information about that is on the Department of Art webpage.

A couple of important announcements and deadlines just to remind you: last fall we asked all the faculty teaching 1000 and 2000 level courses to submit midterm grades between week six and eight to help us identify at risk students. It helped them to get over that hurdle. I just want to remind you that midterm grading for the spring semester will be due between February 24th and March 13th. An email to all faculty will be sent out from the Office of the Provost next week, but I just thought I'll mention that here so you can remind your colleagues as well.

Nominations for Outstanding Teaching award and Outstanding Advisor awards are due both on February 17th which is coming up. Just for your information, the Outstanding Teacher award we will honor up to six faculty members for that and for the Outstanding Advisor award we will honor one faculty advisor and one professional staff advisor with that. So please submit your nominations and help your colleagues who are doing great work be recognized for that.

I wanted to mention about the inclusive access textbook initiative. I don't know how many of you remember about this; some of you I know are doing it and others may not be as familiar with it. We launched this program back in 2018 in order to help reduce the cost of textbooks for our students and to ensure all of our students who are in courses that have these required textbooks. Often they have assigned or attached homework sets with them so that they will have them on day-1 and they wouldn't have to go through the process of going and getting their access code and all of that. It is a voluntary program; you don't have to participate in it. But faculty who are voluntarily using these digital textbooks, we work with the bookstore to set this up to work with the publishers. What happens is then the publishers are giving us a considerably discounted fee for the combination of an E-text book and whatever homework or additional digital media packages come with it, and that fee then gets attached to the course. So as soon as the student registers for the course, that fee gets added to their bill and they automatically have access to all of that starting on day-1 of the course. They don't get behind in their homework and they don't get behind in... We will point out that students do have the option to opt-out of that if they don't wish to do it that way, and if they do then they are responsible for buying all those things themselves and it turns out it is a lot more money for them. Just to give you an example, in fall 2019, we saved our students over a-half-1 million dollars through this program. So that is for faculty in four colleges who voluntarily participated. We had 31 courses using digital textbooks. I would note by the way if it is a multi-section course, all the sections have to agree to do it, so we can't split it by sections of the same course, it is tied to a course. So if any of you are interested in using that, we are allowing that to be expanded. We set up a process so we can manage all of this because the fees actually are just a pass through back, we pay the publisher. So we have to setup someone to monitor those fees and make sure the publisher gets paid etc. There is a form and information on the Provost website you can pull down if you are interested. The

reason I am telling you this now is because in order to do this we need those to be approved and in the process no later than three weeks before registration opens for the term you want to use it. So what that means is that it is too late for summer, but if you are interested in doing it in the fall the deadline will be February 26th because registration for fall opens in March. So I just wanted to let you know about that in case you're interested. If you want to know more about it, feel free to contact Jamie Fager who is the Business Manager in the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics. She's been doing this for several years now. She can give you details and put you in touch with the bookstore or whatever you need.

President Brakel: And as a reminder to Senate, this was the presentation that Bill Ayres and Jamie did at our last meeting in the fall.

Provost Bjorkman: Right. So it is just a reminder of the deadline. Yes?

Assistant Dean Pollauf: Just a question about how that fee is regarding. Since it goes directly on as a course fee does that reduce the student's institutional aid for books? Is it considered part of a book scholarship or is it something separate?

Provost Bjorkman: I do not know the answer to her question. Do you know, Bill?

Assistant Dean Pollauf: Or do we know who to ask that of?

Provost Bjorkman: Jamie probably, but we should actually talk to Financial Aid.

Vice Provost Ayres: That is a question for Financial Aid. The fee doesn't change the students' cost of attendance. It is simply moving a charge from one place to another place. But the total cost of attendance remains the same, which means in general a student's financial aid package ought not to be affected. If a student had a scholarship that is somehow tied specifically to textbooks, we would want to work with Financial Aid to make sure that scholarship would cover this fee.

Assistant Dean Pollauf: The reason why I am asking is because my understanding is that all institutional financial aid there is a limit of \$250. Like UT awards the rocket book power or whatever and there is a limit of \$250 if it is institutional aid that can be applied to books at Barnes and Noble.

Provost Bjorkman: So that funding actually comes from Barnes and Noble. So it actually has a caveat with it which is that they can't use it at another bookstore. But because the Barnes and Noble is working with us and the publisher to do this, it should apply there but we can confirm that.

Senator Molitor: My understanding is the fact that it applies directly to the student's account; any financial aid they get automatically cover it if they have the funds to cover it. So it is not, for example if a student was getting access aid that they can't get refunded, by including these textbooks on their fees on their account, that money can go to cover that.

Assistant Dean Pollauf: Thank you for knowing my bottom line point.

Provost Bjorkman: And the last thing is just about Winter Intersession. That deadline is coming up on March 20th if you are interested in teaching something in Winter Intersession. Please get your proposals in. Save the date, we are going to do another one of our faculty and staff socials. It will be on Wednesday, February 19th from 5:00 PM to 6:30 PM in Libby Hall. We moved it up to Wednesdays so you guys can come because I know you want to go home on Friday night. I hope to see a lot of you there. All faculty and staff on both campuses are invited to attend. We are asking you again if you come to please bring a donation for the student food pantry because we are using this also as an opportunity to help supply of

food pantry for our students. So that concludes my remarks and I appreciate your time. I apologize again for being late. Any questions?

President Brakel: Any questions for the Provost? Thank you, Provost Bjorkman.

Provost Bjorkman: You are welcome.

President Brakel: So I thought given our conversation at our last meeting and some more recent developments that we should probably have at least a discussion regarding certificates. As you recall, there were questions about who could actually take certificate courses, how many credit hours are actually required for a certificate and can these courses count toward a bachelor's degree, for example some questions about standalone vs. stackable certificates. So those were questions that kind of came up during our meeting. As I made the Faculty Senate Executive Committee report today, just before I started this semester, the bill that was signed regarding tech cred was signed by the governor. That is not only something tech cred, but also micro credential programs and that is going to now start an impetus across the state to look at micro credential and how those might be offered at universities. Also, as last week's Grad Council the issue of micro credentials came up and started part of a conversation there. So with all of these things going on I thought it was necessary that we do a review at least on certificates so one, we have a common understanding about certificates and to deal with the certificates that are presently coming forward and then also to begin a broader conversation about micro credentialing in and of itself.

So again, here is House Bill 2 that was signed January 13th. You can see the tech cred program will provide some reimbursements to eligible employers for training costs for both their current employees and prospective employees to earn a micro credential which is going to be at least industry recognized in some way and can't be completed in not more than one year. Also, the individual micro credential assistant program is going to help provide grants for training to earn a micro credential. So this is currently the document that appears to be the most recent guidelines regarding certificates here at the University of Toledo. This was passed by Faculty Senate back in April 2008. Let's take a look at a couple of things just to make sure everybody understands the language. Admission to that program for us is an undergraduate certificate [here] that the program itself can put additional requirements on or the college as well, and so that is important. This was a question that came up as well. Certificate students are subject to all certificate course prerequisites, but not general education requirements. Now you see that we have certificate award requirements which talks about a 2.0 GPA or better and we have language that currently states a majority of the language must be taken from UT. I want to revisit that language here in a moment in the presentation. Then the next deals with the actual undergraduate certificates and proposing. You see that it does follow the curriculum process. In general, undergraduate certificates usually do not have to be approved at the Provost Office, but they do have to be notified. Is that correct?

Vice Provost Ayres: I think you mean to substitute the Ohio Board of Higher Education.

President Brakel: Thank you.

Vice Provost Ayres: The state does not approve certificates, the Provost does.

President Brakel: Right. Thank you. So yes, the state does not necessarily need to approve an undergraduate certificate; graduate certificates need it as a general rule of thumb. You'll notice that in Point B. here says, "*A certificate program developed within a four-year bachelor degree program must require a minimum of 12 credit hours, but may not require no more than 29 credit hours.*" So this implies that it is stackable and will count toward an actual degree. Then you have two other classes or types of certificates that have been approved before. One is a one-year technical certificate that is nearly from 30-

37 credit hours. Again, that says “*Such certificates are required notification to the Board of Regents*” – it is actually Higher Ed; we should update that. Then the short-term certificates are fewer than 30 hours and they can be designed for specific employment situations. This language here seems to be a little interesting because I am not for sure how certificates would go into the TAGS requirements in general, and that seems not to be the case. It might have something to do with the OTM possibly, but I don’t think it would have anything to do with TAGS.

Senator Molitor: Maybe at the time because the TAG program had just started and they were thinking about developing TAGS for certificate programs as well, but, I’m not aware of any.

Vice Provost Ayres: TAGS are specific to courses; they are not relevance in block courses. (1:06:30 min)

Senator Molitor: Right, but they are courses specific to four-year degree programs.

Vice Provost Ayres: Correct.

President Brakel: So in that way it might if you have a stackable certificate.

Senator Molitor: Right.

President Brakel: So that might be a little bit of flushing out there as well. The rest just really talks about the overall processes there. So just to take a look for a moment this is from the Ohio Higher Education and it talks about certificates. These right here talk about the two types of general certificates that we just basically we alluded to in our report where we have the general certificate and types of technical certificates. Then further down in this document, “*If by chance a certificate is meeting some sort of a professional license or other accreditation requirements then those requirements have to be met.*”

Now after our Executive Committee meeting last week I did some looking at other institutions. At Ohio State in 2018, they devised this kind of flow chart as a way to think about certificates, which I thought it might be helpful if you looked at it because it gives us different types that we need to look at. At least at Ohio State the maximum credit overlap from a certificate to the degree was maximum 50%. So that would be different than what we might be doing. And the other thing I find interesting here, while we say a majority of courses, they are saying 100% of all courses must be applied at Ohio State. Taking a look at some of the language from Kent State for a moment, it talks about students and how they get involved with certificates. Their certificate programs is 15-25 existing course inventory. Notice a maximum of nine credits of variable topics; we don’t necessarily specify that. Then from Wright State they have a residency requirement, a minimum of nine semester hours must be earned there at Wright State in connection with their certificates. I am just pointing out some of the differences here between institutions.

For our discussion here are some ideas that we may want to consider. The number of credit hours minimum or the percentage of courses that need to be taken here at UToledo. What should be done with transfer credit. Should a variable topic course be maximized or put a limit on. There are probably many other issues that should be addressed. So hopefully that will begin to give us some common language and I am just now going to throw it open for discussion, comments or ideas that we will send back to Academic Programs to kind of update this language and hopefully continue this discussion toward micro credentials.

Senator Molitor: So, will one of the topics be the overlap with the degree program?

President Brakel: I am throwing it out there [to discuss] how much do we want.

Senator Niamat: Could we develop online certificate programs jointly with other universities, keeping that maximum number of credit hours at UT? Like an online program where faculty members from different universities are teaching for the same certificate program?

President Brakel: That one I am going to have to yield.

Provost Bjorkman: That is an interesting idea.

Unknown Speaker: It is possible.

President Brakel: So apparently it is possible.

Senator Thompson-Casado: Well, if we've already approved certificates that have a fewer number of credits than the 12 that we have stated here. And with regard to transfer credits, to think about study abroad because sometimes those students matriculated that institution and not at UT so that would...certificate as part of the coursework.

President Brakel: In the case of your certificate that is less than 12, I think it falls under one of the other categories of the types of certificates that we could earn, so I think you are fine in that regard as I kind of see the certificates in the different categories.

Senator Thompson-Casado: I also want to pull up under E2, the certificate program does not duplicate programs offered elsewhere in Northwest Ohio. I think we should be able to duplicate and compete.

President Brakel: That is a broader issue.

Vice Provost Ayres: I can speak only to where the likely origin of that is. The form that gets filled out to notify the state of a certificate, that question is on the form. It doesn't specifically say you can't compete, but it is something that the state likes to keep an eye on. I think the state gets concerned if there are too many programs of a specific kind within a particular area.

President Brakel: Other points of discussion? So what do you think then should be perhaps the number of credit hours that would be required toward a certificate or percentage rather than just saying a max or majority of? Senator Giovannucci, do you have your hand up?

Senator Giovannucci: No.

President Brakel: Nobody has any strong feelings one way or the other? Senator Gregory, I see you are thinking real hard.

Senator Gregory: Could you repeat the question, President Brakel; I am not sure I understand, that is why I am thinking hard?

President Brakel: Sure. Presently in our guidelines we say 'a majority of classes should be taken at the University of Toledo.' Should that be specified more specifically that we say that nine hours or 12 hours? How are we going to define that?

Unknown Speaker: So I know there is some type of guideline for how many hours for a Master's degree program can be transferred in and I am thinking maybe like 25% or 30%. It seems like that could be a discussion that is aligned that we can say that 75% or 80% of credit hours for the certificate have to be earned at Toledo.

Senator Pakulski: I think it is going to depend on whether or not it is one of those joint programs that the other gentleman mentioned. I had a certificate program at the University of Akron-- six credits came from

the University of Akron and six came from mine that is online. So, it's already been done for less than the 30% that you would do for a Master's degree. Then the University students who belong to the University of Toledo they got the certificate here and the University of Akron students who belong to the University of Akron they got the certificate there. I think it is probably a case-by-case basis depending of the nature of the program.

Senator Molitor: I just kind of like to echo that comment. There are no state requirements for this. Why should we be restrictive? Why not just evaluate it on a case-by-case basis for what makes sense for a particular program?

President Brakel: Again, I only raise this because other institutions have. So what about transfer credit?

Senator Molitor: I would echo my same comment. Again, there are times when it makes sense that we may want to have more and there are times when maybe it makes sense not to accept any. It depends on the program.

Senator Pakulski: I think we are going to kind of get ourselves in trouble if we say we are taken on a case-by-case basis because I can see telling one student that yes we will accept that course and another student no.

Senator Molitor: I didn't mean on a case-by-case, student by student; I meant on a program by program basis.

Senator Pakulski: Okay.

Senator Molitor: So your program you may say I am not accepting any transfer credit for this program and her program she may say I am going to have to accept it.

Senator Pakulski: Got-you.

Senator Molitor: You are absolutely right, we have to treat students equally in the program.

Senator Hall: I think one other reasons to think about it too is if you look at the OSU document, well, going back. Most of the certificate programs we considered recently have been very straightforward, 12 credits, all very uniform. But if you look at the OSU document, it actually considers a very wide range of potential certificate programs that accomplished different goals. So within that you have a wide range of program requirements and so forth. So for that reason it probably needs to be fair amounts of leeway in regards to how the program accepts transfer credits or any of these other factors.

President Brakel: So what I am kind of hearing right now is that rather than specifying this, and I am going to go out a little more on the limb, that maybe in sort of the instructions down there that we might ask the individual programs as they are proposing their certificates in the future have they considered to address these issues such as transfer credit, the number of credit hours minimum taken at UT etc. Is that a fair assessment of what you are feeling right now? The same way with variable topics. I see a couple of heads nodding.

Senator Molitor: I think from a starting point we give Academic Programs leeway to evaluate these things and provide recommendations and then go back to the program for more information – why do you need all these variable topic courses in this certificate? There may be a very good answer for that. And then over time as we start seeing more of these maybe then it becomes clearer that we need particular guidelines or rules for Academic Programs to operate under.

President Brakel: Any thoughts about certificate in general?

Senator Lee: I guess in regards to variable topics our definition of the reason of having the certificate program rather than a minor or concentration is that it has a technical expertise or a narrow aspect of field and so it is whether that could be accomplished with variable topics, which I can see being helpful if you want to have variable topics on current aspects of a field that might be changing in a way to keep the certificate program up to date with current technologies. But on the other hand, whether you want to define it because you are defining a narrow expertise and so you would not be able to ensure that they got that expertise if they can take a course that might change, and not everyone completing the certificate would have the same experience. So I think those would be two things that I would consider. How does this fit the certificate which has a specific purpose...?

Senator Anderson: Given the law that was signed in January by the governor, does the University has any plans like some part of the university would actually go out to businesses saying we will create whatever you need? Because that might dictate how many of these certificate programs have to be setup and what we need to have minimum in setting them up.

President Brakel: The first part of that- yes. I know the University does have people that are going out to recruit and talk to employers about their needs and trying to get those employers into degree programs. Provost Bjorkman, you may have some additional information.

Provost Bjorkman: Well, Engineering is a great example of that and maybe Senator Molitor can talk about some of that. But for example they work with DANA on this mechatronics program. They are talking to employers about are there specific sets of skills or information that you would like us to provide for students. Yes, colleges are doing that and I think there is a great opportunity there.

Senator Anderson: So kind of a result of that, what they need actually would dictate what gets put into that?

Provost Bjorkman: In those cases that is right.

Senator Molitor: And one thing we learned is this tech cred program the idea is employers can go and get reimbursed for sending their employees to these training programs. I just learned that universities can be reimbursed for sending their faculty to these programs to get them trained to offer these credentials. So I think that is something we should consider as well. If there are faculty who are interested in particular credentials, we can actually be reimbursed with going out and getting that training.

President Brakel: One question that I sent to Matt Schroeder about this is trying to double check how certificates and perhaps other micro credentials were figured into the state share of instruction.

Provost Bjorkman: Good question. Although, they are looking at SSI and the model for that.

President Brakel: Any other questions and comments? Hearing none. I think that brings us to 'other items of business, items from the floor?' Hearing none. I will entertain a motion to adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 5:33 p.m.

IV. Meeting adjourned at 5:33 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Templin
Faculty Senate Office Administrative Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary