

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of March 2, 2021
FACULTY SENATE

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

Approved @ FS on 3/16/2021

Summary of Discussion

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

President Brakel: I have 4 o'clock, so I will call the February 16th Faculty Senate meeting to order and ask Secretary Nigem to call the roll.

Present: Anderson, Bailey, Barnes, Bigioni, Brakel, Chaffee, Chou, Coulter-Harris, Day, de le Serna, Duhon, Edgington, Elgafy, El-Zawahry, Giovannucci, Gregory, Guardiola, Hall, Harmych, Heberle, Insch, Jayatissa, Kistner, Koch, Kujawa, Lawrence, Lecka-Czernik, Lee, Lipscomb, Metz, Milz, Modyanov, Molitor, J. Murphy, Niamat, Nigem, Oberlander, Wood (substitute for Pakulski), Pattin, Perry, Ratnam, Reeves, Smith, Stepkowski, Steven, Taylor, Teclehaimanot, Templin, Thompson-Casado, Tiwari, Topp, Van Hoy, Wedding, Welsch, Zietlow

Excused Absence: Duggan, Garcia-Mata,

Unexcused Absence: Ali, Case, Chaudhuri, Gibbs, Krantz, Longsdorf, L. Murphy

Senator Nigem cont'd: President Brakel, we have a quorum.

President Brakel: Thank you, Secretary Nigem. You received an updated agenda this afternoon that included a Core Curriculum Committee report. So I'll entertain a motion to adopt today's agenda.

Senator Niamat: So moved.

Senator Edgington: Second.

President Brakel: All in favor, put 'yes' in the chat box, or 'no,' or 'abstain.'

Senator Gregory: President Brakel, while we are doing that I just want to check, I think it is probably buried in my email somewhere, I thought we were doing core curriculum today and not the report. I can flip it if you would like; I just want to make sure, before we adopt this agenda, that I know what I showed you.

President Brakel: We are speaking the same language.

Senator Gregory: Okay.

President Brakel: That motion has carried. *Adoption of Agenda Passed.* You have also the Minutes from February 16, 2021. I will have to say that we had to piece these together because I failed to press the record button at the start of our last meeting. So, we did not obtain a recording and that is my fault. But we have pieced these together as best we could, and so please take a moment to review those Minutes. When you are ready, I will entertain a motion to approve. First, are there any additions or corrections to those Minutes?

Senator Kistner: I will move to approve.

President Brakel: I have a motion on the floor to approve these Minutes. Is there a second?

Senator Smith: Second.

President Brakel: Thank you. Any discussion? Please put 'yes' in the chat box, 'no,' or 'abstain.' It looks like those Minutes have been approved. *Motion Passed.*

That brings us to our Executive Committee report today: The Executive Committee met with Provost Bjorkman on February 18th and with Interim President Postel on February 19th. There was an overlap of topics for both meetings. A topic of discussion at both meetings was how the change in leadership for the University's enrollment services would change the enrollment initiatives moving forward. As you may know, Jim Anderson is no longer with us and there is a new interim Vice-President for Enrollment Management, David Meredith. Moving forward you can expect to see a greater focus on recruiting at the college level so that students get to have greater contact with faculty. Also, implementation of some software programs within enrollment management is being prioritized to make sure the systems interface properly before fully taking advantage of what these programs have to offer.

We also discussed if the current semester enrollment decline would result in any budget cuts to colleges, departments and programs this semester. It is not currently anticipated that there would be any additional budget cuts this semester. We had continued discussions regard the move toward responsibility centered management budgeting.

There was also discussion with the Provost, College of Medicine Dean Chris Cooper and Professor William Davis about the dentistry program. There is a new dentistry facility within the ProMedica facilities. Right now, this is largely an administrative move. Dentistry is currently under the surgery department as a Division of Dentistry, and they want to pull the dentistry area out of the surgery department so that it can compete for external funding and to be able to capitalize on other opportunities.

The Executive Committee's regular meeting on Feb 19 was primarily with Dr. Postel. We also discussed the agenda for today's meeting. Progress is still being made to conduct the Dean's evaluations this spring and President-Elect Bigioni has been the point person in getting that set up.

Constitution Chair Mark Templin, President-Elect Terry Bigioni and I met yesterday with Will Lucas, Chair of the Board of Trustees' Governance Committee and other members of the administration to seek Board of Trustee's buy-in on the proposed Constitution. My goal was to be able to begin the second reading of the Constitution today, but Chair Lucas needed to consult with other board members first. There is a Board of Trustee's meeting tomorrow at 9:00 a.m. but it is not clear how Chair Lucas will discuss this with other board members. The current plan is that we should hear a response by this Monday and hopefully begin the second reading at our next Faculty Senate meeting.

This concludes the Faculty Senate Executive Committee Report. Does any Executive Committee Board member have anything they would like to add? Any questions or comments from Senators?

Senator Heberle: President Brakel, this is Senator Heberle.

President Brakel: Yes.

Senator Heberle: I just wanted to say that this wasn't necessarily Executive Committee work, but it is kind of an overlapping initiative between the Executive Committee and the Election Committee to try to do more word of mouth outreach, and also just outreach as to what Senate does with our elections coming up, to try to increase the number of new members of Senate, turnover in terms of Senate, and to encourage folks to accept the nomination if they are nominated. So, I just want to let people know if you have any ideas, you are more than welcome to email me or to sort of think about how to kind of promote Senate as one piece of service that people can do at the University.

President Brakel: Thank you. Does any other Executive Committee member have something to say? Hearing none. Again, any questions or comments from senators? Hearing none. So we will move on to the Provost report.

Provost Bjorkman: Good afternoon, everyone. I hope you're enjoying the sunshine and the little bit of warmer weather of late. The piles of snow are almost gone. I don't know about you, but to me it feels like spring is just kind of around the corner, I hope. A little sunshine and fresh air is good for our mental health. And that reminds me that you should have all received an email notice last week about a special "Wellness" webinar that will be held tomorrow for faculty. Our MAC fellows, who are also faculty members, have been working with the Office of the Provost to develop a webinar tomorrow to discuss faculty self-care during the pandemic. There will be a presentation by Vicki Riddick from the University's Office of Employee Wellness on the resources available to UT faculty. Presentation also by Dr. Deborah Hendricks, who is the Director of the University's Pre-Health Advising Center and also a mindfulness coach. She will be talking about ways to deal with stress during the pandemic. I know how hard you've all been working to support our students' wellbeing during the pandemic, and our MAC fellows really thought it was important to provide some self-care support for our faculty as well – and I applaud them for that. I hope you will be able to participate. It is tomorrow from noon to 1 p.m. on WebEx – and if you don't have it, there is a link to the webinar on the Provost Office website. I want to thank our MAC fellows for organizing this event.

On another note, just a reminder that midterm grade reporting is currently open; it opened last week and it will close on Sunday, March 14th. And as you know, these reports are an important part of our student success initiatives and play an important role in improving the retention and graduation rates for our students and allow us to identify students who may be at risk and intervene to provide assistance while we still can. I appreciate the high level of participation and I hope that will continue to increase our reporting rate even this semester. I also wanted to provide you with feedback today on the great outcomes from Starfish early alert reporting for this spring. This semester we had an all-time high with a reporting rate of 78% across all of our undergraduate course sections. This is the highest reporting rate we've experienced to date at UToledo. I really want to express my appreciation to the faculty for completing these early alert reports. They have a significant impact on the success of our students. In fact, early alerts this semester impacted 94% of our enrolled undergraduate student population. So our success coaches, advisors and other staff are very busy right now working to connect with those students to provide them with various kinds of resources and support.

One other announcement I want to make. I am excited to announce that we have our speaker for the spring commencement on May 8th. We'll be hearing from one of our very successful and entrepreneurial alumni, Ms. Irma Olguin., who graduated from the College of Engineering in 2004 with a bachelor's degree in computer science in engineering. She was the first in her family to go to college. She grew up in the Central Valley of California in Fresno as the daughter of farm laborers, and says she never would have expected that college would be a part of her story. But that was before she got on a Greyhound bus and came all the way across the country to the University of Toledo to begin her studies. Fast forward to today, and she is now the Chief Executive of Bitwise Industries – a Fresno-based tech company that she decided to build in order to provide technology training to people in so-called "underdog cities" who would normally not have such an opportunity – including women and minorities. Bitwise serves a diverse and underrepresented population in the Fresno region through a coding academy, a business incubator, software development, and a service that matches programmers and engineers with local businesses that need tech support. Her goal is to develop a diverse and inclusive workforce in the technology industry and increase the number of women and minorities who have the opportunity to receive technology training. Last year she was featured in Forbes magazine, and by June of 2020, her company had secured \$27M dollars in venture funding and trained 4,500 workers to code. Irma and her

business partner want to replicate this model in other “underdog” cities across the country. It was recently announced, you may have heard it on the news, that the next site for Bitwise will be right here in the city of Toledo. This is according to a recent article in the Atlantic and also an announcement by Mayor Wade Kapszukiewicz. Bitwise is planning to open a site in downtown Toledo at the old main post office building. This will be an exciting new venture and initiative for our community. I have no doubt that Irma Olguin will be an inspirational commencement speaker for our graduates and their families, and I look forward to her message to the entire UToledo community.

That concludes my report. Thank you. I’ll be happy to answer any questions you may have.

Senator Lawrence: I have a question for one of my instructors. They look at their fall schedule - and we have set the course cap at 40 – she was assigned in a room in Rocket Hall that under the current COVID restrictions, only seats 26. So we are curious as to, is there a mechanism there? We can request a fix, but are we missing some kind of process in why that would have happened?

Provost Bjorkman: I would say you probably should circle back with the registrar and inquire about that. We have tried to be intentional about making sure that we were meeting the caps and allowing for social distancing. So it might have just simply been a mistake, but please do circle back with them, or you can also check with Amy Thompson if you have questions about that. We should be able to circle back with you and find an answer for you.

Senator Lawrence: I have a question for one of my instructors. They look at their fall schedule - and we have set the course cap at 40 – she was assigned in a room in Rocket Hall that under the current COVID restrictions, only seats 26. So we are curious as to, is there a mechanism there? We can request a fix, but are we missing some kind of process in why that would have happened?

Provost Bjorkman: I would say you probably should circle back with the registrar and inquire about that. We have tried to be intentional about making sure that we were meeting the magic course caps for the social distancing. So it might have just simply been a mistake, but please do circle back with them, or you can also check with Amy Thompson if you have questions about that. We should be able to circle back with you and find an answer for you.

Senator Lawrence: That is fine. I will check with the Registrar’s Office. Thank you.

Provost Bjorkman: Thanks, Senator Lawrence.

President Brakel: Any additional questions for the Provost? Hearing none. We thank you, Provost Bjorkman. We appreciate it.

Provost Bjorkman: Thank you.

President Brakel: That brings us to the Curriculum Committee report [from] Senator Edgington.

Senator Edgington: Thank you very much, President Brakel. President-Elect Bigioni, I’ll share our Excel sheet. See this. For today we have two new course proposals and modifications that we are bringing to you, and these all have been approved through our committee. Our course proposals, just for some context – these are both new courses that will be part of a certificate in CIM that is being taught through the College of Business. We actually looked at that certificate program at our meeting and approved it, contingent on these two courses being approved. So in approving these two courses we are also approving the certificate program.

Our first course proposal is **BLAW 4900, Cannabis Law**. “This online seminar on Cannabis, which addresses both Marijuana and Hemp, provides a practical guide for managers in navigating laws and regulations related to Cannabis use, distribution and sale; the Legal Environment in which the Cannabis industry and Cannabis businesses operate as well as the ethics supporting the legalization of Cannabis in the United States and states.”

The second course proposal is **EFSB 4900, Cannabis Entrepreneurship**. “EFSB 4900/6900 is an entrepreneurship course with a core focus on business verticals in the cannabis industry. The course will cover a substantial body of knowledge, concepts and tools that entrepreneurs need to know prior to and while starting their new ventures.”

Next are the course modifications---

President Brakel: Senator Edgington, let’s vote on those two first before we go on to course modifications.

Senator Edgington: Okay, that is fine. So these are our two new course proposals. Are there any questions?

Senator Heberle: I was just wondering if there were some explanation for the very specific topic area of the classes. It sounds more like sort of workshops than courses. Can we just hear a little bit more about how these courses will be warranting three (3) credits and all that stuff with that specific kind of approach topic from anybody that might be here representing the department?

Senator Edgington: If there is anybody online that involve medicine and is involved with this program?

Senator Heberle: Or anybody that might know.

Senator Edgington: They have some explanation that they provide here, but I don’t know if that would help, Senator Heberle or not. If there is anybody out there that can speak to this, please do so.

Senator Insch: I can talk about this a little bit. So one of the areas that is pretty much a growing area in the business area that is somewhat unique is the whole area of cannabis, cannabis industry. So one of our certificates that we’ve developed is a certificate in cannabis management and that is going into a program. I think you’ve talked about that, but that is one of the things you’re looking at that is already past that certificate – now we are just doing the coursework for it. The emphasis is there’s actually quite a bit of literature and law related to the cannabis industry itself and there are students out there who are interested in getting some specialization in the cannabis industry. So these are two pieces of that, one covering the law aspect and then one covering more entrepreneurial aspect of the cannabis industry. Down the road I believe there is some desires to actually expand this into a broader certificate that may include some courses in the Pharmacy School and some other places as well. But this is a fairly large growing area. It is kind of a hot topic. It is an area where we think we can kind of build a new program in and have some enrollment enhancement by it.

Senator Edgington: Thank you, Senator Insch. Any other questions?

President Brakel: Just call the question.

Senator Edgington: So hearing no more discussion, please put ‘yes’ in the chat box if you approve these courses, ‘no’ if you do not approve, and ‘a’ for abstain.

President Brakel: And that has been approved. *Courses Approved.* Please go on to course modifications.

Senator Edgington: Course modifications: a few points here from the art program. These all have the same kind of...with it, and so I will say the first one and then I'll breeze through the other ones here.

ART 3200, Sculpture. One of the changes is to the course title. So now it will be called Sculp: Topics. "New Course Title: Sculpture: Topics. Change to long and short title. Course repeatable for up to 18 credits. Modified prereqs (see next column). NOTE: The large number of prereqs was both unnecessary and preventing the timely registration for the class." So, each of these courses are being changed into kind of copies courses.

ART 3210, Ceramics. "New Course title: Ceramics: Topics. Change to long and short title. Change to catalog description. Course repeatable for up to 18 credits. Modified prereqs (see next column.) NOTE: The large number of prereqs was both unnecessary and preventing the timely registration for the class."

ART 3900, NMDP Externship. Again, another "New Course Title: Advanced Graphic Design: Topic. Change to long and short title. Course repeatable for up to 18 credits. Change to catalog description. Addition of prereq: ART 2020."

ART 4010, NM Interactivity. "New Course title: Game Design: Topic. Change to long and short title. Course repeatable up to 18 credits. Change to catalog description. Addition of prereq: ART 3010. NOTE: This course streamlined the pre-req and course title to more accurately reflect content needs."

ART 4210, 3D Concepts. "New Course Title: Advanced Ceramics: Topic. Change to long and short title. Course repeatable up to 18 credits. Change to catalog description. Modified prereqs (see next column). NOTE: The large number of Pre-reqs was unnecessary for success and slowed student progress through their programs of study."

ANTH 3900, North American Archeology. "Removing prereqs from course. NOTE: The change is solely to remove the prerequisites as these seem to be inhibiting students from outside of Anthropology (as well as majors who haven't had a chance to take 2020) from registering for the course. A lecture on methods and history of archaeology in the context of ANTH 3900 will suffice to bring non-majors up to speed for the course content."

THR 3420, Advanced Stage Management. This is a "Change to type of credit (move from Other to Lecture). Change to schedule type (Lecture). NOTE: The course presentation format is a lecture, and we are adjusting the designation to align. We are submitting this course to be changed from a Studio Course to a Lecture Course."

THR 3450, Theatre and Stage Management. "Change to type of credit (move from Other to Lecture). Change to schedule type (Lecture). Removal of prerequisites. NOTE: The course presentation format is a lecture, and we are adjusting the designation to align. We are submitting this course to be changed from a Studio Course to a Lecture Course."

BIOE 4300, Biomedical Quality Control. The "Change to course number: BIOE 2300. Course will no longer be cross-listed at the graduate level. Course will not be repeatable for credit. NOTE: We have modified prerequisites and the level of assessment to offer this course to 2nd year BIOE students instead of 3rd or 4th year students. As such, it is appropriate to change the course number to 2000-level."

NURS 3080, Fundamentals of Nursing and Assessment Across the Lifespan. The change here is “Change to Credit Hours (three credits moved from other to lab). Change to Schedule Type (Lab). Course will not offer out of state educational experiences. NOTE: Needed to offer to students the ability to sign up for a lab when registering.”

Senator Edgington cont’d: Those are 10 course modifications. Is there any discussion on those modifications?

President Brakel: Go ahead and call the question.

Senator Edgington: This time if you approving the modifications, please place ‘yes’ in the chat, ‘no,’ or ‘a’ if you are abstaining.

President Brakel: That has been approved with one ‘abstain.’ *Motion Passed.*

Senator Edgington: Wonderful. Thank you all very much.

President Brakel: Thank you. And now we have the Academic Program Committee report, Senator Lawrence.

Senator Lawrence: Can you see it okay?

President Brakel: Yes.

Senator Lawrence: We have eight (8) proposals that had been reviewed and approved by the committee for Faculty Senate to review and vote on today. One correction: The first one I list as a new program; it is actually a program modification. It was just entered incorrectly in CIM. I will go through each one of these. They’re all pretty simple, pretty basic. But I can entertain any questions after I’ve gone through them.

The first one is in **Theatre Design and Technology, Minor.** It is a program modification. It is not a new minor. What they’ve done here is just change the course requirements, move things around so there are six required credit hours, choosing from three different courses: Theatre 1030, 1040, and 1050. Nine (9) credit hours selected from three theatre courses and then a list of about 12 courses, select two to get six credit hours for a total of 29. So just a revision in the course requirements.

The next one is Theatre for **Stage and Screen Performance, Minor.** This is a correction simply to the catalog display to indicate that it is 21 credit hours required for the minor and a listing of the requirements to be posted correctly in the catalog display. No actual change to the minor itself in terms of requirements.

Women and Gender Studies, **Sexualities Studies, Minor.** This is an adjustment of the required credit hours, 18 hours with 10 hours required and 9 hours elective. It is just a shift in the distribution of those two cracker missed revision.

Similarly, **Women’s and Gender Studies, Minor.** The same deal here. It is a shift in how they are distributing their hours, 21 credit hours with 12 hours required, and 9 hours electives.

The next four are all from the Department of Art. These are all BFA’s degrees. It is the same change in each one of these. Adding a new requirement, ART 1040. Removes what is listed currently as a maximum credit hour for the major. It updated the course list to reflect courses that have been added to the program and removes four hours of electives to get them to 120 hours. Those changes are effective for all four (**Graphic and Interactive Design Concentration, Studio Arts-Photography and Digital Media, Studio Art 3D Studies Concentration, BFA, and Studio Art- 2D Studies Concentration, BFA**) of

Commented [m1]: Note: 10 + 9 does not equal 18 credit hours. Something is not right here.

these Art BA degrees that are here for program modifications. I'll entertain any questions. Hearing none, the committee recommends approval so if you can please enter in the chat 'yes', 'no' or 'abstain' on these proposals. That is our report.

President Brakel: And that has carried. *Motion Passed.* Thank you. Next is Senator Gregory; we have some core curriculum items to address.

Senator Gregory: I'm sorry I don't have these quite as organized as Senator Edgington does, but there are only eight classes. These are courses that are submitted to the core. And just to review, that means they have already been accepted as new courses by all of the various layers, but now they are sort of seeking permission to enter the core curriculum or they are simply modifications.

So the first one is **History 1050, World History to 1500**. This is a course that is already in the core for arts and humanities, but it is proposed for non-US Diversity. We looked at the student learning outcomes and align them with the non-US Diversity outcomes in the catalog. We thought that this would make a very good addition to the core in that sense, so we would recommend it to be included.

The next one is **History 4300, LGBTQ History in America**. This is a new course and it is being proposed to the core for the first time in the US diversity category only. We looked at it carefully and looked at the SLOs and decided that we thought we would recommend it. Maybe two is a good time to stop and ask for questions, quickly. Any questions about those classes? I can't see the chat so somebody let me know if anything is in the chat.

President Brakel: I don't see anything there right now.

Senator Gregory: Thank you. I appreciate that. The next one is **English 1110, College Composition I**. The course is already in the core obviously, but it is with modified prerequisites to accommodate the new test optional option at UToledo. Again, we recommended all of these. And we actually rolled a couple back and asked for tweaks and so these have been vetted very thoroughly.

The next course is **Geography and Planning 2040**, which is World Regional Geography. The course is not new, but it is being proposed to the core for the first time for both core social sciences and also for the non-US Diversity category, and we felt that it met both of those very well. So any questions about College Composition I, the modified prereqs, or the entry of GEPO 2040 into the core for both core social sciences and non-US Diversity?

All right, I am going to move on. The last two courses are **ECON 1155**. This is **Principles of Macro Economics with Data Applications**. This is a new course and it is being proposed to the core for the first time in core social sciences. We voted to recommend it. And then finally **Art 1030, Multi-Cultural Art Appreciation**. This is a course that is already in the core, but there is a proposed modification to the catalog description, and that modification states 'not for major credit in art, or history, or art education.' This is essentially a class that is intended for non-majors. So any questions about ECON 1155 or Art 1030?

Senator Molitor: I just have a quick question about the ECON course. Maybe somebody from either the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee or the ECON Department can answer this. Why did they choose a course number that ended in five (5)? It seems unusual; most of our course numbers end in zero.

Senator Gregory: Do we have anyone here from ECON? That is certainly a question of--- yes? I heard a beep. That is certainly a question that I can take back to them. I mean, it is possible if they do want to

Commented [m2]: Check to see what was actually on Gregory's sheets.

make a change we can probably get that in there before the catalog gets edited. But I do not actually know the answer to that if no one else does.

Senator Molitor: I do not want to stop it from being approved for the Core. I just thought it was kind of unusual.

Senator Gregory: Right.

President Brakel: I recommend Senator Gregory that we vote on all those, except for that ECON class. Let's get an answer to that, okay.

Senator Gregory: Okay. That sounds good. May I echo President Brakel's suggestion that we vote to approve these courses with the exception of the ECON class? Please put 'yes' or 'no' in the chat.

President Brakel: That appears to have carried. Motion Passed. Thank you.

Senator Gregory: Thank you.

President Brakel: At the next Faculty Senate there will be additional curriculum items as well as a report from the Core Curriculum about the assessment of the curriculum. Thank you.

It's been awhile since we've had a report about what is happening with Ohio Faculty Council, and your representative Allyson Day, I've asked her to give a report today. So Senator Day.

Senator Day: Hello. So, my computer connection is a little slow. All fall semester we mostly got together and talked about various COVID response plans and how different universities were dealing with things like teaching evaluations from the spring, who was including them [and] who wasn't. And then more recently we sort of talked about the spring plans for opening, how many people are sort of planning to be mostly online [or] mostly in person. It looks like the 80/20 plan that UT has [is] sort of on the higher end of in person classes, at least in terms of what is being planned right now. And then there is sort of another project emerging with the group that is interesting. The group has been talking about their various boards of trustees, and thinking about what the relationship is between the faculties and their board of trustees. So, what is happening right now is we are sort of doing a fact finding mission to answer some of these questions about what kinds of non-voting memberships..., what the communication strategies are like, and that kind of thing. And then potentially coming up with some sort best practices, in addition to thinking about - every fall there is sort of an onboarding event for new board of trustees' members - how the Ohio Faculty Council can become involved in that as a way to sort of address, I think, what some people experience as sort of a tension between the board of trustees' interest and the faculty interests at various public Ohio universities. So, that's sort of the thing that is on top right now, and that is kind of all I have to report about. Does anyone have potential questions?

President Brakel: Any questions for Senator Day? All right hearing none. President-Elect Bigioni, if we can move to the Dean's survey aspect. If you could put the copy of the survey up, please.

All right, we've mentioned before that this spring is a time where we need to conduct the Deans' surveys, and because we've had a number of newer senators since this was last presented in Senate, I just wanted to do this more as an informational aspect here because the survey itself is already approved by Senate previously. This will be done in April, a date to be announced here. In this particular survey there is really a chance for a Likert scale on different areas that are kind of within the domain of the deans. It is important for senators and faculty to remember that this is only one component of input of information to the provost and to the president regarding the dean's performance. Keep in mind that the president and the provost also establish goals and have things that they have set forth for the deans as well. But this gives

the opportunity for faculty to voice some feedback to the dean for the process of improvement. It is important that we remember that we need to do this as a professional document and make sure that we treat it as such. A couple of cycles ago there were some comments that were of a very unprofessional nature, and we want to make sure that we avoid that in all of these. For each of the areas you will notice that we have a Likert scale ranging from 'I don't have enough information to evaluate this,' all the way up to 'far exceeds expectations.'

[President-Elect Bigioni] scroll down just a little bit so we can see **Area 1**. So you can see here we have issue dealing with the academic integrity and we are looking at: Do they nurture this commitment to high standards? Are they demonstrating commitment to academic freedom? Are they demonstrating collaboration within and between colleges? And then you rank the dean on these different categories. Then as we get down toward the bottom of that area, there will be a box that says, 'in my opinion.' Remember, these are your opinions. They should be of a professional nature. They should not be any name calling or references to other people. We are looking at the performance of the dean, and thus our comments should be of a professional nature in that box.

Let's move on to **Area 2**. So here we have the aspect of leadership and accountability. You can see that again, we are going to have a Likert statement here and you'll rank the deans on these different items here: Leads by example. Demonstrating fairness, respect for all people, and personal accountability. Demonstrates an environment, a fair and clear accountability for the actions and behaviors of those in the college. The deans' decisions are demonstrably free of favoritism and bias. The dean consults all relevant parties before proposing their resolution for a dispute. The dean has a record of prudent, judicious and timely decisions. The dean regularly consults faculty for evaluation of department chairs and associate deans and regulate chairs and request information from the college shared governance body. So we are again rating the dean on these different categories on that Likert scale. And once again, there is another box, 'in my opinion.' And again, any ideas for improvement, or what the dean has been doing very well should go into that box.

Area 3. This deals with undergraduate students' success. You can see that the expectations of the dean in this area include: The dean uses college resources and personnel in continuing efforts to increase retention rates, timely graduation, and academic success of students in each academic program. The dean engages faculty in review of admission requirements where relevant. The dean actively and demonstrably supports and recognizes faculty in their efforts and commitment to student success. The dean works with faculty members in the college council to strengthen curricular activities for undergraduate and graduate studies in order to enhance the quality of their UT experience. And again, Likert scale rated on these categories. Then another box of 'in my opinion' and you state what the dean is doing well and what you think can be improved.

Area 4. deals with graduate and professional student success. We know that we have colleges that have many graduate programs and so here we are addressing that: The dean uses college resources and personnel in continuing efforts to increase retention rates, timely graduation and academic success of students in each academic program. The dean engages faculty and review of admission requirements where irrelevant, supports, recognizes faculty in their efforts and commitment to student success. Will work with the graduate college to ensure offers of financial aid are made to students in a timely manner. Please keep in mind that the dean has some control over that, and also the graduate college may or may not have that information and they may not be to provide that information. But hopefully that information is being communicated out when that does occur. And again, a text box 'in my opinion' [is there] to state the things the dean is doing well and your suggestions for improvement.

Area 5. deals with faculty success. The dean provides insight, motivation to faculty members as they build, strengthen, and refine their teaching research scholarship, or creative activity and service. The dean oversees the mentorship of faculty members through the tenure and promotion processes, especially with helping faculty members reach the rank of full professor. The dean engages associate deans and department chairs as effective mentors for both lecturers and tenure track faculty. The dean oversees the professional development of lecturers to promote excellence and career success. The dean takes steps to work with all faculty members so they understand the decision making processes at the department, college, and university levels. So again, you would rank where you feel like the dean might be at in those categories. You may not have the knowledge for example, how the dean is engaging associate deans and department chairs as the mentors. And that is where you would indicate, for example, 'N/A,' you do not have enough information to evaluate that area. At the bottom again, there will be a box, 'in my opinion' and you state things that you think the dean is doing well and/or comments for improvement.

Area 6. Sustainability of academic programs. Here, the dean is ensuring the sustainability and fiscal health of [the] college programs, including undergraduate, graduate, professional service and research programs. The dean ensures effective fiscal management for the recruitment of students, promotion of programs, and enrollment growth. The dean makes all resource allocations fair and transparent by actively engaging shared governance bodies as issues arise. The dean makes every effort to ensure that faculty members fully understand the college and university's budgetary conditions, the decision making process, the allocation of available resources, and the ways in which decisions support the missions of the college and the University. These are all again on Likert scales, and once again, you can put 'in my opinion' and site relevant examples of evidence that supports your belief.

Area 7. deals with academic excellence and innovation. The expectation here is that the dean nurtures the development of innovative academic programs, courses and instructional activities, which enhance the academic environment. The dean's dedication to excellence and innovation in academic programs is demonstrated by his or her willingness to devote college resources and to appropriately adjust workload in order to secure excellent and innovative academic programs. The dean engages associate deans, chairs, program directors in promoting the academic excellence and innovation described above. And so again, you do those on the Likert scale and then in the box of 'in my opinion,' you would site your examples and what the dean is doing well and your suggestions for improvement.

Area 8. deals with research scholarship and creative activities. The dean is demonstrating commitment to improving the colleges' research scholarly, creative activities. The dean empowers faculty and staff to increase their efforts toward successful research and creative activities by supporting, rewarding, and incentivizing such activities. The dean engages department chairs to mentor faculty in their research scholarship and creative activities. Again, in the box you would provide any evidence supporting your position, as well as what the dean is doing well and suggestions for improvement.

Area 9. is diversity and inclusion. The expectations here are: The dean oversees the implementation of strategies that create and support a diverse and inclusive culture throughout the college, including recruitment, retention of a diverse mix of faculty, staff, and students representing multiple points of view. The dean fosters a supportive culture that yields intellectually stronger and more diverse thought – an analysis along our faculty and students. Those areas would be again rated on a Likert scale, and then you would put your supporting evidence 'in my opinion' in the box there related to this topic.

Area 10. deals with recruitment and retention of faculty and staff, and that the dean respects the faculty expertise regarding programmatic and professional needs. The dean respects the faculty expertise regarding the need for staff. The dean promotes the college to prospective recruits and devotes monetary

and non-monetary resources efficient within the resource constraints of the college to hire high quality, diverse faculty and staff. The dean devotes both monetary and non-monetary resources to retain high quality faculty and staff members. Those items again would be on a Likert scale, and then ‘in my opinion’ you would support your evidence there of what the dean is doing well and what they might improve upon.

Area 11. deals with external relations that the dean is successful in promoting the national and international reputation of the colleges’ faculty members, academic programs, research centers, and the placement of our undergraduate and graduate students. A high priority of the dean is to mentor and assist department chairs and program directors in the collection and dissemination [of] relevant and accurate data which serve to promote the reputation of faculty members, academic programs in the universities such as grants, publications, disciplinary rankings and other professional achievements. The dean forges very productive relationships with external stakeholders to advance the missions of the college and university. And the dean is successful in securing donor gifts in support of the college while donors are offered targeted giving. The dean has the responsibility to seek donor gifts for all programs. And again, you would rank that on the Likert scale and if you don’t have enough information, again, you would put “I don’t have enough information.” Then you have your box again about the areas you believe can be enhanced or what is being done well.

And then **Area 12.** is just where we can have some overall comments here about the administrative performance of the dean. Now, it is going to be important that when this is completed that we keep in mind that we have been operating in a COVID environment within the past year; and thus, has caused a lot of constraints that the dean have had to deal with. We must keep that in mind as we are moving forward on completing this particular survey. Once this is actually done and completed, these responses are done anonymously and then compiled. Once they are compiled then we will use the same process that we had voted on a couple of years ago, that the results will be placed behind a firewall, a password protected firewall, so that the faculty of that college only would be able to see the results of the dean. This was a decision that was decided upon by Faculty Senate a couple of years ago, and we will continue to follow that same process. Please keep in mind that anything that is stated on these can be used by the provost as they are doing the evaluation. Again, everything needs to be of a professional nature.

I’m trying to also watch what is happening here in the chat, and I see a couple that have come in. --- Senator Jayatissa, your question was, did the committee receive any feedback concerns from the deans about evaluation instruments after the first cycle of the evaluation? The feedback that we got at that time was very positive on how this process played out last time. The comments were of a professional nature. There were no attacks; there was some very good feedback with regard to that. So that process went well with regard to that, and thus we didn’t feel like there was a need to modify the instrument. --- Senator Niamat asks, when was this survey last updated? That was last updated almost three years ago now when Linda Rouillard was president of the Faculty Senate. There is a comment to everyone here regarding it could public. It is not supposed to be, but it could be. And that is correct. That is one reason why we are putting it behind the firewall so it is not public information. But at any time, anything that is like that, even our evaluations could be evaluated, or... I should say. --- I thought I saw something from Senator Coulter-Harris. Senator Coulter-Harris, you are asking what would constitute unprofessional comments or an attack? Can I be more specific? I would say anything that could be construed as name calling, that might be derogatory in its nature. I see somebody’s put in comments of an overly personal nature. You know, it is not necessarily relevant to the job. We want to make sure that it is dealing with the actual topic at hand in terms of these different areas. I don’t want to get in some of the specific comments that were made in some previous evaluation years. When we last did it the comments were professional in nature, and we should be able to maintain that this year. All right, I think I missed somebody. I believe it was

Commented [m3]: Cannot understand what was said here

Senator Lawrence, if I recall right. You asked who all is being evaluated? That is all deans who have been in their position, at least, a minimum of two years. So that is really everybody on campus, except for Health and Human Services, because he just began this past fall. And so that is really it. Did I miss any questions in the comments? Are there any questions or comments that senators would like to unmute and ask?

Senator Lawrence: Timeline.

President Brakel: Yes?

Senator Lawrence: What is the schedule moving forward on this timeline?

President Brakel: We are coordinating that. All surveys that are being sent out to faculty are coordinated through, I can't remember the office name right now, and IT as well. I'll have more specific information hopefully on Thursday, that is our next meeting with them. We are hoping that it is going to be early April.

El-Zawahry: I have a small question. Who puts the survey question? Is it something national or is it something just unique to the University of Toledo?

President Brakel: There was a committee that worked on this, going back when Amy Thompson was president. So the committee looked at lots of different surveys from other institutions and actual literature dealing with dean evaluations and came up with this document that was presented to Faculty Senate and approved by Faculty Senate.

Senator El-Zawahry: I have one other question. Are the deans supposed to meet with the faculty to respond to these survey questions, or this is not expected?

President Brakel: It is not expected. If the deans want to do that, that is their prerogative, but it is not expected.

Senator El-Zawahry: May I ask, why not? Shouldn't they be kind of accountable in front of the faculty, or at least we know as faculty that the deans are reading those surveys, responding to them, or acknowledging them?

President Brakel: Okay, let me say it this way. The dean obviously will get a report of the results of that. The reason why Senate voted for it to be behind a lockbox aspect, is that the senators believed that the faculty of that college should know what the results are and be able to talk about that in various meetings that they might have moving forward.

Senator Heberle: I was going to respond in a slightly different way. I think that is right President Brakel, and I also think that I agree, it would be a good sign if a dean did call a faculty meeting in response, or do something to let people know that they heard us, that they heard the responses, etc. I think that would be a good thing, but I don't think that we can, at least not at this late date, require it in this round. But, it might be a subject for discussion at a later Senate meeting as to encourage deans to let faculty know how they are reading these, what their interpretation is of their evaluations. I don't see anything wrong with that idea. I just think it is certainly not something that we can require at this point in this round, but it is certainly something worth thinking about. I don't know if it is a 'good' idea actually, but worth thinking about.

Faculty, Kristina Reuille (from the College of Nursing): I just wanted to say that I agree with Senator Heberle's comments. I understand the idea of the dean responding to these comments being a positive

thing when there are ad hominem and difficult items, personal attacks, and things being brought to bear in these evaluations. I agree that number one, it makes the faculty look bad and number two, I also think that it would make it very difficult for the dean to respond to the other comments in the evaluation without addressing the ad hominem and things like that. And my third comment would simply be that while the dean is our supervisor, the dean also reports to the provost and the provost is the supervisor of the dean, such that we should expect the provost to manage that sort of issue or we should expect the provost to be dealing with the comments of the faculty and then the dean at some point could respond if they chose to. But I can understand why if there were ad hominem and personal attacks being made in a dean's evaluation, that would be very difficult for the dean to address other salient parts of an evaluation that would offer constructive feedback when there are these other issues being thrown in that are not germane to the actual job performance of the dean, necessarily.

President Brakel: Thank you.

President-Elect Bigioni: I would like to add a perspective to that too. In directly addressing the first question, the original question, the comment was made of accountability and of course, the deans are not accountable to us. Right? So, this is not a tool of accountability. It is an information tool. It is a communication tool. I would draw an analogy with the student evaluations that we get when we teach our classes. It is just feedback so that people know how they are doing and can adjust.

Senator El-Zawahry: I agree with you, but it is a form of responsibility. I think like, whenever we hear student's comments, we try to change. We come back to the students and let them know we are changing, or try to respond to their situations. So whenever I am thinking about the dean, who is the supervisor and I know that they are responding to some of the issues that are raised by the faculty, especially if there is something that is common by the faculty, then I know at least that I am heard. But if I am sitting down and doing surveys and I know it is going to nowhere, I may not participate.

President Brakel: I would anticipate that you will probably see deans in your respective college councils make some comments about the surveys. That would be the vehicle where that would occur as well as other personal interactions that you would just hopefully notice.

Senator El-Zawahry: Our dean actually in the College of Medicine, he actually sat down and had a faculty meeting and he had addressed some of the issues in the comments in the survey about two years ago. I think it was very appreciated by us. This is why I would love to see that in other faculty as well.

President Brakel: Right. My guess is we probably did see that from a lot of the deans across the colleges. Of course, there's been some turnover in some of the deanships since then as well. There was a question here about are interim deans evaluated, Robert Steven mentioned that. That is yes, an interim dean is evaluated if they have been in their position a minimum of two years. Because we know that interim deans sometime move beyond that. --- Professor Gilstrap you asked, what is the historical response rate? I could get you that data, but I don't have that data right now.

Senator Coulter-Harris: President Brakel, can I make a statement, please?

President Brakel: Sure.

Senator Coulter-Harris: I just wanted to clarify why I typed that question so that people don't think I am unschooled in ad hominem attacks, because I teach those techniques. I was really more thinking about how far does objective criticism go in these opinion statements? You know, absolutely no personal attacks. I mean, I am fully aware of that, but you know, are people, our faculty, [are they] allowed to

criticize (of course we are) and then how far then? That is what I was thinking is how far can this criticism go? So I just wanted to clarify that. Thank you.

President Brakel: As long as you are giving constructive feedback, I don't see a problem. Again, when it crosses the line, it becomes more of an attack or demoralizing; you know, in that category, that is probably inappropriate. --- Senator Jayatissa asks, can we ask the provost to provide us with the kind of steps were taken to address the finding of the dean evaluations? I really think that, that, in my opinion, is really between the provost and the deans themselves as to what those are. Again, this is only one piece of the puzzle in terms of the evaluation process, and there are more components that are also part of the evaluation process. If you think about it for a moment, if the shoe was on the other foot, students were saying what kinds of steps (asking our department chair) did they take, you may not like that as well. Other questions?

Senator Heberle: I just want to encourage everyone to encourage their constituents to fill out the surveys. Tell them that we've discussed this extensively in Senate; it's been a long hard push to get this done, just to have it done at all, if I remember it in Senate a few years ago before we started doing this. And so it is really something that faculty should take advantage of to have one little piece of their perspective seen.

President Brakel: Right. And that is the one of the reasons why we are reviewing this today, is to begin to get our mindset around this. As we get to move forward, that as you have your college meetings, as you have your department meetings that you begin to alert faculty about this coming up and begin to help that frame of reference to make sure that the evaluations are of a constructive, positive nature. Any other questions or comments? I don't hear any. I've seen some other comments in the chat---

Senator Gregory: President Brakel.

President Brakel: Did I hear somebody?

Senator Gregory: Yes. It was me, Melissa Gregory. If I may interrupt? I was waiting for the questions about the survey to conclude. I have an answer on that course that we decided to put off to next meeting, which we can go ahead and put it off. If we wanted to get it done today, I actually have a response if it fits in the agenda.

President Brakel: I guess I can take that from 'items from the floor.' Does anybody have an objection for revisiting this issue? Hearing none. Go ahead, Senator Gregory.

Senator Gregory: Thank you. The question was about ECON 1155, Principles of Macro Economics with Data Applications, which is seeking entry into the core for social science. Senator Molitor asked why it had a five at the end when all of our courses ended in zero. I have two answers. One is from the Chair of Economics, Kristen Keith, who said they have a course called ECON 1150, which is kind of a theory course and what they want is 1155 that integrates data applications with the theory for the entire course. So this is a course where students use actual macro-economic data and they think it would be more suited to the data analytics program rather than the current macro-economic requirement. So, that is why they came up with the course. And then meanwhile, I also received a helpful email from Cathy Zimmer that said she confirmed with the Registrar's Office that they are now allowing course numbers to end in five or zero so that the catalog can offer a sequencing of numbers. So I was wondering with that explanation, if that was sufficient and if we might vote to approve ECON 1155, Principles of Macro Economics with Data Applications for core social sciences. Should this be a "yes or no" in the chat?

President Brakel: Yes.

Senator Gregory: Okay. Yes, or no in the chat, please.

President Brakel: It looks like that motion has passed. *Motion Passed.* Thank you.

Senator Gregory: Thank you.

President Brakel: All right, that brings us to 'items from the floor.' I do have one item that I need to put out there for everyone. This is from Vice President William McKether, Vice President of Diversity. He is putting together two ad hoc committees and he would like to have some representation from Faculty Senate to serve on those. The first committee is a diversity survey committee, and that is to assist in putting together an April 2021 diversity survey. Then the second committee is a diversity education committee, which is to assist in the thinking through diversity education training initiatives. So, if there is a senator or other faculty member that you would like to suggest, please send me their name or your name and I will forward that to Dr. McKether. Are there other items from the floor? Senator Jayatissa, I see in the box that you've asked, can we revisit and address teaching professor evaluation student process? You are proposing this because you started the online evaluation in fall 2019, and the process may need improvement regarding faculty experience in [the] past few semesters. We did not have any discussion about new evaluation tool since it was first implemented. I'll (President Brakel) touch base with Vice Provost Amy Thompson and we can talk about that, unless Amy, you want to say something right now.

Vice Provost Amy Thompson: Yeah. I'm happy to have that conversation. I think that the big issue is that COVID happened kind of in the middle of this. Right? So, if you remember, we really hadn't been using the 12 University questions because we went to using four questions for the bulk of the time during the pandemic. So [again] we really haven't been using the 12 core questions. One thing that we have been using obviously is campus labs and that is something we are actually going to be pivoting away from and moving forward Qualtrics. So that is going to be one thing that we are going to be working towards as well. We are going to be working at kind of learning the system and using it for survey and evaluation purposes. I appreciate your comment, but we really haven't had a chance to fully implement those questions as we've been kind of in a strange place with the COVID epidemic.

President Brakel: Thank you. Any other items from the floor? As I mentioned before, originally I had planned to have the Constitution second reading begin here during this meeting, but we have to delay that. So I don't have any additional items to present to Senate today. So hearing no more items from the floor, I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

Senator Lee: So moved.

Senator Zietlow: Second.

President Brakel: Please put 'yes' in the chat. Thank you, everyone. We stand adjourned. Meeting adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

IV. Meeting adjourned at 5:25 P.M.

Respectfully submitted: Kimberly Nigem
Faculty Senate Office Administrative Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary